AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

111TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
111–491

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 5136

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 21, 2010.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

111TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
111–491

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 5136

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 21, 2010.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

56–423 WASHINGTON : 2010

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
GLENN NYE, Virginia
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
FRANK M. KRATOVIL, JR., Maryland
BOBBY BRIGHT, Alabama
SCOTT MURPHY, New York
WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York
JOHN GARAMENDI, California
LEONARD BOSWELL, Iowa
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN C. FLEMING, Louisiana
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania

PAUL ARCANGELI, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	1
Purpose of the Legislation	2
Relationship of Discretionary Authorization to Appropriations	2
Summary of Authorizations in the Bill	2
Summary Table of Authorizations	4
Budget Authority Implication	14
Rationale for the Committee Bill	18
Hearings	21
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	21
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	21
OVERVIEW	21
Aircraft Procurement, Army	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	27
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team unmanned aerial vehicles	27
Missile Procurement, Army	27
Overview	27
Items of Special Interest	30
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team non-line-of-sight launch system	30
Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System	30
Javelin Block 1 command launch unit requirements	30
Patriot Advanced Capability-3 Modifications	30
Stinger missile service life enhancement program	31
Surface launched advanced medium range air-to-air missile system	31
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	31
Overview	31
Items of Special Interest	36
Modular handgun system	36
Paladin Integrated Management program	36
Stryker vehicles	36
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	37
Overview	37
Items of Special Interest	41
Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative	41
MK281 target practice rounds	41
Other Procurement, Army	41
Overview	41
Items of Special Interest	52
Defense Advanced GPS Receivers	52
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team network integration kits	52
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team small unmanned ground vehicles	53
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team training/logistics/management	53
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team unattended ground sensors	53
Ground Soldier System acquisition strategy	54
High mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles	54
High-resolution three dimensional topographic data	55
Intelligent Munitions System remote control units	55
Joint Tactical Radio System hand-held radios	55
Non-system training device program	56
Warfighter Information Network–Tactical Increment 2	56
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	57

Page
Overview ... 57
Items of Special Interest ... 59
Joint counter remote control improvised explosive device electronic warfare ... 59
Aircraft Procurement, Navy ... 59
Overview ... 59
Items of Special Interest ... 65
Department of Navy tactical aircraft inventory ... 65
UH–1Y/AH–1Z rotorcraft upgrade program ... 66
Weapons Procurement, Navy ... 66
Overview ... 66
Items of Special Interest ... 69
Littoral Combat Ship Module weapons ... 69
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps ... 69
Overview ... 69
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy ... 72
Overview ... 72
Items of Special Interest ... 75
U.S. Navy shipbuilding ... 75
Aircraft carriers ... 75
DDG 51 class destroyer ... 75
DDG 1000 class destroyer ... 76
Littoral Combat Ship ... 76
Maritime Landing Platform ... 77
Ohio-class replacement program ... 77
U.S. shipbuilding industrial base ... 78
Other Procurement, Navy ... 79
Overview ... 79
Procurement, Marine Corps ... 88
Overview ... 88
Items of Special Interest ... 93
Marine Corps communications switching and control systems ... 93
Marine Corps joint tactical radio systems ... 93
Marine Corps M88A2 recovery vehicles ... 93
Marine Corps small unmanned ground vehicles ... 93
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force ... 94
Overview ... 94
Items of Special Interest ... 101
F–35 modifications ... 101
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force ... 101
Overview ... 101
Missile Procurement, Air Force ... 103
Overview ... 103
Items of Special Interest ... 106
Minuteman III Solid Rocket Motor Warm Line ... 106
Other Procurement, Air Force ... 107
Overview ... 107
Procurement, Defense-Wide ... 112
Overview ... 112
Items of Special Interest ... 118
Advance procurement for AN/TPY–2 X-band radars ... 118
Common data link ... 118
Fielding of Aegis ballistic missile defense interceptors ... 119
Lighter-than-air vehicles for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance ... 119
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 120
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 120
Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations ... 120
Subtitle B—Army Programs ... 120
Section 111—Procurement of Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team Increment One Equipment ... 120
Section 112—Report on Army Battlefield Network Plans and Programs 120
Subtitle C—Navy Programs ... 120
Section 121—Incremental Funding for Procurement of Large Naval Vessels ... 120
Section 122—Multiyear Procurement of F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G Aircraft ... 121

Page

Section 123—Report on Naval Force Structure and Missile Defense 121
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 122
Section 131—Preservation and Storage of Unique Tooling for F–22 Fighter Aircraft 122
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters 122
Section 141—Limitation on Procurement of F–35 Lightning II Aircraft . 122
Section 142—Limitations on Biometric Systems Funds 122
Section 143—Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Initiatives Database 123
Section 144—Study on Lightweight Body Armor Solutions 123
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 123
OVERVIEW 123
Army Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 125
Overview 125
Items of Special Interest 136
Abrams tank modernization 136
Biometrics enabled intelligence 136
Bradley Fighting Vehicle modernization 136
Cellulose nanocomposites for Army infrastructure and troop protection 137
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team 137
Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team unattended ground sensors 138
Focus for Minerva research 139
Future Combat Systems system-of-systems engineering and program management 139
Ground Combat Vehicle program 139
Maingate tactical network architecture 141
Medium Extended Air Defense System 141
Military engineering advanced technology 142
Non-line-of-sight launch system 142
Paladin Integrated Management program 142
Self-inerting munitions technology development 143
Social science research capacity 143
Stryker vehicle improvised explosive device mitigation technology 143
Tactical electronic surveillance systems 144
Navy Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 144
Overview 144
Items of Special Interest 157
Composite deckhouse design for DDG 51 flight III class ships 157
Development of hybrid multi-functional composites for submarine structures 157
Expeditionary Fire Support System Precision Extended Range Munition 157
Future integrated nuclear power systems 158
High-Integrity Global Positioning System 158
Marine Corps military fleet simulation computer co-simulation 158
Marine operations, Scripps Institute 159
Marine personnel carrier 159
Navy non-line-of-sight launch system development 159
Navy Unmanned Combat Air System 160
Next Generation Enterprise Network 160
Photonic digital beamforming systems 160
Small diameter bomb increment II 161
Ultra High Frequency Hosted Payloads program 161
VH–(XX) acquisition program and VH–3D/VH–60N legacy fleet sustainment 162
Air Force Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 162
Overview 162
Items of Special Interest 174
Conversion of excess ballistic missiles for space transportation uses ... 174
Cyber Boot Camp 174
Defense applications of commercial satellites 175
Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle common upper stage engine 175
F–35 aircraft 175
Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle and Broad Area Maritime Surveillance system commonality 178
Metals Affordability Initiative 178

Page

National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System . 179
Next-generation military satellite communications technology development ... 180
Non-volatile hardened memory ... 180
Operationally Responsive Space ... 180
Space Based Space Surveillance ... 181
Star tracker technology ... 181
Technology Research and Innovation Outreach for Space ... 181
Defense-Wide Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ... 182
Overview ... 182
Items of Special Interest ... 196
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense and defense against sea-based missile attacks ... 196
Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University ... 196
Counter-ideology programs ... 197
Cognitive computing efforts ... 197
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency ... 198
Digital media study ... 199
Directed energy research programs ... 199
Environmental management information systems ... 200
Environmental Security Technical Certification Program ... 200
Federal Voting Assistance Program ... 201
Ground combat uniform research and development ... 201
Intergovernmental Value Added Network ... 202
Investment review process for human dynamics activities ... 202
Israeli cooperative programs ... 203
K–12 education in computer sciences and mathematics ... 203
Knowledge, Innovation, and Technology Sharing ... 204
Management of defense basic research ... 205
Mechanism to provide funds for defense laboratories ... 206
Missile Defense Agency special programs ... 206
Missile defense command, control, and communications ... 206
Multi-Agency Collaboration Environment ... 207
Over-the-horizon broadcast extension capability ... 207
Regional missile defense plans ... 207
Role of non-lethal weapons ... 208
Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics workforce ... 210
Special Operations Technology Development ... 211
Test Resource Management Center budget certification briefing ... 211
Trusted computing in defense systems ... 211
Unmanned systems manning ... 212
Unmanned system technology development ... 212
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense ... 212
Overview ... 212
Items of Special Interest ... 214
Joint test and evaluation program ... 214
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 214
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 214
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations ... 214
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations ... 214
Section 211—Report Requirements for Replacement Program of the Ohio-Class Ballistic Submarine ... 214
Section 212—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Program ... 215
Section 213—Inclusion in Annual Budget Request and Future-Years Defense Program of Sufficient Amounts for Continued Development and Procurement of Competitive Propulsion System for F–35 Lightning II Aircraft ... 215
Section 214—Separate Program Elements Required for Research and Development of Joint Light Tactical Vehicle ... 215
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs ... 216
Section 221—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Missile Defenses in Europe ... 216
Section 222—Repeal of Prohibition of Certain Contracts by Missile Defense Agency with Foreign Entities ... 216
Section 223—Phased, Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense in Europe . 217

Page
Section 224—Homeland Defense Hedging Policy 217
Section 225—Independent Assessment of the Plan for Defense of the Homeland against the Threat of Ballistic Missiles 218
Section 226—Study on Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities of the United States 218
Section 227—Reports on standard missile system 218
Subtitle D—Reports 218
Section 231—Report on Analysis of Alternatives and Program Requirements for the Ground Combat Vehicle Program 218
Section 232—Cost Benefit Analysis of Future Tank-Fired Munitions 218
Section 233—Annual Comptroller General Report on the VH–(XX) Presidential Helicopter Acquisition Program 219
Section 234—Joint Assessment of the Joint Effects Targeting System 219
Subtitle E—Other Matters 219
Section 241—Escalation of Force Capabilities 219
Section 242—Pilot Program to Include Technology Protection Features During Research and Development of Defense Systems 219
Section 243—Pilot Program on Collaborative Energy Security 219
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 219
OVERVIEW 219
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 247
Budget Request Adjustments 247
Base Operations Support 248
C–130 Force Structure Adjustments 248
Corrosion Control and Prevention 249
Defense Contract Audit Agency General Counsel 249
Environmental Restoration at Formerly Used Defense Sites 250
Execution of Readiness Funding 250
Industrial Base Fund 251
Office of Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analysis 251
Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative 251
Training and Recertification of the Acquisition Workforce 251
Energy Issues 252
Department of Defense Alternative Fuel Use 252
National Security Impacts of Petroleum Refining 252
Workplace and Depot Issues 252
Army Cooperative Arrangements 252
Contractor Support to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization 253
Submarine Maintenance Workload 253
Use of Temporary Shipyard Workforce for Nuclear Maintenance 254
Readiness Issues 254
Air Force's Ability to Train on Core Mission Competencies 254
Analysis of the Use of Commercial F–5 Aggressor Aircraft for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps Pilot Training 255
Availability of Full-Time Trainers in the Army 256
Aviation Assets for National Guard 257
Completion of Annual Training Requirements for Army and Marine Corps 257
Criticality of Pre-Deployment Language Training 258
F–35 Lightning II Aircraft and National Guard 259
Language, Cultural Awareness, and Regional Expertise 259
Review of Army and Marine Corps Readiness Reporting 259
Ship Maintenance Industrial Base Support 260
Ship Material Readiness 261
Simulation Training for F–35 Joint Strike Fighter 262
Surface Ship Life Cycle Management 263
Training for Global Ballistic Missile Defense 263
Other Matters 264
Air Force Food Transformation Initiative 264
Army Post Laundry Facilities 265
Army Reporting Requirements 266
Human Terrain System 266
National Guard Support for Charitable Organizations 266
Notification of Use of Authority to Expedite Background Investigations 267
Operation and Support Costs for Non-Standard Items of Equipment 267

Page

Private Security Guards Functions to Be Performed by Civilian Employees 267
Sale of Arsenal Products outside the Department of Defense 268
Security Clearance Reform 268
Supply Chain Management 269
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 269
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 269
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 269
Subtitle B—Energy and Environmental Provisions 270
Section 311—Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minnesota 270
Section 312—Payment to Environmental Protection Agency of Stipulated Penalties in Connection with Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine 270
Section 313—Testing and Certification Plan for Operational Use of an Aviation Biofuel Derived from Materials That Do Not Compete with Food Stocks 270
Section 314—Report Identifying Hybrid or Electric Propulsion Systems and Other Fuel-Saving Technologies for Incorporation into Tactical Motor Vehicles 270
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues 270
Section 321—Technical Amendments to Requirement for Service Contract Inventory 270
Section 322—Repeal of Conditions on Expansion of Functions Performed under Prime Vendor Contracts for Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair 271
Section 323—Pilot Program on Best Value for Contracts for Private Security Functions 271
Section 324—Standards and Certification for Private Security Contractors 272
Section 325—Prohibition on Establishing Goals or Quotas for Conversion of Functions to Performance by Department of Defense Civilian Employees 272
Subtitle D—Reports 272
Section 331—Revision to Reporting Requirement Relating to Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums 272
Section 332—Additional Reporting Requirements Relating to Corrosion Prevention Projects and Activities 272
Section 333—Modification and Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements 273
Section 334—Report on Air Sovereignty Alert Mission 273
Section 335—Report on the SEAD/DEAD Mission Requirements for the Air Force 273
Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority 274
Section 341—Permanent Authority to Accept and Use Landing Fees Charged for Use of Domestic Military Airfields by Civil Aircraft 274
Section 342—Improvement and Extension of Arsenal Support Program Initiative 274
Section 343—Extension of Authority to Reimburse Expenses for Certain Navy Mess Operations 274
Section 344—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Army Human Terrain System 275
Section 345—Limitation on Obligation of Funds Pending Submission of Classified Justification Material 275
Section 346—Limitation on Retirement of C–130 Aircraft from Air Force Inventory 275
Section 347—Commercial Sale of Small Arms Ammunition in Excess of Military Requirements 275
Section 348—Limitation on Air Force Fiscal Year 2011 Force Structure Announcement Implementation. 275
Subtitle F—Other Matters 276
Section 351—Expedited Processing of Background Investigations for Certain Individuals 276
Section 352—Adoption of Military Working Dogs by Family Members of Deceased or Seriously Wounded Members of the Armed Forces who Were Handlers of the Dogs 276

Page

Section 353—Revision to Authorities Relating to Transportation of Civilian Passengers and Commercial Cargoes by Department of Defense when Space Unavailable on Commercial Lines 276
Section 354—Technical Correction to Obsolete Reference Relating to Use of Flexible Hiring Authority to Facilitate Performance of Certain Department of Defense Functions by Civilian Employees 277
Section 355—Inventory and Study of Budget Modeling and Simulation Tools 277
Section 356—Sense of Congress regarding Continued Importance of High-Altitude Aviation Training Site, Colorado 277
Section 357—Department of Defense Study on Simulated Tactical Flight Training in a Sustained G Environment 277
Section 358—Study of Effects of New Construction of Obstructions on Military Installations and Operations 277

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 278
OVERVIEW 278
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 278
Subtitle A—Active Forces 278
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 278
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels 278
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 279
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 279
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 279
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 279
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2011 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians 280
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to Be on Active Duty for Operational Support 281
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 281
Section 421—Military Personnel 281

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 283
OVERVIEW 283
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 283
Army Freedom Team Salute Program 283
Award of Prisoner-of-War Medal to Service Members Held at Wauwilermoos, Switzerland 284
Committee's Concerns with the DOD Report on Child Custody and Database to Track the Number of Cases Involving Child Custody Disputes of Members of the Armed Forces 284
Fit, but Unsuitable Separations 285
Military Leave for Training 285
Report on Medal of Honor Award Process 286
Retention of Military Technicians who Lose Dual Status in the Selected Reserve due to Combat-Related Disability 286
Review of Hispanic American Service Cross Recipients from World War I 287
Review of the House Committee on Armed Services Report on Professional Military Education 287
Transferability of Individualized Education Programs 288
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 288
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally 288
Section 501—Age for Health Care Professional Appointments and Mandatory Retirements 288
Section 502—Authority for Appointment of Warrant Officers in the Grade of W–1 by Commission and Standardization of Warrant Officer Appointing Authority 288
Section 503—Nondisclosure of Information from Discussions, Deliberations, Notes, and Records of Special Selection Boards 288
Section 504—Administrative Removal of Officers from List of Officers Recommended for Promotion 288
Section 505—Eligibility of Officers to Serve on Boards of Inquiry for Separation of Regular Officers for Substandard Performance and Other Reasons 289

Page

Section 506—Temporary Authority to Reduce Minimum Length of Active Service as a Commissioned Officer Required for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer 289
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 289
Section 511—Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Reserve Components 289
Section 512—Military Correction Board Remedies for National Guard Members 289
Section 513—Removal of Statutory Distribution Limits on Navy Reserve Flag Officer Allocation 289
Section 514—Assignment of Air Force Reserve Military Technicians (Dual Status) to Positions outside Air Force Reserve Unit Program 290
Section 515—Temporary Authority for Temporary Employment of Non-Dual Status Military Technicians 290
Section 516—Revised Structure and Functions of Reserve Forces Policy Board 290
Section 517—Merit Systems Protection Board and Judicial Remedies for National Guard Technicians 290
Subtitle C—Joint Qualified Officers and Requirements 291
Section 521—Technical Revisions to Definition of Joint Matters for Purposes of Joint Officer Management 291
Section 522—Changes to the Process Involving Promotion Boards for Joint Qualified Officers and Officers with Joint Staff Experience 291
Subtitle D—General Services Authorities 291
Section 531—Extension of Temporary Authority to Order Retired Members of the Armed Forces to Active Duty in High-Demand, Low-Density Assignments 291
Section 532—Correction of Military Records 292
Section 533—Modification of Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) to Specifically Identify a Space for Inclusion of Email Address 292
Section 534—Recognition of Role of Female Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Review of Military Occupational Specialties Available to Female Members 292
Subtitle E—Military Justice and Legal Matters 292
Section 541—Continuation of Warrant Officers on Active Duty to Complete Disciplinary Action 292
Section 542—Enhanced Authority to Punish Contempt in Military Justice Proceedings 293
Section 543—Limitations on Use in Personnel Action of Information Contained in Criminal Investigative Report or in the Index Maintained for Law Enforcement Retrieval and Analysis 293
Section 544—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents who Are Members of the Armed Forces Deployed in Support of a Contingency Operation 293
Section 545—Improvements to Department of Defense Domestic Violence Programs 293
Section 546—Public Release of Restricted Annex of Department of Defense Report of the Independent Review Related to Fort Hood Pertaining to Oversight of the Alleged Perpetrator of the Attack 293
Subtitle F—Member Education and Training Opportunities and Administration 294
Section 551—Repayment of Education Loan Repayment Benefits 294
Section 552—Active Duty Obligation for Graduates of the Military Service Academies Participating in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program 294
Section 553—Waiver of Maximum Age Limitation on Admission to Service Academies for Certain Enlisted Members who Served during Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom 294
Section 554—Report of Feasibility and Cost of Expanding Enrollment Authority of Community College of the Air Force to Include Additional Members of the Armed Forces 294
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education 295
Section 561—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 295

Page

Section 562—Enrollment of Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces who Reside in Temporary Housing in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools 295
Subtitle H—Decorations, Awards, and Commemorations 295
Section 571—Notification Requirement for Determination Made in Response to Review of Proposal for Award of a Medal of Honor Not Previously Submitted in Timely Fashion 295
Section 572—Department of Defense Recognition of Spouses of Members of the Armed Forces 295
Section 573—Department of Defense Recognition of Children of Members of the Armed Forces 296
Section 574—Clarification of Persons Eligible for Award of Bronze Star Medal 296
Section 575—Award of Vietnam Service Medal to Veterans who Participated in Mayaguez Rescue Operation 296
Section 576—Authorization for Award of Medal of Honor to Certain Members of the Army for Acts of Valor during the Civil War, Korean War, or Vietnam War 296
Section 577—Authorization and Request for Award of Distinguished-Service Cross to Jay C. Copley for Acts of Valor during the Vietnam War 296
Section 578—Program to Commemorate 60th Anniversary of the Korean War 297
Subtitle I—Military Family Readiness Matters 297
Section 581—Appointment of Additional Member of Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council 297
Section 582—Director of the Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs 297
Section 583—Pilot Program of Personalized Career Development Counseling for Military Spouses 297
Section 584—Modification of Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program 297
Section 585—Importance of Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs 298
Section 586—Comptroller General Report on Department of Defense Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs 298
Section 587—Comptroller General Report on Exceptional Family Member Program 298
Section 588—Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Military Spouse Employment Programs 298
Section 589—Report on Department of Defense Military Spouse Education Programs 298
Subtitle J—Other Matters 299
Section 591—Establishment of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Units for Students in Grades above Sixth Grade 299
Section 592—Increase in Number of Private Sector Civilians Authorized for Admission to National Defense University 299
Section 593—Admission of Defense Industry Civilians to Attend United States Air Force Institute of Technology 299
Section 594—Date for Submission of Annual Report on Department of Defense STARBASE Program 299
Section 595—Extension of Deadline for Submission of Final Report of Military Leadership Diversity Commission 299
Section 596—Enhanced Authority for Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense and Coast Guard Civilian Employees and their Families to Accept Gifts from Non-Federal Entities 299
Section 597—Report on Performance and Improvements of Transition Assistance Program 300
Section 598—Sense of Congress regarding Assisting Members of the Armed Forces to Participate in Apprenticeship Programs 300
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 300
OVERVIEW 300
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 301
Career Retention Bonus 301
Critical Language and Cultural Training of Special Operations Forces 301
Local Procurement of Fresh Meat, Poultry, Seafood, Fish, and Produce by Commissary and Exchange Stores 302

Page

Procurement of Locally Caught Seafood and Fresh-Water Fish by Commissaries 303
Reserve Retirement 303
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 303
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 303
Section 601—Fiscal Year 2011 Increase in Military Basic Pay 303
Section 602—Basic Allowance for Housing for Two-Member Couples when One or Both Members Are on Sea Duty 304
Section 603—Allowances for Purchase of Required Uniforms and Equipment 304
Section 604—Increase in Amount of Family Separation Allowance 304
Section 605—One-Time Special Compensation for Transition of Assistants Providing Aid and Attendance Care to Members of the Uniformed Services with Catastrophic Injuries or Illnesses 304
Section 606—Expansion of Definition of Senior Enlisted Member to Include Senior Enlisted Member Serving within a Combatant Command 304
Section 607—Ineligibility of Certain Federal Civilian Employees for Reservist Income Replacement Payments on Account of Availability of Comparable Benefits under Another Program 305
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 305
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 305
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals 305
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers 305
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities 305
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays 306
Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses 306
Section 617—Treatment of Officers Transferring between Armed Forces for Receipt of Aviation Career Special Pay 306
Section 618—Increase in Maximum Amount of Special Pay for Duty Subject to Hostile Fire or Imminent Danger or for Duty in Foreign Area Designated as an Imminent Danger Area 306
Section 619—Special Payment to Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense Killed or Wounded in Attacks Directed at Members or Employees outside of Combat Zone, Including Those Killed or Wounded in Certain 2009 Attacks 306
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 307
Section 631—Extension of Authority to Provide Travel and Transportation Allowances for Inactive Duty Training outside of Normal Commuting Distances 307
Section 632—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Attendance of Designated Persons at Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Events 307
Section 633—Mileage Reimbursement for Use of Privately Owned Vehicles 307
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits 308
Section 641—Elimination of Cap on Retired Pay Multiplier for Members with Greater than 30 Years of Service who Retire for Disability . 308
Section 642—Equity in Computation of Disability Retired Pay for Reserve Component Members Wounded in Action 308
Section 643—Elimination of the Age Requirement for Health Care Benefits for Non-Regular Service Retirees 308
Section 644—Clarification of Effect of Ordering Reserve Component Member to Active Duty to Receive Authorized Medical Care on Reducing Eligibility Age for Receipt of Non-Regular Service Retired Pay 308
Section 645—Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Recipients of Pre-Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Affected by Required Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation 308
Section 646—Payment Date for the Retired and Retainer Pay 309
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 309

Page

Section 651—Shared Construction Costs for Shopping Malls or Similar Facilities Containing a Commissary Store and One or More Non-appropriated Fund Instrumentality Activities 309
Section 652—Addition of Definition of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Telephone Services for Use in Contracts to Provide Such Services for Military Personnel Serving in Combat Zones 309
Section 653—Feasibility Study on Establishment of Full Exchange Store in the Northern Mariana Islands 309
Subtitle F—Alternative Career Track Pilot Program 310
Section 661—Pilot Program to Evaluate Alternative Career Track for Commissioned Officers to Facilitate an Increased Commitment to Academic and Professional Education and Career-Broadening Assignments 310
Subtitle G—Other Matters 312
Section 671—Participation of Members of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program in Active Duty Health Profession Loan Repayment Program 312
Section 672—Retention of Enlistment, Reenlistment, and Student Loan Benefits Received by Military Technicians (Dual Status) 312
Section 673—Cancellation of Loans of Members of the Armed Forces Made from Student Loan Funds 312
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 312
OVERVIEW 312
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 314
Comparative Cognitive Test Study 314
Comparative Effectiveness of Neuroimaging Modalities on the Detection of Traumatic Brain Injury 314
Continuation of Health Insurance for Reservists on Active Duty 314
Delays in Awarding New TRICARE Contracts 315
Development of Non-Addictive Topical Pain Therapeutics 315
Exposure Registry Feasibility Study 316
Feasibility of TRICARE Prime in Certain Commonwealths and Territories of the United States 316
Former Military Medics and Corpsmen 316
Genitourinary Trauma in the Military 316
Health Information Technology Interoperability between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs 316
Medical Technology and Spectrum Sharing 317
Medical Training for Chemical-Biological Casualties 317
Outreach Tools Using an Interactive Virtual Agent 317
Pre-Deployment Counseling for Unmarried Service Members with Dependent Children 317
Study on the Treatment of Service Members of the Active and Reserve Component for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder 318
Suicide and the Individual Ready Reserve 318
TRICARE Outpatient Prospective Payment System 319
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 319
Subtitle A—Improvements to Health Benefits 319
Section 701—Extension of Prohibition on Increases in Certain Health Care Costs 319
Section 702—Extension of Dependent Coverage under TRICARE 319
Section 703—Survivor Dental Benefits 319
Section 704—Aural Screenings for Members of the Armed Forces 319
Section 705—Temporary Prohibition on Increase in Copayments under Retail Pharmacy System of Pharmacy Benefits Program 320
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration 320
Section 711—Adminisitration of TRICARE 320
Section 712—Updated Terminology for the Army Medical Service Corps 320
Section 713—Clarification of Licensure Requirements Applicable to Military Health-Care Professionals who Are Members of the National Guard Performing Duty while in Title 32 Status 320
Section 714—Annual Report on Joint Health Care Facilities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs 320
Section 715—Improvements to Oversight of Medical Training for Medical Corps Officers 321

Page

Section 716—Study on Reimbursement for Costs of Health Care Provided to Ineligible Individuals 321
Section 717—Limitation on Transfer of Funds to Department of Defense–Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Project 321
Section 718—Enterprise Risk Assessment of Health Information Technology Programs 321
Subtitle C—Other Matters 321
Section 721—Improving Aural Protection for Members of the Armed Forces 321
Section 722—Comprehensive Policy on Neurocognitive Assessment by the Military Health System 321
Section 723—National Casualty Care Research Center 322
Section 724—Report on Feasibility of Study on Breast Cancer among Female Members of the Armed Forces 322
Section 725—Assesment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder by Military Occupation 322
Section 726—Visiting NIH Neuroscience Fellowship Program 322
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 322
OVERVIEW 322
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 323
Acquisition Oversight for TRICARE Management Agency 323
Acquisition Process for Information Technology 323
Advanced Technology Clusters 324
Application of Berry Amendment to Tents and Related Items 325
Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan 325
Competition Requirements for Acquisitions Involving Federal Prison Industries 325
Denial of Award Fees to Contractors for Jeopardizing Government Personnel 326
Employment Impact of Military Construction 327
Matters Relating to the Common Database for Tracking Contracts and Contractor Personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan 327
Titanium Supply for Defense Uses 329
Undefinitized Contractual Actions 330
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 330
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 330
Section 801—Disclosure to Litigation Support Contractors 330
Section 802—Designation of F135 and F136 Engine Development and Procurement Programs as Major Subprograms 330
Section 803—Conforming Amendments Relating to Inclusion of Major Subprograms to Major Defense Acquisition Programs under Various Acquisition-Related Requirements 331
Section 804—Enhancement of Department of Defense Authority to Respond to Combat and Safety Emergencies through Rapid Acquisition and Deployment of Urgently Needed Supplies 331
Section 805—Prohibition on Contracts with Entities Engaging in Commercial Activity in the Energy Sector of Iran 331
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 332
Section 811—Extension of Authority to Procure Certain Fibers; Limitation on Specification 332
Section 812—Small Arms Production Industrial Base Matters 332
Section 813—Additional Definition Relating to Production of Specialty Metals within the United States 332
Subtitle C—Studies and Reports 332
Section 821—Studies to Analyze Alternative Models for Acquisition and Funding of Technologies Supporting Network-Centric Operations 332
Section 822—Annual Joint Report and Comptroller General Review on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan 333
Section 823—Extension of Comptroller General Review and Report on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan 333
Section 824—Interim Report on Review of Impact of Covered Subsidies on Acquisition of KC–45 Aircraft 333

Page

Section 825—Reports on Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System 333
Subtitle D—Other Matters 334
Section 831—Extension of Authority for Defense Acquisition Challenge Program 334
Section 832—Energy Savings Performance Contracts 334
Section 833—Consideration of Sustainable Practices in Procurement of Products and Services 334
Section 834—Definition of Materials Critical to National Security 334
Section 835—Determination of Strategic or Critical Rare Earth Materials for Defense Applications 335
Section 836—Review of National Security Exception to Competition 335
Section 837—Inclusion of Bribery in Disclosure Requirements of the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System 336
Section 838—Requirement for Entities with Facility Clearances that are not under Foreign Ownership Control or Influence Mitigation 336
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 336
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 336
Advisory Panel on Improving Interagency National Security Coordination 336
Arctic Operations and the Northwest Passage 337
Augmentation of Army Brigade Combat Teams to Advise and Assist Foreign Security Forces 337
Certification and Accreditation Process for Information Technology Programs 338
Common Alignment of World Regions in the Internal Organization of Departments and Agencies with International Responsibilities 339
Intelligence Information Sharing 339
Personnel Management Policy and Plans Affecting Special Operations Forces 340
Senior Workforce in the Business Transformation Agency 340
Strategic Management Plan 341
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 341
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 341
Section 901—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 341
Section 902—Realignment of the Organizational Structure of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to Carry Out the Reduction Required by Law in the Number of Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense 341
Section 903—Unified Medical Command 342
Subtitle B—Space Activities 342
Section 911—Integrated Space Architectures 342
Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related Matters 343
Section 921—5–Year Extension of Authority for Secretary of Defense to Engage in Commercial Activities as Security for Intelligence Collection Activities 343
Section 922—Space and Counterspace Intelligence Analysis 343
Subtitle D—Other Matters 344
Section 931—Revisions to the Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences 344
Section 932—Increased Flexibility for Combatant Commander Initiative Fund 344
Section 933—Two-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Temporary Waiver of Reimbursement of Costs of Activities for Nongovernmental Personnel at Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies 344
Section 934—Additional Requirements for Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review in 2011 344
Section 935—Codification of Congressional Notification Requirement before Permanent Relocation of Any United States Military Unit Stationed outside the United States 344
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 345
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 345
Counter-Drug Activities 345
Counterterrorism 345
Counterterrorism Initiatives 345

Page
Countering Extremist Use of the Internet 348
Countering Network-Based Threats 348
Defense Threat Reduction Agency Mission and Resourcing 349
Rotary-Wing Assets for United States Special Operations Forces 349
Strategies for Countering Irregular Warfare Challenges 350
Interagency Coordination 351
Center for Strategic Communications and Public Diplomacy 351
Force Protection Policies 352
Funding of National Security Requirements 352
Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center 352
Policy and Guidance for Defense Support of Civil Authorities 353
Report on the Potential Use of Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization Initiatives to Support Humanitarian Mine Action .. 354
Solid Rocket Motor Industrial Base 354
Other Matters 355
Department of Defense Rapid Innovation Program 355
Feasibility Study for Transfer of Aircraft to Non-Federal Entities 357
Impact Assessment of Cybersecurity Standards 358
Knowledge Management for Information Operations Programs 359
Military Liaison Elements 359
Rebalancing of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Force 360
Report on Acquisition Strategy for Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment 361
Report on Department of Defense Support to State Defense Forces 361
Study on the Feasibility of the Democratic Republic of Georgia as a Transportation Base 361
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 362
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 362
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority 362
Section 1002—Authorization of Additional Appropriations for Operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Haiti for Fiscal Year 2010 362
Section 1003—Budgetary Effects of this Act 362
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 362
Section 1011—Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia 362
Section 1012—Joint Task Forces Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities 362
Section 1013—Reporting Requirement on Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities 363
Section 1014—Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments 363
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 363
Section 1021—Requirements for Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels 363
Section 1022—Requirements for the Decommissioning of Naval Vessels 363
Section 1023—Requirements for the Size of the Navy Battle Force Fleet 364
Section 1024—Retention and Status of Certain Naval Vessels 364
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 364
Section 1031—Extension of Certain Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism 364
Section 1032—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 364
Section 1033—Certification Requirements Relating to the Transfer of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities 365
Section 1034—Prohibition on the Use of Funds to Modify or Construct Facilities in the United States to House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 366
Section 1035—Comprehensive Review of Force Protection Policies 367
Section 1036—Fort Hood Follow-On Review Implementation Fund 367
Section 1037—Inspector General Investigation of the Conduct and Practices of Lawyers Representing Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 367
Subtitle E—Studies and Reports 367

Page

Section 1041—Department of Defense Aerospace-Related Mishap Safety Investigation Reports 367
Section 1042—Interagency National Security Knowledge and Skills 368
Section 1043—Report on Establishing a Northeast Regional Joint Training Center 368
Section 1044—Comptroller General Report on Previously Requested Reports 368
Section 1045—Report on Nuclear Triad 369
Section 1046—Cybersecurity Study and Report 369
Subtitle F—Other Matters 369
Section 1051—National Defense Panel 369
Section 1052—Quadrennial Defense Review 369
Section 1053—Sale of Surplus Military Equipment to State and Local Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agencies 370
Section 1054—Department of Defense Rapid Innovation Program 370
Section 1055—Technical and Clerical Amendments 370
Section 1056—Limitation on Air Force Fiscal Year 2011 Force Structure Announcement Implementation 370
Section 1057—Budgeting for the Sustainment and Modernization of Nuclear Delivery Systems 371
Section 1058—Limitation on Nuclear Force Reductions 371
Section 1059—Sense of Congress on the Nuclear Posture Review 372
Section 1060—Strategic Assessment of Strategic Challenges Posed by Potential Competitors 372
Section 1061—Electronic Access to Certain Classified Information 372
Section 1062—Justice for Victims of Torture and Terrorism 372
Section 1063—Policy regarding Appropriate Use of Department of Defense Resources 373
Section 1064—Executive Agent for Preventing the Introduction of Counterfeit Microelectronics into the Defense Supply Chain 373

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 373
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 373
Civilian Personnel Authorizations 373
Conversion of Department of Defense Civilian Positions to General Schedule 374
Deployed Civilians 374
Retirement Eligibility for Department of Defense Fire Fighters 375
Scholarship Program for Civilians in the Mental Health Profession 375
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 376
Section 1101—Authority for the Department of Defense to Approve an Alternate Method of Processing Equal Employment Opportunity Complaints within One or More Component Organizations under Specified Circumstances 376
Section 1102—Clarification of Authorities at Personnel Demonstration Laboratories 376
Section 1103—Special Rule Relating to Certain Overtime Pay 377
Section 1104—One-Year Extension of Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas 377
Section 1105—Waiver of Certain Pay Limitations 377
Section 1106—Services of Post-Combat Case Coordinators 378
Section 1107—Authority to Waive Maximum Age Limit for Certain Appointments 378
Section 1108—Sense of Congress regarding Waiver of Recovery of Certain Payments Made under Civilian Employees Voluntary Separation Incentive Program 379
Section 1109—Suspension of DCIPS Pay Authority Extended for a Year 379

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS 380
OVERVIEW 380
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 381
Air Force Requirements for Light Air Support Aircraft 381
Annual Report on Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 382
Concerns Regarding Iraqi Contractor Employees 382
Countering Narcotics in Afghanistan 382
Counterinsurgency Efforts in Pakistan 383

Page
Cyber Attacks Involving China ... 383
Future Agreements with the Government of Iraq ... 384
Non-Standard Rotary-Wing Study ... 384
Realignment of U.S. Marines from Japan to Guam ... 385
Resources for Success in Afghanistan and Policy against Arbitrary Limitations on Deployed Personnel ... 385
Security Concerns Involving North Korea ... 386
Security Developments in Pakistan and Implications for Afghanistan ... 386
Support for United States Special Operations Forces during the Redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq ... 388
Transition in Iraq ... 388
United States Africa Command Intelligence and Knowledge Development Directorate ... 389
U.S. Forces Korea Transfer of Wartime Operational Control of Republic of Korea Forces ... 389
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 390
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training ... 390
Section 1201—Expansion of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism ... 390
Section 1202—Addition of Allied Government Agencies to Enhanced Logistics Interoperability Authority ... 390
Section 1203—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces ... 390
Section 1204—Air Force Scholarships for Partnership for Peace Nations to Participate in the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program ... 391
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan ... 391
Section 1211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Purposes Relating to Iraq ... 391
Section 1212—Commanders' Emergency Response Program ... 391
Section 1213—Modification of Authority for Reimbursement to Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations ... 392
Section 1214—Modification of Report on Responsible Redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq ... 392
Section 1215—Modification of Reports Relating to Afghanistan ... 392
Section 1216—No Permanent Military Bases in Afghanistan ... 393
Section 1217—Authority to Use Funds for Reintegration Activities in Afghanistan ... 393
Section 1218—One-Year Extension of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund ... 393
Section 1219—Authority to Use Funds to Provide Support to Coalition Forces Supporting Military and Stability Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan ... 394
Section 1220—Requirement to Provide United States Brigade and Equivalent Units Deployed to Afghanistan with the Commensurate Level of Unit and Theater-Wide Combat Enablers ... 394
Subtitle C—Other Matters ... 394
Section 1231—NATO Special Operations Coordination Center ... 394
Section 1232—National Military Strategic Plan to Counter Iran ... 394
Section 1233—Report on Department of Defense's Plans to Reform the Export Control System ... 394
Section 1234—Report on the United States Efforts to Defend against Threats Posed by the Advanced Anti-Access Capability of Potentially Hostile Foreign Countries ... 395
Section 1235—Report on Force Structure Changes in Composition and Capabilities at Military Installations in Europe ... 395
Section 1236—Sense of Congress on Missile Defense and New START Treaty with Russian Federation ... 396
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ... 396
OVERVIEW ... 396
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 397
Biological Threat Reduction ... 397
Cooperative Threat Reduction Defense and Military Contacts Program ... 398
Metrics for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ... 398
New Initiatives for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ... 398
Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Project ... 399
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 399

Page

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 399
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 399
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 399
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 399
Department of Defense Inspector General Growth Plan 399
Fuel Infrastructure Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization 400
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 400
Subtitle A—Military Programs 400
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds 400
Section 1402—Study on Working Capital Fund Cash Balances 400
Section 1403—Modification of Certain Working Capital Fund Requirements 401
Section 1404—Reduction of Unobligated Balances within the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund 402
Section 1405—National Defense Sealift Fund 402
Section 1406—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 402
Section 1407—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 402
Section 1408—Defense Inspector General 402
Section 1409—Defense Health Program 402
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 403
Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds 403
Section 1412—Revision to Required Receipt Objectives for Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile 403
Subtitle C—Other Matters 403
Section 1421—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home 403
Section 1422—Plan for Funding Fuel Infrastructure Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization Requirements 403
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS 408
OVERVIEW 408
SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS 408
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 443
F–35A Aircraft 443
Force Protection Measures on United States Forward Operating Bases in Afghanistan 443
H–60 Modifications 444
Iraq Security Forces Fund 444
Marine Corps Radio Systems 445
Special Operations Funding for Overseas Operations 445
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 446
Section 1501—Purpose 446
Section 1502—Army Procurement 446
Section 1503—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 446
Section 1504—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement 446
Section 1505—Air Force Procurement 446
Section 1506—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement 446
Section 1507—Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense Program 446
Section 1508—National Guard and Reserve Equipment 447
Section 1509—Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund 447
Section 1510—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 447
Section 1511—Operation and Maintenance 447
Section 1512—Limitations on Availability of Funds in Afghanistan Security Forces Fund 447
Section 1513—Limitations on Iraq Security Forces Fund 447
Section 1514—Military Personnel 448
Section 1515—Working Capital Funds 448
Section 1516—Defense Health Program 448
Section 1517—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 448
Section 1518—Defense Inspector General 448
Section 1519—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq 448
Section 1520—Availability of Funds for Rapid Force Protection in Afghanistan 448

Page
Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations 449
Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority 449
TITLE XVI—IMPROVED SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE IN THE ARMED FORCES 449
OVERVIEW 449
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 449
Improved Coordination between Military and Civilian Law Enforcement in Response to Sexual Assaults Involving a Service Member 449
Inclusion of Community Organizations 450
Reduced Delays for Convening Courts-Martial Involving Charges of Sexual Assault 450
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 450
Section 1601—Definition of Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program and Other Definitions 450
Subtitle A—Immediate Actions to Improve Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program 450
Section 1611—Specific Budgeting for Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program 450
Section 1612—Consistency in Terminology, Position Descriptions, Program Standards, and Organizational Structures 450
Section 1613—Guidance for Commanders 451
Section 1614—Commander Consultation with Victims of Sexual Assault 451
Section 1615—Oversight and Evaluation 451
Section 1616—Sexual Assault Reporting Hotline 451
Section 1617—Review of Application of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program to Reserve Components 451
Section 1618—Review of Effectiveness of Revised Uniform Code of Military Justice Offenses regarding Rape, Sexual Assault, and Other Sexual Misconduct 452
Section 1619—Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program 452
Section 1620—Use of Sexual Assault Forensic Medical Examiners 452
Section 1621—Sexual Assault Advisory Board 452
Section 1622—Department of Defense Sexual Assault Advisory Council 452
Section 1623—Service-Level Sexual Assault Review Boards 453
Section 1624—Renewed Emphasis on Acquisition of Centralized Department of Defense Sexual Assault Database 453
Subtitle B—Sexual Assault Prevention Strategy and Annual Reporting Requirement 453
Section 1631—Comprehensive Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention Strategy 453
Section 1632—Annual Report on Sexual Assaults Involving Members of the Armed Forces and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program 453
Subtitle C—Amendments to Title 10 454
Section 1641—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office 454
Section 1642—Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates 454
Section 1643—Sexual Assault Victims Access to Legal Counsel and Victim Advocate Services 455
Section 1644—Notification of Command of Outcome of Court-Martial Involving Charges of Sexual Assault 455
Section 1645—Copy of Record of Court-Martial to Victim of Sexual Assault Involving a Member of the Armed Forces 455
Section 1646—Medical Care for Victims of Sexual Assault 455
Section 1647—Privilege against Disclosure of Certain Communications with Sexual Assault Victim Advocates 456
Subtitle D—Other Matters 456
Section 1661—Recruiter Selection and Oversight 456
Section 1662—Availability of Services under Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program for Dependents of Members, Military Retirees, Department of Defense Civilian Employees, and Defense Contractor Employees 456
Section 1663—Application of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program in Training Environments 456

Page

Section 1664—Application of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program in Remote Environments and Joint Basing Situations 457
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 457
PURPOSE 457
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 457
Section 2001—Short Title 489
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to Be Specified by Law 489
Section 2003—Effective Date 489
Section 2004—General Reduction across Division 489
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 489
SUMMARY 489
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 489
Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, Land Disposal 489
Fort Bragg Parking Concerns due to BRAC Force Structure 490
Quarters #1, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois 490
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 490
Planning and Design, Army 492
Unspecified Minor Construction, Army 492
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 492
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 492
Section 2102—Family Housing 492
Section 2103—Use of Unobligated Army Military Construction Funds in Conjunction with Funds Provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Project 492
Section 2104—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project 493
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project 493
Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects 493
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 493
SUMMARY 493
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 493
Defense Access Road Assessment to Support Naval Support Activity, Northwest Annex, Virginia 493
Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range 493
Planning and Design, Navy 494
Silver Strand Training Complex, California 494
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 494
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 494
Section 2202—Family Housing 495
Section 2203—Technical Amendment to Reflect Multi-Increment Fiscal Year 2010 Project 495
Section 2204—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project 495
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 495
SUMMARY 495
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 495
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 495
F–22 Raptor Basing 496
Ogden Air Logistics Center, Hill Air Force Base, Utah 496
Planning and Design, Air Force 496
Unspecified Minor Construction, Air Force 496
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 497
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 497
Section 2302—Family Housing 497
Section 2303—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Project 497
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 497
SUMMARY 497
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 497
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 497

Page
Planning and Design, Defense-Wide 498
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 498
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations 498
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 498
Section 2402—Family Housing 498
Section 2403—Energy Conservation Projects 498
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations 498
Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide 498
Section 2412—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2000 Project 499
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM 499
SUMMARY 499
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 499
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 499
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO 499
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES 499
SUMMARY 499
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 499
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station 499
Planning and Design, Air National Guard 500
Planning and Design, Army National Guard 500
Stratton Air National Guard Base 501
Unspecified Minor Construction, Air National Guard 501
Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard 501
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 501
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 501
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 502
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 502
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 502
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 502
Section 2606—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects 502
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES 503
SUMMARY 503
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 503
Defense Access Roads Assessment 503
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 504
Subtitle A—Authorizations 504
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 504
Section 2702—Authorized Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 504
Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 504
Subtitle B—Other Matters 504
Section 2711—Transportation Plan for BRAC 133 Project under Fort Belvoir, Virginia, BRAC Initiative 504
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS 504
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 504
Assessment of Improvements in Construction Techniques to Achieve Life-Cycle Cost-Effective Facilities 504
Carbon Fiber Grid Precast Concrete 505
Collaborative Efforts to Address Installation Encroachment 505

Page

Department of Defense Policy Regarding Installation Energy Management 506
Disposal Plans for Excess and Obsolete Facilities 506
East Coast Homeport Cost Assessment 507
Enhanced Use Leases 507
Ensuring Realistic Air-to-Air Training for Fifth-Generation Aircraft Units 508
Future Unmanned Aerial Systems Training, Operations, and Sustainability 509
Guam Civilian Infrastructure Requirements to Support and Sustain Realignment of Military Installations and the Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam 509
Naval Air Station North Island Transportation Improvements 510
Naval Station Mayport, Florida, Homeporting Alternatives 510
Report on Workforce Housing and Medical Needs of Guest Workers on Guam 511
Sensors Center of Excellence—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 512
Technologies to Achieve Progressive Collapse Resistance 513
Vulnerability of Defense Critical Infrastructure to Electromagnetic Pulse Attack 513
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 514
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 514
Section 2801—Availability of Military Construction Information on Internet 514
Section 2802—Authority to Transfer Proceeds from Sale of Military Family Housing to Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund 514
Section 2803—Enhanced Authority for Provision of Excess Contributions for NATO Security Investment Program 514
Section 2804—Duration of Authority to Use Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund for Construction and Repairs at Pentagon Reservation 514
Section 2805—Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects inside the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility 514
Section 2806—Veterans to Work Pilot Program for Military Construction Projects 515
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 515
Section 2811—Notice-and-Wait Requirements Applicable to Real Property Transactions 515
Section 2812—Treatment of Proceeds Generated from Leases of Non-Excess Property Involving Military Museums 515
Section 2813—Repeal of Expired Authority to Lease Land for Special Operations Activities 515
Section 2814—Former Naval Bombardment Area, Culebra Island, Puerto Rico 515
Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Guam Realignment 515
Section 2821—Sense of Congress regarding Importance of Providing Community Adjustment Assistance to Government of Guam 515
Section 2822—Department of Defense Assistance for Community Adjustments Related to Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam 516
Section 2823—Extension of Term of Deputy Secretary of Defense's Leadership of Guam Oversight Council 516
Section 2824—Utility Conveyances to Support Integrated Water and Wastewater Treatment System on Guam 516
Section 2825—Report on Types of Facilities Required to Support Guam Realignment 516
Section 2826—Report on Civilian Infrastructure Needs for Guam 517
Section 2827—Comptroller General Report on Planned Replacement Naval Hospital on Guam 517
Subtitle D—Energy Security 517
Section 2831—Consideration of Environmentally Sustainable Practices in Department Energy Performance Plan 517

Page

Section 2832—Plan and Implementation Guidelines for Achieving Department of Defense Goal regarding Use of Renewable Energy to Meet Facility Energy Needs 517
Section 2833—Insulation Retrofitting Assessment for Department of Defense Facilities 517
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances 518
Section 2841—Conveyance of Personal Property Related to Waste-to-Energy Power Plant Serving Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska 518
Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Whittier Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricant Tank Farm, Whittier, Alaska 518
Section 2843—Land Conveyance, Fort Knox, Kentucky 518
Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Naval Support Activity (West Bank), New Orleans, Louisiana 518
Section 2845—Land Conveyance, Former Navy Extremely Low Frequency Communications Project Site, Republic, Michigan 518
Section 2846—Land Conveyance, Marine Forces Reserve Center, Wilmington, North Carolina 518
Subtitle F—Other Matters 519
Section 2851—Requirements Related to Providing World Class Military Medical Facilities 519
Section 2852—Naming of Armed Forces Reserve Center, Middletown, Connecticut 519
TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 519
SUMMARY 519
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 524
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 524
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 524
Subtitle A—Fiscal Year 2010 Projects 524
Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 524
Section 2902—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 524
Subtitle B—Fiscal Year 2011 Projects 524
Section 2911—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 524
Section 2912—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 524
Section 2913—Authorized Defense-Wide Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations 525
Section 2914—Construction Authorization for National Security Agency Facilities in a Foreign Country 525
Subtitle C—Other Matters 525
Section 2921—Notification of Obligation of Funds and Quarterly Reports 525
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 525
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 525
OVERVIEW 525
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 539
National Nuclear Security Administration 539
Overview 539
Weapons Activities 539
Stockpile Stewardship 539
Stockpile Management 540
Directed Stockpile Work 541
Stockpile Surveillance 541
B61 Phase 6.2/6.2A Life Extension Study 541
Science Campaign 542
Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign 542
Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign 542
Readiness Campaign 542
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities 543
Use of prior year balances 543
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation 544

Page

Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development 545
Radiation detection technology 545
Nonproliferation and International Security 545
Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention 546
Global Nuclear Energy Partnership 546
International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation 547
Second Line of Defense 547
Fissile Materials Disposition 547
United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition 547
Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition 547
Global Threat Reduction Initiative 548
Report on Securing Vulnerable Nuclear Materials 548
Naval Reactors 548
Office of the Administrator 549
Environmental and Other Defense Activities 549
Overview 549
Defense Environmental Cleanup 549
Execution of Funding Provided for Defense Environmental Cleanup by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 549
Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant 550
Other Defense Activities 550
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal 551
Report on Defense Repository at Yucca Mountain 551
Closing of the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Repository 551
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 552
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations 552
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration 552
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup 552
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities 552
Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance 552
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 552
Section 3111—Extension of Authority Relating to the International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting Program of the Department of Energy 552
Section 3112—Energy Parks Initiative 552
Section 3113—Establishment of Technology Transfer Centers 552
Section 3114—Aircraft Procurement 553
Subtitle C—Reports 553
Section 3121—Comptroller General Report on NNSA Biennial Complex Modernization Strategy 553
Section 3122—Report on Graded Security Protection Policy 553

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD 553
OVERVIEW 553
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 553
Section 3201—Authorization 553

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES 553
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 553
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations 553

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 554
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 554
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2011 554
Section 3502—Extension of Maritime Security Fleet Program 554
Section 3503—United States Merchant Marine Academy Nominations of Residents of the Northern Mariana Islands 554
Section 3504—Administrative Expenses for Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program 554
Section 3505—Vessel Loan Guarantees: Procedures for Traditional and Nontraditional Applications 554

Departmental Data 555
Department of Defense Authorization Request 555
Committee Position 563
Communications from Other Committees 563
Fiscal Data 576
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 576
Committee Cost Estimate 577

Page

Compliance with House Rule XXI 577
Oversight Findings 590
General Performance Goals and Objectives 590
Constitutional Authority Statement 591
Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act 591
Statement of Federal Mandates 591
Federal Advisory Committee Statement 591
Applicability to the Legislative Branch 592
Record Votes 592
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 601
Additional Views 602
  Additional views of Mr. Marshall 602
  Additional views of Mr. McKeon, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Akin, Mr. Forbes, Mr. Miller, Mr. Wilson, Mr. LoBiondo, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Turner, Mr. Kline, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Franks, Mr. Shuster, Mrs. McMorris Rodgers, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Wittman, Ms. Fallin, Mr. Hunter, Dr. Fleming, Mr. Coffman, Mr. Rooney, Mr. Platts 604
  Additional views of Mr. Turner 609

111TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
111–491

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

MAY 21, 2010.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5136]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5136) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 5136. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would, (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2011: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the Armed Forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for overseas contingency operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for the Maritime Administration.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

The bill does not generally provide budget authority. This bill authorizes appropriations; subsequent appropriation acts will provide budget authority. However, the committee strives to adhere to the recommendations as issued by the Committee on the Budget as it relates to the jurisdiction of this committee.

The bill addresses the following categories in the Department of Defense budget: procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; operation and maintenance; military personnel; working capital funds; and military construction and family housing. The bill also addresses the Armed Forces Retirement Home, Department of Energy National Security Programs, the Naval Petroleum Reserve and the Maritime Administration.

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

SUMMARY OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE BILL

The President requested discretionary budget authority of $725.9 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee for fiscal year 2011. Of this amount, $548.9 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $159.3 billion was requested for the overseas contingency operations requirements covering the entire fiscal year, and $17.7 billion was requested for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of $725.9 billion in fiscal year 2011, including $159.3 billion for overseas contingency operations. The base committee authorization of $566.6 billion is a $16.4 billion increase above the levels pro-

vided for in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

The committee also recognizes the request from the Department of Defense for additional authorization in fiscal year 2010 for increases in overseas contingency operations and for humanitarian and disaster assistance to assist victims following the earthquake in Haiti. The committee recommends an additional $33.7 billion in supplemental authorizations in fiscal year 2010.

The following table summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2011 and compares these amounts to the President's request.

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
National Defense Function (050) Funding, Base Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I - Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,976,867	9,494	5,986,361
Missile Procurement, Army	1,887,437	-255,974	1,631,463
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,723,561	-107,316	1,616,245
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,979,414	-32,466	1,946,948
Other Procurement, Army	9,765,808	-367,080	9,398,728
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	215,868	-215,868	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	18,508,613	624,000	19,132,613
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,359,794	-8,900	3,350,894
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	15,724,520		15,724,520
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	817,991		817,991
Other Procurement, Navy	6,450,208		6,450,208
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,344,044	35,000	1,379,044
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	15,366,508	-10,600	15,355,908
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	667,420	5,000	672,420
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,463,272	7,500	5,470,772
Other Procurement, Air Force	17,845,380	66,350	17,911,730

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,280,368	119,400	4,399,768
Subtotal, Title I - Procurement	**111,377,073**	**-131,460**	**111,245,613**
Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	10,333,392	-16,638	10,316,754
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	17,693,496	285,150	17,978,646
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	27,247,302	22,600	27,269,902
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	20,661,600	51,496	20,713,096
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	194,910		194,910
Subtotal, Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**76,130,700**	**342,608**	**76,473,308**
Title III - Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	33,971,965	260,256	34,232,221
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	38,134,308	-157,865	37,976,443
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,590,340	-22,000	5,568,340
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	36,844,512	-159,924	36,684,588
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	30,583,896	-383,300	30,200,596
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,879,077	63,000	2,942,077
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,367,764	7,000	1,374,764
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	285,234	2,000	287,234
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,301,035	10,792	3,311,827
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	6,572,704	55,821	6,628,525

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,941,143	38,996	5,980,139
US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense	14,068		14,068
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	108,032		108,032
Cooperative Threat Reduction	522,512		522,512
Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund	217,561	12,000	229,561
Environmental Restoration, Army	444,581		444,581
Environmental Restoration, Navy	304,867		304,867
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	502,653		502,653
Environmental Restoration, Defense	10,744		10,744
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites	276,546	20,000	296,546
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	5,000	-5,000	0
Subtotal, Title III - Operation and Maintenance	**167,878,542**	**-258,224**	**167,620,318**
Title IV - Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	138,540,700	0	138,540,700
Subtotal, Title IV - Military Personnel	**138,540,700**	**0**	**138,540,700**
Title XIV - Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	54,636		54,636
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	66,861		66,861
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	39,468		39,468
Working Capital Fund, DECA	1,273,571		1,273,571

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
National Defense Sealift Fund	934,866		934,866
Defense Coalition Support, Defense	10,000	-10,000	0
Defense Health Program	30,935,111	56,841	30,991,952
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	1,467,307		1,467,307
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	1,131,351		1,131,351
Office of the Inspector General	283,354		283,354
Subtotal, Title XIV - Other Authorizations	**36,196,525**	**46,841**	**36,243,366**
Subtotal, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	**530,123,540**	**-235**	**530,123,305**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Military Construction, Army	4,078,798	119,376	4,198,174
Military Construction, Navy	3,879,104	62,535	3,941,639
Military Construction, Air Force	1,311,385	4,388	1,315,773
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	3,118,062	-118,482	2,999,580
Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense	124,971		124,971
NATO Security Investment Program	258,884		258,884
Military Construction, Army National Guard	873,664	146,238	1,019,902
Military Construction, Army Reserve	318,175	40,156	358,331
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	61,557	30,000	91,557
Military Construction, Air National Guard	176,986	115,385	292,371

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	7,832	39,500	47,332
Subtotal, Military Construction	**14,209,418**	**439,096**	**14,648,514**
Family Housing			
Family Housing Construction, Army	92,369		92,369
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Army	518,140		518,140
Family Housing Construction, Navy And Marine Corps	186,444		186,444
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Navy And Marine Corps	366,346		366,346
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	78,025		78,025
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Air Force	513,792		513,792
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Defense-Wide	50,464		50,464
Homeowners Assistance Fund	16,515		16,515
DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,096		1,096
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,823,191**		**1,823,191**
Base Realignment and Closure			
Base Realignment and Closure Account 1990	360,474		360,474
Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005	2,354,285		2,354,285
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	**2,714,759**		**2,714,759**
Undistributed Adjustments			
General Reductions	0	-441,096	-441,096
Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments	**0**	**-441,096**	**-441,096**

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
Subtotal, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	**18,747,368**	**-2,000**	**18,745,368**
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**548,870,908**	**-2,235**	**548,868,673**
Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations			
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Energy Security and Assurance	6,188	0	6,188
Weapons Activities	7,008,835	0	7,008,835
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,687,167	0	2,687,167
Naval Reactors	1,070,486	0	1,070,486
Office of the Administrator	448,267	0	448,267
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,588,039	0	5,588,039
Other Defense Activities	878,209	0	878,209
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**17,687,191**	**0**	**17,687,191**
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	28,640		28,640
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**28,640**		**28,640**
Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authori	**17,715,831**	**0**	**17,715,831**
Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,715,831**	**0**	**17,715,831**
Total, National Defense Function (050) Funding, Base Budget Request	**566,586,739**	**-2,235**	**566,584,504**
National Defense Function (050) Funding, OCO Budget Request			

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Overseas Contingency Operations			
Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,373,803		1,373,803
Missile Procurement, Army	343,828		343,828
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	687,500		687,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	702,591	-50,100	652,491
Other Procurement, Army	5,827,274	38,172	5,865,446
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	3,250,000	214,368	3,464,368
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	420,358	423,000	843,358
Weapons Procurement, Navy	93,425		93,425
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	565,084		565,084
Other Procurement, Navy	480,735		480,735
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,778,243	76,000	1,854,243
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	1,362,420	-265,900	1,096,520
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	292,959		292,959
Missile Procurement, Air Force	56,621		56,621
Other Procurement, Air Force	3,087,481		3,087,481
Procurement, Defense-Wide	874,546	501,500	1,376,046
Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund	3,415,000		3,415,000

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
National Guard & Reserve Equipment	0	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, Procurement	**24,611,868**	**1,637,040**	**26,248,908**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	150,906	-38,172	112,734
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	60,401		60,401
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	266,241		266,241
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	157,240	500,000	657,240
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**634,788**	**461,828**	**1,096,616**
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	62,602,618	-400,000	62,202,618
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	8,946,634		8,946,634
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,136,522		4,136,522
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	13,487,283		13,487,283
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	9,426,358		9,426,358
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	286,950		286,950
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	93,559		93,559
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	29,685		29,685
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	129,607		129,607
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	544,349		544,349
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	350,823		350,823

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	11,619,283	-654,300	10,964,983
Iraq Security Forces Fund	2,000,000		2,000,000
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	1,551,781	-1,045,000	506,781
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**115,205,452**	**-2,099,300**	**113,106,152**
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	15,275,502		15,275,502
Subtotal, Military Personnel	**15,275,502**		**15,275,502**
Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	17,000		17,000
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	468,384		468,384
Defense Health Program	1,398,092		1,398,092
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	457,110		457,110
Office of the Inspector General	10,529		10,529
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**2,351,115**		**2,351,115**
Military Construction			
Military Construction, Army	929,996	0	929,996
Military Construction, Air Force	280,506	0	280,506
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	46,500		46,500
Subtotal, Military Construction	**1,257,002**	**0**	**1,257,002**
Subtotal, Overseas Contingency Operations	**159,335,727**	**-432**	**159,335,295**

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2011

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**159,335,727**	**-432**	**159,335,295**
Total, National Defense Function (050) Funding, OCO Budget Request	**159,335,727**	**-432**	**159,335,295**
Total, National Defense	**725,922,466**	**-2,667**	**725,919,799**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV - Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	71,200		71,200
Title XXXIV - Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270)	23,614		23,614
Title XXXV - Maritime Administration (Function 400)	164,353		164,353
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)			
Title X - General Transfer Authority	[3,500,000]		[3,500,000]
Title XV - Special Transfer Authority	[3,500,000]		[3,500,000]
MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)			
Defense Production Act	[28,746]		[28,746]

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2011 is $739.3 billion, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. In addition to funding for programs addressed in this bill, the total 050 request includes discretionary funding for national defense programs not in the committee's jurisdiction, discretionary funding for programs that do not require additional authorization in fiscal year 2011, and mandatory programs.

The following table details changes to all aspects of the national defense budget function.

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	548,870,908	-2,235	548,868,673
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	17,715,831		17,715,831
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050) -- BASE BILL	566,586,739	-2,235	566,584,504
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	159,335,727	-432	159,335,295
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**725,922,466**	**-2,667**	**725,919,799**
Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization			
Defense Production Act Purchases	28,746		28,746
Indefinite Account: National Science Center, Army	25		25
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	10,317		10,317
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	8,884		8,884
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**47,972**		**47,972**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	130,000		130,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**130,000**		**130,000**
Other Discretionary Programs	7,017,000		7,017,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**7,017,000**		**7,017,000**
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	**7,194,972**		**7,194,972**

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	708,254,607	-2,667	708,251,940
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,845,831		17,845,831
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,017,000		7,017,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary	**733,117,438**	**-2,667**	**733,114,771**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Estimates)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	4,754,000		4,754,000
Concurrent receipt policy proposal	410,000	-410,000	
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,240,000	-76,000	1,164,000
Offsetting receipts	-1,751,000		-1,751,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**4,653,000**	**-486,000**	**4,167,000**
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,158,000		1,158,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**1,158,000**		**1,158,000**
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	44,000		44,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	292,000		292,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**336,000**		**336,000**
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	**6,147,000**	**-486,000**	**5,661,000**

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	712,907,607	-488,667	712,418,940
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,003,831		19,003,831
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,353,000		7,353,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory	**739,264,438**	**-488,667**	**738,775,771**

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, is a key mechanism through which the Congress of the United States fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense (DOD) generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the House Committee on Armed Services. The committee includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

The committee remains steadfast in its continued and unwavering support for the men and women of the armed forces, the civilian employees of the DOD, and the Department of Energy's (DOE) National Nuclear Security Administration. The armed forces continue to be deeply engaged in a number of ongoing military operations around the world, most significantly, the wars in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq, and relief operations in the Republic of Haiti. The committee is deeply committed to providing full authorization for the funding required to restore the readiness of our military; enhance the quality of life of military service members and their families; sustain and improve the armed forces; and properly safeguard the national security of the United States. In addition to providing authorization of appropriations, the committee bill promotes the committee's main policy objectives: enhancing authorities and capabilities for counterterrorism; strengthening and modernizing missile defenses; enhancing efforts to reduce and secure nuclear materials around the world; taking care of our troops and their families; restoring military readiness: resourcing the President's counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan; enhancing support for the Islamic Republic of Pakistan; transitioning in Iraq; eliminating waste and recovering savings through acquisition reform; and maintaining robust oversight.

H.R. 5136 authorizes $566.6 billion in budget authority for the DOD and the national security programs of the DOE. The committee also authorizes $159.3 billion to support overseas contingency operations during fiscal year 2011, and authorizes $33.7 billion for fiscal year 2010 supplemental appropriations for overseas contingency operations. The committee provides the resources necessary to support a 21st century military strategy; sustain the armed forces in the two wars they are fighting today; and prepare for the threats of tomorrow, whatever and wherever they may be.

The committee makes counterterrorism a priority, providing the armed forces with the additional tools they need to disrupt, dismantle, and eventually defeat al Qa'ida and its extremist allies. The committee includes funds to implement the initial recommendations of the Fort Hood Follow-on Review conducted by the Department of Defense in the wake of the shooting at Fort Hood. It also builds upon past efforts and creates new initiatives to discredit extremist ideology. The committee increases funds for re-

search and for taking additional steps to counter the use the Internet by extremists. It also addresses urgent force protection needs in Afghanistan, allowing the Department to cut through red tape by expanding rapid acquisition authority to deliver the resources needed to protect our troops. The committee enhances the capacity of the armed forces, specifically special operations forces, to act directly against terrorist organizations.

Recognizing the important role that foreign nations play in the fight against terrorists, the committee expands funding to build the partnership capacity of foreign military forces to participate in support of military and stability operations and authorizes a joint Department of Defense and Department of State effort to train and equip non-military security forces in the Republic of Yemen. It authorizes coalition support funds to reimburse nations providing support in connection with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and with the broader counterterrorism and counterinsurgency mission in Pakistan to fight against al Qa'ida, the Pakistan Taliban, and other violent extremists. The committee also extends the authorization of the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund to ensure the success of efforts to build the counterinsurgency capabilities of Pakistan's security forces.

The committee supports the President's new counterinsurgency strategy in the war in Afghanistan. To better reflect the new strategy, the committee requires a new semi-annual report on trends and developments in Afghanistan and requires reporting on progress in stopping the momentum of the Taliban and their allies, building the capacity of the Afghan National Security Forces, and building the capacity of the Afghan Government. The committee bill also continues close congressional oversight of operations in Iraq, requiring reports focused on the redeployment of U.S. troops and their equipment over the next few months, and on the development of military capabilities that are necessary for the Government of Iraq to stand on its own.

The committee prepares America to deal with 21st century threats such as weapons of mass destruction. The committee provides $10.3 billion, an increase of $361.6 million above the budget request, for ballistic missile defense and in support of the Administration's Phased Adaptive Approach, which addresses immediate needs. To prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to reduce the risk that these weapons could fall into terrorists' hands, the committee fully funds the DOD Cooperative Threat Reduction Program and DOE's nonproliferation program, which includes funding for the President's plan to secure and remove all known vulnerable nuclear materials that can be used for weapons.

The men and women that make up the armed forces are the heart and soul of our national security. The committee makes sure that our troops and their loved ones are receiving the first class benefits that they deserve. To improve the quality of life for our forces and their families, the committee provides a 1.9 percent pay raise for all service members, continuing efforts to reduce the pay raise gap between the uniformed services and the private sector. The committee bill increases the maximum amount of hostile fire and imminent danger pay for the first time since 2004, and increases family separation allowance for service members whose deployment or temporary duty requires them to live away from their

families. The committee allows TRICARE beneficiaries to extend coverage to their dependent children until age 26, the same benefit that was afforded to individuals with private insurance policies in separate health care legislation passed earlier this year. Other initiatives to support military families include $345.0 million to modernize DOD schools, $65.0 million for Impact Aid education programs, and the creation of a new career development pilot program for military spouses.

The strain of two wars has taken a toll on military readiness. To boost readiness and reduce the strain on our forces, the committee increases the size of the military by 7,000 Army troops and 500 Air Force personnel, which supports the President's budget request. The committee significantly increases operation and maintenance funding to support the daily operations, training, and administration of U.S. military forces at home and abroad. The committee also provides critical funds to restore equipment stocks, including $9.9 billion for Army and Marine Corps equipment reset and depot maintenance, $4.5 billion for depot maintenance of active and reserve Air Force aircraft, and $109.0 million for Navy ship and aircraft depot maintenance. To address national guard and reserve equipment shortfalls, the committee authorizes $7.2 billion to provide aircraft missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, and other equipment.

To help prepare the armed forces for future military requirements, the committee authorizes major weapon programs and platforms that will protect our national security in the years ahead. Demonstrating the committee's commitment to reverse the decline in the size of the Navy fleet, the committee authorizes 9 new ships, including 2 Virginia-class submarines, 2 DDG 51 destroyers, and 2 Littoral Combat Ships. The committee also authorizes the F–35 competitive engine program, a necessary insurance policy for the F–35 Lightning II aircraft program that will generate long-term savings for taxpayers and also reduce the national security risk of depending on a single engine for ultimately 95 percent of our nation's fighter fleet.

In keeping with the committee's interest and longstanding defense policy oversight, the committee seeks to improve the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) process. The committee replaces the QDR Independent Review Panel appointed by the Secretary of Defense with a National Defense Panel consisting of ten members, with the Secretary of Defense appointing two panel co-chairs, and the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees each appointing two members. To assist the Department in maximizing the value of the next Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review, the committee directs the Department to include a particular focus on counterterrorism missions, including in the area of information operations, strategic communications, and interrogation and detention. In the area of acquisition reform, the committee's legislative efforts this year were primarily focused on separate legislation, H.R. 5013, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010, which separately passed the House of Representatives. The committee includes a variety of other acquisition related provisions with a particular focus on reducing or

eliminating the Department's vulnerability in the area of strategic materials, and on oversight of contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 results from hearings that began on January 13, 2010, and that were completed on May 5, 2010. The full committee conducted 16 sessions. In addition, a total of 38 sessions were conducted by 7 different subcommittees and 1 special oversight panel.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $111.4 billion for procurement. This represents a $6.3 billion increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommends authorization of $111.2 billion, a decrease of $131.5 million from the fiscal year 2011 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 procurement program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Appropriation	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
Aircraft Procurement, Army	516	5,976,867		9,494	516	5,986,361
Missile Procurement, Army	5,727	1,887,437		-255,974	5,727	1,631,463
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	32,607	1,723,561	-5,000	-107,316	27,607	1,616,245
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	0	1,979,414		-32,466	0	1,946,948
Other Procurement, Army	6,571	9,765,808		-367,080	6,571	9,398,728
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	0	215,868		-215,868	0	0
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY	**45,421**	**21,548,955**	**-5,000**	**-969,210**	**40,421**	**20,579,745**
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	224	18,508,613	13	624,000	237	19,132,613
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,566	3,359,794		-8,900	1,566	3,350,894
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	13	15,724,520			13	15,724,520
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	0	817,991			0	817,991
Other Procurement, Navy	0	6,450,208			0	6,450,208
Procurement, Marine Corps	595	1,344,044		35,000	595	1,379,044
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	**2,398**	**46,205,170**	**13**	**650,100**	**2,411**	**46,855,270**
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	133	15,366,508		-10,600	133	15,355,908
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	3,500	667,420		5,000	3,500	672,420
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,045	5,463,272		7,500	4,045	5,470,772
Other Procurement, Air Force	0	17,845,380		66,350	0	17,911,730
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE	**7,678**	**39,342,580**		**68,250**	**7,678**	**39,410,830**
Procurement, Defense-Wide	93	4,280,368		119,400	93	4,399,768
Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Appropriation	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
National Guard & Reserve Equipment	0	0			0	0
TOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE	**93**	**4,280,368**		**119,400**	**93**	**4,399,768**
TOTAL, FY 2011 PROCUREMENT PROGRAM	**55,590**	**111,377,073**	**-4,987**	**-131,460**	**50,603**	**111,245,613**

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $6.0 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $6.0 billion, an increase of $9.5 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY							
FIXED WING							
001	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	0	0			0	0
002	C-12 CARGO AIRPLANE	0	0			0	0
003	E-MARSS	0	88,483			0	88,483
004	MQ-1 UAV	26	459,310			26	459,310
005	RQ-11 (RAVEN)	312	20,152			312	20,152
006	BCT UNMANNED AERIAL VEH (UAVS) INCR 1	0	44,206		-9,506	0	34,700
	Program Reduction				[-9,506]		
ROTARY							
008	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	50	305,272			50	305,272
009	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK III	16	332,681			16	332,681
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	161,150			0	161,150
011	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	72	1,250,566			72	1,250,566
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	100,532			0	100,532
013	CH-47 HELICOPTER	40	1,101,293			40	1,101,293
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	57,756			0	57,756
015	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING	0	9,383			0	9,383
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT							
016	C-12 AIRCRAFT MODS	0	0			0	0
017	MQ-1 PAYLOAD - UAS	0	100,413			0	100,413
018	MQ-1 WEAPONIZATION - UAS	0	14,729			0	14,729
019	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)	0	29,899			0	29,899
020	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)	0	16,981			0	16,981
021	AH-64 MODS	0	393,769		2,000	0	395,769
	Vibration Management Enhancement Program (VMEP)				[2,000]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
022	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
023	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	0	66,207			0	66,207
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
025	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	0	13,716			0	13,716
026	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	0	814			0	814
027	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	0	63,085		17,000	0	80,085
	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L-ARNG				[17,000]		
028	KIOWA WARRIOR	0	94,400			0	94,400
029	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	0	219,425			0	219,425
030	GATM ROLLUP	0	100,862			0	100,862
031	RQ-7 UAV MODS	0	505,015			0	505,015
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
034	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	0	7,328			0	7,328
GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS							
035	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	0	24,478			0	24,478
036	ASE INFRARED CM	0	174,222			0	174,222
OTHER SUPPORT							
037	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	4,885			0	4,885
038	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	0	76,129			0	76,129
039	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	0	52,423			0	52,423
040	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	0	82,844			0	82,844
041	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	1,567			0	1,567
042	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	0	2,892			0	2,892
043	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	0	0			0	0
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**516**	**5,976,867**		**9,494**	**516**	**5,986,361**

Items of Special Interest

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request contained $44.2 million for Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee notes that, despite six years of system development work, 2009 limited user test results for Class I UAV found significant performance, reliability, and operational concept problems with the Class I UAV. Specifically, test reports indicate the Class I UAV is too loud and has too short a range to be tactically useful in many operations. Also, the Class I is intended to be transported and operated at the platoon level, but during the test proved unreliable and difficult to support and use by platoons, resulting in consolidation of the UAVs at the battalion level. The committee also notes that sufficient funds have already been provided by Congress for the Army to procure the first two brigade sets of Class I UAVs, and additional test assets. Based on test results to date and the availability of other funds, the committee believes that investment in additional brigade sets of Class I UAVs is premature.

The committee recommends $34.7, a decrease of $9.5 million, for EIBCT Class I UAVs.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $1.9 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.6 billion, a decrease of $256.0 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
001	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	78	480,247			78	480,247
002	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY:	0	116,732		-14,000	0	102,732
	Program Reduction				[-14,000]		
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	240	31,881			240	31,881
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	715	163,929			715	163,929
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	0	30,326			0	30,326
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	48,355			0	48,355
008	BCT NON LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM - INCREME	0	350,574		-350,574	0	0
	Program Reduction				[-350,574]		
009	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	2,592	291,041		-25,000	2,592	266,041
	Program Reduction				[-25,000]		
010	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,058	15,886			2,058	15,886
011	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS	44	211,517			44	211,517
	MODIFICATIONS						
012	PATRIOT MODS	0	57,170		133,600	0	190,770
	Program Increase				[133,600]		
013	ITAS/TOW MODS	0	13,281			0	13,281
014	MLRS MODS	0	8,217			0	8,217
015	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS	0	39,371			0	39,371
016	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS	0	10			0	10
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
017	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	19,569			0	19,569
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES							
018	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	0	3,613			0	3,613
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	0	1,208			0	1,208
020	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	0	4,510			0	4,510
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**5,727**	**1,887,437**		**-255,974**	**5,727**	**1,631,463**

Items of Special Interest

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team non-line-of-sight launch system

The budget request contained $350.6 million for the non-line-of-sight launch system (NLOS–LS).

The committee notes that the Army terminated the NLOS–LS program in April 2010. As a result, the requested procurement funds are not needed.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $350.6 million, for NLOS–LS procurement.

Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System

The budget request contained $291.0 million for procurement of Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) rockets.

The committee supports the GMLRS, which is seeing extensive use in Operation Enduring Freedom. However, the committee understands that foreign military sales should provide production efficiency savings.

The committee recommends $266.0 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, for GMLRS rockets.

Javelin Block 1 command launch unit requirements

The committee is concerned that many Army National Guard units will not receive the upgraded "Block 1" Javelin command launch units (CLU), under current fielding plans, even as the entire active-duty Army transitions to Block 1 CLUs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011, detailing the Block 1 fielding plan, by component, and the estimated cost to pure-fleet the entire Army with Block 1 CLUs.

Patriot Advanced Capability-3 Modifications

The budget request contained $57.2 million for Patriot Modifications, but included no funds to outfit an additional battalion with Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC–3) equipment.

The U.S. Army Patriot force is on schedule to reach 15 battalions by 2012. Patriot remains the Department of Defense High Demand/Low Density land-based air and missile defense capability called upon to support our forces on a global scale. In 2007, the Army was authorized to grow the force from 13 to 15 battalions. Since then, the deployment requirements and operational tempo have dramatically increased to include, starting in April 2010, open-ended rotations to our North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally, the Republic of Poland. Patriot soldiers and equipment are deployed today in the United States Central Command, United States European Command, and United States Pacific Command areas of operation; more than 50 percent of the force is deployed at any given time. The Army has assessed an operational need for further force structure but has not programmed the manpower spaces or funding to upgrade a 16th existing battalion set of equipment and add it to the deployable force structure. Considering the growing demand for regional missile defense assets, the committee believes further force structure is necessary.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the adequacy of the Patriot force structure to meet current and projected global threats to our forces and submit a report on the assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011.

The committee is also aware that the Army's unfunded requirements letter included a request for $133.6 million to repair and recertify PAC–3 missiles and to upgrade 24 additional Patriot launchers to the PAC–3 capability. The additional missile procurement funds would provide the depot engineering support to shorten the time that some PAC–3 missiles will be out of the inventory awaiting recertification. The additional launcher upgrades would provide operational Patriot forces a second PAC–3 capable launcher. Many of the PAC–3 capable units ready for deployment have only a single PAC–3 capable launcher today (deployed units were provided the second launcher as a higher priority requirement). The second launcher provides a commander the ability to have more missiles ready to fire; an additional launch point; or increased confidence and reliability at the unit level compared to a single launcher.

The committee recommends $190.8 million, an increase of $133.6 million, for Patriot Modifications.

Stinger missile service life enhancement program

The committee is concerned that most Stinger missiles could exceed their storage life by the end of 2015. The committee understands that the Army and Marine Corps are evaluating the feasibility of a service life enhancement program (SLEP) as a way of mitigating the risk of the aging inventory. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2011, that specifies the schedule and cost estimates for the proposed SLEP. The report should also contain a cost and schedule estimate for lethality enhancements including, but not limited to, a proximity fuze.

Surface launched advanced medium range air-to-air missile system

The budget request contained $116.7 million for the surface launched medium range air-to-air missile (SLAMRAAM) system.

The committee notes that the budget request provides procurement funds to acquire six SLAMRAAM launch vehicles and nine fire control vehicles. The committee believes that the numbers of different vehicles requested should better align with fielding and operational plans, which do not require fire control vehicles in excess of available launch platforms.

The committee recommends $102.7 million, a decrease of $14.0 million, for SLAMRAAM procurement.

WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $1.7 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.6 billion, a decrease of $107.3 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY							
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES							
001	BRADLEY PROGRAM	0	0			0	0
002	BRADLEY TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	0	0			0	0
003	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	0	0			0	0
004	STRYKER VEHICLE	83	299,545			83	299,545
005	FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS)	0	0			0	0
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
007	FCS SPIN OUTS	0	0			0	0
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES							
009	STRYKER (MOD)	0	146,352			0	146,352
010	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	0	31,083			0	31,083
011	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)	0	215,133			0	215,133
012	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	0	105,277		-105,277	0	0
	Program Reduction				[-105,277]		
013	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	17	69,609			17	69,609
014	ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE	17	77,930			17	77,930
015	M88 FOV MODS	0	9,157			0	9,157
016	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	9	44,133			9	44,133
017	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	0	230,907			0	230,907
018	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	21	183,000			21	183,000
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES							
019	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	0	3,145			0	3,145
WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES							
020	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119	2	5,575			2	5,575
021	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)	1,655	28,179			1,655	28,179

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
022	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL	5,900	79,496			5,900	79,496
023	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	350	18,941			350	18,941
024	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)	0	0			0	0
025	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)	238	4,465			238	4,465
026	MORTAR SYSTEMS	138	17,082			138	17,082
027	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	0	235			0	235
028	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	3,869	16,282			3,869	16,282
029	M110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)	155	5,159			155	5,159
030	M4 CARBINE	11,494	20,180			11,494	20,180
031	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	3,659	7,153			3,659	7,153
032	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO	0	0			0	0
033	HANDGUN	5,000	3,371	-5,000	-3,371	0	0
	Program Reduction			[-5,000]	[-3,371]		
034	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)	0	0			0	0
MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH							
035	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS	0	4,286			0	4,286
036	M4 CARBINE MODS	0	14,044			0	14,044
037	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS	0	0			0	0
038	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS	0	5,922			0	5,922
039	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS	0	15,852			0	15,852
040	M119 MODIFICATIONS	0	39,810			0	39,810
041	M16 RIFLE MODS	0	3,855			0	3,855
042	M14 7.62 RIFLE MODS	0	0			0	0
043	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	0	6,083			0	6,083
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES							
044	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	0	0			0	0
045	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	0	7,869			0	7,869

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
046	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	0	409			0	409
047	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	0	4,042		1,332	0	5,374
	Additional Small Arms- Nevada National Guard				[1,332]		
048	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	0			0	0
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**32,607**	**1,723,561**	**-5,000**	**-107,316**	**27,607**	**1,616,245**

Items of Special Interest

Modular handgun system

The budget request contained $3.4 million for 5,000 new modular handgun systems to replace the M9 pistol.

This is a new start program for fiscal year 2011. The committee notes that neither the Joint Requirements Oversight Council nor the Army Requirements Oversight Council have approved this requirement. Without a validated requirement, the committee believes this request lacks the necessary justification to proceed.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $3.4 million, for the modular handgun system.

Paladin Integrated Management program

The budget request contained $105.3 million for procurement of upgraded M109A6 Paladin artillery systems.

The committee supports the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program. The committee understands that with the cancelation of the Non-Line of Sight Cannon system that the PIM program is the Army's only mobile artillery development program. However, the committee expects the PIM program to be delayed an additional six to eight months, based on technology integration challenges. As a result, the expected commencement of low-rate initial production is expected to slip into fiscal year 2012, obviating the need for procurement funds in fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $105.3 million, for PIM vehicle procurement.

Stryker vehicles

The budget request contained $299.6 million for 83 new Stryker vehicles and $591.4 million for Stryker vehicle upgrades.

The committee supports the Stryker vehicle program, and believes that Stryker brigades provide the Army with a flexible and mobile force with combat capability between light brigades and heavy brigades, as originally planned by the Army. The committee also supports efforts to evaluate the double-V hull upgrade to select Stryker vehicles for service in Operation Enduring Freedom. If testing demonstrates the value of the double-V hull upgrade, the committee expects the Army to move forward quickly with these reconfigured vehicles.

However, the committee is concerned that the Army's future plans for upgrading Stryker vehicles and adding Stryker brigades are not clear. Specifically, the committee notes that prior year funding appears adequate to equip the eight planned Stryker brigades while also providing funds for additional maintenance float and training vehicles, yet the Army is requesting an additional $299.6 million for new vehicles in fiscal year 2011. The committee also understands that as of April 2010, the Army has in excess of $850.0 million in unobligated Stryker procurement funds dating back to fiscal year 2008 funding. While the Army claims to have plans to expend these funds on Stryker vehicles, the committee remains concerned, given the many other urgent needs in the Army's budget, that constant changes in requirements by the Army have delayed use of these funds for this long. The committee expects the Army to rapidly clarify its force structure and upgrade plans for

Stryker vehicles and execute the funding on hand. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to deliver a report to the congressional defense committees by February 5, 2011, that provides a detailed explanation of changes in Stryker force structure, new requirements for upgrades and maintenance fleets, and the associated procurement and development funding through fiscal year 2017 needed to achieve these requirements.

The committee recommends $891.0 million, the full amount requested, for Stryker vehicle procurement and upgrades.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $2.0 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.9 billion, a decrease of $32.5 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY							
SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION							
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	0	195,406			0	195,406
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	0	79,622			0	79,622
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES	0	5,377			0	5,377
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	0	160,712			0	160,712
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	0	0			0	0
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	0	15,887			0	15,887
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	0	95,222			0	95,222
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	0	167,632			0	167,632
MORTAR AMMUNITION							
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	0	14,340			0	14,340
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	0	24,036			0	24,036
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	0	96,335		-28,600	0	67,735
	Program Reduction				[-28,600]		
TANK AMMUNITION							
012	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES	0	7,794			0	7,794
013	CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES	0	114,798			0	114,798
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION							
014	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES	0	7,329			0	7,329
015	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES	0	76,658			0	76,658
016	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES	0	45,752		4,000	0	49,752
	Additional M1066 155MM Illuminating Cartridges				[4,000]		
017	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982	0	62,114			0	62,114
018	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T	0	29,309			0	29,309
ARTILLERY FUZES							
019	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	0	25,047			0	25,047

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
MINES							
020	MINES, ALL TYPES	0	817			0	817
021	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES	0	8,000			0	8,000
NETWORKED MUNITIONS							
022	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	53,005			0	53,005
023	SCORPION, INTELLIGENT MUNITIONS SYSTEM , ALL	0	10,246		-10,246	0	0
	Milestone C Schedule Delay- Funding ahead of need				[-10,246]		
ROCKETS							
024	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	43,873			0	43,873
025	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	0	120,628			0	120,628
OTHER AMMUNITION							
026	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	19,824			0	19,824
027	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	41,803			0	41,803
028	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	0	39,472			0	39,472
029	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	0	11,389			0	11,389
MISCELLANEOUS							
030	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	0	17,499			0	17,499
031	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	0	5,266			0	5,266
032	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	0	5,322			0	5,322
033	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	9,768			0	9,768
034	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	0	12,721			0	12,721
035	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	0	11,786			0	11,786
036	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	0	100			0	100
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT							
037	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	144,368		2,380	0	146,748
	Iowa Army Ammunition Plant Energy and Utility Monitoring Project				[2,380]		
038	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	9,504			0	9,504

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
039	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	0	9,025			0	9,025
040	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL	0	178,367			0	178,367
041	ARMS INITIATIVE	0	3,261			0	3,261
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**0**	**1,979,414**		**-32,466**	**0**	**1,946,948**

Items of Special Interest

Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative

The budget request contained $216.5 million for 120mm mortar, all types, of which $98.6 million was for the Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative (APMI) program.

The APMI program would provide precision guided mortar capability to address a Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statement (JUONS) from Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). The committee understands the APMI program has completed a down-select process that resulted in substantially lower unit costs than had been originally budgeted for by the Army in the budget request for fiscal year 2011. The Army indicates that it will only require $19.9 million in fiscal year 2011 procurement funds to address the JUONS requirement from OEF.

The committee recommends a total reduction of $78.7 million for the APMI program, a reduction of $28.6 million in the base request, and a reduction of $50.1 million in the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request, as part of title 15 of this Act.

MK281 target practice rounds

The budget request contained $230.3 million for Ctg, 40mm, all types, of which $24.8 million was for the MK281, Mod 0 target practice round and $89.4 million was for the MK281, Mod 1 target practice round.

The committee recognizes MK281 target practice rounds are a non-dud producing, eco-friendly round which enables its use for fire and maneuver engagement training with the MK19 weapon system during the day and night at Joint National Training Centers. The committee also notes the MK19 is being used extensively in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Therefore, the committee would encourage the Army to continue the procurement of MK281 target practice rounds as specified in the supporting budget documentation to support current target practice round requirements.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $9.8 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $9.4 billion, a decrease of $367.1 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY							
TACTICAL VEHICLES							
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	2,359	25,560			2,359	25,560
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	391	38,713			391	38,713
003	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS	0	0			0	0
004	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	0	0			0	0
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	2,960	918,195			2,960	918,195
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN	0	21,317			0	21,317
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	0	549,741			0	549,741
008	PLS ESP	0	100,108		-50,000	0	50,108
	Program Reduction				[-50,000]		
009	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	94	114,478		-25,500	94	88,978
	Program Reduction				[-25,500]		
010	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY	0	230,978			0	230,978
011	FAMILY OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTEC (MRAP)	0	0			0	0
012	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	55	37,519			55	37,519
013	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P	708	173,565			708	173,565
014	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	0	0			0	0
015	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	0	349,256		-30,000	0	319,256
	Program Reduction				[-30,000]		
016	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)	0	0			0	0
017	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL	0	234			0	234
018	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS, OPA1	0	746			0	746
NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES							
019	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	4	1,875			4	1,875
020	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	0	3,323			0	3,323

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
021	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	0	19,586			0	19,586
COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS							
022	VEHICLE MTD MINE DECTE	0	0			0	0
023	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM	0	11,411			0	11,411
024	WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	0	421,798		-25,000	0	396,798
	Program Reduction				[-25,000]		
025	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	0	4,690			0	4,690
COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS							
026	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS (S	0	115,744			0	115,744
027	SHF TERM	0	14,198			0	14,198
028	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	0	662			0	662
029	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	0	32,193		51,200	0	83,393
	Program Increase				[51,200]		
030	SMART-T (SPACE)	0	10,285			0	10,285
031	SCAMP (SPACE)	0	930			0	930
032	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	0	4,586			0	4,586
033	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	0	1,506			0	1,506
COMM - COMBAT SUPPORT COMM							
034	MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER	0	938			0	938
COMM - C3 SYSTEM							
035	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	0	20,387			0	20,387
COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS							
036	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	0	700			0	700
037	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	0	209,568		-10,200	0	199,368
	Program Reduction				[-10,200]		
038	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	0	5,796			0	5,796
039	SINCGARS FAMILY	0	14,504			0	14,504

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
040	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS - OPA2	0	3,860			0	3,860
041	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATIONS OPERATIONS SYSEMS	0	9,501			0	9,501
042	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	0	5,965			0	5,965
043	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	0	26,358			0	26,358
044	IMS REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	0	6,603		-6,603	0	0
	Program Reduction				[-6,603]		
045	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	0	5,125			0	5,125
046	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	0	2,397			0	2,397
047	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY	0	9,983			0	9,983
048	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	0	23,606			0	23,606
COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM							
049	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	0	1,465			0	1,465
INFORMATION SECURITY							
050	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	0	25,959			0	25,959
051	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	0	63,340		36,661	0	100,001
	Biometrics Equipment- Transfer from RDA 171				[36,661]		
COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS							
052	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	0	137			0	137
053	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	0	28,406			0	28,406
054	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	0	11,566			0	11,566
COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS							
055	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	0	201,081			0	201,081
056	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	0	6,264			0	6,264
057	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM(	0	178,242			0	178,242
058	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	0	10,427			0	10,427
ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)							
063	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS)	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
064	JTT/CIBS-M	0	3,321			0	3,321
065	PROPHET GROUND	0	71,517			0	71,517
066	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)	0	0			0	0
067	SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)	0	0			0	0
068	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS)	0	441			0	441
069	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	0	0			0	0
070	DCGS-A (MIP)	0	137,424			0	137,424
071	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	0	9,279			0	9,279
072	TROJAN (MIP)	0	28,345			0	28,345
073	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	0	7,602			0	7,602
074	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) (MIP	0	7,416			0	7,416
075	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)	0	18,721			0	18,721
ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)							
076	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	0	32,980		47,100	0	80,080
	Program Increase- Unfunded Requirement				[47,100]		
077	WARLOCK	0	24,127			0	24,127
078	BCT UNATTENDED GROUND SENSOR	0	29,718		-29,718	0	0
	Program Reduction				[-29,718]		
079	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	0	1,394			0	1,394
080	CI MODERNIZATION	0	1,263			0	1,263
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)							
081	FAAD GBS	0	91,467		-20,000	0	71,467
	Program Reduction				[-20,000]		
082	SENTINEL MODS	0	30,976			0	30,976
083	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)	0	24,939			0	24,939
084	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	0	70,528			0	70,528

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
085	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	0	255,641		-20,000	0	235,641
	Program Reduction				[-20,000]		
086	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	0	248,899			0	248,899
087	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	0	8,520			0	8,520
088	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS	0	0			0	0
089	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM)	0	2,088			0	2,088
090	BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS	0	0			0	0
091	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	0	6,042			0	6,042
092	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)	0	0			0	0
093	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE	0	0			0	0
094	PROFILER	0	4,408			0	4,408
095	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)	0	2,843			0	2,843
096	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)	0	39,786			0	39,786
097	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND - PLATFORM (JBC-P)	0	147			0	147
098	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD	0	65,970			0	65,970
099	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	0	815			0	815
100	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	0	16,475			0	16,475
101	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	0	275,867			0	275,867
102	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM	0	2,062			0	2,062
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS							
103	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	0	53,768		-25,000	0	28,768
	Program Reduction				[-25,000]		
104	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	0	49,077		16,200	0	65,277
	AFATDS Forward Entry Devices Unfunded Requirement				[16,200]		
105	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC	0	25,866			0	25,866

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
106	FAAD C2	0	42,511		-20,000	0	22,511
	Program Reduction				[-20,000]		
107	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD	0	57,038			0	57,038
108	KNIGHT FAMILY	0	120,723			0	120,723
109	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	0	1,710			0	1,710
110	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	0	10,858			0	10,858
111	TC AIMS II	0	10,457			0	10,457
112	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)	0	0			0	0
113	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER	0	1,594			0	1,594
114	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE	0	18,492			0	18,492
115	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	0	96,162			0	96,162
116	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)	0	99,819			0	99,819
117	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	0	15,466			0	15,466
118	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCOTM)	0	0			0	0
ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION							
119	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM	0	97,858			0	97,858
120	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	0	36,158			0	36,158
121	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	0	203,864			0	203,864
122	CSS COMMUNICATIONS	0	39,811			0	39,811
123	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	0	39,360			0	39,360
ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)							
124	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)	0	663			0	663
125	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	0	6,467			0	6,467
ELECT EQUIP - MODS TACTICAL SYS/EQ							
126	WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (UAS)	0	0			0	0
ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT							
127	ITEMS UNDER $5M (SSE)	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
128	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	0	542			0	542
129	BCT NETWORK	0	176,543		-176,543	0	0
	Program Reduction				[-176,543]		
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
129A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	2,560			0	2,560
CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT							
130	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	0	2,489			0	2,489
131	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	0	9,305			0	9,305
132	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	0	180,351			0	180,351
133	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)	0	831			0	831
BRIDGING EQUIPMENT							
134	TACTICAL BRIDGING	0	62,817			0	62,817
135	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	0	105,837			0	105,837
ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT							
136	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST	0	43,871			0	43,871
137	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS	0	35,002			0	35,002
138	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	0	54,093			0	54,093
139	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	0	3,655			0	3,655
140	AERIAL DETECTION	0	0			0	0
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
141	HEATERS AND ECU'S	0	20,610			0	20,610
142	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES	0	0			0	0
143	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	0	5,416			0	5,416
144	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)	0	0			0	0
145	LAND WARRIOR	0	0			0	0
146	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	0	7,813			0	7,813

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
147	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	0	110,524		-14,500	0	96,024
	Program Reduction				[-14,500]		
148	MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM	0	38,872			0	38,872
149	FORCE PROVIDER	0	41,539			0	41,539
150	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	0	23,826			0	23,826
151	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	0	69,496			0	69,496
152	MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM:	0	26,532			0	26,532
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)	0	31,420			0	31,420
PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT							
154	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	0	175,069			0	175,069
WATER EQUIPMENT							
155	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	0	3,597			0	3,597
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT							
156	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	0	30,365			0	30,365
MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT							
157	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	0	159,285			0	159,285
158	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	0	3,702			0	3,702
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT							
159	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	0	48,379			0	48,379
160	SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM	0	17,498			0	17,498
161	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	0	12,452			0	12,452
162	DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC	0	0			0	0
163	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING	0	62,111			0	62,111
164	LOADERS	0	7,205			0	7,205
165	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	0	8,458			0	8,458
166	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	0	64,032			0	64,032
167	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	0	10,783			0	10,783

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
168	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS	0	64,959			0	64,959
169	CONST EQUIP ESP	0	11,063			0	11,063
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	0	20,565			0	20,565
RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT							
171	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	0	202,764			0	202,764
172	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER (HCCC	0	37,683			0	37,683
173	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	0	8,052			0	8,052
GENERATORS							
174	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	0	113,573			0	113,573
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT							
175	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)	0	29,460			0	29,460
176	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	0	12,936			0	12,936
177	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	0	17,352			0	17,352
TRAINING EQUIPMENT							
178	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	0	23,400			0	23,400
179	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	0	297,200		11,750	0	308,950
	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Virtual Trainers (MRAP-VVT) Alabama National Guard				[5,000]		
	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Virtual Trainers (MRAP-VVT) California National Guard				[6,000]		
	Tabletop Trainers, Individual Gunnery Trainer (IGT)- California National Guard				[750]		
180	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	0	64,912			0	64,912
181	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA	0	26,120			0	26,120
182	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	0	4,964			0	4,964
TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)							
183	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	0	38,778			0	38,778
184	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	0	104,472			0	104,472
185	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	0	19,166			0	19,166
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
186	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	42,229			0	42,229
187	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	0	56,195			0	56,195
188	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	0	1,873			0	1,873
189	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	0	103,046		-16,600	0	86,446
	Program Reduction				[-16,600]		
190	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	0	2,233			0	2,233
191	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE	0	0			0	0
192	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	0	44,483			0	44,483
193	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	0	13,104			0	13,104
194	MA8975	0	3,894			0	3,894
195	BCT UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE	0	20,046		1,254	0	21,300
	Program Increase				[1,254]		
196	BCT TRAINING/LOGISTICS/MANAGEMENT	0	61,581		-61,581	0	0
	Program Reduction				[-61,581]		
OPA2							
197	INITIAL SPARES - C&E	0	38,707			0	38,707
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**6,571**	**9,765,808**		**-367,080**	**6,571**	**9,398,728**

Items of Special Interest

Defense Advanced GPS Receivers

The budget request contained $32.2 million for acquisition of 8,297 Defense Advanced GPS Receivers (DAGR).

To date, approximately 220,000 DAGR units have been delivered to the Army, replacing the need to purchase jamming-susceptible commercial GPS receivers. The Army acquisition objective is to purchase 462,288 units. Approximately 60 percent of the currently fielded DAGRs thus far have been installed in vehicles, creating a GPS void for individual service members. Additional funding for DAGR procurement should reduce the cost of each unit and increase the number of units available for deployment to individual warfighters. The committee is aware that purchase of additional DAGRs was the third item in the Army's unfunded requirements letter to Congress.

The committee recommends $83.4 million, an increase of $51.2 million, for procurement of additional DAGRs.

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team network integration kits

The budget request contained $176.6 million for Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) network integration kits (NIK).

The committee understands that the NIKs and the connectivity that they enable are the heart of the EIBCT program, and is what could eventually distinguish the EIBCT network from current Army network capabilities. However, the committee has numerous concerns with the performance and cost of this critical element of the EIBCT. The committee notes that 2009 limited user test (LUT) results for the EIBCT vehicle network integration kits found significant performance, reliability, and operational concept problems. In addition, the committee notes that these poor test results occurred while the NIKs were tested in a very small network of just a few nodes, which was operating in an unencrypted format and not subject to jamming or other network interference. The results of the test raise serious questions about the ability of the program to develop a network large enough and secure enough to achieve program requirements on its current schedule. While the program claims that fixes will be in place by the September 2010 LUT, the committee remains concerned that the LUT will feature a very limited number of network nodes that will still be operating in an unencrypted format.

The committee also notes that even if the NIKs perform as planned, they may provide little additional capability to EIBCT units and will likely be very expensive. Despite the per-vehicle unit price for a NIK of approximately $1.0 million, the only functionality it brings is transmitting limited sensor data, such as still images and icons, for display on an existing Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below terminal. The committee is not confident that this limited network capability justifies spending almost $1.0 million per vehicle kit, when the Army has lower cost alternatives available for providing enhanced network capability down to the platform level.

Finally, the committee understands that sufficient funds have already been provided by Congress through fiscal year 2010 for the Army to procure the first two brigade sets of network integration

kits, and additional test assets. Based on test results to date and the availability of other funds, the committee believes that investment in additional brigade sets of network integration kits is premature.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $176.6 million, for procurement of EIBCT network integration kits.

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team small unmanned ground vehicles

The budget request contained $20.1 million for Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) small unmanned ground vehicles (SUGV).

The committee notes that despite six years of system development work, 2009 limited user test results for the SUGVs found significant performance and reliability problems. Specifically, test reports indicated that SUGVs were overweight, allowed insufficient range between each SUGV and its operator to keep the operator safe, and have limited utility at night due to sensor limitations. The committee also notes that sufficient funds have already been provided by Congress for the Army to procure the first two brigade sets of SUGVs, and additional test assets. Based on test results to date and the availability of other funds, the committee believes that investment in additional brigade sets of SUGVs is premature.

The committee recommends $21.3 million, an increase of $1.3 million, for EIBCT SUGVs.

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team training/logistics/management

The budget request contained $61.6 million for Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) training/logistics/management fielding support.

The committee understands that the requested funds are for support of fielding of other EIBCT equipment. Because of reductions to EIBCT procurement funds elsewhere in this title 1, the committee does not believe that the $61.6 million in associated fielding support funding that was requested will be necessary.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $61.6 million, for EIBCT training/logistics/management support.

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team unattended ground sensors

The budget request contained $29.7 million for Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) unattended ground sensors.

The committee notes that, despite six years of system development work, 2009 limited user test results for the EIBCT urban-unattended ground sensors (U–UGS) and tactical-unattended ground sensors (T–UGS) found significant performance, reliability, and operational concept problems. Specifically, test reports indicated that the sensors were difficult to emplace, fell well below reliability requirements, and contributed "little to unit situational awareness" due to poor image quality and slow image transmission over the network. The committee also notes that sufficient funds have already been provided by Congress for the Army to procure the first two brigade sets of U–UGS and T–UGS, and additional test assets. Based on test results to date and the availability of other funds,

the committee believes that investment in additional brigade sets of U–UGS or T–UGS is premature.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $29.7 million, for procurement of EIBCT U–UGS and T–UGS.

Ground Soldier System acquisition strategy

The budget request contained $110.5 million for the Ground Soldier System (GSS) Increment I program to support the low-rate initial production of 4,598 GSS units.

The committee understands that the GSS program would provide situational awareness and understanding to the dismounted leader, allowing for faster and more accurate decisions in the tactical fight while also reducing fratricide. The committee notes GSS Increment I would primarily focus on providing the ground soldier with improved situational awareness, command and control, hands-free color display, and improved hearing protection/enhancement and voice and position location information. The committee is aware that GSS Increment I would use technologically mature systems, including radios and communication software, with program risk found in the integration of these systems.

The committee believes the current acquisition strategy for GSS Increment I is high risk, and has concerns regarding the proposed schedule to move the program from milestone A to milestone C, effectively bypassing milestone B, within 21 months of the initial development contract award. The committee notes that the schedule does not account for any major obstacles which might surface due to the complexities involved with systems integration.

The committee expects all developmental testing to be completed and analyzed before any decision is made prior to beginning Milestone C. The committee also expects that the Army will fully comply with section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, prior to any Milestone B or milestone C decision. The committee recommends $96.0 million, a reduction of $14.5 million, for the Ground Soldier System Increment I program.

High mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles

The committee understands the high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) has provided a proven capability for a light tactical vehicle (LTV) for the armed forces for over 25 years. The committee notes that through congressional support and significant investment during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, over 40,000 HMMWVs have been recapitalized through an extensive recapitalization program that provided additional performance and survivability capabilities to HMMWVs. In addition, over 50,000 new Up-Armored HMMWVs (UAH) have been procured during this period.

The committee is aware that the fiscal year 2011 Overseas Contingency Operations budget request contained $1.3 billion in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund for new production of HMMWVs and UAHs, and the fiscal year 2010 Supplemental budget request for ongoing military operations contained $318.9 million for new production of HMMWVs and UAHs. The committee supports the President's request to utilize these funds for the procurement of new HMMWVs as specified in the supporting budget documentation. The committee also recognizes that HMMWV and UAH re-

quirements may exist beyond these purposes, particularly for the Army National Guard. The committee encourages the military services and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to adequately resource and effectively address any unmet LTV requirements in future budget submissions.

High-resolution three dimensional topographic data

The committee understands that there is a requirement for high-resolution three dimensional (3D) topographic terrain data with co-collected high resolution color imagery to meet warfighter requirements in planning and executing operations in urban terrain in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee also understands that tactical commanders have provided Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statements (JUONS) to the Department of Defense for high-resolution 3D topographic terrain data with co-collected high-resolution color imagery, but that these JUONS have not been resourced.

The committee is concerned about the lack of the high-resolution 3D topographic terrain data needed by commanders and warfighters to conduct population-centric operations over the complex and urban terrain that characterize today's hybrid-multi-modal warfare.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as the executive agent for high-resolution 3D topographic terrain data for U.S. ground forces and special operations forces, to conduct a study regarding the extent of the shortfall of high-resolution 3D topographic terrain data, to include resources required to meet this requirement. The report should also address whether organizational changes are required to ensure day-to-day visibility of the importance of this capability within the intelligence community. The committee directs the Commander, USACE to provide this report to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2010.

The committee further directs the Director of the Joint Staff to request the combat commands to provide their views on the importance of high-resolution 3D topographic terrain data, and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees transmitting the responses from the combatant commands by September 1, 2010.

Intelligent Munitions System remote control units

The budget request contained $6.6 million for procurement of Intelligent Munitions System (IMS) remote control units.

The committee notes that the low-rate initial production decision for the IMS remote control units has slipped to fiscal year 2012 due to technological challenges that emerged during development testing. Therefore, the committee does not believe that the amount requested is needed in fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $6.6 million, for IMS remote control units.

Joint Tactical Radio System hand-held radios

The budget request contained $209.6 million for procurement of various models of Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) radios.

The committee supports the goals of the JTRS program. In particular, the committee supports the program's innovative acquisition model that seeks to maintain multiple vendors for each class of JTRS radios and annual competition throughout the life of the JTRS program. However, the committee notes that the JTRS small form factor "c" (SFF–C) radio, also referred to as a "rifleman radio," has been delayed for at least a year. In addition, the committee notes that the Army received $25.3 million in fiscal year 2010 for more than 2,700 early-model SFF–C radios, which is more than enough for testing and initial low-rate production. Therefore, the committee believes that no procurement funds are needed in fiscal year 2011 for JTRS SFF–C radios.

The committee recommends $199.4 million, a decrease of $10.2 million, for JTRS radio procurement.

Non-system training device program

The budget request contained $297.2 million to continue the non-system training device (NSTD) program, but included no funds to procure the following NSTD programs: Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Virtual Trainers (MRAP–VVT) for the California National Guard, MRAP–VVTs for the Alabama National Guard, and Tabletop Trainers, Individual Gunnery Trainers (IGT) for the California National Guard.

The Army's NSTD program is an initiative used to introduce realistic and effective training devices into individual and unit training settings. The committee understands there is an emphasis on training military personnel in urban operations and asymmetric tactical situations similar to those being experienced by soldiers in Overseas Contingency Operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee understands these devices provide capabilities that allow soldiers and units to train for tasks and missions that would be unsafe or too resource intensive to conduct with actual weapons, weapons systems, and/or ammunition. The committee supports this initiative and believes these programs could significantly improve soldier survivability and performance.

The committee recommends $308.9 million for the NSTD program for a total increase of $11.7 million, including: an increase of $6.0 million for MRAP–VVTs for the California National Guard, $5.0 million for MRAP–VVTs for the Alabama National Guard, and $0.7 million for Tabletop Trainers, IGTs for the California National Guard.

Warfighter Information Network—Tactical Increment 2

The budget request contained $421.8 million for procurement of Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (WIN–T) equipment.

The committee supports the Army's WIN–T program and understands that it is a critical element of the Army's overall effort to provide advanced networking capabilities in its tactical formations. The committee notes that the three increments of the WIN–T program are now programs of record that conform to Department of Defense acquisition policies, and therefore believes that adequate oversight mechanisms are in place to ensure proper testing of WIN–T equipment. However, the committee notes that WIN–T Increment 2 received only partial approval for low-rate initial produc-

tion, and that as a result execution of funds already provided will be slower than planned.

The committee recommends $396.8 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, for WIN–T equipment procurement.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $215.9 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The committee recommends a transfer of this funding to title XV of this Act.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK	0	0			0	0
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE	0	0			0	0
	FORCE TRAINING						
003	TRAIN THE FORCE	0	0			0	0
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
004	OPERATIONS	0	215,868		-215,868	0	0
	Transfer to Title XV				[-215,868]		
	TOTAL, JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND	**0**	**215,868**		**-215,868**	**0**	**0**

Items of Special Interest

Joint counter remote control improvised explosive device electronic warfare

The committee is aware that there are several thousand military vehicles in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom that are equipped with legacy counter remote control improvised explosive device electronic warfare (CREW) systems. The committee has continually urged the Secretary of Defense to expeditiously upgrade or replace these legacy CREW systems. The committee understands the future joint-counter remote control improvised explosive device electronic warfare (JCREW) program of record for the military services is the JCREW 3.3 system and this system is expected to be fielded in fiscal year 2012. The committee notes both the Army and the Marine Corps will attempt to continue to upgrade their legacy systems to keep pace with threats until JCREW 3.3 becomes available.

The committee is aware the single manager for JCREW, who is a flag grade officer designated by the Secretary of the Navy, the Department of Defense Executive Agent for the program, is responsible for improving the efficiency and economy of future ground-based CREW technology development, and for eliminating duplication and overlap of effort. The military services are required to follow the single manager's guidance for integrating, fielding, and replacing CREW systems.

The committee believes the individual military services should assume a greater amount of responsibility related to providing joint acquisition goals, objectives, and execution of the JCREW program office rather than relying solely on Department of Navy budgets and Overseas Contingency Operations funds via the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization. This funding instability discourages continued investment in current and future CREW technology, could potentially reduce or eliminate surge capability necessary to respond to other contingencies; and inhibits the development of affordable joint solutions. The committee encourages the military services to ensure inputs to the Department of Defense program objective memorandum to enable the JCREW joint program office to continue the development and acquisition of joint CREW systems.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, outlining forecast requirements for armed forces sustainment of CREW legacy systems and future CREW system requirements.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $18.5 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $19.1 billion, an increase of $624.0 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY							
COMBAT AIRCRAFT							
001	EA-18G	12	1,028,801			12	1,028,801
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	55,081			0	55,081
003	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	22	1,784,894	8	500,000	30	2,284,894
	Excess to MYP III Funding Needs				[-130,500]		
	Program Increase			[8]	[630,500]		
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	2,295			0	2,295
005	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	7	1,667,093			7	1,667,093
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	219,895			0	219,895
007	JSF STOVL	13	2,289,816			13	2,289,816
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	286,326			0	286,326
009	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	30	2,121,036			30	2,121,036
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	81,875			0	81,875
011	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	28	738,709			28	738,709
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	69,360			0	69,360
013	MH-60S (MYP)	18	478,591			18	478,591
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	70,080			0	70,080
015	MH-60R	24	897,933			24	897,933
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	162,006			0	162,006
017	P-8A POSEIDON	7	1,824,437			7	1,824,437
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	166,153			0	166,153
019	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE	4	819,184			4	819,184
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	118,619			0	118,619
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT							
021	C-40A	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
TRAINER AIRCRAFT							
022	JPATS	38	266,065			38	266,065
OTHER AIRCRAFT							
023	KC-130J	0	0			0	0
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
025	RQ-7 UAV	0	0			0	0
026	MQ-8 UAV	3	47,484			3	47,484
027	STUASLO UAV	18	23,912			18	23,912
028	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	0	0	3	33,000	3	33,000
	UC-12W Aircraft			[3]	[33,000]		
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT							
029	EA-6 SERIES	0	14,891	2	56,000	2	70,891
	UC-35ER Aircraft			[2]	[56,000]		
030	AEA SYSTEMS	0	33,772			0	33,772
031	AV-8 SERIES	0	19,386			0	19,386
032	F-18 SERIES	0	492,821			0	492,821
033	H-46 SERIES	0	17,685			0	17,685
034	AH-1W SERIES	0	11,011			0	11,011
035	H-53 SERIES	0	25,871		35,000	0	60,871
	CH-53 Reliability Improvements				[35,000]		
036	SH-60 SERIES	0	67,779			0	67,779
037	H-1 SERIES	0	3,060			0	3,060
038	EP-3 SERIES	0	90,323			0	90,323
039	P-3 SERIES	0	221,982			0	221,982
040	E-2 SERIES	0	47,046			0	47,046
041	TRAINER A/C SERIES	0	23,999			0	23,999

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
042	C-2A	0	16,020			0	16,020
043	C-130 SERIES	0	17,839			0	17,839
044	FEWSG	0	21,928			0	21,928
045	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	0	16,092			0	16,092
046	E-6 SERIES	0	149,164			0	149,164
047	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	0	43,443			0	43,443
048	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	0	14,679			0	14,679
049	T-45 SERIES	0	61,515			0	61,515
050	POWER PLANT CHANGES	0	19,948			0	19,948
051	JPATS SERIES	0	1,831			0	1,831
052	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS	0	8,084			0	8,084
053	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	0	21,947			0	21,947
054	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	0	101,120			0	101,120
055	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	0	0			0	0
056	ID SYSTEMS	0	20,397			0	20,397
057	RQ-7 SERIES	0	18,121			0	18,121
058	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	0	21,985			0	21,985
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
059	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	1,244,673			0	1,244,673
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES							
060	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	0	322,063			0	322,063
061	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	17,998			0	17,998
062	WAR CONSUMABLES	0	25,248			0	25,248
063	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	0	7,579			0	7,579
064	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	45,916			0	45,916
065	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	1,752			0	1,752
066	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	224	18,508,613	13	624,000	237	19,132,613

Items of Special Interest

Department of Navy tactical aircraft inventory

The budget request contained $1.8 billion for the procurement of 22 F/A–18E/F Super Hornet strike-fighters.

The committee is concerned by the manner in which the Navy and the Marine Corps are managing and accepting an unprecedented level of operational risk within the Department of the Navy tactical aircraft force structure while waiting for the F–35B and F–35C to complete development, testing, and fielding. The committee does not expect that the Navy and Marine Corps will be able to fully meet future operational strike-fighter requirements of any combatant commander if the tactical aircraft inventory management plan remains unchanged. The committee remains concerned with five areas of the Navy and Marine Corps tactical aircraft portfolio: (1) strike-fighter inventory requirements and estimated shortfalls; (2) sustainment and viability of the strike-fighter legacy fleet; (3) courses of action that are being implemented, resulting in unprecedented levels of operational risk; (4) F–35B and F–35C affordability; and, (5) closure of the F/A–18E/F production line.

The committee is disappointed with the manner in which officials of the Department of the Navy have conveyed strike-fighter inventory requirements and estimated shortfalls over the past several years. The committee notes that the validated strike-fighter inventory requirement is 1,240 aircraft, but currently the Navy is using the current operational demand figure of 1,154 aircraft as its baseline for projections of future shortfalls. This is an inaccurate depiction of the actual shortfall of tactical fighters in the inventory, and the Navy and Marine Corps strike-fighter shortfall mitigation strategies are either optimistic or not credible since the mitigation strategies are not funded.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee describes the ongoing development problems with the F–35 series Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) and notes that the JSF is significantly delayed, well over cost projections, and not likely to arrive in the Navy-Marine Corps inventories in sufficient numbers to offset the pending retirements of F/A–18 series and AV–8B aircraft. The committee estimates that by fiscal year 2017 the Navy-Marine Corps inventory could easily be 250 aircraft short of requirements, or the equivalent of 5 carrier air wings. This is an unacceptable outcome and the committee will not support future budget requests that fail to address the factual realities of a naval strike-fighter shortfall. Absent a complete reversal of development and production performance in the JSF program, the committee expects future budget submissions to extend the production of the F/A–18E/F series aircraft to prevent U.S. naval airpower from losing significance in the nation's arsenal. Although the Marine Corps chose not to recapitalize its current fleet of fixed-wing F/A–18A/D aircraft with F/A–18E/F aircraft, the committee believes that procuring F/A–18E/F aircraft should be considered as a means in resolving the Marine Corps' inevitable strike-fighter inventory shortfall.

The committee recommends an increase of $500.0 million, which when combined with $130.5 million excess funding as a result of the third multiyear procurement, shall be available for the procure-

ment of an additional eight F/A–18E/F Super Hornet strike-fighters.

UH–1Y/AH–1Z rotorcraft upgrade program

The budget request contained $896.6 million for the procurement of 31 UH–1Y and AH–1Z rotorcraft.

The committee understands that the advance procurement funding appropriated in fiscal year 2010 only supports the procurement of 28 aircraft in fiscal year 2011. The Marine Corps has informed the committee that the UH–1Y and AH–1Z prime contractor plans to provide internal advance procurement funding, at the risk of the contractor, to support the procurement of 31 aircraft in fiscal year 2011. The committee understands the funding which the contractor intends to use for advance procurement was originally intended to be applied towards cost-reduction initiatives to lower the unit recurring flyaway cost of the rotorcraft.

The committee is concerned that the Marine Corps' budget request is shortsighted in applying the contractor's funds towards advance procurement for only three additional aircraft instead of towards already pre-planned cost-reduction initiatives. Applying these funds towards cost-reduction initiatives would provide a larger return on investment by decreasing the overall cost of the rotorcraft across the life of the program, and in turn, could bolster the committee's future support regarding any future multi-year procurement contract authority request from the Marine Corps.

Therefore, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Navy to reevaluate the business case for using the contractor's funds in fiscal year 2011 for procurement of only three additional rotorcraft vice the long-term benefits gained in using these funds for cost-reduction initiatives.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $3.4 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.4 billion, a decrease of $8.9 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II MODS	24	1,106,911			24	1,106,911
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	3,446			0	3,446
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	196	300,178			196	300,178
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
004	AMRAAM	101	155,553			101	155,553
005	SIDEWINDER	146	52,293			146	52,293
006	JSOW	333	131,141			333	131,141
007	STANDARD MISSILE	67	295,922			67	295,922
008	RAM	90	74,976			90	74,976
009	HELLFIRE	575	43,495			575	43,495
010	AERIAL TARGETS	0	43,988			0	43,988
011	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	0	3,981			0	3,981
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
012	ESSM	33	48,152			33	48,152
013	HARM MODS	0	53,543			0	53,543
014	STANDARD MISSILES MODS	0	61,896			0	61,896
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
015	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	3,281			0	3,281
016	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	1	505,734			1	505,734
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
018	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	52,152			0	52,152
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
019	ASW TARGETS	0	10,123			0	10,123
MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP							
020	MK-54 TORPEDO MODS	0	42,144			0	42,144
021	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	0	43,559			0	43,559
022	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	0	6,090			0	6,090
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
023	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	43,766			0	43,766
024	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	0	9,557			0	9,557
DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION							
025	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	3,494			0	3,494
GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS							
026	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	0	14,316			0	14,316
MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS							
027	CIWS MODS	0	41,408			0	41,408
028	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	0	20,657			0	20,657
029	GUN MOUNT MODS	0	43,991			0	43,991
030	LCS MODULE WEAPONS	0	9,808		-8,900	0	908
	NLOS-LS program termination				[-8,900]		
031	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS	0	52,426			0	52,426
032	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	0	23,007			0	23,007
OTHER							
033	MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM	0	0			0	0
034	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	0			0	0
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
035	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	58,806			0	58,806
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**1,566**	**3,359,794**		**-8,900**	**1,566**	**3,350,894**

Items of Special Interest

Littoral Combat Ship Module weapons

The budget request contained $9.8 million for Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Module Weapons, of which $8.9 million was requested for procurement of 45 non-line-of-sight launch system (NLOS–LS) missiles.

The committee notes that the Army has terminated the NLOS-LS program, and even if it is continued by the Navy, an additional year of development work will be required. As a result, the committee does not agree with Navy procurement funding for NLOS–LS in fiscal year 2011. In title II of this report, the committee recommends an increase in Navy research and development funding to support continued development work for the NLOS–LS program if the Navy determines that is in the best interest of the LCS program.

The committee recommends $0.9 million, a decrease of $8.9 million, for LCS Module weapons.

Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $818.0 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $818.0 million, no change in the budget request, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC							
NAVY AMMUNITION							
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	80,028			0	80,028
002	JDAM	0	0			0	0
003	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	0	38,721			0	38,721
004	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	0	21,003			0	21,003
005	PRACTICE BOMBS	0	33,666			0	33,666
006	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	0	53,667			0	53,667
007	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	0	59,626			0	59,626
008	JATOS	0	2,869			0	2,869
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	0	34,492			0	34,492
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	0	37,234			0	37,234
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	0	36,275			0	36,275
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	0	46,192			0	46,192
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	0	11,310			0	11,310
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	4,105			0	4,105
MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION							
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	0	64,839			0	64,839
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	0	15,329			0	15,329
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	0	62,835			0	62,835
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	0	17,877			0	17,877
019	81MM, ALL TYPES	0	41,053			0	41,053
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	0	6,458			0	6,458
021	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	0	2,937			0	2,937
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	9,298			0	9,298
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	0	13,995			0	13,995
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	0	70,423			0	70,423

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	19,464			0	19,464
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	0	18,032			0	18,032
027	NON LETHALS	0	3,009			0	3,009
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION	0	8,985			0	8,985
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	4,269			0	4,269
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**0**	**817,991**			**0**	**817,991**

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $15.7 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $15.7 billion, no change in the budget request, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY							
OTHER WARSHIPS							
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	0	1,731,256			0	1,731,256
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	908,313			0	908,313
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,441,452			2	3,441,452
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	1,691,236			0	1,691,236
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	0	1,255,799			0	1,255,799
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	408,037			0	408,037
007	SSBN ERO	0	0			0	0
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
009	DDG 1000	0	186,312			0	186,312
010	DDG-51	2	2,922,190			2	2,922,190
011	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	47,984			0	47,984
012	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	2	1,230,984			2	1,230,984
013	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	278,351			0	278,351
AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS							
014	LPD-17	0	0			0	0
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
016	LHA REPLACEMENT	1	949,897			1	949,897
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
018	INTRATHEATER CONNECTOR	1	180,703			1	180,703
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST							
019	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	1	88,561			1	88,561
020	OUTFITTING	0	306,640			0	306,640
021	SERVICE CRAFT	0	13,770			0	13,770
022	LCAC SLEP	4	83,035			4	83,035
023	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	13	15,724,520			13	15,724,520

Items of Special Interest

U.S. Navy shipbuilding

The budget request contained $15.7 billion in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy and $380.0 million in title XIV of this Act for the construction of nine Navy vessels. The budget request also included the fourth and final incremental funding authorization for construction of the aircraft carrier USS Gerald R. Ford (CVN 78); funding for advance procurement necessary for the construction of vessels to be authorized in future fiscal years; and incremental funding for the complex refueling overhaul of the aircraft carrier USS Theodore Roosevelt (CVN 71).

The committee notes that the Long-Range Plan for the Construction of Naval Vessels, known as the 30–year shipbuilding plan, submitted in accordance with section 231 of title 10, United States Code, proposes an average of 10 new vessels per year during the 5-year period of the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP). While this is a positive step in shipbuilding procurement, the total number of battle force vessels remains essentially constant during the FYDP due to the high rate of ship retirements planned during the period. Only after the FYDP, do the battle force levels begin to increase in real terms and the stated goal of a 313-ship Navy is not achieved until fiscal year 2018. The committee further notes that a short term solution to the stagnant number of battle force ships through the FYDP is to delay retirement of vessels with useful service life and that a planned approach to retire no more ships in any one fiscal year than are being delivered to the Navy would accomplish this goal.

Aircraft carriers

The committee is concerned that the decision by the Secretary of Defense in April 2009, prior to the completion of the congressionally mandated analysis of the Quadrennial Defense Review, to shift aircraft carrier construction to five-year centers for the stated purpose of "a more fiscally sustainable path" was shortsighted. The committee has recently learned via receipt of Department of Defense Selected Acquisition Reports that the cost to construct the next three Ford-class aircraft carriers is likely to increase by up to $4.0 billion because of the change in construction centers. The committee notes that the current 30-year shipbuilding plan would not maintain a force of 11 operational aircraft carriers past fiscal year 2040 and therefore does not conform to the requirement in section 5062b of title 10, United States Code, to maintain an operational fleet of 11 aircraft carriers.

The committee expects that subsequent plans will conform to current law, or the Secretary of the Navy will request a change to statute commensurate with detailed analysis of the effect a reduction to 10 operational aircraft carriers will have on the national military strategy. In title I of this Act, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to phase the construction of aircraft carriers to minimize the total cost for procurement of the vessels.

DDG 51 class destroyer

The committee is pleased with the effort by the Navy to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the radar and hull alternatives

needed for a future sea-based ballistic missile defense (BMD) platform. The analysis has determined that the proposed Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR) system matched to a DDG 51 class destroyer hull is the most cost-effective method of fielding a new generation of sea-based BMD. The committee notes that this new radar development program will leverage existing technologies of both the DDG 1000 class destroyer program and the DDG 51 class destroyer program. The committee understands that the AMDR system is not likely to reach full development for a number of years and that a funding authorization request for the first ship will not occur until fiscal year 2016. In the meantime, the committee understands that the Navy's plan is to continue the restart of the DDG 51 production line begun last year using a procurement strategy of three ships every two years in a "2–1–2–1" build plan. The committee has significant concerns whether such an acquisition strategy can sustain a competitive relationship between the two current surface warfare construction yards.

DDG 1000 class destroyer

The committee is concerned with the Nunn-McCurdy cost breach incurred by the DDG 1000 destroyer program. The committee understands that the current cost breach was caused by costs associated with research and development efforts charged against only three vessels vice the original seven.

The committee notes that this cost threshold breach was known by the Navy far in advance of the receipt of notification required by law. The committee was informed that official notification of the cost breach was not technically required until after submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2011, as the budget request was the official truncation of the class to three vessels. This argument is disingenuous in that both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy made public statements and transmitted official correspondence to the committee that the program would be truncated to three vessels as early as mid–2008.

However, regardless of how the Navy has arrived at this juncture, the fact remains that one vessel is currently under construction and significant materiel orders have been made for the second. The committee is also keenly aware of the industrial base consequences of a decision by the Secretary of Defense to terminate the program.

Littoral Combat Ship

The Littoral Combat Ship program has failed its initial intent to build inexpensive ships with modular capability and field them to the fleet at a high rate. None of those goals have been met. The ships are expensive; the modular capability has not been tested or verified; and in some cases is still undergoing development; and only two of the ships have been delivered to the Navy.

Last year, the committee supported the request of the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations to revamp the acquisition strategy for these vessels and to down-select to one variant of the ship with the award of the fiscal year 2010 two-ship authorization. The new acquisition strategy is aimed at reducing overall costs by procuring 10 ships in the Future Years Defense Plan using a fixed price incentive contract in fiscal year 2010 with

priced options for 8 additional ships, 2 per year, in fiscal years 2011–15. In addition, the government would gain all rights to the technical data package required to compete the winning design to a second source shipyard which would build 5 additional ships, for a total of 15 ships, between fiscal years 2012 and 2015. The committee supported this plan as the best alternative to provide needed capability to the fleet in the shortest time possible, at the least cost. The plan was also proposed to the committee as the best way to divorce the prime contractors from the program and to transition the ship's installed combat systems to government furnished equipment that complimented equipment currently in use in the fleet.

As of this report, the Navy has received the proposals from the two authorized competitors and is in the process of source selection leading to contract award. The committee is cautiously optimistic that, with a down-select to one variant and stability in the construction schedule, this troubled program can begin to fulfill its original purpose of providing capable ships, in quantity, at an affordable cost.

Maritime Landing Platform

The Maritime Landing Platform (MLP), as originally briefed to Congress was to be a part of the larger Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) (MPF(F)) which would provide the capability of a sea-base when conducting both high-end combat operations or humanitarian operations where access to port facilities was not available.

The budget request has abandoned the previous MPF(F) concept in favor of a smaller prepositioning force for use in low-threat environments. Likewise, the MLP vessel itself, funded at a level of $120.0 million in fiscal year 2010, has been changed to a smaller vessel than the one proposed to and authorized by Congress last year, which will provide only incremental operational capability from the original design. These changes to the future capability of the amphibious force were made without notification or consultation with the committee, and appear to be driven purely from budgetary pressure and not from a well defined capabilities analysis. In addition, the current plan to build three MLP vessels, in fiscal years 2011, 2013, and 2015, is inefficient. The proposed MLP vessel is a modified design of a previously built commercial product tanker and can easily be supported by the shipyard chosen for construction at a rate of one per year. The committee expects the budget request for fiscal year 2012 to reset the construction centers for the remaining MLP vessels to fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

Ohio-class replacement program

The committee strongly supports a robust sea-based strategic deterrent force. The current 14 ships of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines are a national treasure and have helped keep the nation safe for over two decades. Like the ballistic missile submarine classes that preceded them, a percentage of these vessels remain in an alert posture, at sea, invulnerable to attack by potential enemies, ready to retaliate should the nation be attacked. The committee supports efforts to retain this capability into the future.

However, the committee has questions concerning the current program to replace the Ohio-class ships. First, the basic require-

ment of how much and what type of deterrent capability is sufficient for the national military strategy has not been communicated to the committee. Second, the committee has not been afforded the opportunity to review the analysis of alternatives conducted by the Navy, which determined that a submarine large enough to support the Trident II D5 missile weapons system is the preferred vessel to continue deterrent capability. Third, the committee has concerns that the decision to proceed with a submarine program of similar size as the Ohio-class ships was made prior to the analysis of alternatives, and that a potential use of a modified Virginia-class submarine, in production today, was discounted in favor of maintaining the Trident II D5 weapons system. Because of these concerns, elsewhere in this Act the committee will authorize, but withhold authority to obligate more than 50 percent of the funds requested for development of this program until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the committee of the necessity to continue sea-based deterrence with the Trident II D5 weapons system.

U.S. shipbuilding industrial base

The committee has reservations as to the continued health of the shipbuilding industrial base and its ability to remain viable in its current form. The shipbuilding industrial base currently serving the needs of Navy and the nation is a legacy from the cold war when the size of the Navy fleet, and the construction required to maintain that fleet, was significantly higher than today. The committee is concerned that the relatively low orders for new ships as proposed in the 30-year shipbuilding plan are not sufficient to maintain all shipyards currently constructing naval vessels. This is a very difficult situation for the Navy since reducing the number of shipyards constructing vessels could have the unintended consequence of driving up cost due to limited or no competition for particular classes of ships, yet the current industrial base adds increased costs due to the significant overhead rates that must be charged to each vessel.

Perhaps even more significant than shipyard over-capacity for the current shipbuilding plan is the reduction in vendors willing to provide equipment and materiel necessary for the shipbuilding industry. Low orders coupled with significant government requirements for testing, traceability, and financial controls have driven many former suppliers out of the market altogether. The committee received testimony that the vendor supply base is currently 60 to 70 percent sole source. While this almost total lack of competition may be manageable in terms of maintaining the ability to construct vessels, it is not a condition that is bringing the best value to the taxpayer.

The committee understands that the Secretary of the Navy has embarked on a comprehensive review of the industrial base, including the supply base. The committee requests the Secretary of the Navy to inform the committee when the comprehensive review is complete and to make available to the committee those officials who participated in the review to testify before the committee at a hearing in open session aimed at oversight of this potential threat to national security.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $6.5 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $6.5 billion, no change in the budget request, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY							
SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT							
001	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	0	12,137			0	12,137
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	0	14,923			0	14,923
003	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT	0	0			0	0
NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT							
004	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	0	23,167			0	23,167
PERISCOPES							
005	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	0	85,619			0	85,619
OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT							
006	DDG MOD	0	296,691			0	296,691
007	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	0	11,974			0	11,974
008	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	0	3,962			0	3,962
009	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	25,614			0	25,614
010	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	7,730			0	7,730
011	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	132,039			0	132,039
012	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	0	44,057			0	44,057
013	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	0	22,811			0	22,811
014	DSSP EQUIPMENT	0	3,869			0	3,869
015	CG MODERNIZATION	0	356,958			0	356,958
016	LCAC	0	9,142			0	9,142
017	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	0	0			0	0
018	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	0	15,908			0	15,908
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	126,842			0	126,842
020	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	0	7,470			0	7,470
021	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	13,016			0	13,016
REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT							

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
022	REACTOR POWER UNITS	0	438,503			0	438,503
023	REACTOR COMPONENTS	0	266,469			0	266,469
OCEAN ENGINEERING							
024	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	0	10,227			0	10,227
SMALL BOATS							
025	STANDARD BOATS	0	27,725			0	27,725
TRAINING EQUIPMENT							
026	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	16,094			0	16,094
PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT							
027	OPERATING FORCES IPE	0	49,856			0	49,856
OTHER SHIP SUPPORT							
028	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	0	116,829			0	116,829
029	LCS MODULES	0	82,951			0	82,951
LOGISTIC SUPPORT							
030	LSD MIDLIFE	0	106,612			0	106,612
SHIP RADARS							
031	RADAR SUPPORT	0	12,030			0	12,030
SHIP SONARS							
032	SPQ-9B RADAR	0	8,887			0	8,887
033	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	0	87,219			0	87,219
034	SSN ACOUSTICS	0	237,015			0	237,015
035	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	29,641			0	29,641
036	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	0	14,056			0	14,056
ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT							
037	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	0	20,739			0	20,739
038	SSTD	0	2,206			0	2,206
039	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	0	57,481			0	57,481

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
040	SURTASS	0	8,468			0	8,468
041	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER	0	18,586			0	18,586
ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT							
042	AN/SLQ-32	0	49,677			0	49,677
RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT							
043	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	0	105,624			0	105,624
044	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	0	1,299			0	1,299
SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT							
045	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	0	71,558			0	71,558
OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT							
046	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	0	31,091			0	31,091
047	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	0	338			0	338
048	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	0	33,358			0	33,358
049	ATDLS	0	2,273			0	2,273
050	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	0	8,920			0	8,920
051	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	0	81,441			0	81,441
052	SHALLOW WATER MCM	0	9,236			0	9,236
053	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	0	9,319			0	9,319
054	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	0	3,328			0	3,328
055	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	0	4,248			0	4,248
TRAINING EQUIPMENT							
056	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	29,061			0	29,061
AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT							
057	MATCALS	0	16,747			0	16,747
058	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	0	7,658			0	7,658
059	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	0	15,169			0	15,169
060	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	0	17,531			0	17,531

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
061	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	6,851			0	6,851
062	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	0	8,551			0	8,551
063	ID SYSTEMS	0	29,572			0	29,572
064	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	0	9,098			0	9,098
OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT							
065	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT	0	8,542			0	8,542
066	TADIX-B	0	6,909			0	6,909
067	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	0	9,832			0	9,832
068	DCGS-N	0	16,634			0	16,634
069	CANES	0	34,398			0	34,398
070	RADIAC	0	6,104			0	6,104
071	CANES-INTELL	0	10,432			0	10,432
072	GPETE	0	5,861			0	5,861
073	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	0	4,445			0	4,445
074	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	0	4,737			0	4,737
075	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	51,048			0	51,048
SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS							
076	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	0	0			0	0
077	PORTABLE RADIOS	0	0			0	0
078	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	0	260,551			0	260,551
079	MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA)	0	9,250			0	9,250
080	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	0	39,846			0	39,846
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS							
081	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	0	0			0	0
082	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	0	59,013			0	59,013
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS							
083	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	0	28,665			0	28,665

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
084	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	0	161,021			0	161,021
SHORE COMMUNICATIONS							
085	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	0	2,256			0	2,256
086	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	0	1,309			0	1,309
087	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	0	3,422			0	3,422
CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT							
088	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	0	120,529			0	120,529
CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT							
089	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	0	18,322			0	18,322
OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT							
090	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	0	20,189			0	20,189
DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT							
091	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	0	0			0	0
SONOBUOYS							
092	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES	0	87,846			0	87,846
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
093	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	51,742			0	51,742
094	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	0	8,429			0	8,429
095	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	0	11,134			0	11,134
096	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	0	37,063			0	37,063
097	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	0	25,581			0	25,581
098	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	0	1,573			0	1,573
099	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	0	40,696			0	40,696
100	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	0	35,855			0	35,855
101	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	0	20,662			0	20,662
102	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS	0	12,812			0	12,812
103	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	12,018			0	12,018

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT							
104	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	0	1,086			0	1,086
105	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	8,076			0	8,076
SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT							
106	NATO SEASPARROW	0	11,121			0	11,121
107	RAM GMLS	0	11,805			0	11,805
108	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	0	54,290			0	54,290
109	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	162,307			0	162,307
110	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	88,698			0	88,698
111	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	0	5,698			0	5,698
FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
112	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	0	184,034			0	184,034
ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
113	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	88,004			0	88,004
114	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	5,282			0	5,282
115	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	8,323			0	8,323
116	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	7,121			0	7,121
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
117	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	0	58,288			0	58,288
118	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	3,546			0	3,546
OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE							
119	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	0	36,588			0	36,588
120	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	0	7,337			0	7,337
121	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	0	34,519			0	34,519
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
122	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	0	3,719			0	3,719
123	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	0	584			0	584

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
124	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	0	13,935			0	13,935
125	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	0	12,853			0	12,853
126	TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	31,741			0	31,741
127	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	0	3,132			0	3,132
128	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	5,154			0	5,154
129	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	0	24,770			0	24,770
130	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	0	1,128			0	1,128
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
131	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	0	15,504			0	15,504
132	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	6,655			0	6,655
133	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	6,315			0	6,315
134	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	0	66,549			0	66,549
TRAINING DEVICES							
135	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	11,429			0	11,429
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
137	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	47,306			0	47,306
138	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	2,067			0	2,067
139	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	7,679			0	7,679
141	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	1,433			0	1,433
143	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	12,754			0	12,754
144	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	0	5,317			0	5,317
145	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	20,033			0	20,033
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	154,805			0	154,805
147	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	0	377,353			0	377,353
OTHER							
148	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	0			0	0
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
148A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	19,767			0	19,767
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	215,906			0	215,906
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**0**	**6,450,208**			**0**	**6,450,208**

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $1.3 billion Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.4 billion, an increase of $35.0 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS							
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES							
001	AAV7A1 PIP	0	7,749			0	7,749
002	LAV PIP	0	41,277			0	41,277
003	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS	0	0		55,000	0	55,000
	USMC M88A2 Unfunded Requirement				[55,000]		
ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS							
004	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	10	9,723			10	9,723
005	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	2	10,356			2	10,356
006	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	0	22,230			0	22,230
007	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	0	26,091			0	26,091
WEAPONS							
008	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM	0	0			0	0
OTHER SUPPORT							
009	MODIFICATION KITS	0	40,916			0	40,916
010	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	0	13,115			0	13,115
GUIDED MISSILES							
011	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE	0	5,175			0	5,175
012	JAVELIN	0	0			0	0
013	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW	0	21,570			0	21,570
014	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)	0	20,315			0	20,315
OTHER SUPPORT							
015	MODIFICATION KITS	0	3,798			0	3,798
COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS							
016	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	0	10,776			0	10,776
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT							
017	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	0	25,636			0	25,636

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)							
018	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	32,877			0	32,877
019	MODIFICATION KITS	0	0			0	0
COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)							
020	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	0	3,405			0	3,405
021	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	0	67,568			0	67,568
RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)							
022	RADAR SYSTEMS	0	860			0	860
INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)							
023	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	3,906			0	3,906
024	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	92,377			0	92,377
025	RQ-11 UAV	16	32,490			16	32,490
026	DCGS-MC	0	4,582			0	4,582
OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)							
027	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	0	0			0	0
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)							
028	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	0	258,947			0	258,947
029	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	0	33,021			0	33,021
030	RADIO SYSTEMS	0	40,551		-14,100	0	26,451
	Marine Corps Joint Tactical Radio Systems				[-14,100]		
031	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	32,279		-10,000	0	22,279
	WFNS-T Program Reduction				[-10,000]		
032	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	0	15,278			0	15,278
ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES							
033	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	0	1,157			0	1,157
034	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	0	12,696			0	12,696
TACTICAL VEHICLES							

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
035	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	17	4,849			17	4,849
036	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	0	5,253			0	5,253
037	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	0	11,721			0	11,721
038	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	550	133,827			550	133,827
039	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	0	19,156			0	19,156
040	TRAILERS	0	8,075			0	8,075
OTHER SUPPORT							
041	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	6,016			0	6,016
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT							
042	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	0	5,110			0	5,110
043	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	0	10,743			0	10,743
044	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	0	29,330		4,100	0	33,430
	Nitrile Rubber Collapsible Fuel Bladders				[4,100]		
045	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	0	19,419			0	19,419
046	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	11,718			0	11,718
047	EOD SYSTEMS	0	64,093			0	64,093
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT							
048	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	16,419			0	16,419
049	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)	0	10,976			0	10,976
050	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	24,376			0	24,376
051	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	2,748			0	2,748
GENERAL PROPERTY							
052	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	0	6,722			0	6,722
053	TRAINING DEVICES	0	5,668			0	5,668
054	CONTAINER FAMILY	0	897			0	897
055	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	0	18,261			0	18,261
056	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
057	BRIDGE BOATS	0	12,567			0	12,567
058	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN	0	4,283			0	4,283
OTHER SUPPORT							
059	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	7,572			0	7,572
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
060	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	13,524			0	13,524
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**595**	**1,344,044**		**35,000**	**595**	**1,379,044**

Items of Special Interest

Marine Corps communications switching and control systems

The budget request contained $32.3 million for Marine Corps communications switching and control systems. Of that amount, $22.7 million was requested for Warfighter Network Services Tactical equipment.

The committee is concerned that the Marine Corps has been slow to execute on-hand funding from fiscal year 2009 and fiscal year 2010. In addition, the committee notes that $10.5 million in additional funding for this equipment is authorized in title XV of this Act.

The committee recommends $12.7 million, a decrease of $10.0 million, for Warfighter Network Services Tactical equipment.

Marine Corps joint tactical radio systems

The budget request contained $40.6 million for Marine Corps radio systems. Of that amount, $20.5 million was requested for joint tactical radio system (JTRS) radios.

The committee continues to support the JTRS program. However, the committee notes that low-rate initial production of the two JTRS model radios requested by the Marine Corps in fiscal year 2011 may be delayed, and that the Marine Corps has other funds available to procure radios to meet near-term requirements.

The committee recommends $6.4 million, a decrease of $14.1 million, for Marine Corps procurement of JTRS radios.

Marine Corps M88A2 recovery vehicles

The budget request contained $12.0 million for Marine Corps M88A2 recovery vehicle procurement.

The committee understands that the Marine Corps requirement for M88A2 vehicles has increased by 28 vehicles, and that the M88A2 recovery vehicle is seeing extensive use in Operation Enduring Freedom in support of Marine Corps operations. The committee also notes that the Marine Corps Unfunded Programs List for fiscal year 2011 includes $55.0 million for 24 additional M88A2 vehicles.

The committee recommends $67.0 million, an increase of $55.0 million, in Marine Corps procurement for additional M88A2 recovery vehicles.

Marine Corps small unmanned ground vehicles

The budget request contained no funds for Marine Corps procurement of small ground robots for use by Marine Corps infantry forces.

The committee is concerned that despite the potential utility of such robots for infantry forces, the Marine Corps has no current plans to equip its forces with this capability. In particular, the committee believes that man-portable robots between 10–30 pounds may prove highly useful for Marine Corps infantry units in Operation Enduring Freedom. Therefore, the committee directs the Commandant of the Marine Corps to deliver, by March 1, 2011, a report to the congressional defense committees outlining the Marine Corps' plans for fielding small ground robots, including specific requirements, cost estimates, and deployment timelines.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $15.4 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $15.4 billion, a decrease of $10.6 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
001	F-35	22	3,729,242		29,700	22	3,758,942
	Transfer from APAF 043				[29,700]		
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	257,000			0	257,000
003	F-22A	0	158,039			0	158,039
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
005	C-17A (MYP)	0	14,283		114,400	0	128,683
	Transfer from APAF 088				[114,400]		
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
006	C-130J	8	463,267			8	463,267
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	48,000			0	48,000
008	HC-130J	4	349,300			4	349,300
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	10,000			0	10,000
010	MC-130J	5	467,465			5	467,465
011	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	60,000			0	60,000
012	HC/MC-130 RECAP	0	0			0	0
013	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
014	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT	8	351,200			8	351,200
	UPT TRAINERS						
015	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT	15	65,699			15	65,699
016	USAFA POWERED FLIGHT PROGRAM	12	4,099			12	4,099
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
017	JPATS	0	0			0	0
	HELICOPTERS						
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	6,432			0	6,432

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
019	V22 OSPREY	5	393,098			5	393,098
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	13,621			0	13,621
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT							
021	C-29A FLIGHT INSPECTION ACFT	0	0			0	0
022	C-12 A	0	0			0	0
023	C-40	0	0			0	0
024	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	0	2,424			0	2,424
025	HH-60M OPERATIONAL LOSS REPLACEMENT	3	104,447			3	104,447
026	RQ-11	0	0			0	0
027	STUASL0	0	3,253			0	3,253
OTHER AIRCRAFT							
028	TARGET DRONES	9	85,505			9	85,505
029	C-37A	2	52,000			2	52,000
030	RQ-4 UAV	4	649,629		-25,600	4	624,029
	Transfer to APAF 031				[-25,600]		
031	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	90,200		25,600	0	115,800
	Transfer from APAF 030				[25,600]		
032	MC 130 IN BA 04	0	9,932			0	9,932
033	MQ-1	0	0			0	0
034	MQ-9	36	863,595			36	863,595
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT							
035	B-2A	0	63,371			0	63,371
036	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
037	B-1B	0	200,090			0	200,090
038	B-52	0	69,074			0	69,074
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT							
039	A-10	0	165,361			0	165,361

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
040	F-15	0	302,235			0	302,235
041	F-16	0	167,188		2,500	0	169,688
	F-16CM Center Pedestal Display				[2,500]		
042	F-22A	0	492,199			0	492,199
043	F-35 MODIFICATIONS	0	123,936		-116,300	0	7,636
	Block 3 Retrofit				[-86,600]		
	Transfer to APAF 001				[-29,700]		
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT							
044	C-5	0	740,369			0	740,369
045	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	166,900			0	166,900
046	C-9C	0	10			0	10
047	C-17A	0	351,614			0	351,614
048	C-21	0	339			0	339
049	C-32A	0	12,113			0	12,113
050	C-37A	0	12,162			0	12,162
TRAINER AIRCRAFT							
051	GLIDER MODS	0	120			0	120
052	T-6	0	24,644			0	24,644
053	T-1	0	83			0	83
054	T-38	0	28,288			0	28,288
055	T-43	0	0			0	0
OTHER AIRCRAFT							
056	KC-10A (ATCA)	0	13,777			0	13,777
057	C-12	0	7,645			0	7,645
058	MC-12W	0	10,826			0	10,826
059	C-20 MODS	0	736			0	736

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
060	VC-25A MOD	0	13,175			0	13,175
061	C-40	0	10,697			0	10,697
062	C-130	0	257,339		73,500	0	330,839
	NP-2000 Eight-Bladed Propeller System				[8,500]		
	Transfer from RDAF 220				[65,000]		
063	C-130 MODS INTEL	0	3,963			0	3,963
064	C130J MODS	0	80,205			0	80,205
065	C-135	0	44,228			0	44,228
066	COMPASS CALL MODS	0	176,558			0	176,558
067	DARP	0	105,540			0	105,540
068	E-3	0	195,163			0	195,163
069	E-4	0	37,526			0	37,526
070	E-8	0	188,504		-11,700	0	176,804
	Transfer to APAF 080				[-11,700]		
071	H-1	0	2,457			0	2,457
072	H-60	0	11,630			0	11,630
073	RQ-4 UAV MODS	0	119,415			0	119,415
074	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS	0	1,944			0	1,944
075	OTHER AIRCRAFT	0	159,423			0	159,423
076	MQ-1 MODS	0	208,213			0	208,213
077	MQ-9 MODS	0	108,922			0	108,922
078	MQ-9 PAYLOAD - UAS	0	115,383			0	115,383
079	CV-22 MODS	0	13,964			0	13,964
AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS							
080	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	0	622,020		11,700	0	633,720
	Transfer from APAF 070				[11,700]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
081	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	0	91,701			0	91,701
POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT							
082	B-1	0	6,791			0	6,791
083	B-2A	0	26,217			0	26,217
084	B-52	0	3,443			0	3,443
085	C-5	0	195			0	195
086	C-5	0	0			0	0
087	KC-10A (ATCA)	0	5,702			0	5,702
088	C-17A	0	153,347		-114,400	0	38,947
	Transfer to APAF 005				[-114,400]		
089	C-130	0	28,295			0	28,295
090	EC-130J	0	0			0	0
091	F-15	0	21,599			0	21,599
092	F-16	0	17,838			0	17,838
093	T-6	0	9,450			0	9,450
094	OTHER AIRCRAFT	0	53,953			0	53,953
095	T-1	0	0			0	0
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS							
096	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS	0	24,619			0	24,619
WAR CONSUMABLES							
097	WAR CONSUMABLES	0	92,939			0	92,939
OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES							
098	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	0	1,079,742			0	1,079,742
099	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - MQ-1	0	37,500			0	37,500
OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF							
103	CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS	0	0			0	0

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
DARP							
104	DARP	0	19,117			0	19,117
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
104A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	12,981			0	12,981
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**133**	**15,366,508**		**-10,600**	**133**	**15,355,908**

Items of Special Interest

F–35 modifications

The budget request contained $94.2 million for F–35 modifications, of which $86.6 million was included to procure 25 kits to retrofit 25 low-rate initial production (LRIP) F–35A aircraft to the block three configuration.

Under the recently-revised F–35 schedule, the committee notes that development of block three hardware and software components will not be complete until 2015, and believes that the request to procure kits to retrofit 25 LRIP F–35A aircraft to the block three configuration is premature.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $7.6 million, a decrease of $86.6 million for F–35A modifications.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $667.4 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $672.4 million, an increase of $5.0 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE							
ROCKETS							
001	ROCKETS	0	19,106			0	19,106
CARTRIDGES							
002	CARTRIDGES	0	141,049			0	141,049
BOMBS							
003	PRACTICE BOMBS	0	34,094			0	34,094
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	183,845		5,000	0	188,845
	Bomb Line Modernization				[5,000]		
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,500	104,642			3,500	104,642
FLARE, IR MJU-7B							
006	CAD/PAD	0	37,016			0	37,016
007	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)	0	3,383			0	3,383
008	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	1,000			0	1,000
009	MODIFICATIONS	0	1,112			0	1,112
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	0	5,015			0	5,015
FUZES							
011	FLARES	0	72,758			0	72,758
012	FUZES	0	57,337			0	57,337
SMALL ARMS							
013	SMALL ARMS	0	7,063			0	7,063
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**3,500**	**667,420**		**5,000**	**3,500**	**672,420**

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $5.5 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $5.5 billion, a decrease of $7.5 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 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 Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE							
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC							
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	0	60,647			0	60,647
TACTICAL							
002	JASSM	171	215,825			171	215,825
003	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	178	64,523			178	64,523
004	AMRAAM	246	355,358			246	355,358
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	460	44,570			460	44,570
006	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	2,985	134,884			2,985	134,884
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES							
007	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION	0	833			0	833
CLASS IV							
008	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	0	48			0	48
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS	0	123,378		7,500	0	130,878
	MM III SRM Warm Line				[7,500]		
010	AGM-65D MAVERICK	0	260			0	260
011	AGM-88A HARM	0	4,079			0	4,079
012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	0	10,795			0	10,795
MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS							
013	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	0	43,192			0	43,192
SPACE PROGRAMS							
014	ADVANCED EHF	0	38,078			0	38,078
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	208,520			0	208,520
016	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	1	517,601			1	517,601
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	58,110			0	58,110
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	122,490			0	122,490
019	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	0	14,894			0	14,894

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
020	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	0	64,609			0	64,609
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0			0	0
022	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	0	0			0	0
023	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	0	88,719			0	88,719
024	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	3	1,153,976			3	1,153,976
025	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)	0	0			0	0
026	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	1	700,704			1	700,704
027	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	270,000			0	270,000
028	NATL POLAR-ORBITING OP ENV SATELLITE	0	26,308			0	26,308
SPECIAL PROGRAMS							
029	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM	0	0			0	0
033	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	0	247,584			0	247,584
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
033A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	893,287			0	893,287
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**4,045**	**5,463,272**		**7,500**	**4,045**	**5,470,772**

Items of Special Interest

Minuteman III Solid Rocket Motor Warm Line

The budget request contained $44.2 million for the Minuteman III Solid Rocket Motor Warm Line program.

The Solid Rocket Motor Warm Line program is designed to maintain sufficient industrial capability for solid rocket motors in order to sustain the Minuteman III weapon system through 2030, as directed by Congress. However, the budget request only supports low-rate production of three rocket motor sets in fiscal year 2011 and would result in program termination in fiscal year 2012. The committee understands that a production rate below six per year would require regular requalification of the technicians for each production run.

The committee has not yet received a plan to sustain the solid rocket motor industrial base as required by section 1078 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Absent a comprehensive plan, the committee supports retaining the industrial capability to sustain the Minuteman III weapons system.

The committee recommends $51.7 million, an increase of $7.5 million, for the Minuteman III Solid Rocket Motor Warm Line program, which should provide sufficient resources for six rocket motor sets in fiscal year 2011.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $17.8 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $17.9 billion, an increase of $66.4 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	0	29,207			0	29,207
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	0	45,618			0	45,618
003	CAP VEHICLES	0	902			0	902
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (CARGO	0	31,773		4,100	0	35,873
	Battlefield Airman- Unfunded Requirement				[4,100]		
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	52,867			0	52,867
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SPECIA	0	18,358			0	18,358
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	0	26,924			0	26,924
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
008	HALVERSEN LOADER	0	0			0	0
009	ITEMS LESS THAT $5,000,000	0	14,501			0	14,501
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
010	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU	0	25,404			0	25,404
011	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000(VEHICLES)	0	54,570			0	54,570
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM						
012	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (BPA	0	0			0	0
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
013	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	0	216,381			0	216,381
014	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	0	1,582			0	1,582
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
015	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	2,634			0	2,634
016	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	0	30,685			0	30,685

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS							
017	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	0	6,517			0	6,517
018	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	0	112,056			0	112,056
019	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN	0	55,326			0	55,326
020	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	0	21,018			0	21,018
021	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	0	28,164			0	28,164
022	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	0	18,416			0	18,416
023	TAC SIGNIT SPT	0	377			0	377
024	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT	0	0			0	0
SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS							
025	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	0	74,285			0	74,285
026	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	0	9,210			0	9,210
027	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	0	8,688			0	8,688
028	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	0	99,281			0	99,281
029	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	0	29,637			0	29,637
030	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	0	11,112			0	11,112
031	GCSS-AF FOS	0	53,349			0	53,349
032	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	0	20,525			0	20,525
033	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	0	58,284			0	58,284
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS							
034	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	0	101,993			0	101,993
035	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE	0	193,830		6,950	0	200,780
	Application Software Assurance Center				[6,950]		
036	AFNET	0	151,643			0	151,643
037	VOICE SYSTEMS	0	25,399			0	25,399
038	USCENTCOM	0	36,020			0	36,020
DISA PROGRAMS							

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
039	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	0	24,804			0	24,804
040	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	0	5,279			0	5,279
041	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	0	5,926			0	5,926
042	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	0	60,383			0	60,383
043	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	0	91,004			0	91,004
044	MILSATCOM SPACE	0	221,545			0	221,545
045	SPACE MODS SPACE	0	18,384			0	18,384
046	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	0	18,801			0	18,801
ORGANIZATION AND BASE							
047	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	0	268,140		35,100	0	303,240
	Vehicles and Support Equipment- Unfunded Requirement				[35,100]		
048	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER	0	34,925			0	34,925
049	RADIO EQUIPMENT	0	14,541			0	14,541
050	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	0	11,613			0	11,613
051	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	0	108,308			0	108,308
MODIFICATIONS							
052	COMM ELECT MODS	0	74,356			0	74,356
PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP							
053	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	0	20,873			0	20,873
054	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SAFETY)	0	14,292			0	14,292
DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ							
055	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	12,853			0	12,853
BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
056	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	0	4,788			0	4,788
057	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	0	28,390			0	28,390
058	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	0	1,879			0	1,879

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
059	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	0	38,558		17,200	0	55,758
	Theater Posture- Unfunded Requirement				[17,200]		
060	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S)	0	4,989		3,000	0	7,989
	F-22 Raptor Weather Shelters				[3,000]		
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS							
062	DARP RC135	0	23,296			0	23,296
063	DCGS-AF	0	271,015			0	271,015
065	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	0	489,680			0	489,680
066	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	0	32,668			0	32,668
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
066A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	14,258,508			0	14,258,508
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
070	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	19,046			0	19,046
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**0**	**17,845,380**		**66,350**	**0**	**17,911,730**

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2011 contained $4.3 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $4.4 billion, an increase of $119.4 million, for fiscal year 2011.

The Committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Defense-Wide request are discussed following the table.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE							
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA							
001	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA	0	4,000			0	4,000
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA							
002	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	1,477			0	1,477
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA							
003	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	2,052			0	2,052
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA							
004	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	0	32,263			0	32,263
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA							
005	DIA SUPPORT TO CENTCOM INTELLIGENCE ACT	0	0			0	0
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA							
017	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	0	14,625			0	14,625
018	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	0	5,275			0	5,275
019	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	2,803			0	2,803
020	TELEPORT PROGRAM	0	78,227			0	78,227
021	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	153,288			0	153,288
022	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	0	4,391			0	4,391
023	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK	0	86,206			0	86,206
024	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE	0	1,710			0	1,710
025	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	0	0			0	0
026	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM	0	0			0	0
027	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	0	22,493			0	22,493
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA							
028	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	4,846			0	4,846
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT							
029	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	4	10,478			4	10,478

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA							
030	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS	0	1,451			0	1,451
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY							
031	VEHICLES	0	50			0	50
032	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	12,007			0	12,007
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA							
033	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	0			0	0
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY							
034	TERMINAL HIGH ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE FIELDING	67	858,870			67	858,870
035	AEGIS FIELDING	8	94,080		50,000	8	144,080
	Program Increase				[50,000]		
036	AN/TPY-2 RADAR	0	0			0	0
036A	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	0		65,000	0	65,000
	Advance Procurement				[65,000]		
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA							
045	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	0	2,546			0	2,546
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD							
050	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	0	124,050			0	124,050
050A	COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	0	0			0	0
051	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE	0	20,138			0	20,138
UNDISTRIBUTED							
052	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE	0	0			0	0
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS							
053	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	0	11,526			0	11,526
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS							
054	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	0	27,179			0	27,179
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
054A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	678,531			0	678,531
AVIATION PROGRAMS							
055	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	0	79,840			0	79,840
056	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	0	107,934			0	107,934
057	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	0	179,375			0	179,375
058	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	9	179,949			9	179,949
059	UNMANNED VEHICLES	0	0			0	0
060	SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION	0	19,996			0	19,996
061	SOF U-28	0	404			0	404
062	RQ-11 UAV	0	2,090			0	2,090
063	CV-22 SOF MOD	5	124,035			5	124,035
064	MQ-1 UAS	0	1,948			0	1,948
065	MQ-9 UAV	0	1,965			0	1,965
066	STUASL0 UAV	0	12,148			0	12,148
067	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	0	22,500			0	22,500
068	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	0	489			0	489
SHIPBUILDING							
069	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)	0	0			0	0
070	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE	0	823			0	823
AMMUNITION PROGRAMS							
071	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	0	79,608			0	79,608
072	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	0	24,215			0	24,215
OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS							
073	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	0	58,390			0	58,390
074	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	0	75,892			0	75,892
075	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	0	30,094			0	30,094
076	DCGS-SOF	0	5,225			0	5,225

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
077	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS	0	206			0	206
078	SPEC APPLICATION FOR CONT	0	0			0	0
079	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	0	11,706			0	11,706
080	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	977			0	977
081	TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	30,965			0	30,965
082	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS	0	28,354			0	28,354
083	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	0	20,000			0	20,000
084	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	0	102,556			0	102,556
088	SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	0	52,353			0	52,353
089	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	0	9,714			0	9,714
090	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	0	30,900			0	30,900
091	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	0	221			0	221
092	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR	0	18,626			0	18,626
093	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	0	35,234			0	35,234
094	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	0	804			0	804
095	DRUG INTERDICTION	0	0			0	0
096	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	7,774			0	7,774
097	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	0	269,182		4,400	0	273,582
	High Speed Assault Craft MKII				[4,400]		
098	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	0	25,266			0	25,266
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
098A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	4,112			0	4,112
CBDP							
099	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION	0	90,635			0	90,635
100	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	0	74,686			0	74,686
101	DECONTAMINATION	0	21,570			0	21,570
102	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)	0	19,389			0	19,389

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
103	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	0	27,542			0	27,542
104	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	0	136,114			0	136,114
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**93**	**4,280,368**		**119,400**	**93**	**4,399,768**

Items of Special Interest

Advance procurement for AN/TPY–2 X-band radars

The budget request contained $858.9 million for fielding of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) equipment and $94.1 million for fielding of Aegis ballistic missile defense interceptors, but contained no funds for fielding of Army-Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance—Model 2 (AN/TPY–2) X-band radars.

The AN/TPY–2 radar is capable of operating in either a forward-based mode to provide information to the ballistic missile defense system (BMDS) and all of its potential interceptors, or in terminal mode to provide information to a co-located THAAD battery. The Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP) for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) includes funding to purchase a total of 14 AN/TPY–2 X-band radars by fiscal year 2015. Nine of the AN/TPY–2 radars are required for the nine currently-programmed THAAD batteries. At present, two AN/TPY–2 radars are deployed in forward-based mode, one in Japan and the other in the State of Israel. While the future requirements for AN/TPY–2 radars to support the BMDS and the Administration's plan for regional missile defense systems are undefined, the FYDP includes three additional radars that could potentially be forward-based.

Thus far, MDA has contracted for acquisition of seven AN/TPY–2 radars, the last of which will be delivered later in 2010. Funding for the additional seven radars will not begin until fiscal year 2012, leaving a potential production gap of over a year. The committee is concerned that this production gap will result in higher unit costs and greater schedule risks in the acquisition of AN/TPY–2 radars. MDA also plans to field the AN/TPY–2 radars for the THAAD batteries through its Sensors Directorate using research, development, test, and evaluation funds, and not through the THAAD fielding procurement account. The committee is concerned that not all of the additional AN/TPY–2 radars will be acquired using procurement funding.

The committee recommends $65.0 million for advance procurement of equipment for future purchases of AN/TPY–2 radars to avoid obsolescence of key components and to maintain the industrial base. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to request all additional future funding for acquisition of AN/TPY–2 radars within the defense-wide procurement account.

Common data link

In recent years, new competition has brought improved capabilities and cost savings to the common data link (CDL) on airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms and unmanned aerial systems. However, the committee believes that equal participation in the further development of CDL specifications, and providing supporting systems engineering, would allow even more competition for CDL. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to define a common control interface for CDL terminals and directs its use for all new equipment purchases made after fiscal year 2011.

Recognizing the benefits of multiple vendors supplying competitive offerings for this vital communications service, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that all Department of

Defense efforts to install CDL on new blocks and models of Department of Defense platforms should adopt the CDL common control interface and that all future CDL procurements for these platforms shall be competitively awarded.

Fielding of Aegis ballistic missile defense interceptors

The budget request contained $94.1 million for fielding of Aegis ballistic missile defense (BMD) interceptors, a reduction of $131.5 million from the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level.

The request would support the purchase of eight Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) Block 1B interceptors in fiscal year 2011, the first year that Block 1B interceptors would be purchased using procurement funding.

In fiscal year 2012, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) anticipates increasing the purchase of SM–3 Block 1B interceptors to 66, at a projected cost of $701.9 million. Yet the production schedule contained in the Department's detailed budget justification book shows an 18-month gap between the last deliveries of Block 1A interceptors in December 2011 and the first deliveries of the Block 1B purchases in July 2013.

In March 2010, the Government Accountability Office reported that the "Aegis BMD program is putting the SM–3 Block IB at risk for cost growth and schedule delays by planning to begin manufacturing in 2010 before its critical technologies have been demonstrated in a realistic environment." The first flight test to demonstrate the Block 1B interceptor's technology readiness has been delayed until the winter of 2011.

The committee is concerned that the lack of stability in the purchase of SM–3 interceptors and the steep expansion of production of Block 1B interceptors in fiscal year 2012 could damage the industrial base and delay increases in the inventory of a system that will play a central role in the Phased, Adaptive Approach to missile defenses in Europe announced by the President in September 2009. The committee notes that the development of regional missile defense plans beyond Europe, pursuant to the Administration's Ballistic Missile Defense Review released on February 1, 2010, may also expand the near-term requirement for Aegis BMD interceptors.

The committee recommends $144.1 million, an increase of $50.0 million, to provide for greater stability in SM–3 production and to reduce the size of the production increase in fiscal year 2012. The committee expects that MDA will only allocate additional funding for SM–3 Block 1B production in fiscal year 2011 if the first flight test is successful.

The committee recommends $144.1 million, an increase of $50.0 million, to provide for greater stability in SM–3 production and to reduce the size of the production increase in fiscal year 2012. The committee expects that MDA will only allocate additional funding for SM–3 Block 1B production in fiscal year 2011 if the first flight test is successful.

Lighter-than-air vehicles for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance

The committee is concerned about the duplication of effort among the military services in regard to the acquisition of lighter-than-air

vehicles used by the military services for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and communications.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011, detailing the Department's Future Years Defense Program requirement for lighter-than-air vehicles, by service, to include: the Special Operations Command; comparative operational and sensor capabilities; and unit and system costs of each vehicle and system; and completed analyses of alternatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2011 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Procurement of Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team Increment One Equipment

This section would limit the Secretary of the Defense from taking any steps to procure more than two brigade sets of Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team Increment One equipment, with a waiver based on providing testing data and reports to the congressional defense committees and an exception for meeting operational need statements.

Section 112—Report on Army Battlefield Network Plans and Programs

This section would require a report from the Secretary of the Army on the Army's plans for future tactical network technology and the acquisition programs to achieve this network. This section would also limit obligation of certain Army procurement funds for tactical communications equipment until the report is received. There is an exception for meeting operational need statements.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Incremental Funding for Procurement of Large Naval Vessels

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to incrementally fund large naval vessels over a period of years not to exceed three quarters of the amount of years of planned ship construction. The planned ship construction time-period is defined starting in the year of authorization and ending in the year of projected delivery. Large naval vessels are defined as those vessels exceeding 17,000 tons light ship displacement. Additionally, this section would authorize an additional year of incremental funding for the vessel LPD 26 should the Secretary determine it is in the interest of the Navy to do so.

Section 122—Multiyear Procurement of F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G Aircraft

This section would amend section 8011 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–118) to clarify that the Secretary of Defense must submit a certification of full funding for a multiyear contract for the procurement of F/A–18E, F/A–18F, or EA–18G aircraft not later than 30 days prior to the contract award. This section would also amend section 128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to require that the Secretary submit the certification required by section 2306b(i)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by September 1, 2010. This section would specify that the Secretary may submit an update to the report on multiyear contracts, as required by section 2306b(l)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to reflect a multiyear contract for such aircraft, by not later than September 1, 2010. This section would clarify that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a multiyear contract for the procurement of such aircraft meets the requirements under section 2306b(i)(3) and section 2306b(l)(3) of title 10, United States Code, that a multiyear contract be specifically authorized by law in an Act other than an appropriations Act and in an appropriations Act, respectively.This section would clarify that the requirement of section 8008(b) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–56) regarding a request for authority to enter into a multiyear contract shall not apply to a multiyear contract for such aircraft. Lastly, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to use the fiscal savings garnered from the Navy's entry into the fiscal year 2010 through 2013 multiyear procurement contract, now considered excess to the Future Years Defense Plan current program of record, and procure the maximum quantity of additional F/A–18E or F/A–18F aircraft that the excess funding would enable.

Section 123—Report on Naval Force Structure and Missile Defense

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Chief of Naval Operations, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the requirements of the major combatant surface vessels with respect to missile defense. The report would include an analysis of the number of vessels needed to fulfill the missions of missile defense, including the mission of the phased, adaptive approach to ballistic missile defense in Europe, when balanced against the competing tasks of meeting surface fleet demands in each of the geographic areas. The section would additionally require the Secretary outline the need to either upgrade existing ships outfitted with the Aegis weapons system to more robust missile defense capability or procure additional vessels above the current requirement of 88 large surface combatants. The Secretary would also be required to discuss expected technological advancements associated with missile defense systems and to provide the construct for deployment of Aegis ships equipped with missile defense systems within the context of the fleet response plan.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Preservation and Storage of Unique Tooling for F–22 Fighter Aircraft

This section would amend subsection (b) of section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2219) by striking "2010" and inserting "2011".

SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 141—Limitation on Procurement of F–35 Lightning II Aircraft

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of amounts necessary for the procurement F–35 aircraft to an amount necessary for the procurement of 30 such aircraft unless the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation submit certifications to the congressional defense committees, not later than January 15, 2011, that specified items pertaining to the F–35 program have been accomplished. The section would also allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the full achievement of some items if the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certifies that the failure to fully achieve some items would not delay or otherwise negatively affect the F–35 aircraft test schedule for fiscal year 2011, impede production of 42 F–35 aircraft in such fiscal year, and otherwise increase risk to the F–35 aircraft program.

Section 142—Limitations on Biometric Systems Funds

This section would limit the obligation of funding for biometrics programs within the Department of Defense until the Secretary of Defense provides a report to the congressional defense committees on the actions taken:

(1) (To implement paragraphs (16)(a)-(f) of National Security Presidential Directive dated June 5, 2008;

(2) To implement the recommendation included in Government Accountability Office (GAO) report -08–1065;

(3) To implement the recommendations included in GAO report -09–49;

(4) To fully and completely characterize the current biometrics architecture and establish the objective architecture for the Department of Defense;

(5) To ensure that an official within the Office of the Secretary of Defense has sufficient authority and is responsible to ensure that all funding for biometrics programs and operations is effectively programmed, budgeted, and executed; and

(6) To ensure that an officer within the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has sufficient authority and is responsible to ensure the development and implementation of common and interoperable standards for the collection, storage, and use of biometrics data by all combatant commanders and their commands.

Further, this section would require written approval for all obligations of funds for biometrics program and activities within the

Department of Defense by the Director of Defense Biometrics in the Office of the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Section 143—Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Initiatives Database

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to direct the military services and the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to create a comprehensive improvised explosive device defeat initiative database and work with the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to develop a Department of Defense-wide database for all counter-improvised explosive device initiatives. This database would include all "defeat the device," "attack the network," and counter-improvised explosive device type efforts from across the Department, including the Rapid Equipping Force, joint concept technology demonstrations, and quick reaction task force efforts.

Section 144—Study on Lightweight Body Armor Solutions

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to direct a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) to identify and examine the requirements for lighter weight body armor systems. This section would require that not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the FFRDC shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report recommending ways in which the Secretary of Defense and each secretary of the military departments may more effectively address the research, development, and procurement requirements regarding reducing the weight of body armor.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $76.1 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $76.5 billion, an increase of $342.6 million to the budget request.

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Appropriation	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	10,333,392	-16,638	10,316,754
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	17,693,496	285,150	17,978,646
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	27,247,302	22,600	27,269,902
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	20,661,600	51,496	20,713,096
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	194,910		194,910
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION	**76,130,700**	**342,608**	**76,473,308**

ARMY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $10.3 billion for Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $10.3 billion, a decrease of $16.6 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 research, development, test, and evaluation, Army are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY					
BASIC RESEARCH					
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	21,780		21,780
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	195,845	5,000	200,845
		Global Military Operating Environments		[2,000]	
		Social Science Research Capacity		[3,000]	
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	91,161	5,000	96,161
		Minerva		[5,000]	
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	98,087		98,087
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**406,873**	**10,000**	**416,873**
APPLIED RESEARCH					
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	29,882	4,000	33,882
		Nanomanufacturing of Integrated Smart Materials Systems		[4,000]	
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	48,929		48,929
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	14,624		14,624
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	43,476		43,476
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,330		17,330
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	49,525		49,525
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	18,190		18,190
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	20,582		20,582
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	64,740	2,500	67,240
		Enhanced Visual Fidelity Simulation		[2,500]	
014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	60,342		60,342
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	5,324		5,324

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,893		7,893
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	42,645	7,000	49,645
		Self-Inerting Munitions Technology Development		[3,000]	
		Unmanned Hybrid Projectile Project		[4,000]	
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	60,859		60,859
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	40,228		40,228
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	19,118		19,118
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	21,042		21,042
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	18,364		18,364
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	25,573		25,573
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	6,768		6,768
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	79,189	6,000	85,189
		Cellulose Nanocomposites for Army Infrastructure and Troop Protection		[5,000]	
		Geosciences/Atmospheric Research		[1,000]	
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	22,198		22,198
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	27,746		27,746
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	96,797	19,507	116,304
		Bone-Integrated Prosthetics for Combat-Injured Soldiers		[2,000]	
		Epigenetic Disease Research		[2,500]	
		Improving Soldier Recovery from Catastrophic Bone Injuries		[6,500]	
		Maine Natural Biopolymer Research and Development Partnership		[1,320]	
		Scleral Healing and Bone Repair with Sphere-Templated Polymers		[1,687]	
		Tracking the Health of Soldiers with Advanced Implantable Nano-Sensors		[2,500]	
		Traumatic Brain Injury Research Initiative		[3,000]	

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**841,364**	**39,007**	**880,371**
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,364	8,077	45,441
		Heat Illness Research at West Chester University's HEAT Institute to Ensure the Safety of Warfighters		[375]	
		Manufacturing Research and Development of Parachutes		[5,702]	
		Precision Airdrop Accuracy Enhancement		[2,000]	
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	71,510	28,130	99,640
		Advanced Medical Training and Technology Platform		[3,000]	
		ALS Therapy Development Institute Gulf War Research Program		[4,830]	
		Bethesda Hospitals' Emergency Preparedness Partnership Collaboration Toolbox		[2,500]	
		Exoskeleton Development for Wounded Service Members		[3,000]	
		Hadron Particle Therapy		[5,000]	
		Next Generation Leishmaniasis Drug Development		[2,300]	
		Ophthalmic Robotic Surgery		[5,000]	
		Personal Status Monitor		[1,000]	
		Software-Based Treatment for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder		[1,500]	
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,454		57,454
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,438		64,438
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	89,499	9,730	99,229
		Advanced Battery Manufacturing Research and Development		[5,000]	
		Smart Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Program		[4,730]	
034	0603006A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	8,102		8,102

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	7,921		7,921
036	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,359	7,000	57,359
		Applied Communications and Information Networking		[7,000]	
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	8,015		8,015
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	15,334		15,334
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	12,309		12,309
040	0603103A	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	0		0
041	0603105A	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,688		6,688
042	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,550		10,550
043	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,350	3,000	21,350
		Advanced Ground Electronic Warfare System (AGES)		[3,000]	
044	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	84,553		84,553
045	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	9,986		9,986
046	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	26,953		26,953
047	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	9,151		9,151
048	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,912		39,912
049	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	15,878		15,878
050	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	27,393	-7,500	19,893
		Fort Bliss Renewable and Alternative Energy Initiative		[2,500]	
		Program Reduction		[-10,000]	
051	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	24,873		24,873
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**696,592**	**48,437**	**745,029**
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
052	0603024A	UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID)	0		0
053	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION(NON SPACE)	11,455		11,455

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
054	0603308A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	27,551		27,551
055	0603327A	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	0		0
056	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	15,596		15,596
057	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	2,425		2,425
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	42,183		42,183
059	0603653A	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	136,302		136,302
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	18,556		18,556
061	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	17,962	-5,000	12,962
		Program Reduction		[-5,000]	
062	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	0		0
063	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	4,695		4,695
064	0603782A	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL	190,903		190,903
065	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	5,060		5,060
066	0603801A	AVIATION - ADV DEV	8,355		8,355
067	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	80,490		80,490
068	0603805A	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	14,290		14,290
069	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	28,132		28,132
070	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	48,323		48,323
071	0603850A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	970		970
072	0305205A	ENDURANCE UAVS	93,000		93,000
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**746,248**	**-5,000**	**741,248**
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
073	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	89,210		89,210
074	0604220A	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS	72,550		72,550
075	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	172,269		172,269
076	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	784		784

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
077	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	22,574		22,574
078	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	23,194		23,194
079	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	80,337	3,000	83,337
		Helicopter Portable Oxygen Delivery System Generation III		[3,000]	
080	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,710		3,710
081	0604609A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD	5,335		5,335
082	0604611A	JAVELIN	9,999		9,999
083	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,519		3,519
084	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,892		9,892
085	0604642A	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	1,990		1,990
086	0604646A	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	81,247	-81,247	0
		Program Terminated		[-81,247]	
087	0604647A	NON-LINE OF SIGHT CANNON	0		0
088	0604660A	FCS MANNED GRD VEHICLES & COMMON GRD VEHICLE	0		0
089	0604661A	FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT	568,711	-71,300	497,411
		Program Reduction		[-71,300]	
090	0604662A	FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS	50,304		50,304
091	0604663A	FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES	249,948		249,948
092	0604664A	FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	7,515		7,515
093	0604665A	FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D	610,389		610,389
094	0604666A	SPIN OUT TECHNOLOGY/CAPABILITY INSERTION	0		0
095	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD	52,549		52,549
096	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,118		2,118
097	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD	27,756		27,756
098	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - SDD	34,209		34,209
099	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	30,291		30,291

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
100	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	14,041		14,041
101	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - SDD	15,547		15,547
102	0604778A	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	0		0
103	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	27,670		27,670
104	0604783A	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	0		0
105	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD	24,345		24,345
106	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD	41,039		41,039
107	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - SDD	90,736		90,736
108	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - SDD	34,474		34,474
109	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD	95,577		95,577
110	0604814A	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS	26,371		26,371
111	0604817A	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	29,884		29,884
112	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	60,970		60,970
113	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	13,576		13,576
114	0604823A	FIREFINDER	24,736		24,736
115	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR DEM/VAL	20,886		20,886
116	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	53,624	52,000	105,624
		Paladin Integrated Management- Program Increase		[52,000]	
117	0604869A	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	467,139		467,139
118	0604870A	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	7,276		7,276
119	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	23,957		23,957
120	0605018A	ARMY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (A-IMHRS)	100,500		100,500
121	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	130,340		130,340
122	0605455A	SLAMRAAM	23,700		23,700
123	0605456A	PAC-3/MSE MISSILE	62,500		62,500
124	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	251,124		251,124

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
125	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	934,366		934,366
126	0605626A	E-MARSS	211,500		211,500
127	0303032A	TROJAN - RH12	3,697		3,697
128	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	21,571		21,571
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,021,546**	**-97,547**	**4,923,999**
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
129	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	26,158		26,158
130	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,614		8,614
131	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,102		42,102
132	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,492		20,492
133	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	163,788		163,788
134	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	17,704		17,704
135	0605502A	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
136	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	393,937	22,900	416,837
		Range Infrastructure- Unfunded Requirement		[22,900]	
137	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	59,040	17,700	76,740
		Instrumentation- Unfunded Requirement		[17,700]	
138	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	41,812		41,812
139	0605605A	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	4,710		4,710
140	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	5,055		5,055
141	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,185		7,185
142	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	18,078		18,078
143	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	5,460		5,460
144	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	68,191		68,191
145	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	61,450		61,450
146	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	3,926		3,926

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
147	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,685		73,685
148	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	48,309	1,000	49,309
		Army Educational Outreach Program		[1,000]	
149	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	53,338		53,338
150	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	3,195		3,195
151	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	16,154		16,154
152	0909999A	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,142,383**	**41,600**	**1,183,983**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
153	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	51,619		51,619
154	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE/JLENS	372,493		372,493
155	0203347A	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO CYBER (ISC) MIP	2,360	-2,360	0
		Program Reduction		[-2,360]	
156	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	24,622		24,622
157	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	204,481		204,481
158	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	25,540		25,540
159	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	134,999		134,999
160	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	710		710
161	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	6,329		6,329
162	0203759A	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	3,935		3,935
163	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	24,280		24,280
164	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	0		0
165	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	14,870		14,870
166	0208010A	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	0		0
167	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	12,403		12,403
168	0208058A	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	3,153		3,153

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
170	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	0		0
171	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	54,784	-36,661	18,123
		Transfer to OPA 051- Biometrics Equipment		[-36,661]	
172	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	125,569		125,569
173	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	33,694		33,694
174	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	13,024		13,024
175	0303158A	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	0		0
177	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	54,300		54,300
178	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	103,002		103,002
179	0305219A	MQ-1 SKY WARRIOR A UAV	123,156		123,156
180	0305232A	RQ-11 UAV	1,599		1,599
181	0305233A	RQ-7 UAV	7,805		7,805
182	0307207A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	0		0
183	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	14,114	-14,114	0
		Program Reduction		[-14,114]	
184	0702239A	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	0		0
185	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	61,098		61,098
186	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,447		4,447
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,478,386**	**-53,135**	**1,425,251**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**10,333,392**	**-16,638**	**10,316,754**

Items of Special Interest

Abrams tank modernization

The budget request contained $107.5 million in PE 23735A for research and development of M1 Abrams tank upgrades.

The committee supports continued upgrades to the Army's fleet of M1 Abrams tanks. The committee notes that with the demise of the Future Combat Systems (FCS) manned ground vehicles (MGV) program, the M1 Abrams will remain the Army's premier combat platform for decades. As a result, the committee believes that an aggressive upgrade program is necessary to keep the M1 Abrams tank fleet capable of defeating all possible threats. The committee is concerned, however, that the Army's current incremental plan for M1 Abrams upgrades could result in a production break in the fiscal year 2013–14 timeframe. The committee urges the Army to develop an Abrams modernization strategy during the fiscal year 2012 budget deliberations that avoids any production gaps and integrates critical survivability technologies, such as an active protection system, in the initial tranche of upgrades.

The committee recommends $107.5 million, the full amount requested, for research and development of M1 Abrams tank upgrades.

Biometrics enabled intelligence

The budget request contained $14.1 million in research and development in PE 37665A, an operational systems development budget activity, a 6.7 budget activity, for engineering and manufacturing development (EMD), a 6.5 budget activity, for the joint personnel identification version 2 (JPIv2) biometrics collection device. The budget request also included $106.2 million in PE 33140A for biometrics design and development.

Currently, there is no JPIv2 device available to be able to initiate EMD in PE 37665A in fiscal year 2011. The Army program manager currently plans to enter EMD in fiscal year 2012, if the technology readiness level (TRL) of the devices being considered for JPIv2 can be assessed at TRL 6. However, the Army has not established its acquisition strategy outlining the number of devices it will compete in the technology demonstration phase and the EMD phase of the program.

The committee believes the Army, when requesting funding, should align the purpose of the funds requested with the appropriate budget activity. The committee also believes the $14.1 million request is premature, with sufficient funding available in PE 33140A for technology development required on JPIv2.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $14.1 million, in PE 37665A for engineering and manufacturing development of JPIv2.

Bradley Fighting Vehicle modernization

The budget request contained $97.0 million in PE 23735A for research and development of Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFV) upgrades.

The committee supports continued upgrades to the Army's fleet of BFVs and views ongoing upgrades to the BFV fleet as a critical element of the Army's overall combat vehicle modernization plan.

However, the committee is concerned that the Army is not executing funds made available in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 for BFV upgrade research and development. The committee notes that even if the Army's Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) is fielded on schedule that it is only intended to slowly replace the M2 variant of the BFV starting in 2017. This fielding plan would leave dozens of other BFV variants in heavy brigade combat teams for an indefinite period. In addition, the committee understands that BFV chassis-based vehicles are being considered for replacement of some M113 vehicles. As a result, the committee believes that it is far too soon for the Army to stop investing in the BFV fleet, or even slowing its upgrade plans. With the GCV program just beginning, the committee views any Army move to slow or terminate BFV upgrades as premature. The committee does not believe that upgrades to the BFV fleet will impact the GCV program or diminish the need for a new Army combat vehicle. Therefore, the committee expects the Army to move quickly to establish any needed BFV upgrade requirements and execute the funds provided for this purpose. Specifically, the committee urges the Army to consider engine or other upgrades that would improve mobility and increase electrical generating capacity.

The committee recommends $97.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 23735A for research and development of BFV upgrades.

Cellulose nanocomposites for Army infrastructure and troop protection

The budget request contained $79.1 million in PE 62784A for military engineering technology, but included no funds for the development of cellulose nanocomposite panels for ballistic protection.

The committee understands that the use of cellulose nanocomposite panels for ballistic protection could further development of cost effective, reduced weight and rapidly erectable field structures as well as class IV construction materials. The committee notes this technology could accelerate the Army's capability by addressing immediate requirements for blast and ballistic modular protective structures to meet different threat levels in overseas contingency operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 62784A for the development of cellulose nanocomposites for Army infrastructure and troop protection.

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team

The budget request contained $1.6 billion for Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) research and development, and $682.7 million for procurement.

In addition to the myriad of program challenges detailed elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned with the continued lack of stability in the EIBCT program's budget request. The committee views the lack of accurate and stable budget request information as a sign that the Army's plans for the EIBCT program remain in flux almost a year after termination of the FCS program. The committee notes that since the termination of the Future Combat Systems program in June 2009, the Army has submitted an amended request for EIBCT fiscal year 2010 procurement funding,

an amended request for fiscal year 2011 procurement funds in March 2010, and two reprogramming requests for EIBCT funds in April 2010. In addition, the budget justification materials submitted in support of the fiscal year 2011 request contained numerous errors, including the embedding of advance procurement funds within procurement lines. The committee notes that the lack of fidelity in EIBCT budget request information may lead to denials of reprogramming requests, funding restrictions, or other actions taken by the committee to ensure that funding provided is not misused.

Finally, the committee understands that with the termination of the non-line-of-sight-launch system program that relevant procurement funds provided in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 appear to be more than enough to fund two full brigade sets of the remaining program elements, plus additional test assets. With the program not set to complete initial operational test and evaluation until late fiscal year 2011, the committee believes that the procurement funds requested in the budget request are premature.

The committee recommends $1.4 billion, a decrease of $208.3 million, for EIBCT research and development. The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $682.7 million, for EIBCT procurement.

Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team unattended ground sensors

The budget request contained $7.5 million in PE 64664A for Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) unattended ground sensor (UGS) development.

The committee understands that the UGS development program will reach a total funding level of approximately $130.0 million at the end of fiscal year 2010 and that limited low-rate production has been approved. The committee is concerned that despite being six years into its development, test data from technical field tests and Limited User Tests (LUT) conducted in fiscal year 2009 show that the demonstrated reliability of the Tactical-UGS and Urban-UGS is still poor. As reported by Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) during the most recent LUT, both systems demonstrated poor communications connectivity, inadequate transmission ranges, poor image quality, and frequent system failures. The committee notes that the Increment 1 EIBCT program acquisition decision memorandum approved by the Defense Acquisition Executive on December 24, 2009, directs DOT&E and the Army to conduct a comparative test of EIBCT-equipped units with units equipped as currently deployed for operations. The committee believes that the results of the comparative test will be critical to determining whether the program of record should be continued, modified, or terminated. If the comparative test reveals that the program of record should go forward, the committee believes that it is in the best interests of the warfighter to conduct a full and open competition prior to full-rate production. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to require full and open competition prior to making full-rate procurement decisions; and to consider multi-source procurement.

The committee recommends $7.5 million in PE 64664A, the full amount requested, for UGS research and development.

Focus for Minerva research

The budget request contained $91.2 million in PE 61103A for Army university research initiatives. Of this amount, $15.3 million was requested for the Minerva Initiative.

The committee continues to note the importance of using social science research and expertise to support key Department of Defense (DOD) missions, including irregular warfare, counterinsurgency, and stability and reconstruction operations. The Secretary of Defense established the Minerva Initiative to provide one of the primary mechanisms for the Department to foster basic social science and humanities research at the university level.

After nearly two years in operation, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not provided enough focus for the Minerva Initiative topics to develop an effective critical mass of talent concentrated on key mission areas. The original broad area announcement for the Minerva Initiative outlined seven topical areas. While these areas are all valuable in fostering foundational social science research for the Department and university researchers willing to work on topics of DOD interest, the committee is concerned that funds for the Minerva Initiative are spread too thinly to develop deep expertise in any of the current topic areas.

The committee recommends $96.2 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 61103A to conduct research on how best to counter extremist ideologies. The committee notes elsewhere in this report on how the Department might structure such a counter-ideology program and how Minerva might support such a program.

Future Combat Systems system-of-systems engineering and program management

The budget request contained $568.7 million in PE 64661A for Future Combat Systems (FCS) system-of-systems engineering and program management.

The committee remains concerned that more than a year after the Secretary of Defense directed the Army to terminate the FCS program of record that the contract for FCS has not been renegotiated to account for the dramatically reduced scope of the program, which is now the Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team program. The committee believes that the large amount of contractor "system-of-systems" integration and overhead requested exceeds what is needed given the reduction of the FCS program from 18 to just 4 major program elements. The committee expects the renegotiated contract to require significantly less contractor overhead, program management, and systems integration in fiscal year 2011. In addition, the committee understands that termination costs for the non-line of sight cannon program will be substantially lower than originally forecast.

The committee recommends $497.4 million, a decrease of $71.3 million, in PE 64661A for FCS system-of-systems engineering and program management.

Ground Combat Vehicle program

The budget request contained $934.4 million in PE 65625A for development of the Army Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV).

The committee supports the Army's move away from the Future Combat Systems (FCS) manned ground vehicle (MGV) path to modernizing the Army's combat vehicle fleet. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee noted that it was not inclined to support the high-risk path the Army was on with the MGV family of vehicles, which the committee was concerned would encounter significant technical challenges and, in the end, prove unaffordable given the Army's many other needs. The committee believes that the projected cost of the MGVs, along with requirements ill-suited for the current operational environment, set the MGV effort on its ultimate path to termination by the Secretary of Defense in April 2009.

The committee supports the initial acquisition strategy for the GCV program, which appears to be more disciplined, and focused on producing a single variant of a new ground combat vehicle with a design flexible enough to accommodate future upgrades. The committee believes that a future mix of upgraded M1 Abrams tanks, upgraded M2 Bradley fighting vehicles, and new GCVs will provide the Army with a flexible mix of armored fighting platforms. In addition, the committee supports the current acquisition strategy for GCV that maintains competition throughout the technology development, and engineering and manufacturing development phases.

However, the committee is concerned with some of the requirements in place for the GCV, which the committee believes are extremely ambitious in some areas. The committee notes that it was, first and foremost, poorly thought-through requirements that led FCS MGVs to eventual termination. Specifically, early limitations on MGV weight and size, based on what turned out to be flawed operational concepts, including C–130 transportability, led to an overly-complex MGV design that resulted in cost growth, unplanned weight increases, and significant schedule delays. The committee is concerned that, once again, the Army may be asking the defense industry to build a "gold-plated" vehicle that may take longer to develop than planned and prove to be extremely expensive to procure.

The committee is also concerned that the Army chose to release a detailed request for proposals in February 2010, a full eight months before it completes the analysis of alternatives (AOA) for the GCV program. The Army's choice to do so suggests that it is a pro-forma exercise that will in fact have little bearing on the initial contract awards planned for September 2010, and that the Army will not seriously consider upgrading or modifying current platforms.

Therefore, the committee urges the Army to take two actions. First, the committee believes the Army must carefully review the requirements for the GCV program and consider a more incremental approach that separates "needs" from "wants." While the committee supports the program's early focus on vehicle and crew survivability, the committee is concerned that other requirements may prove too costly and complex. For example, while the committee understands that deployment of non-lethal weapons, the ability to intercept direct and indirect fire threats, aggressive fuel efficiency improvements, and the ability to defeat heavily armored vehicles at extended range may be desirable, it is concerned that

requiring these capabilities in the initial GCV model could needlessly complicate the vehicle's design, and could be included as incremental upgrades at a later time. Second, after streamlining the GCV requirements, the committee recommends that the Army conduct a thorough AOA before proceeding to technology development contract awards. Specifically, the committee believes the Army should carefully consider whether or not it is possible to upgrade current vehicles, including some foreign designs, to meet baseline GCV requirements on an accelerated schedule that could get a vehicle in the hands of troops more quickly than the current seven-year timeline.

The committee recommends $934.4 million, the full amount requested, for the Army GCV program.

Maingate tactical network architecture

The committee supports the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) program, but encourages the Army to explore alternative network solutions in order to mitigate the risk of JTRS fielding delays. The committee believes that one alternative could be provided by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Maingate network gateway technology, which is intended to enable mobile ad hoc network communications between analogue and digital Army radio systems. The committee understands that the Army has conducted limited testing of networks using Maingate technology. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Defense Research and Engineering to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 30, 2011, comparing the technological readiness, test performance, reliability, and cost of a notional Army tactical network using the JTRS Ground Mobile Radio running the Wideband Networking Waveform and Soldier Radio Waveform, and the Maingate network gateway. The report should also include a detailed description of the notional network's composition and size.

Medium Extended Air Defense System

The committee is concerned that the tri-national Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) co-development program will deliver a capability that is not integrated with the Army's Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) architecture and joint operational concept. The Army's IAMD architecture relies on the IAMD Battle Command System (IBCS) to provide battle management and command and control (C2) across all Army air and missile defense sensors and shooters. IBCS also provides the interface to other air and missile defense battle management and C2 systems such as the Missile Defense Agency's Command and Control, Battle Management, and Communications (C2BMC) and the Navy's Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC), which enables access to their sensors and interceptor systems. However, the MEADS program, as currently planned, does not include the IBCS.

The committee is aware that the United States requested that its international partners restructure the MEADS program in the fall of 2008 and has proposed substituting IBCS as the MEADS battle manager. The committee believes that both United States and coalition forces benefit by leveraging a battle management and C2 system that enables access to a full complement of air and missile defense systems.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2010, evaluating the options for restructuring the MEADS program structure and governance. The evaluation should include, at a minimum, an assessment of cost, schedule, performance, and international implications for each option.

Military engineering advanced technology

The budget request contained $27.4 million in PE 63734A for military engineering advanced technology.

The committee notes that budget justification materials indicate that $20.5 million of this amount is for "Deployable Force Protection Technology Integration Demonstrations and Red Teaming." The committee does not believe the demonstration and red teaming work described requires the requested funding level.

The committee recommends $17.4 million, a decrease of $10.0 million, in PE 63734A for military engineering advanced development.

Non-line-of-sight launch system

The budget request contained $81.3 million in PE 64646A for non-line-of-sight launch system (NLOS–LS) research and development.

The committee notes that the Army terminated the NLOS–LS program in April 2010. However, the committee is concerned that the Army chose to terminate a program that had been touted for years as a key element in improving the lethality of light infantry brigades. The committee is also concerned that the Army is walking away from a $1.0 billion investment in research and development for this system. While the committee understands the need for the Army to reduce redundancy and fund other priorities, the committee believes that in this case the Army could have extended the engineering and manufacturing development phase for another year at a modest cost. This extension could have at least provided the Army with more options for procuring different versions of the missile, perhaps at a lower unit price. As a result, the committee has provided additional funding to the Navy elsewhere in this title to complete development of the NLOS–LS program. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2011, on how it can use some of the technology developed under the NLOS–LS program in the future.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $81.3 million, in PE 64646A for NLOS–LS research and development.

Paladin Integrated Management program

The budget request contained $53.6 million in PE 64854A for Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program research and development.

The committee notes that the Army has delayed the planned milestone C low-rate initial production decision for the PIM program, due to technological development challenges. As a result, the committee believes additional research and development funds are needed for the PIM program in fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommends $105.6 million, an increase of $52.0 million, in PE 64854A for the PIM program.

Self-inerting munitions technology development

The budget request contained $42.6 million in PE 62624A for weapons and munitions technology, but included no funds for self-inerting munitions technology development.

The committee notes unexploded ordnance (UXO) is common to all munitions, and that it is particularly significant in the case of cluster munitions where the UXO rate can be as high as 20 to 30 percent. The committee recognizes these items function as unintended landmines, limiting battle-space command and control through increased hazards to friendly forces during combat operations. They also pose continued hazards to civilians and peacekeepers in post-conflict environments. The committee understands the purpose of this program is to develop technology that removes humanitarian hazards, prevents illicit reuse, and protects the environment from explosives in UXO.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62624A for the development of self-inerting munition technology.

Social science research capacity

The budget request contained $195.8 million in PE 61102A, $429.8 million in PE 61153N, and $351.0 million in PE 61102F for basic research activities, including support for specific researchers.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has a program for supporting early career postdoctoral scientists and engineers by funding creative research opportunities. Each military department sponsors a Young Investigator Program (YIP), or some equivalent, that funds research by exceptional young faculty members in order to encourage their teaching and research careers to provide the Department of Defense with a future pipeline of scientific talent.

Historically, YIP and similar programs have focused on supporting researchers in traditional physical and biological sciences of interest to the Department. With the increasing importance and emphasis on social science research, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should leverage YIP to encourage promising young social science researchers as well.

Therefore, the committee recommends $198.8 million, an increase of $3.0 million, in PE 61102A; $432.8 million, an increase of $3.0 million, in PE 61153N; and $354.0 million, an increase of $3.0 million, in PE 61102F for YIP and equivalent programs to fund promising faculty members to encourage social science research that supports defense needs.

Stryker vehicle improvised explosive device mitigation technology

The committee notes that attacks on Stryker vehicles in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) have resulted in significant casualties, and that the Army is researching a new "double V" hull design to provide improved protection against improvised explosive devices (IED). In addition to this effort, the committee understands that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) is evaluating other IED survivability technologies that could be applied to a wide range of military vehicles, including

Army Stryker vehicles. These technologies include roof or side-mounted IED blast-attenuation seating systems, rocket propelled grenade fence armor, and IED mine blast armor kits, all of which could mitigate the effects of IED attacks in OEF. The committee also understands that some of these technologies have already been fielded on Marine Corps and North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally vehicles in OEF. Further, the committee understands that these technologies could be installed in the near-term on current Army Stryker vehicles during reset or in theater. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, JIEDDO to provide a report by January 30, 2011, to the congressional defense committees evaluating these technologies, their potential for installation on existing Stryker or other vehicles, and any actions taken by JIEDDO or the Army to field these technologies.

Tactical electronic surveillance systems

The budget request contained $17.9 million in PE 63766A for tactical electronic surveillance systems.

The committee notes that budget justification materials indicate that $9.0 million of this amount is for requirements analysis and validation, and that this represents a $5.0 million increase over the fiscal year 2010 funding level for this project. The committee does not believe the activities described justify this increase in funds.

The committee recommends $12.9 million, a decrease of $5.0 million, in PE 63766A for tactical electronic surveillance systems advanced development.

NAVY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $17.7 billion for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $18.0 billion, an increase of $285.2 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY					
BASIC RESEARCH					
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	108,679	9,500	118,179
		Gulf of Mexico/ Texas Border Geoid Model		[2,000]	
		Modernization of Marine Research Facility Pier, San Diego		[7,500]	
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	17,979		17,979
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	429,767	10,000	439,767
		High-Precision Nanoparticle Formation Control		[1,000]	
		Navy Educational Outreach		[1,000]	
		ONAMI Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology and Nanobiotechnology (N3I)		[5,000]	
		Social Science Research Capacity		[3,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**556,425**	**19,500**	**575,925**
APPLIED RESEARCH					
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	98,150		98,150
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	107,448	7,000	114,448
		Applied Research in Intelligent Autonomous Systems (ARIAS)		[1,500]	
		Harbor Shield Homeland Defense Port Security Initiative		[5,500]	
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	43,776		43,776
007	0602234N	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	0		0
008	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	70,168	5,150	75,318
		Cognitive Radio Institute		[1,650]	
		High Bandwidth, Mobile Medical Communications Platform to Revolutionize Rural Health Care		[3,500]	
009	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	113,724		113,724

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
010	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	83,902	5,500	89,402
		Photonic Digital-Beamforming System		[5,500]	
011	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	49,491		49,491
012	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,002		6,002
013	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	69,186	5,000	74,186
		Alternative Power System Testing for Innovative Sensor Delivery and Deployment Concepts		[5,000]	
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	36,833		36,833
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**678,680**	**22,650**	**701,330**
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	117,908	2,500	120,408
		High Resolution Anti-Mine UAV-based System		[2,500]	
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	61,877	7,000	68,877
		Future Logistics Immersive Training Environment (FLITE)		[3,000]	
		Mobile Laser Deposition Work Cell		[3,000]	
		Over the Horizon Vessel Tracking		[1,000]	
017	0603235N	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	96,720	-40,900	55,820
		High-Integrity Global Positioning System (HIGPS)		[-40,900]	
018	0603236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	98,261		98,261
019	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	82,143		82,143
020	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	115,089		115,089
021	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,131		11,131
022	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	18,076	2,400	20,476
		Navy Special Warfare Performance and Injury Prevention Program for SBT 22 at Stennis Space Center		[2,400]	

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
023	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	49,276		49,276
024	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	53,177		53,177
025	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,941		21,941
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**725,599**	**-29,000**	**696,599**
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
026	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	123,331		123,331
027	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	9,480		9,480
028	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	4,275		4,275
029	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,249		8,249
030	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	6,452		6,452
031	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,658		1,658
032	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	81,347		81,347
033	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	57,796		57,796
034	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	93,830		93,830
035	0603513N	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	51		51
036	0603525N	PILOT FISH	81,784		81,784
037	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	142,858		142,858
038	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	134,497		134,497
039	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,358		1,358
040	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	21,673		21,673
041	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	608,566	4,000	612,566
		Development of Hybrid Multi-Functional Composites for Submarine Structures		[4,000]	
042	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	5,590		5,590
043	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	17,883	10,000	27,883
		Composite Deckhouse Design for DDG 51 Class Ships		[10,000]	
044	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	1,796	5,000	6,796

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Hydrodynamic Test Facilities		[5,000]	
045	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	366,509		366,509
046	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	5,459	2,500	7,959
		Small Scale Nuclear Reactors		[2,500]	
047	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	447,804		447,804
048	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	226,288	79,250	305,538
		Axial Flow High Power Density Waterjets		[4,250]	
		Navy Non-Line of Sight Launch System Development		[75,000]	
049	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	24,344		24,344
050	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	5,388		5,388
051	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	242,765		242,765
052	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	40,505	800	41,305
		USMC Military Fleet Simulation Computer Co-simulation		[800]	
053	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	25,873		25,873
054	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	52,282		52,282
055	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,560		13,560
056	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	20,207		20,207
057	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	30,403		30,403
058	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	3,746	8,700	12,446
		Crtical Power Securitization for Naval Installations		[3,700]	
		Undersea Perimeter Security Integrated Defense Environment		[5,000]	
059	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	71,920		71,920
060	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	4,139	3,500	7,639
		Development of Flame Retardant Textile Fabric for Military Clothing and Other Applications		[1,500]	
		Navy In Transit Visibility System- GTMO		[2,000]	

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
061	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	219,463		219,463
062	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	58,030		58,030
063	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	183,187		183,187
064	0603755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	4,385		4,385
065	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	41,433		41,433
066	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	36,457		36,457
067	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,196		9,196
068	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	905		905
069	0603851M	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	43,272		43,272
070	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	159,151		159,151
071	0603879N	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER (SE)	0		0
072	0603889N	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	0		0
073	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	0	4,650	4,650
		High Power Laser Technologies Initiative (UCF)		[4,650]	
074	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	51,693		51,693
075	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	56,542		56,542
076	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	25,121		25,121
077	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	34,793		34,793
078	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT - MIP	2,161		2,161
079	0303562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS - MIP	4,253		4,253
080	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT - MIP	663		663
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**3,914,371**	**118,400**	**4,032,771**
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
081	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	44,329		44,329
082	0604214N	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	22,867		22,867
083	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	45,667		45,667

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
084	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	55,792		55,792
085	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,735		5,735
086	0604221N	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,574		3,574
087	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,733		3,733
088	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	89,955		89,955
089	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	171,132		171,132
090	0604245N	H-1 UPGRADES	60,498		60,498
091	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	64,834		64,834
092	0604262N	V-22A	46,070		46,070
093	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,689		8,689
094	0604269N	EA-18	22,042		22,042
095	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	80,819		80,819
096	0604273N	VH-71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	159,785		159,785
097	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	120,602		120,602
098	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	687,723		687,723
099	0604300N	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	0		0
100	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	193,933		193,933
101	0604311N	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	1,373	5,000	6,373
		Land Based Test Facility		[5,000]	
102	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	44,091	-26,000	18,091
		Small Diameter Bomb Increment II		[-26,000]	
103	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	96,186		96,186
104	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	45,885		45,885
105	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL - COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	21,517		21,517
106	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	274,371		274,371
107	0604503N	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	118,897		118,897

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
108	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	5,665		5,665
109	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	70,117	3,500	73,617
		Aviation Data Management and Control System for Amphibious Ships		[3,500]	
110	0604518N	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	5,044		5,044
111	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	155,489		155,489
112	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	50,537		50,537
113	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	153,686		153,686
114	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	4,443		4,443
115	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	5,455		5,455
116	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	25,282		25,282
117	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,489		10,489
118	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	10,759		10,759
119	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	12,567		12,567
120	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	45,930		45,930
121	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	5,860		5,860
122	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	84,525		84,525
123	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	6,820		6,820
124	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	12,337	5,000	17,337
		Chronic Lyme Medical Social Research Network		[1,000]	
		U.S. Navy Pandemic Influenza Vaccine Program		[4,000]	
125	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	66,636		66,636
126	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	667,916	92,300	760,216
		Block 4 Premature need		[-29,000]	
		F-35 Competitive Engine		[121,300]	
127	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	707,791	92,200	799,991

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Block 4 Premature Need		[-29,100]	
		F-35 Competitive Engine		[121,300]	
128	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	22,783		22,783
129	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	28,280		28,280
130	0605018N	NAVY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (N-IMHRS)	27,444		27,444
131	0605212N	CH-53K RDTE	577,435		577,435
132	0605430N	C/KC-130 AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP)	0		0
133	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	100,846		100,846
134	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	929,240		929,240
135	0204201N	CG(X)	0		0
136	0204202N	DDG-1000	549,241		549,241
137	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM - MIP	1,318		1,318
138	0304503N	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION - MIP	1,415		1,415
139	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	17,019		17,019
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**6,852,468**	**172,000**	**7,024,468**
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
140	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	18,755		18,755
141	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	66,066		66,066
142	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	37,522		37,522
143	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,149		8,149
144	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	49,165		49,165
145	0605502N	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
146	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	662	5,000	5,662
		Center for Commercialization of Advanced Technology		[5,000]	
147	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	58,329		58,329

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
148	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,451		3,451
149	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	72,094		72,094
150	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	95,332		95,332
151	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	376,418		376,418
152	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	15,746		15,746
153	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	4,013		4,013
154	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	19,700		19,700
155	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	17,721		17,721
156	0305885N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	1,859		1,859
157	0804758N	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	4,260		4,260
158	0909999N	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**849,242**	**5,000**	**854,242**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
160	0604227N	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	0		0
161	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYP	266,368		266,368
162	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	81,184		81,184
163	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,997		34,997
164	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	6,815		6,815
165	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	10,331		10,331
166	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	35,120		35,120
167	0204136N	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	148,438		148,438
168	0204152N	E-2 SQUADRONS	19,011		19,011
169	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	26,894		26,894
170	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	10,587		10,587
171	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	23,464		23,464
172	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	4,357		4,357

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
173	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	50,750		50,750
174	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,519		1,519
175	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	39,398		39,398
176	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	14,207		14,207
177	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	28,854		28,854
178	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	32,877		32,877
179	0205632N	MK-48 ADCAP	26,234		26,234
180	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	133,611	2,000	135,611
		Unmanned Aerial Systems Maintenance, Repair and Overhaul Advanced Technologies Initiative		[2,000]	
181	0205658N	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,535		3,535
182	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	74,229		74,229
183	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	245,298		245,298
184	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	100,424	-30,400	70,024
		Marine Personnel Carrier Program Delay		[-20,000]	
		PERM Program Reduction		[-10,400]	
185	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	19,466		19,466
186	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	20,316		20,316
187	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	912		912
188	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,633		2,633
189	0208058N	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	3,586		3,586
194	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	422,268	5,000	427,268
		UHF Hosted Payloads Program		[5,000]	
195	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	63,563		63,563
196	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	25,934		25,934
197	0303158M	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	0		0
198	0303158N	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	0		0

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
199	0303238N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES) - MIP	8,375		8,375
201	0305149N	COBRA JUDY	36,527		36,527
202	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	63,878		63,878
203	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	4,435		4,435
204	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	35,212		35,212
205	0305205N	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	0		0
206	0305206N	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	0		0
207	0305207N	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	19,263		19,263
208	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	8,377		8,377
209	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	16,665		16,665
210	0305220N	RQ-4 UAV	529,250		529,250
211	0305231N	MQ-8 UAV	10,665		10,665
212	0305232M	RQ-11 UAV	512		512
213	0305233N	RQ-7 UAV	934		934
214	0305234M	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	26,209		26,209
215	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	18,098		18,098
216	0307207N	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	0		0
217	0307217N	EP-3E REPLACEMENT (EPX)	0		0
218	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	8,158		8,158
219	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	18,649		18,649
220	0702239N	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	3,250		3,250
221	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	46,173		46,173
222	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	0		0
223	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,284,901		1,284,901
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**4,116,711**	**-23,400**	**4,093,311**

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	17,693,496	285,150	17,978,646

Items of Special Interest

Composite deckhouse design for DDG 51 flight III class ships

The budget request contained $17.9 million in PE 63563N for ship concept advanced design, but contained no funds for development of a composite deckhouse for flight III of the DDG 51 class destroyer.

The committee supports the Navy decision to re-start the DDG 51 class destroyer acquisition program and to work toward a flight III version of the vessel by fiscal year 2016. To support the goal of that flight of ships of advanced radar and ship control systems, the Navy must make significant design changes to the class, in order to upgrade power and cooling capability. The committee realizes that those design changes have the potential to add significant weight to the vessel which could limit operational effectiveness. The committee supports an effort, aimed at reducing overall life-cycle costs of the class, to develop a composite deckhouse for the flight III ships that would significantly reduce the weight to center of buoyancy ratio and increase operational effectiveness of the vessel. The committee notes that the technological advancements for the composite deckhouse of the DDG 1000 program can significantly aid this effort.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63563N for development of a composite deckhouse for potential use on flight III DDG 51 class destroyers.

Development of hybrid multi-functional composites for submarine structures

The budget request contained $608.6 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development, but contained no funding for the development of hybrid multi-functional composites for submarine structures.

The committee notes the excellent results of the Virginia-class submarine program of composite technology in the areas of the wide aperture array and main ballast tank vent gratings. The committee understands the use of composites is beneficial in life-cycle maintenance costs, as well as weight savings, which are always a key element of submarine design. The committee understands that emerging technologies using hybrid composite structures have the potential to continue to reduce weight with increased strength for many submarine applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63561N for continued development of hybrid multi-functional composite technology.

Expeditionary Fire Support System Precision Extended Range Munition

The budget request contained $108.9 million in PE 26623M for Marine Corps ground combat support research and development. Of this amount, $10.4 million was requested for the Expeditionary Fire Support System (EFFS) Precision Extended Range Munition (PERM) program.

The committee notes that the EFFS 120mm mortar system will be capable of firing the Army Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative (APMI) round, which will offer similar performance to the pro-

posed EFFS PERM round. The committee also notes that the PERM round will not achieve low-rate initial production until fiscal year 2015 and that the Army APMI round is set to field in early in fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends that the Marine Corps evaluate the performance of the APMI prior to beginning a development program to produce a munition with similar performance.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $10.4 million, in PE 26623M for the EFFS PERM program.

Future integrated nuclear power systems

The budget request contained $366.5 million in PE 63570N for advanced nuclear power systems, but contained no funds for development of small scale pressurized water reactors suitable for destroyer-sized vessels or for alternative nuclear power systems using thorium liquid salt technology.

The committee remains committed to an all nuclear powered naval battle force. The committee notes that significant challenges in size and weight of nuclear technology make inclusion of integrated nuclear power systems on destroyer sized vessels currently impossible. Therefore, the committee believes that additional funding in engineering research and development is needed to design a smaller scale version of a naval pressurized water reactor, or to design a new reactor type potentially using a thorium liquid salt reactor developed for maritime use.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63570N for research and design efforts to develop an integrated nuclear power system capable of use on destroyer-sized vessels either using a pressurized water reactor or a thorium liquid salt reactor.

High-Integrity Global Positioning System

The budget request contained $40.9 million in PE 63235N for the High-Integrity Global Positioning System (HIGPS).

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

The committee recommends no funds in PE 63235N for the High-Integrity Global Positioning System, a decrease of $40.9 million from the budget request.

Marine Corps military fleet simulation computer co-simulation

The budget request contained $40.5 million in PE 63635M for Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support System, but included no funds for Marine Corps fleet simulation computer co-simulation technology programs.

The committee understands the application of computer co-simulation tools could be used to increase fuel efficiency of Marine Corps combat vehicles and tactical wheeled vehicle fleets.

The committee recommends $41.3 million, an increase of $800 thousand, in PE 63635M for fleet simulation computer co-simulation technology programs for the Marine Corps.

Marine operations, Scripps Institute

The budget request contained $108.7 million in PE 61103N for University Research Initiatives, but contained no funds for efforts to upgrade facilities used extensively by Navy research vessels at the Nimitz Marine Facility in Point Loma, California.

The committee understands the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, in affiliation with the University of California, San Diego, is undertaking a major program to replace pier and wharf facilities at their Point Loma location. The committee is aware that these facilities are extensively used by Navy research vessels and are instrumental for continued naval oceanographic projects. Because of the unique requirements of Navy research vessels and other vessels of the Department of Defense for pier supplied electrical distribution systems, information technology systems, and support services such as heavy lift cranes and advanced fendering systems, additional funding is required above the levels funded by the institution for construction of the new wharf and pier facility to effectively berth Navy research vessels.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 61103N for integration of advanced electrical, information technology, crane, and associated support services of the new wharf and pier facilities at the Nimitz Marine Facility to optimize efficiency for Navy research vessels. The committee considers this funding appropriate for appropriation in the research and development account since this funding is not targeted to construction or repair but rather to upgrade the research capability of the facility.

Marine personnel carrier

The budget request contained $108.9 million in PE 26623M for Marine Corps ground combat support research and development. Of this amount, $26.8 million was requested for the Marine Personnel Carrier (MPC) program.

The committee notes that the program's planned milestone A decision in March 2010 has been indefinitely postponed. As a result, the MPC program will not need the full amount of research and development funds requested.

The committee recommends $6.8 million, a decrease of $20.0 million, in PE 26623M for Marine Personnel Carrier research and development.

Navy non-line-of-sight launch system development

The budget request contained $226.3 million in PE 63581N for Littoral Combat Ship mission module research and development but contained no funds for the non-line-of-sight launch system (NLOS–LS).

The committee notes that the Army's termination of the NLOS–LS could leave the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) without sufficient capability to defeat small boat threats and unable to provide precision fire support to Marine Corps forces. The committee is informed that the NLOS–LS will likely require only one more year of research and development work to achieve threshold requirements. Therefore, in order to take advantage of the $1.5 billion in development funds spent to date, the committee encourages the Navy to complete development of the NLOS–LS system for use on the LCS. The committee also directs the Assistant Secretary of the

Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 15, 2010, on the feasibility and utility of the Navy completing development of the NLOS–LS. The report should include an analysis of possible unit cost reduction options.

The committee recommends $301.3 million, an increase of $75.0 million, in PE 63581N for research and development of the NLOS–LS for use on the LCS.

Navy Unmanned Combat Air System

The budget request contained $266.4 million in PE 64402N for the Navy's Unmanned Combat Air System (N–UCAS) development and demonstration program.

The committee notes that the N–UCAS development program is exhibiting less than optimal program execution as it relates to cost, schedule, and performance and the program is currently undergoing an acquisition strategy restructuring to improve the aforementioned areas of execution. The committee understands that the primary purpose of the N–UCAS program is to demonstrate the ability to launch and recover from an aircraft carrier a tailless, remotely piloted aircraft. However, the committee also understands that the N–UCAS program may be putting efforts towards developing low observable materials and technologies that are not required for successful completion of the required demonstration.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the Secretary of the Navy review the scope of the program for any unneeded technology development efforts that may be occurring in the N–UCAS development and demonstration program.

Next Generation Enterprise Network

In the conference report (H. Rept. 111–288) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the conferees expressed concern over the pace of acquisition decisions that are necessary to transition from the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) to the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN). The committee reiterates its support for the overall segmentation strategy for NGEN, which would break the single omnibus contract of NMCI into multiple smaller contracts. The committee believes that such an approach will not only promote increased competition in the future, but it will also support the development of greater in-house capability within the Navy and provide for a level of operational control by naval personnel over the network that is not available currently under the NMCI contract.

Photonic digital beamforming systems

The budget request contained $83.9 million in PE 62271N for electromagnetic systems applied research, but contained no funds for development of photonic digital beamforming technology.

The committee is interested in the development of new technologies that accomplish multiple functions of legacy technology. One such development is the introduction of photonic digital beamforming systems. The committee believes this new technology has the potential to significantly reduce radio frequency communication paths currently used on naval warships, saving on weight, spare parts, logistics support, and personnel manning.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 62271N for development of photonic digital beamforming technology.

Small diameter bomb increment II

The budget request contained $44.0 million in PE 64329N for the Small Diameter Bomb Increment II (SDB II) program.

The SDB II is to provide the warfighter the capability to attack mobile targets in all weather, from stand-off range. SDB II will be integrated on the F–15E for the Air Force and Joint Strike Fighter variants for the Navy.

The committee is aware of delays in the Air Force's SDB II contract award. The committee understands the Navy had planned to integrate and qualify the SDB II and its carriage rack onto the Joint Strike Fighter carrier and short takeoff vertical landing variants beginning in November 2009. The Air Force contract is not expected to be awarded until June 2010. The committee notes the Navy only requires six months of funding in fiscal year 2010 because the development decision has slipped for the SDB II program, causing a corresponding slip in the Navy's plans to contract for integration and qualification of the SDB II. As a result, the program office has identified $26.0 million in fiscal year 2010 funds as excess to program needs.

The committee recommends $18.0 million, a decrease of $26.0 million, in PE 64329N for the SDB II program.

Ultra High Frequency Hosted Payloads program

The budget request contained $405.7 million in PE 33109N for the Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) program, but contained no funds for the Ultra High Frequency (UHF) Hosted Payloads program.

MUOS will replace the existing UHF Follow-On (UFO) constellation and provide a much higher data rate capability for mobile users. However, the MUOS program has suffered significant schedule delays that may create an unacceptable gap in critical UHF service.

Narrowband UHF satellite communications (SATCOM) provide tactical, over-the-horizon radio links for our men and women in combat in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as well as around the world. The committee understands that the existing UHF system is oversubscribed by 200 to 300 percent and that user requests for access to UHF SATCOM have often been denied due to a lack of available channels, forcing our troops to use less reliable line-of-sight radios. The current UFO fleet of satellites is reaching the end of life and the delays in the follow-on MUOS program risk an unacceptable degradation of service. As a result, the Navy is pursuing a diverse set of mitigation measures that provide an incremental strategy to augment the declining UHF communications capacity.

To that end, the committee encourages full utilization of commercially-hosted government payloads and the development of additional UHF augmentation by the commercial satellite industry for military use. Specifically, the committee supports the UHF Hosted Payloads program that was cancelled in February 2009 and the potential it holds both as a transitional gap-filler between the UFO

and MUOS systems, and as an ongoing augmentation providing critical support to tens of thousands of legacy UHF terminals.

The committee recommends $410.7 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 33109N to explore the entire range of options beyond the MUOS program for meeting UHF SATCOM needs.

VH–(XX) acquisition program and VH–3D/VH–60N legacy fleet sustainment

The committee notes with disappointment that the Navy invested $3.3 billion in the VH–71 program with little to no return on investment for the taxpayer. Furthermore, the committee understands that termination costs for the program may reach an additional $555.0 million. Due to termination, the Navy will also be required to invest additional resources, beyond originally anticipated, to sustain the current VH–3D and VH–60N legacy fleet of executive helicopters. The committee notes that in the new program to develop a replacement Presidential helicopter, the Navy plans to produce at least two airframes, an executive model to transport the President, members of his family, and heads-of-state, and a passenger/cargo variant to support the President during times of emergency. The committee supports this acquisition strategy. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Comptroller General to conduct an annual review of the VH–(XX) acquisition program. Details of the review requirements are contained in the legislative provisions section of this report.

AIR FORCE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $27.2 billion for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $27.3 billion, an increase of $22.6 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF					
BASIC RESEARCH					
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	350,978	3,000	353,978
		Social Science Research Capacity		[3,000]	
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	136,297	10,000	146,297
		Integrated Industrial Microalgae Biofuel Program		[10,000]	
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,198		13,198
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**500,473**	**13,000**	**513,473**
APPLIED RESEARCH					
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	137,273		137,273
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	144,699		144,699
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	87,452		87,452
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	207,049		207,049
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	157,497	2,000	159,497
		Information Tools for Persistent Surveillance Data Sets		[2,000]	
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	111,857	3,000	114,857
		Technology Research and Innovation Outreach for Space (TRIOS)		[3,000]	
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	61,330		61,330
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	103,596		103,596
012	0602702F	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	0		0
013	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	117,283	1,000	118,283
		Cyber Boot Camp		[1,000]	
014	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	53,384		53,384
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,181,420**	**6,000**	**1,187,420**

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
015	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	33,414	14,700	48,114
		Additive Manufacturing Consortium		[3,000]	
		Advanced Solar Photovoltaics and Power Conversion Modules		[1,700]	
		Metals Affordability Initiative		[10,000]	
016	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	2,935		2,935
017	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	44,677		44,677
018	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	53,588		53,588
019	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	136,135		136,135
020	0603231F	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	0		0
021	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	16,992		16,992
022	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	83,705		83,705
023	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	5,899		5,899
024	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,814		24,814
025	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	15,755		15,755
026	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	17,461		17,461
027	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	39,701	2,000	41,701
		Aerial MultiAxis Platform Enhanced for C-130 Center Wing Box Removal and Replacement		[2,000]	
028	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	32,382		32,382
029	0603789F	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	0		0
030	0603924F	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	1,847		1,847
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**509,305**	**16,700**	**526,005**
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
031	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,019		5,019
032	0603287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,576		3,576

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
033	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III - OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	0		0
034	0603430F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	351,817		351,817
035	0603432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	164,232		164,232
036	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	45,012		45,012
037	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	26,172		26,172
038	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,372		4,372
039	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	635		635
040	0603830F	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP)	8,349		8,349
041	0603845F	TRANSFORMATIONAL SATCOM (TSAT)	0		0
042	0603850F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	20,580		20,580
043	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	66,745		66,745
044	0603854F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE)	36,123		36,123
045	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,534		2,534
046	0603860F	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	13,952		13,952
047	0604015F	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER	198,957		198,957
048	0604283F	BATTLE MGMT COM & CTRL SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	0		0
049	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	22,389		22,389
050	0604330F	JOINT DUAL ROLE AIR DOMINANCE MISSILE	9,799		9,799
051	0604337F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	34,339		34,339
052	0604436F	NEXT-GENERATION MILSATCOM TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	0	50,000	50,000
		Program Increase		[50,000]	
053	0604635F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	32,513		32,513
054	0604796F	ALTERNATIVE FUELS	24,064		24,064
055	0604830F	AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING	85		85
056	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	93,978	40,000	133,978
		Program Increase		[40,000]	

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
057	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	12,260		12,260
058	0305178F	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM (NP	325,505	-300,000	25,505
		Program Reduction		[-300,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,503,007**	**-210,000**	**1,293,007**
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
059	0603840F	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	18,171		18,171
060	0604222F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	60,545		60,545
061	0604226F	B-1B	0		0
062	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	8,066		8,066
063	0604240F	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	0		0
064	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	89,966	3,900	93,866
		Joint Analysis Countermeasures Knowledge Assessment & Life-Cycle (JACKAL) Electronic Warfare (EW) Improvement Program		[3,900]	
065	0604280F	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	631		631
066	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	102,941		102,941
067	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	50		50
068	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	153,505		153,505
069	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	40,276		40,276
070	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	426,525	-30,000	396,525
		Delay in Completion of Second Satellite		[-30,000]	
071	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	25,937		25,937
072	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	530,047		530,047
073	0604443F	THIRD GENERATION INFRARED SURVEILLANCE (3GIRS)	0		0
074	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	6,693		6,693
075	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	1,622		1,622

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
076	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	37,987		37,987
077	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	10,650		10,650
078	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	36,905		36,905
079	0604740F	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	10		10
080	0604750F	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,364		1,364
081	0604800F	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	883,773	403,426	1,287,199
		Competitive Engine		[242,500]	
		Transfer from RDAF 135		[160,926]	
082	0604851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	71,843		71,843
083	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	30,245	28,000	58,245
		Evaluate RL-10 Engines		[28,000]	
084	0605011F	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	0		0
085	0605221F	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT	863,875		863,875
086	0605229F	CSAR HH-60 RECAPITALIZATION	12,584		12,584
087	0605277F	CSAR-X RDT&E	0		0
088	0605278F	HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E	15,536		15,536
089	0605452F	JOINT SIAP EXECUTIVE PROGRAM OFFICE	0		0
090	0207434F	LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	0		0
091	0207451F	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP)	1,832		1,832
092	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	57,393		57,393
093	0305176F	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	0		0
094	0401138F	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	26,407		26,407
095	0401318F	CV-22	18,270		18,270
096	0401845F	AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S)	15,826		15,826
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**3,549,475**	**405,326**	**3,954,801**

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
097	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	21,245		21,245
098	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	61,587		61,587
099	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	26,752		26,752
100	0605502F	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	0		0
101	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	20,665		20,665
102	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	759,868		759,868
103	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	23,551		23,551
104	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	47,623		47,623
105	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	46,327		46,327
106	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,579		27,579
107	0606323F	MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE	18,901		18,901
108	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	24,968		24,968
109	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,544		1,544
110	0909999F	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
111	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,764		3,764
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,084,374**		**1,084,374**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
112	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III - OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	0		0
113	0604263F	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM	0		0
114	0605018F	AIR FORCE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (AF-IMHRS)	43,300		43,300
115	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	42,255		42,255
117	0101113F	B-52 SQUADRONS	146,096		146,096
118	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	3,631		3,631
119	0101126F	B-1B SQUADRONS	33,234		33,234
120	0101127F	B-2 SQUADRONS	260,466		260,466

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
121	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	28,441		28,441
122	0101314F	NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM	5,359		5,359
124	0102325F	ATMOSPHERIC EARLY WARNING SYSTEM	0		0
125	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	23,732		23,732
126	0102823F	STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	15		15
127	0203761F	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND	10,580		10,580
128	0205219F	MQ-9 UAV	125,427		125,427
129	0207040F	MULTI-PLATFORM ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT	15,574		15,574
130	0207131F	A-10 SQUADRONS	5,661		5,661
131	0207133F	F-16 SQUADRONS	129,103		129,103
132	0207134F	F-15E SQUADRONS	222,677		222,677
133	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	12,937		12,937
134	0207138F	F-22A SQUADRONS	576,330		576,330
135	0207142F	F-35 SQUADRONS	217,561	-160,926	56,635
		Transfer to RDAF 081		[-160,926]	
136	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	6,040		6,040
137	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	62,922		62,922
138	0207170F	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	2,407		2,407
139	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	944		944
140	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE - PARARESCUE	2,921		2,921
141	0207247F	AF TENCAP	11,648		11,648
142	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	3,017		3,017
143	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	20,652		20,652
144	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	147,396		147,396
145	0207277F	ISR INNOVATIONS	0		0
146	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	20,000		20,000

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
147	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	93,102		93,102
148	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	58,313		58,313
149	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	239,755		239,755
150	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	0		0
151	0207423F	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	67,532		67,532
153	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	3,310		3,310
154	0207438F	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	15,170		15,170
155	0207445F	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	85,492		85,492
156	0207446F	BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK	0		0
157	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,584		1,584
158	0207449F	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	24,229		24,229
159	0207581F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	168,917		168,917
160	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	19,263		19,263
161	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	21,638	3,700	25,338
		Battlefield Airman- Unfunded Requirement		[3,700]	
162	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,020		6,020
163	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	2,863		2,863
164	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	79,112		79,112
165	0208021F	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	2,294		2,294
166	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	1,117		1,117
173	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	10,006		10,006
174	0302015F	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	12,532		12,532
175	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	78,784		78,784
176	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	140,017		140,017
177	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,393		3,393
178	0303150F	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,055	8,000	11,055

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Defense Energy and Awareness Program (DEAP)		[8,000]	
179	0303158F	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	2,157		2,157
180	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	186,582		186,582
182	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	149,268		149,268
185	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	5,708		5,708
186	0305103F	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,030		2,030
187	0305105F	DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER	279		279
188	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	21,667		21,667
189	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	32,373		32,373
190	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	33,268		33,268
191	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	63,573		63,573
194	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	469		469
196	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	40		40
198	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	165,936		165,936
199	0305165F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	34,471		34,471
201	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	4,572		4,572
202	0305174F	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	2,929		2,929
203	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	9,933		9,933
204	0305193F	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	1,254		1,254
205	0305205F	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	0		0
206	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	168,963		168,963
207	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	15,337		15,337
208	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	93,398		93,398
209	0305219F	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	28,913		28,913
210	0305220F	RQ-4 UAV	251,318		251,318
211	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	7,267		7,267

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
212	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	828,171		828,171
213	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	132,706		132,706
214	0305887F	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	5,512		5,512
215	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	72,199		72,199
216	0305924F	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE	10,630		10,630
217	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	43,838		43,838
218	0307141F	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOPMENT	21,912	2,800	24,712
		Cyber Transition Program		[2,800]	
219	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	2,952		2,952
220	0401115F	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	113,107	-65,000	48,107
		Transfer to APAF 062		[-65,000]	
221	0401119F	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	58,990		58,990
222	0401130F	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	177,212		177,212
223	0401132F	C-130J PROGRAM	26,770		26,770
224	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	17,227		17,227
225	0401218F	KC-135S	20,453		20,453
226	0401219F	KC-10S	56,669		56,669
227	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	4,988		4,988
228	0401315F	C-STOL AIRCRAFT	1,283		1,283
229	0401839F	AIR MOBILITY TACTICAL DATA LINK	0		0
230	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	7,345		7,345
231	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,514		1,514
232	0702976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION - LOGISTICS	0		0
233	0708012F	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	0		0
234	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	227,614		227,614
235	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,141	3,000	9,141

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Micro-Grid Energy Storage Utilizing a Deployable Zinc-Bromide Flow Battery		[3,000]	
236	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	667		667
237	0804757F	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	9		9
238	0804772F	TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS	0		0
239	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	116		116
240	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	6,107		6,107
241	0901212F	SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT (NOT OTHERWISE ACCOUNTED FOR)	0		0
242	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,811		7,811
243	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	11,179		11,179
244	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	49,816		49,816
245	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,406,781		12,406,781
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**18,919,248**	**-208,426**	**18,710,822**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**27,247,302**	**22,600**	**27,269,902**

Items of Special Interest

Conversion of excess ballistic missiles for space transportation uses

Section 205 of the Commercial Space Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–303) requires a certification by a U.S. Government agency to the Congress at least 30 days before such agency converts an excess ballistic missile for use as a space transportation vehicle if the action: "(a) would result in cost savings to the federal government when compared to the cost of acquiring space transportation services from United States commercial providers; (b) meets all mission requirements of the agency, including performance, schedule, and risk requirements; (c) is consistent with international obligations of the United States; and (d) is approved by the Secretary of Defense or his designee."

In a recent Government Accountability Office decision, "In the Matter of Space Exploration Technologies Corporation," File B–402186, February 1, 2010, the Air Force testified that it interprets the term "conversion" to "occur when the excess [intercontinental ballistic missile] assets are removed from their storage place and united with commercial components something that typically does not occur until launch is imminent and long after the contract or delivery order for the applicable launch service has been awarded."

Given that the purpose of Public Law 105–303 is to promote the United States commercial space industry, the committee is troubled by the Air Force interpretation of the term "conversion" and believes that the certification should be provided to Congress with sufficient time to review and take action, if necessary. The committee recommends that an agency considering conversion should provide a certification concurrent with awarding a contract or delivery order for space transportation services. Moreover, the certification letter should provide sufficient financial detail to demonstrate that the action would result in cost savings to the United States. The committee notes that while the original development and procurement costs of excess ballistic missile assets are sunk costs, the costs to refurbish or modify excess assets for space launch or suborbital use are current costs and should be paid for by the agency proposing to use the assets.

Cyber Boot Camp

The budget request contained $117.3 million in PE 62788F for work to develop better command, control, and communications systems within the Air Force, including funds to support the Advanced Course in Engineering (ACE) Cyber Boot Camp summer program for the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC).

The committee is encouraged by efforts at the Air Force Research Laboratory Rome Research Site (AFRL/RRS) to develop educational curriculum to train the future workforce of cyber operations experts. The mission of ACE is to develop ROTC cadets into cyber officers. ACE is a 10-week summer program consisting of classes, on-the-job mentoring, and officer development that targets the top students in computer-related disciplines and teaches them to become original thinkers, problem solvers, and technical leaders. ACE is the only cyber education offered by the Department of Defense for ROTC cadets. The committee recognizes that this program is vital to ensuring a robust information technology workforce that is capa-

ble of handling current and future cyber threats to our systems. The committee believes ACE Cyber Boot Camp should be expanded beyond the Air Force to include ROTC cadets from other military services.

The committee recommends $118.3 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 62788F for AFRL/RRS to support the expansion of the ACE Cyber Boot curriculum to other service ROTC participants, and to provide for additional 10-week courses to accommodate this expansion.

Defense applications of commercial satellites

The committee is aware of numerous opportunities for hosting defense payloads on commercial satellites. For example, the committee understands that it may be possible to place weather data sensors on a commercial satellite platform that would augment or replace dedicated weather satellite systems. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force, to conduct a study of the options for hosting defense payloads on commercial satellites. The committee expects the study to identify feasible options that offer potential savings and the specific actions required to take advantage of these opportunities. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report on the study to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011.

Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle common upper stage engine

The budget request contained $30.2 million in PE 64853 for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program, but included no funds for research and development to achieve a common upper stage between the Atlas and Delta launch vehicles. In fiscal year 2010, Congress provided $20.0 million for this purpose. The committee supports continuing work to modify Delta IV RL–10 upper stage engines to the Atlas V RL–10 configuration to enable efficient use of the existing RL–10 inventory.

The committee recommends $58.2 million, an increase of $28.0 million, for research and development of a common upper stage engine for the Delta and Atlas launch vehicles.

F–35 aircraft

The budget request contained $2.4 billion in PEs 64800F, 64800N, and 64800M for development of the F–35 aircraft, but contained no funds for development of a competitive F–35 propulsion system. The budget request also contained $7.7 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force and Aircraft Procurement, Navy for procurement of 22 F–35As, 13 F–35Bs, and 7 F–35Cs.

The competitive F–35 propulsion system program is developing the F136 engine, which would provide a competitive alternative to the currently-planned F135 engine. For the past four years, the committee recommended increases for the F–35 competitive propulsion system, and notes that in all cases, funds have been appropriated by Congress for this purpose. Despite section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which requires the Secretary of Defense to obligate and expend sufficient annual amounts for the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the F–35, the committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense

(DOD) has, for the fifth consecutive year, chosen not to comply with both the spirit and intent of this law by opting not to include funds for this purpose in the budget request.

In the committee report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (H. Rept. 111–166), the committee noted cost increases in the F135 development program, as well as cost increases for the procurement of F135 engines between December 2005 and December 2008. A March 2010 report on the Joint Strike Fighter by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) notes that F135 engine development cost is now estimated to cost $7.3 billion, a 50 percent increase over the original contract award. In its report, GAO also notes that for the fiscal year 2009 F135 engine contract, the negotiated price for the F–35B engine and lift fan was 21 percent higher than the budget estimate, and the negotiated unit cost for the F–35A engine was 42 percent higher than budgeted. Over the past year, as a result of these cost increases in fiscal year 2009, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics directed that a Joint Assessment Team (JAT) review the F135 cost structure, and the JAT concluded that engine contractor improvement plans were credible but challenging, and would require additional investment by the contractor for cost reduction initiatives.

On February 23, 2010, the Deputy Secretary of Defense submitted to the committee an update of the 2007 DOD "Joint Strike Fighter Alternate Engine Acquisition and Independent Coast Analysis" for the competitive engine program which noted that an investment of $2.9 billion over six years in additional cost would be required to finish F136 engine development and to conduct directed buys to prepare the F136 for competitive procurement of F–35 engines in 2017. This report also noted that long-term costs for either a one-engine or two-engine competitive acquisition strategy are the same, on a net present value basis.

Given the F135 development and procurement cost increases and that long-term F–35 engine costs would be the same for a competitive F–35 engine acquisition strategy, the committee is puzzled by the Department's decisions over the past five years to not include an F–35 competitive propulsion system program in its budget requests. The committee remains unwavering in its belief that the non-financial factors of a two-engine competitive program, such as better engine performance, improved contractor responsiveness, a more robust industrial base, increased engine reliability and improved operational readiness, strongly favor continuing the F–35 competitive propulsion system program. Therefore, the committee recommends a total increase of $485.0 million for the competitive engine program in PEs 64800F, 64800N, and 64800M as noted in the funding tables elsewhere in this report.

Over the past year, the F–35 Joint Program Office (JPO) and F–35 contractor failed to meet promised expectations with regard to cost and schedule performance. As a result, in addition to the JAT, the Department of Defense conducted two other reviews of the F–35 program which included a 2009 update to the 2008 Joint Estimating Team (JET), known as JET 2, and chartered an independent manufacturing review team (IMRT). The JET 2 was tasked to conduct an independent cost and schedule estimate of the development and production program, while the IMRT reviewed

production capacity and risk. The JET 2 concluded that the F–35 development program would take 30 months longer and cost some $3.0 billion more, and the IMRT concluded that the contractor's planned production ramp rates were high risk and not achievable within the contractor's planned timeframe. To reduce development and production risk, the Department of Defense proposes to procure one additional F–35C developmental test aircraft; stand-up an additional software simulation facility; utilize three operational F–35s for developmental test purposes; adjust the production profile in line with the IMRT recommendations and reduce planned production in the Future Years Defense Program by 122 aircraft; and increase amounts budgeted for F–35 development and production. Together, these actions are projected to delay the completion of F–35 development by 13 months compared to last year's plan, and cost $2.8 billion more. In accordance with section 2433 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force informed the committee on March 25, 2010, that the F–35 program will exceed unit cost thresholds by more than 50 percent compared to the original baseline estimate.

On March 11, 2010, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics described the F–35 program as having "unprecedented concurrency" of development, test, and production activities. On March 24, 2010, at a hearing held jointly by the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, the Office of the Secretary of Defense's Director of Operational Test and Evaluation testified that "the primary issues with the Joint Strike Fighter program have been late delivery of test aircraft and the failure to adjust to the reality by building and resourcing realistic system development and test plans, as well as plans for producing and delivering aircraft." Additionally, on March 24, 2010, GAO's Director of Acquisition and Sourcing Management testified to the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces that the "DOD intends to procure up to 307 aircraft at a cost of $58.2 billion before completing developmental flight testing by mid-fiscal year 2015." The committee notes that, under current plans in the spring of 2015, the Department will have requested a total of 550 aircraft, over 22 percent of the planned procurement of 2,443 F–35s, before developmental testing is complete. The committee also notes that, notwithstanding the JAT, JET 2, and IMRT findings and continued unprecedented research and development and procurement concurrency, the request for 43 total F–35 aircraft for fiscal year 2011 is the same as projected in fiscal year 2009 for fiscal year 2011. In its testimony on March 24, 2010, GAO also noted that "with most of development testing still ahead, the risk and impact from required design changes are significant," and may require "alterations to the production process, changes to the supply base and costly retrofitting of aircraft already produced and fielded." Consequently, the committee remains concerned that despite the Department's recent reduction of 122 aircraft in the Future Years Defense Program, the F–35 production ramp rate may still too high and the Department should consider further reductions until developmental testing is complete.

For fiscal year 2011, the committee recommends authorization of the budget request for 42 aircraft, subject to the Department's completion of certain milestones planned by the Department for calendar year 2010. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 141) which would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to certify, not later than January 15, 2011, that certain milestones have been completed before an amount necessary for the procurement of more than 30 F–35 aircraft would be obligated or expended.

Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle and Broad Area Maritime Surveillance system commonality

The Air Force's Global Hawk unmanned aerial system (UAS) and the Navy's Broad Area Maritime Surveillance (BAMS) system were planned to achieve maximum system commonality and interoperability.

The committee is concerned that differing, evolving service unique requirements, coupled with Global Hawk UAS vanishing vendor issues are resulting in a divergence in each service's basic goal of maximum system commonality and interoperability, particularly with regard to the communications systems.

The committee directs that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to certify and provide written notification of compliance to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2011, that he has reviewed the communications requirements and acquisition strategy for both the Global Hawk UAS and BAMS systems programs, that the requirements of each service's communications systems have been validated, and the acquisition strategy being executed for each system achieves the greatest possible commonality and represents the most cost effective option for each program.

Metals Affordability Initiative

The budget request contained $33.4 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapon systems.

Congress has supported the Metals Affordability Initiative (MAI) as a peer review process to provide science and technology funding for promising aerospace projects in the Air Force advanced materials program with the objective of improving the strength and durability of materials available to the warfighter, as well as reduce costs. The committee continues to support government-industry collaboration provided through MAI. It provides significant improvements in the manufacturing of specialty metals for aerospace applications for the government and aerospace industry, and provides improved affordability of aerospace metals. Further, the committee continues to encourage the Air Force to budget for this highly successful initiative in future years.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63112F for the Metals Affordability Initiative.

National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System

The budget request contained $325.5 million in PE 35178F for the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS).

This tri-agency program, involving the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was established in 1994 to combine the weather satellite programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Air Force. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee expressed concern about the significant cost, schedule and management challenges facing the program.

Section 913 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the President to develop a strategy for the management and funding of the NPOESS program and an implementation plan to execute this strategy. The section also limited the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2010 until reports on the strategy and the plan were submitted to Congress.

On February 1, 2010, the Executive Office of the President announced its intention to restructure the NPOESS program by terminating the joint procurement of weather satellites and assigning responsibility for each of the three planned orbits to the agency holding the majority of the interest in that orbit. The Department of Commerce will populate the afternoon orbit and the Department of Defense will populate the early morning orbit. The U.S. Government will continue to rely on the European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites (EUMETSAT) to provide weather data from the mid-morning orbit period.

On March 12, 2010, the Director of the Office of Management and the Budget and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy submitted a report on the strategy and implementation plan required by section 913 of Public Law 111–84. The report explained that the Department of Defense would identify the path forward to accomplishing the early morning orbit mission by reviewing its requirements consistent with its acquisition regulations, making a Material Development Decision, and then performing an Analysis of Alternatives. The committee does not expect this process to be completed in less than a year.

The report also stated that the Department of Defense budget request for fiscal year 2011 "will remain unchanged to allow work to continue on the satellite components as well as to transition the afternoon acquisition efforts to NOAA." The committee has received no information from the Department of Defense on how it intends to support continued work on satellite components in fiscal year 2011 or how current work related to the afternoon orbit will be transitioned to NOAA.

The committee does not support additional funding, beyond that currently available in fiscal year 2010, for the acquisition of a satellite for the afternoon orbit until a transition plan has been prepared and until the Department of Defense has completed its process for determining the path forward for populating the morning orbit.

The committee recommends $25.5 million, a decrease of $300.0 million, in PE 35178F for NPOESS.

Next-generation military satellite communications technology development

The budget request included no funds in PE 64436F for next-generation military satellite communications technology development. In the conference report (H. Rept. 111–288) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, Congress authorized creation of this program element to carry out technology development efforts, in part to fill gaps left by the cancellation of the transformational satellite communications program. The committee considers it a priority to continue developing sufficiently mature communication technologies that could be used on future blocks of current communication satellites or, eventually, on next-generation communication satellites to minimize the technical, cost, and schedule risk. The committee is especially interested in risk reduction efforts that could have applications on future satellites, and in military-unique radiation hardening requirements and techniques with a focus on reducing the cost, weight, and complexity of current technologies.

The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in PE 64436F for next-generation military satellite communications technology development.

Non-volatile hardened memory

The committee recognizes that non-volatile, radiation-hardened memory provides a dedicated, light-weight storage capacity with important defense applications. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of the Air Force to prepare a technology development and investment plan to ensure that the U.S. Government continues along a near-term path to develop and produce eight megabyte or greater non-volatile, radiation-hardened memory chips. The committee further directs the Secretary to deliver this plan to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011.

Operationally Responsive Space

The budget request contained $94.0 million in PE 64857F for Operationally Responsive Space (ORS). However, the budget request did not include sufficient funding to accelerate the development of critical ORS infrastructure, and to acquire enabling technologies.

The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) established the ORS Office to respond to the needs of the joint force commander and to build the enabling infrastructure to deliver space capabilities in operationally relevant timelines. The committee commends the progress made thus far on the ORS–1 satellite, which has been a warfighter priority, and the development of an open architecture with a plug-in-play bus, modular payloads, and standard interfaces. In this next stage, the committee recommends increased funding to further develop such activities. The committee also supports accelerating the development of critical infrastructure to expand user access to ORS capabilities and data. These efforts would expand ground and communications segments providing data to multiple operational

commands and users. This work would also accelerate development of a space vehicle that would accommodate multiple payloads on shorter timelines.

The committee recommends $134.0 million, an increase of $40.0 million, in PE 64857F to acquire additional ORS satellites to meet commanders' urgent needs, support enabling technologies, and to further develop and procure an open architecture with a plug-in-play bus, modular payloads, and standard interfaces.

Space Based Space Surveillance

The budget request contained $185.9 million in PE 64425F for the Space Based Space Surveillance (SBSS) project.

The SBSS project is a critical priority for space situational awareness (SSA) and is structured into two acquisition efforts: a Block 10 system and follow-on systems. Launch of the Block 10 system has been delayed several times and is currently scheduled for July 2010. Delays in the Block 10 satellite launch have affected the schedule for the follow on product development and delivery, reducing the funding requirement for SBSS in fiscal year 2011.

SBSS will support SSA by providing timely, actionable data for detecting, tracking and identifying objects in space in order to execute global space operations, provide threat assessment and warning, conduct operational-level space campaign planning and strategy, and maintain the space operating picture. After launch, the Block 10 system is expected to operate until January 2016. The committee understands that the Air Force intends to decelerate acquisition of the follow-on SBSS system to incorporate lessons learned from initial operation of the Block 10 system.

The committee recommends $155.9 million, a decrease of $30.0 million, in PE 64425F for the Space Based Space Surveillance project.

Star tracker technology

The committee is concerned with the decline and potential loss of domestically produced, survivable, moderate accuracy star trackers for defense and national security satellite programs. The committee believes that star trackers are a foundational technology for enabling both military and civilian satellites to fulfill their missions. The committee understands that star trackers should be survivable against current and near-term threats, including laser illumination and exo-atmospheric nuclear detonations.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to prepare a technology development and investment plan to ensure that the U.S. Government retains the ability to produce moderate accuracy, survivable star trackers. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit this plan to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011.

Technology Research and Innovation Outreach for Space

The budget request contained $111.9 million in PE 62601F for space technology, but contained no funds for the Technology Research and Innovation Outreach for Space (TRIOS) project.

The TRIOS project is designed to expand the number of private sector companies, universities, and government entities participating in the nation's small satellite space sector. This expansion

should directly benefit Department of Defense space organizations at Kirtland Air Force Base, the Air Force Research Lab Space Vehicles and Directed Energy Directorates, the Operationally Responsive Space Office, and the Space Development and Test Wing, by providing ready access to innovative vendors and well-qualified scientists, engineers, and technicians. This will expedite the development and launch of the new small, lower-cost, responsive space systems required to support the Department's numerous and rapidly changing warfighter missions around the world.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62601F for the Technology Research and Innovation Outreach for Space project.

DEFENSE-WIDE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $20.7 billion for Defense-Wide research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $20.7 billion, an increase of $51.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2011 research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Defense-Wide program are discussed following the table.

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW					
BASIC RESEARCH					
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	47,412	5,000	52,412
		University Strategic Partnerships		[5,000]	
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	328,195	-44,720	283,475
		Ant-Based Cyber Defense		[1,080]	
		Computer Science Futures		[1,000]	
		DARPA Reduction		[-50,000]	
		Vaccine Stabilization Initiative		[3,200]	
003	0601111D8Z	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	0		0
004	0601114D8Z	DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH	0		0
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	109,911	5,233	115,144
		Energy and Power Career Development STEM Initiative		[4,000]	
		STEM Outreach Education		[1,233]	
006	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	49,508	5,500	55,008
		Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station		[5,500]	
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**535,026**	**-28,987**	**506,039**
APPLIED RESEARCH					
007	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	22,448		22,448
008	0602228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	15,067	12,500	27,567

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Institutions		[5,000]	
		Morehouse College, John H. Hopps Defense Research Scholars Program		[3,000]	
		Nanoscience and Biotechnology Laboratories and Research Program		[2,000]	
		Thurgood Marshall College Fund		[2,500]	
009	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	32,830		32,830
010	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	281,262		281,262
011	0602304E	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	90,143	-21,000	69,143
		Cognitive Computing		[-21,000]	
012	0602305E	MACHINE INTELLIGENCE	44,682		44,682
013	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	32,692		32,692
014	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	169,287	8,700	177,987
		Therapeutic Drug Against Multiple Bio-Threat Agents		[2,500]	
		Viral WMD: Protection and Treatment for the Warfighter		[6,200]	
015	0602663D8Z	JOINT DATA MANAGEMENT ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,261		3,261
016	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	10,000		10,000
017	0602670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH	9,499		9,499
018	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	224,378		224,378
019	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	312,586	-5,000	307,586
		DARPA Reduction		[-5,000]	
020	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	286,936	-15,000	271,936
		DARPA Reduction		[-15,000]	
021	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	212,742		212,742
022	1160401BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	26,545	5,000	31,545
		Special Operations Technology Development		[5,000]	

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
023	1160407BB	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,774,358**	**-14,800**	**1,759,558**
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)					
024	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,556		20,556
025	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	44,423		44,423
026	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	85,299	15,255	100,554
		Digital Media Study		[2,500]	
		Early Responders Distance Learning Center (ERDLC)		[1,255]	
		Explosive Loading Laboratory Testing Program for Forward Force Protection		[3,000]	
		Multi-State Combined Injury Consortium		[5,000]	
		Risk Assessment and Resource Allocation in Combating Terrorism		[3,500]	
027	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES - PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	295,163		295,163
028	0603175C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	132,220		132,220
029	0603200D8Z	JOINT ADVANCED CONCEPTS	6,808		6,808
030	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	22,700		22,700
031	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21) - THEATER CAPABILITY	750		750
032	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	303,078	-31,000	272,078
		DARPA Reduction		[-31,000]	
033	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	98,130	-2,000	96,130
		DARPA Reduction		[-2,000]	
034	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	177,113	3,000	180,113
		Integrated Chemical and Biological Detection System Technology Demonstration		[3,000]	
035	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	8,386		8,386
036	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	206,917		206,917

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
037	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	30,035		30,035
038	0603663D8Z	JOINT DATA MANAGEMENT RESEARCH	6,289		6,289
039	0603665D8Z	BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	11,416		11,416
040	0603668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH	10,000		10,000
041	0603670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED DEVELOP	11,510		11,510
042	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	18,916		18,916
043	0603711D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	9,943		9,943
044	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	20,542	7,000	27,542
		Next Generation Manufacturing Technologies Initiative		[4,000]	
		Woody Biomass Conversion to Jet Fuel		[3,000]	
045	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,109		29,109
046	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	68,021		68,021
047	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	26,878	2,000	28,878
		Feature Size Yield Enhancement		[2,000]	
048	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	10,966		10,966
049	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	197,098		197,098
050	0603745D8Z	SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR (SAR) COHERENT CHANGE DETECTION (CDD)	0		0
051	0603750D8Z	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	0		0
052	0603755D8Z	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	200,986		200,986
053	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	219,809	-2,000	217,809
		DARPA Reduction		[-2,000]	
054	0603765E	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	167,008	-15,000	152,008
		DARPA Reduction		[-15,000]	
055	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	234,985	-15,000	219,985
		DARPA Reduction		[-15,000]	

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
056	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	205,032	-5,000	200,032
		DARPA Reduction		[-5,000]	
057	0603768E	GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	0		0
058	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,986		13,986
059	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	30,910		30,910
060	0603805S	DUAL USE TECHNOLOGY	0		0
061	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	78,244	10,000	88,244
		Counter-Ideology Program		[10,000]	
061A	0603XXXD8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM	0		0
062	0603828D8Z	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	111,946		111,946
063	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	38,140		38,140
064	0603901C	DIRECTED ENERGY RESEARCH	98,688	50,000	148,688
		Program Increase		[50,000]	
065	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	97,642	2,000	99,642
		Center for Defense Systems Research (CDSR)		[2,000]	
066	0603942D8Z	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	23,310		23,310
067	1160402BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	30,806	4,600	35,406
		Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center		[4,600]	
068	1160422BB	AVIATION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	4,234		4,234
069	1160472BB	SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,942		4,942
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)	**3,412,934**	**23,855**	**3,436,789**
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
070	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	32,132		32,132
071	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	21,592		21,592
072	0603709D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	9,878		9,878

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
073	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,060		18,060
074	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	30,419	15,000	45,419
		Environmental Security Technical Certification Program		[10,000]	
		Pilot Program on Collaborative Energy Security		[5,000]	
075	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	436,482		436,482
076	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,346,181		1,346,181
077	0603883C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT	0		0
078	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	277,062		277,062
079	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	454,859		454,859
080	0603886C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR	0		0
081	0603888C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	1,113,425		1,113,425
082	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	402,769		402,769
083	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA	270,189	-25,000	245,189
		Program Reduction		[-25,000]	
084	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	1,467,278		1,467,278
085	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	112,678		112,678
086	0603894C	MULTIPLE KILL VEHICLE	0		0
087	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	10,942		10,942
088	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND	342,625		342,625
089	0603897C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE HERCULES	0		0
090	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	68,726		68,726
091	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	86,198		86,198
092	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	7,529		7,529
093	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	153,056		153,056
094	0603908C	BMD EUROPEAN INTERCEPTOR SITE	0		0
095	0603909C	BMD EUROPEAN MIDCOURSE RADAR	0		0

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
096	0603911C	BMD EUROPEAN CAPABILITY	0		0
097	0603912C	BMD EUROPEAN COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	0		0
098	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	121,735	88,000	209,735
		Arrow 2/ASIP		[42,000]	
		Arrow 3		[8,000]	
		David's Sling Weapon System		[38,000]	
099	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,735		14,735
100	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	13,786		13,786
101	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	4,802		4,802
102	0604400D8Z	UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	49,292		49,292
103	0604648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	0		0
104	0604670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGIN	7,459		7,459
105	0604787D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	19,413		19,413
106	0604828D8Z	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	16,637		16,637
107	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3)	281,378		281,378
108	0604881C	AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	318,800		318,800
109	0604883C	PRECISION TRACKING SPACE SYSTEM RDT&E	66,969		66,969
110	0604884C	AIRBORNE INFRARED (ABIR)	111,671		111,671
111	0605017D8Z	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	20,310		20,310
112	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	4,027		4,027
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**7,713,094**	**78,000**	**7,791,094**
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)					
113	0604051D8Z	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)	24,344		24,344
114	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	7,973		7,973
115	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	239,861		239,861

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
116	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	407,162		407,162
117	0604709D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	4,155		4,155
118	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	49,364		49,364
119	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	20,954		20,954
120	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	7,307		7,307
121	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,937		11,937
122	0605018BTA	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (DIMHRS)	11,800		11,800
123	0605020BTA	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES	184,131	-3,700	180,431
		Intergovernmental Value Added Network		[-3,700]	
124	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	391		391
125	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	5,000		5,000
126	0605140D8Z	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	35,512		35,512
127	0605648D8Z	DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM	0		0
128	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	17,842		17,842
129	0303158K	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	0		0
130	0807708D8Z	WOUNDED ILL AND INJURED SENIOR OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (WII-SOC) STAFF OFFIC	1,590		1,590
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)	**1,029,323**	**-3,700**	**1,025,623**
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
131	0603757D8Z	TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2)	0		0
132	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,113		5,113
133	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	8,052		8,052
134	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	162,286	6,830	169,116
		Over the Horizon Broadcast Extension Capability		[6,830]	
135	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	2,500		2,500
136	0604943D8Z	THERMAL VICAR	8,851		8,851
137	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	10,287		10,287

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
138	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	49,282	1,000	50,282
		Center for Technology and National Security Policy		[1,000]	
139	0605110D8Z	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	4,743		4,743
140	0605117D8Z	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	95,520		95,520
141	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	94,577		94,577
142	0605128D8Z	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	0		0
143	0605130D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	32,755		32,755
144	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	29,824		29,824
145	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	6,264		6,264
146	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	15,091		15,091
147	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	6,227		6,227
148	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	120,995		120,995
149	0605502BP	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF	0		0
150	0605502BR	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	0		0
151	0605502C	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA	0		0
152	0605502D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
153	0605502E	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
154	0605502S	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
155	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TR	2,189		2,189
156	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	13,858		13,858
157	0605799D8Z	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	19,701		19,701
158	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	61,054	-5,000	56,054
		Defense Technical Information Center		[-5,000]	
159	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	64,737	-25,000	39,737
		Federal Voting Assistance Program		[-25,000]	
160	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	18,688		18,688

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
161	0605897E	DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION	11,000		11,000
162	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	56,257		56,257
163	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	6,099		6,099
164	0606301D8Z	AVIATION SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES	10,900		10,900
165	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	23,081		23,081
168	0303166D8Z	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	31,500		31,500
169	0303169D8Z	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	5,135		5,135
170	0305103E	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	10,000		10,000
171	0305193D8Z	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	21,272		21,272
173	0305400D8Z	WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT	845		845
174	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	92,253	3,500	95,753
		Modeling and Simulation Development in Support of National Security Training and Decision Analysis		[3,500]	
175	0901585C	PENTAGON RESERVATION	20,482		20,482
176	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ - MDA	29,754		29,754
177	0901598D8W	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	278		278
177A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	61,577		61,577
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,213,027**	**-18,670**	**1,194,357**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
178	0604130V	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS)	5,522		5,522
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORM	2,139		2,139
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	290		290
181	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	6,634		6,634
182	0607713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	0		0
183	0607828D8Z	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	44,139		44,139
184	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	0		0

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
185	0208043J	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,288		2,288
186	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	74,023		74,023
188	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	9,379		9,379
195	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	467		467
196	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	16,629		16,629
197	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS	9,130		9,130
198	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	9,529		9,529
199	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	8,881		8,881
200	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	45,941		45,941
201	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,077		14,077
202	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	388,827		388,827
204	0303148K	DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	0		0
205	0303149J	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	2,261		2,261
206	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	26,247		26,247
207	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	20,991		20,991
208	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	3,366		3,366
209	0303260D8Z	JOINT MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE	1,161		1,161
210	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	6,880		6,880
211	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	16,272	4,000	20,272
		Technology Development for Quiet Tactical UAV		[4,000]	
214	0305103D8Z	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	501		501
216	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,251		2,251
217	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	10,486		10,486
221	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	9,136		9,136
223	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	29,831		29,831
227	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	1,290		1,290

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
230	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,513		3,513
232	0305219BB	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	98		98
234	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,988		2,988
235	0305600D8Z	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, ADVANCEMENT AND IN	1,416		1,416
245	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	21,798		21,798
246	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,813		2,813
247	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	2,807		2,807
248	0909999D8Z	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
249	1001018D8Z	NATO AGS	93,885		93,885
250	1105219BB	MQ-9 UAV	98		98
251	1160279BB	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG	0		0
252	1160403BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	68,691		68,691
253	1160404BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,582	2,798	4,380
		Naval Special Warfare Tactical Athlete Program		[2,798]	
254	1160405BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	23,879		23,879
255	1160408BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	62,592		62,592
256	1160421BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT	14,406		14,406
257	1160423BB	JOINT MULTI-MISSION SUBMERSIBLE	14,924		14,924
258	1160426BB	OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) DEVELOPMENT	0	5,000	5,000
		Battery Research Initiative: A Partnership of Purdue University and NSWC Crane		[5,000]	
259	1160427BB	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	2,915		2,915
260	1160428BB	UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV)	0	4,000	4,000
		SIGINT Payload for Expeditionary Unmanned Aircraft System (EUAS)		[4,000]	
261	1160429BB	MC130J SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION	7,624		7,624
262	1160474BB	SOF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS	1,922		1,922
263	1160476BB	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	2,347		2,347

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
264	1160477BB	SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	479		479
265	1160478BB	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	593		593
266	1160479BB	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	0		0
267	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,994		1,994
268	1160482BB	SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION	14,473		14,473
269	1160483BB	SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	13,986		13,986
270	1160484BB	SOF SURFACE CRAFT	2,933		2,933
271	1160488BB	SOF PSYOP	4,193		4,193
272	1160489BB	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	5,135		5,135
273	1160490BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	9,167		9,167
274	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,832,019		3,832,019
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**4,983,838**	**15,798**	**4,999,636**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**20,661,600**	**51,496**	**20,713,096**

Items of Special Interest

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense and defense against sea-based missile attacks

The committee commends the Department of Defense funding increase for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) program to advance the capabilities of sea-based missile defense. The committee believes the investment in sea-based missile defenses will serve to strengthen the security of the United States. Nevertheless, the committee believes there are additional steps the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) should take to expand sea-based missile defense capabilities.

First, the committee believes MDA should increase its collaboration with the Navy to ensure sea-based ballistic missile defenses are fully integrated into the broader missile defense Command and Control, Battle Management, and Communications system. Additionally, both the Navy and MDA should work to see Aegis BMD ships receive the widest array of off-board sensor data necessary to support theater, regional and national missile defense operations.

Second, the committee understands that the Department's objectives for pursuing early-intercept capabilities are to handle large raid sizes, provide more shoot-look-shoot opportunities, constrain countermeasure deployments, and hedge against advanced threats. The committee believes that capability enhancements planned for the Standard Missile-3 (SM–3) interceptor may provide such early intercept capability. Specifically, the next-generation SM–3 Block IIA interceptor with a planned increase in velocity and SM–3 Block IIB interceptor with a planned lighter kill vehicle, flexible propulsion, and upgraded fire control software, should enable greater early-intercept capability when fielded in either a ship-based configuration or relocatable land-based configuration. The committee therefore encourages MDA to continue the requisite technology development and maturation of these promising capabilities.

Finally, the committee remains concerned about the nation's vulnerability to cruise missiles and shorter-range ballistic missiles that could be launched from off the coast. This vulnerability is particularly acute for the east coast of the United States. Accordingly, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Northern Command, with contribution from the Director of MDA and the Director of the Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Office, to provide the congressional defense committees with an assessment by March 15, 2011, of the vulnerability of the United States homeland to cruise missiles and shorter-range ballistic missiles that could be launched from off the coast, and a plan for how such vulnerabilities are being addressed.

Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University

The budget request contained $49.3 million in PE 65104D8Z for technical studies, support, and analysis, but contained no funds for analyses by the Center for Technology and National Security Policy (CTNSP) at the National Defense University.

The committee recognizes that CTNSP continues to provide valuable support to the Department through the development of a wide range of studies which are designed to inform and sharpen national

security decision making. The committee continues to be the beneficiary of CTNSP studies and CTNSP experts, and encourages the CTNSP to continue to explore issues of importance to the Department and the nation. The committee believes the CTNSP should explore research into several key areas, including science and technology to support irregular warfare, test and evaluation infrastructure, improving integration of social science research into defense programs, and workforce development for future cyber warriors.

The committee recommends $50.3 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 65104D8Z for the CTNSP.

Counter-ideology programs

The budget request contained $78.2 million in PE 63826D8Z for Quick Reaction Special Projects in the Rapid Reaction Technology Office, but included no funds to address the science and technology gaps identified in the "Strategic Communication Science and Technology Plan" from April 2009.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) has not sufficiently focused its activities to counter violent extremist ideologies. While there are many strategic communication and information operations programs that aim to undermine the ideological narrative of various violent extremist groups, it is not apparent that they are coordinated and supported to the same extent that programs to undermine communism were during the cold war. As noted elsewhere in this report, there are social science programs within the Department that could prove valuable in establishing a concerted program to delegitimize violent extremist ideologies.

The committee encourages the Department to take a holistic view of its messaging and counter-messaging activities and develop a strategy that links these efforts with other science and technology efforts in order to better understand adversarial ideologies. As noted elsewhere in this report, the Department must first understand the ideological environment, including how these groups leverage digital media, and then translate that understanding into synchronized action that coordinates near-, mid-, and far-term actions across the federal government. Active and continuous monitoring should be institutionalized in order to improve the execution of ongoing and future planned efforts.

The committee recommends $88.2 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63826D8Z for initiatives identified in the April 2009 "Strategic Communication Science and Technology Plan" that focus DOD activities to counter adversarial ideologies.

Cognitive computing efforts

The budget request contained $90.1 million in PE 62304E for Cognitive Computing at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). Of this amount, $21.0 million was requested for the Transformative Apps and Healing Heroes programs.

The committee is aware that the goal of the Transformative Apps program is to put mobile, tactical applications in the hands of warfighters and to create a new military apps marketplace with a vibrant development community. The committee understands that the Army Chief Information Officer (CIO) has established a similar development effort called "Apps for the Army," which includes a

cash award competition. The committee believes that because of the CIO's day-to-day experience supporting the warfighting community, the CIO would possess a closer understanding of the warfighter's needs and requirements. The committee is concerned that the DARPA effort is not adequately coordinated and de-conflicted with the Army initiative, or that an adequate case has been made as to the unique challenge that makes this a hard problem requiring DARPA support.

The committee is also aware that the goal of the Healing Heroes effort is to bring the power of social networking, modern information technology, and machine learning to bear on the medical problems of American veterans. Because of the policy and regulatory requirements associated with addressing the medical challenges of our warfighters, such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–191) (HIPAA) and the Privacy Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–579), the committee is concerned that DARPA does not have adequate policy expertise to translate these legal strictures into technical systems. While the committee supports the goals of this program, it is not confident that DARPA should lead this type of activity, or that it should pursue technical solutions using real patient data without a well-defined memorandum of agreement with a partner that has deeper experience with HIPAA and Privacy Act information.

Therefore, the committee recommends $69.1 million, a decrease of $21.0 million, in PE 62304E for the Transformative Apps and Healing Heroes programs.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

The committee remains supportive of the mission of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in researching and developing innovative, leap-ahead capabilities for the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee recognizes that DARPA has undergone several corporate changes over the last year, including changes to its management structure, program priorities, execution goals, and business model. The committee commends the new director of DARPA for taking steps to improve the overall efficiency of DARPA operations. Most notably, by making key changes to its financial execution procedures, DARPA's obligation rates are up 17 percent over the average of the previous five years; and are a vast improvement over historical averages.

Despite these improvements, the committee is aware of other potential program execution problems. During its review of DARPA's fiscal year 2011 budget request, the committee noted several programs, in particular the 6.3 programs, lacked clear transition paths. The committee remains concerned that without strong transition paths in place, or programmed service or agency transition funding, many of these programs will fail to be adopted by a program of record or science and technology activity. Additionally, some programs were noted to have late-year starts or were still undergoing performer selections. The committee believes that with only two quarters remaining for the obligation of the fiscal year 2010 funds, DARPA will be unable to effectively obligate the requested funds.

The committee makes a series of recommendations for general reductions in DARPA programs:

[In millions of dollars]

61101E—Defense Research Sciences	(−50M)
62715E—Materials and Biological Technology	(−5M)
62716E—Electronics Technology	(−15M)
63286E—Advanced Aerospace Systems	(−31M)
63287E—Space Programs and Technology	(−2M)
63760E—Command, Control, and Communications Systems	(−2M)
63765E—Classified DARPA Programs	(−15M)
63766E—Network-Centric Warfare Technology	(−15M)
63767E—Sensor Technology	(−5M)

These recommendations are made without prejudice to the particular account identified.

Digital media study

The budget request contained $85.3 million in PE 63122D8Z for Combating Terrorism Technical Support, but contained no funds for efforts to better understand the impact of digital media exploited by extremist groups and individuals.

The committee recognizes the rapid increase in adversarial use of new media products to disseminate their messages and biased rhetoric in order to undermine U.S. interests and entice populations to actively and passively support global terrorism. Various groups around the globe, such as al-Qa'ida and the Taliban, persistently utilize the Internet to recruit, train, and fundraise. Through popular websites, such as video sharing and social networking sites, their misleading and persuasive products often reach the stage of public opinion first, ultimately rendering subsequent factual counter messages useless. The amount of deceptive misinformation continues to grow at a staggering pace and the majority remains unanswered and misunderstood by moderate authorities.

The Department's ability to analyze extremist online propaganda within the proper cultural and linguistic context is critical to comprehending our adversaries' ideological campaign, which is a significant driver for insurgencies and prolonged terrorist attacks. The committee believes defense policy will be appropriately guided if the Department understands the full scope of our enemies' online information campaign.

The committee recommends $87.8 million, an increase of $2.5 million, in PE 63122D8Z for the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office to conduct an extensive study to determine the state of the virtual media environment our adversaries occupy. The committee also directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities to brief the House Committee on Armed Services, by February 1, 2011, on the plan for executing this digital media study.

Directed energy research programs

The budget request contained $96.7 million in PE 63901C for directed energy research programs for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The budget request supports transitioning the Airborne Laser (ABL) aircraft to a national laser test platform for advanced directed energy research. It will also allow the MDA to continue focused directed energy research and development to hedge against future threats.

The committee understands that the Director, Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) has begun a review of the Department-

wide portfolio of directed energy research efforts in light of the availability of the ABL aircraft to act as the test-bed for directed energy research activities beyond missile defense.

The committee is aware of a number of promising technologies being reviewed that may warrant additional resources, and understands that the review of these technologies is scheduled to be completed by DDR&E in June 2010. However, the committee is concerned that the budget request does not include sufficient funding to support appropriate testing and retention of the ABL workforce, which has developed critical directed energy technology skills.

The committee supports developmental efforts that appear most likely to yield operational capabilities and directs the Director, Defense Research and Engineering to submit a report on the Department's review of directed energy technologies to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2010.

The committee recommends $146.7 million, an increase of $50.0 million, in PE 63901C to support increased research, development, and testing of directed energy technologies, including using ABL as a test platform.

Environmental management information systems

The committee is aware that the Army has conducted a pilot program to evaluate an internet-based environmental management information system (EMIS). The committee understands that the Army has utilized an EMIS to demonstrate how a system can cost effectively and efficiently automate environmental compliance and greenhouse gas emission tracking and reduction. As a result of this pilot, the Army appears to have experienced cost savings, energy reductions, increased compliance with federal, state and local environmental regulations, while at the same time improving mission readiness and installation sustainability. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to examine the lessons learned from this pilot to determine the potential for leveraging this technology to share with other components within the Department of Defense and the other military departments.

Environmental Security Technical Certification Program

The budget request contained $30.4 million in PE 63851D8Z for the environmental security technical certification program.

The committee supports the Department of Defense efforts to demonstrate and promote implementation of innovative cost-effective environmental technologies through the environmental security technical certification program. The committee also supports the efforts of this program, highlighted in the recent Quadrennial Defense Review, to use military installations as a test bed "to demonstrate and create a market for innovative energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies coming out of the private sector and DoD and Department of Energy laboratories." The committee recognizes that much more can be done in this area.

The committee recommends $45.4 million, an increase of $15.0 million, in PE 63851D8Z, including an increase of $10.0 million to accelerate efforts to demonstrate and implement innovative environmental, energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies, and an increase of $5.0 million for a pilot program on collaborative energy security authorized elsewhere within this title.

Federal Voting Assistance Program

The budget request contained $64.7 million in PE 65803SE for research and development supporting the Defense Human Resources Agency. Of this amount, $39.0 million was requested for the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP). The committee required the Department of Defense conduct an electronic absentee voting demonstration project for uniformed services voters in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). The committee is aware that the immaturity of system standards makes it impossible for the Department of Defense to get the Election Assistance Commission certified system guidelines required by the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) in fiscal year 2011. The committee continues to support the goals of FVAP, but the challenges in maturing the needed system standards calls for a gradual increase in funding to mitigate developmental risks.

Therefore, the committee recommends $39.7 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, in PE 65803SE for the FVAP.

Ground combat uniform research and development

Section 352 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) established, as a policy of the United States, that the design and fielding of all future ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms of the armed forces may uniquely reflect the identity of the individual military services, provided that the ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms, to the maximum extent practicable: (1) provide members of every military service an equivalent level of performance, functionality, and protection commensurate with their respective assigned combat missions; (2) minimize risk to the individual soldier, sailor, airman, or marine operating in the joint battlespace; and (3) provide interoperability with other components of individual war fighter systems, including body armor and other individual protective systems. The committee notes that part of the rationale for section 352 of Public Law 111–84 was to reduce the multiple research, design, development, and fielding efforts for military ground combat uniforms being undertaken by the military departments and to improve the overall combat capability of those assigned to ground combat missions.

In an interim response to section 352 of Public Law 111–84, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found no performance standards for specific combat environments, no criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of camouflage patterns, and no requirements for the services to test interoperability between their uniforms and other protective gear. Furthermore, while GAO found some examples of uniform technology being shared across the services, the committee emphasizes the importance of sharing new technologies, advanced materials, and other advances in ground combat uniform design and development between the military services. The committee notes that some of the military departments have used the Army Natick Soldier Research, Development, and Engineering Center during development of their ground combat uniforms to test the effectiveness of the camouflage, and, in some cases, camouflage effectiveness of ground combat uniforms and protective gear. The committee believes, however, that Natick's resources could be bet-

ter utilized for joint research and development. Because of its expertise, the committee urges the services to consider expanding their use of the Army Natick Soldier Research, Development, and Engineering Center as a center of excellence for uniform research and development to guide their development of camouflage effectiveness and performance criteria and testing.

Additionally, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consider designating an executive agent (EA) to oversee Department of Defense activities related to research and development of ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms. The committee envisions that such an EA would be similar to the functions performed by the executive agent for operation of the Department of Defense Combat Feeding Research and Engineering Program.

Intergovernmental Value Added Network

The budget request contained $184.1 million in PE 65020BTA for the Business Transformation Agency (BTA), including $3.7 million for the Intergovernmental Value Added Network (IVAN).

The committee is aware that BTA has developed IVAN to address long standing material weaknesses associated with intergovernmental transactions identified by the Government Accountability Office and the Department of Defense Inspector General. IVAN will provide a system for internal control and financial visibility, as well as ensure the timeliness and accuracy of accounting transaction postings. These goals are important for ensuring the full transparency of Department financial transactions as well as providing capabilities necessary to achieve financial audit readiness. The committee supports the objectives of IVAN, but is discouraged that this system has not been transitioned to other military departments or interagency partners. Because there has not been wide spread adoption of IVAN to remedy this long-standing problem, the committee believes that continued investment is unlikely to result in any benefit for the nation.

Therefore, the committee recommends $180.4 million, a decrease of $3.7 million, in PE 65020BTA for IVAN.

Investment review process for human dynamics activities

The committee recognizes the need for human dynamics programs within the Department of Defense, which, according to the Defense Science Board, include "the actions and interactions of personal, interpersonal, and social/contextual factors and their effects on behavioral outcomes." The committee has been supportive of human dynamics activities in the past, such as the Human Terrain System, the Minerva Initiative, cultural engagement teams and associated programs.

The committee believes that for the Department to have a robust human dynamics effort, it requires senior leadership engagement and a governance forum for understanding the range of service and combatant commander requirements, existing programs, program gaps and required resources needed to create a critical mass of expertise within the government.

The committee also recognizes that one area in particular that would benefit from senior leadership would be data standards and data tagging methodologies for socio-cultural information. The committee understands that collecting useful socio-cultural information

in a manner that can be ingested and analyzed by automated information processing systems is a key technical challenge to integrating human terrain understanding into the overall battlespace operational picture.

The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense establish a process, including a reviewing and decision-making body, to review investments and recommend programming decisions for Department of Defense programs associated with human dynamics. This process should also serve as intra- and interdepartmental coordination body for human dynamics research. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the development of the investment review process to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Israeli cooperative programs

The budget request contained $121.7 million in PE 63913C for Israeli cooperative programs. This represents a decrease of $79.6 million from the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level. The fiscal year 2011 budget request contained $46.7 million for continued development of David's Sling Weapon System (DSWS), $12.2 million for improvements to the Arrow Weapon System (AWS), and $50.8 million for Arrow-3.

Since 1986, the United States and the State of Israel have cooperated on missile defense. The U.S. Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has three significant initiatives with Israel to develop and improve its indigenous capability to defend against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles: DSWS for defense against short-range systems; AWS for defense against medium-range systems; and the Arrow-3 Interceptor, an upper-tier follow-on to the AWS. MDA is also developing, testing, and exercising interoperability between the U.S. ballistic missile defense system (BMDS) and the Israeli Missile Defense Architecture to ensure Israeli systems can be integrated into the global BMDS.

However, the budget request does not support acceleration of full scale development of the DSWS, completion of the development and testing of AWS improvements, and beginning coproduction of the Arrow-3 interceptor. The committee is aware that progress has been achieved over the past year in meeting the agreed Arrow-3 knowledge points.

The committee recommends $209.7 million for Israeli cooperative programs, an increase of $88.0 million in PE 63913C, including $84.7 million for DSWS, $54.2 million for AWS improvements, and $58.8 million for Arrow-3.

K–12 education in computer sciences and mathematics

The budget request contained $328.2 million in PE 61101E for basic research in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), including funds for the Computer Futures program; $48.3 million in PE 65803A for basic research in the Army, including funds for the Army Educational Outreach Program; and $429.8 million in PE 61153N for basic research in the Navy, including funds for educational outreach programs in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) to stimulate careers in computer science and engineering.

The committee remains concerned about reports such as the National Academy of Science study "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" which indicate that the United States may not be producing sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers (S&E) to meet our future national security needs. The strength of the nation is founded on a knowledge economy. If the nation is unable to meet the demands in S&Es, it will have severe detrimental effects on the defense sector and the broader economic health of the nation. Facing a similar challenge 50 years ago, President Eisenhower increased investments in science and mathematics education that made significant progress in the years that followed. However, in the past several decades the impact of those investments has declined.

In that same spirit, service and agency investments in K–12 educational outreach programs represent an investment in the nation's intellectual capital that the committee believes will reap significant rewards in the future. The Computer Futures program is supporting K–12 educational programs to develop and foster students in computer science and mathematics at an early age in order to create a pipeline to support the nation's future scientific and engineering needs in these areas. The Army Educational Outreach Program includes a range of Army-sponsored research, education, competitions, internships and practical experiences designed to engage and guide students and teachers in STEM education. The Navy also supports a similar variety of STEM opportunities.

The committee recommends $329.2 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 61101E for DARPA's Computer Futures program to create and validate additional curriculum covering new topics, and to expand the program into new school systems. The committee recommends $49.3 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 65803A for expansion of the Army Educational Outreach Program to create new curricula and to expand the geographic diversity of the participating schools. The committee also recommends $430.8 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 61153N for the expansion of the Navy educational outreach program to provide more focus on cyber-related computer science and mathematics students.

Knowledge, Innovation, and Technology Sharing

The committee remains committed to ensuring that knowledge created through the Department of Defense's (DOD) research and development programs are fully exploited across the DOD science and technology enterprise. The committee notes that over the past several years, the Army has developed and implemented the Knowledge, Innovation, and Technology Sharing (KITS) system. The committee understands that the KITS system is an innovation and knowledge management tool designed to identify, capture, manage, and share information generated by service-funded research and development activities. The KITS system enables researchers, procurement staff, technology transition agents, and patent attorneys to capture vital innovation knowledge generated by Army-funded research and development activities and store it in a single integrated database. The committee notes that KITS is currently operational at five Army research, development, and engineering organizations. The committee believes that such an integrated system could foster greater collaboration on technology development and transitions issues in support of the Department and

industry and should be made available across the DOD research and development community.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, to review the Army KITS systems and brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services Committee and the House Committee on Armed Services Committee, by September 15, 2010, on the utility of the program for use across the services and relevant agencies, including the cost of adopting the system, as well as any potential savings it may offer the defense science and technology enterprise.

Management of defense basic research

The committee is encouraged by recent sustained increases for basic research within the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee recognizes the critical contribution basic research investments make in creating a strong scientific foundation that supports the long-term development of future military capabilities.

The committee notes the concerns regarding the defense basic research program raised by the JASON scientific advisory group and the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Department of Defense Basic Research. Considering the increasing investments being made in defense basic research, the committee remains concerned about the quality, relevance, and focus of the basic research efforts, and the coordination of those efforts within the Department, including the services and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and relevant programs within the federal government.

The committee is encouraged that the Basic Science Office, within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, recently proposed a clear, actionable strategic defense basic research plan that would address many of those concerns. The committee supports the five goals set forth to strengthen the defense basic research enterprise, including:

(1) Provide scientific leadership for the DOD basic research enterprise;

(2) Attract the nation's best scientists and engineers to contribute to and lead DOD research;

(3) Ensure the coherence and balance of the DOD basic research portfolio;

(4) Foster connections between DOD performers and the DOD community;

(5) Maximize the discovery potential of the defense research business environment.

The committee is concerned that the proposed basic research strategy is not properly resourced to develop and execute useful management tools for ensuring the quality and relevance of defense basic research. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to provide adequate resources to oversee, plan, execute, and evaluate its basic research program and investments. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2010, on actions being taken to implement the proposed basic research strategy.

Mechanism to provide funds for defense laboratories

Section 219 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended by section 2801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), granted the directors of the Department of Defense laboratories the authority and resources to conduct, at their discretion, a program for innovative research and development, incentives to hire and retain skilled scientists and engineers, transition of technology to warfighters, and funding of minor construction projects. The committee notes that the statute requires that all funds available to laboratory directors, up to three percent, may be used to support the selected efforts. The committee is concerned that the utilization of section 219 of Public Law 110–417, due to various reasons, has not been fully implemented across the Department of Defense laboratories. The committee reminds the Department of Defense that the use of all funds include, directly appropriated funds, funds derived from work for other Department of Defense organizations, other federal agencies, and nonfederal organizations, or from other sources of laboratory revenue, excluding congressionally directed appropriations. The intent of section 219 of Public Law 110–417 is to provide authorization to access up to three percent of all such funds.

The committee believes that to improve the performance and technical capabilities of the laboratories requires a proper balance between central management control and local director discretion. However, the Department of Defense's laboratory corporate structure provides consultation, not direction, to the laboratory directors. Section 219 of Public Law 110–417 is modeled after the successful Department of Energy Laboratory Directed Research and Development program, and affords Department of Defense laboratory directors the opportunity to reinvigorate the in-house workforce and programs essential to the development of military capabilities.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not moving expeditiously to implement this useful new authority. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a briefing, by September 1, 2010, on the details of the status of implementation of section 219 of Public Law 110–417, as amended by section 2801 of Public Law 111–84, including specific bureaucratic, regulatory, and statutory barriers to full implementation and the organizations involved in those barriers, and a schedule for full implementation of this section as intended.

Missile Defense Agency special programs

The budget request contained $270.2 million in PE 63891C for Missile Defense Agency (MDA) special programs.

The committee recommends $245.2 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, in PE 63891C for MDA special programs.

Missile defense command, control, and communications

The committee is concerned that a potential adversary could conduct cyber attacks and/or satellite communications (SATCOM) jamming against elements of the missile defense network. These tech-

nologies are readily available and have proliferated. An attack against the missile defense network could have asymmetric effects and may imperil the defense of national interests at home and abroad.

The committee directs the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command and the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to prepare a joint report on actions planned or taken to mitigate the threat posed to theater, regional, and global missile defense command, control, communications, and computer capabilities by cyber and SATCOM jamming threats. The report should identify key nodes and vulnerabilities and any actions taken to protect those nodes and mitigate the vulnerabilities. The report may be delivered in classified form but should include an unclassified summary.

The committee further directs the Commander and the Director to submit this report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Multi-Agency Collaboration Environment

The committee is aware that the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration sponsored a program intended to break down interagency information stovepipes and promote greater information sharing among the Department of Defense and its partners. The Multi-Agency Collaboration Environment (MACE) is an innovative effort to address many of the information sharing problems identified by the 9/11 Commission which continue to plague the U.S. Government. MACE provides a unique proving ground for federated information sharing architectures and techniques. Equally important, the contracting paradigm for MACE is a radical departure for the Department, and offers a potential future standard that leverages Darwinian principles in support of information systems program management. The committee plans to closely monitor the progress of MACE, and encourages the Department to make greater use of this capability.

Over-the-horizon broadcast extension capability

The budget request contained $162.3 million in PE 64940D8Z for Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to develop, by January 1, 2012, an over-the-horizon broadcast extension capability by the Air Force 46th Test Squadron. The purpose of this capability is to provide Air National Guard elements with a mission critical data link that is integrated with test data networks, allowing sharing of tactical data link data by geographically-separated ranges.

The committee recommends $169.1 million in PE 64940D8Z, an increase of $6.8 million, for Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development.

Regional missile defense plans

The new Phased Adaptive Approach (PAA) for missile defense in Europe announced by the President on September 17, 2009, is likely to create increased force structure and inventory demands. Furthermore, as noted in the Ballistic Missile Defense Review (BMDR) released on February 1, 2010, the Phased Adaptive Approach is to be tailored to other geographic regions such as East Asia and the

Middle East, which is also likely to create significant force structure and inventory demands. As acknowledged in the BMDR, "regional demand for U.S. BMD assets is likely to exceed supply for some years to come."

Until these regional missile defense architectures are completed, the committee is concerned that the Department's missile defense force structure and inventory requirements, and the resulting resource implications will be difficult to quantify. In addition, certain missile defense capabilities, such as Aegis ballistic missile defense ships, will remain high demand, low density assets that must be carefully managed across the combatant commands so that no one theater accepts greater risk at the expense of another.

The committee is aware that the Department is developing regional missile defense architectures based on the PAA and also developing a comprehensive force management process. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2010, describing: (1) the regional missile defense architectures, including the force structure and inventory requirements derived from the architectures, and (2) the comprehensive force management process, and the capability, deployment, and resource outcomes that have been determined by this process.

Role of non-lethal weapons

The committee reiterates its belief that non-lethal weapons (NLW) can and should play an increasingly important role in meeting the evolving requirements of U.S. military strategy. The committee supports a robust science and technology effort leading to deployment of non-lethal weapons capabilities, including directed energy technologies, which can provide escalation-of-force options to the warfighter for situations where the use of lethal force may be counterproductive to U.S. goals and objectives.

The committee appreciates the Department's "Report on Requirements for Non-Lethal Weapons", submitted in response to a requirement in committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. The committee notes that the December 2009 Report stated that "Non-lethal weapons will continue to make useful contributions in a range of military operations for the foreseeable future." In the letter of transmittal, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics wrote that the Department "strongly supports the timely development and fielding of NLW for the armed forces." The report also identified actions being taken by the Department to address the concerns raised in the April 2009 Government Accountability Office report titled, "DOD Needs to Improve Program Management Policy, and Testing to Enhance Ability to Field Operationally Useful Non-Lethal Weapons."

Despite these positive developments, the committee remains concerned that the Department does not fully appreciate the important role non-lethal capabilities can play in helping to ensure mission success. For example, the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Commander, U.S. Central Command, and the Commander, U.S. Forces Afghanistan, have reaffirmed the need to limit unintended non-combatant casualties in on-going contingency

operations; yet they have not explicitly identified the role non-lethal weapons can play in achieving this end.

The committee believes the importance of non-lethal weapons has increased as a result of the shift in United States military strategy toward civilian casualty avoidance, particularly in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Moreover, although the goal of civilian casualty avoidance is likely to be an enduring requirement of future U.S. military engagements, the importance of non-lethal weapons is not explicitly recognized in the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review. In addition, the research and development budget requests for fiscal year 2011, for both the Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Program and the individual service NLW programs are less than the appropriated amounts for fiscal year 2010, which are insufficient to close the capability gaps referenced in the Department of Defense report to Congress. Procurement funding has declined substantially in recent years and is less than one-fifth of the total fiscal year 2011 Department of Defense non-lethal weapons budget request, complicating the ability to field systems more broadly in support of current counter-piracy, stability operations, or other unconventional and irregular contingencies. These budgetary trends do not reflect an urgent need for non-lethal capabilities, despite the Department's affirmation of their continuing utility. The committee is troubled by this apparent disconnect.

The committee's oversight of the Department's non-lethal weapons activities is handicapped by the lack of comprehensive and easily identifiable data on non-lethal weapons budgets and programs. These programs are grouped in multiple categories, depending upon whether the program is a joint or service initiative, or in the research, development, or acquisition phase. Moreover, funding is contained in multiple service line items that are not easily identifiable. This complicates the ability to understand the breadth of the Department's non-lethal weapons program in order to avoid program duplication and redundancies. Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the military departments to clearly identify a procurement account for NLW line items in their future year budget submissions. The committee expects that each line item description will identify the specific programs for which funds are being requested; provide summary justification for the program; identify whether the program is a joint or service-specific initiative; and the amount of funding provided during the past fiscal year. The committee also expects the Department to provide similar information for all budget requests for research, development, test, and evaluation for NLWs.

The Department's report also states that, "Commander, Central Command has mandated NLW training as a prerequisite for deploying forces." Consistent with the deployment of force application and force protection capabilities, the committee believes that effective operational testing and evaluation, as well as proper training on non-lethal weapons are critical to effective fielding. Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to begin operationally testing, including training of counter-personnel NLWs prior to fielding these devices to deploying service members.

Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics workforce

The committee believes that one of the enduring strengths of the Department of Defense is the technological capability provided by a strong science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce. The committee has repeatedly expressed concerns, echoed by reports from the National Academy of Science and the Defense Science Board, which indicate that the United States is not producing sufficient numbers of qualified scientists and engineers to meet our future national security needs. In addition to the national security implications, the committee agrees with leading economists that the continual decline in the STEM workforce will have a significant impact on our economic security, affecting the nation's competitiveness and technological leadership on the world stage.

The committee commends the service secretaries and the Secretary of Defense for placing increased emphasis on developing and implementing STEM programs, particularly K–12 programs, but remains concerned that there has not been a commensurate increase in planning, coordination or investments across the Department. The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Defense has not complied with a March 31, 2009, deadline for a response to a study required in the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009. The committee directed the Secretary to include in the study the findings from an assessment of all STEM related programs across the Department and the recommendations for the enhancement and coordination of such programs.

The committee emphasizes that the Department of Defense has a mandate to continually analyze, understand, and address critical STEM needs in areas, such as:

(1) Enduring scientific and technical disciplines where the Department of Defense may potentially have critical shortages in personnel or expertise;

(2) Emerging scientific and technical areas where the Department should promote growth of the workforce;

(3) Tools necessary to foster and grow a diverse and culturally competent STEM workforce; and

(4) Efforts that mutually support broader national goals to promote STEM education and increase the international competiveness of the United States.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to conduct greater mentoring and outreach with STEM professional societies or other organizations to help support STEM education outreach programs. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries to do more to increase diversity and equity in the STEM workforce pipeline in order to leverage the untapped potential of a broader range of the population. Not only does this have the potential to increase the resource pool to support traditional scientific and engineering pursuits for national defense, but it also has the potential to provide valuable benefits for other related organizations, such as the intelligence community, the Foreign Service, and the acquisition corps.

Special Operations Technology Development

The budget request contained $26.5 million in PE 1160401BB for Special Operations Technology Development (SOTD).

The committee recognizes that SOTD provides valuable support to U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) through the development of laboratory prototypes for applied research and technology projects. The committee also recognizes that SOTD provides USSOCOM with an ability to make small incremental investments with the Department, other government agencies, and commercial organizations in order to influence the direction of emerging technologies and capabilities in support of U.S. Special Operations Forces (USSOF).

The committee notes that the list of unfunded requirements it received for USSOCOM research and development efforts is in excess of $41.0 million, indicating significant shortfalls in this critical area. The committee understands that these unfunded requirements would provide transformational enhancements for USSOF engaged in direct and indirect missions in the Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and other areas.

The committee recommends $31.5 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE PE 1160401BB for Special Operations Technology Development to support USSOCOM research and development unfunded requirements, including digital night vision devices, non-lethal weapons applications, and classified program areas in direct support of USSOF missions.

Test Resource Management Center budget certification briefing

The committee recognizes that the Director, Test Resource Management Center is required to review and certify as adequate the budgets of each military department, Operational Test and Evaluation, and each Defense Agency with test and evaluation responsibilities as directed by section 231 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) that established the Test Resource Management Center. Further, section 251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) amended section 196(c) of title 10, United States Code to grant the Director, Test Resource Management Center the same authority to military service department information as provided the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation to ensure that the Director has access to all the information needed to certify service budgets and provide recommendations regarding Department of Defense test and evaluation infrastructure. The committee seeks to ensure that communication between the Test Resource Management Center and the services and agencies is adequate for the performance of the Director's legislated duties. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Test Resource Management Center to brief the committee by December 1, 2010 on the budget certification process for fiscal year 2012.

Trusted computing in defense systems

The committee commends the Department of Defense for developing a robust framework for risk management of the global supply chain. The report provided to the committee in response to section 254 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) clearly shows that the Department of Defense

assessed the threats to the entire spectrum of hardware and software for gathering, storing, transmitting, retrieving, or processing information, including counterfeit as well as maliciously manipulated components.

The committee encourages the Department to build upon this work through the establishment of additional pilot projects to test out this risk management framework, which may prove useful in refining technologies or concepts requiring greater maturation, as well as integrating risk management practices more broadly across the Department.

Unmanned systems manning

The committee recognizes the importance of unmanned systems and encourages the Department of Defense to continue investing in technology that reduces manning requirements for current system operations. The committee believes the Department should pursue technologies that allow high levels of automation of routine tasks thus allowing mission management by significantly fewer personnel.

Unmanned system technology development

The committee recognizes the urgent need to develop new unmanned technologies that are more responsive to battlefield conditions and constantly evolving enemy tactics. The committee encourages the use of joint training exercises, like Trident Spectre, to achieve rapid technology development and a higher level of responsiveness within the acquisition process.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained $194.9 million for Operational research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $194.9 million, the requested amount for fiscal year 2011.

Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE					
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	59,430		59,430
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	12,899		12,899
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	122,581		122,581
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**194,910**		**194,910**
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**194,910**		**194,910**

Items of Special Interest

Joint test and evaluation program

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense supports a program within operational test and evaluation that is chartered to provide non-materiel solutions to resolve joint warfighting issues. The committee recognizes that the Joint Test and Evaluation (JT&E) program has been successful at providing rapid and affordable solutions to joint problems by crafting solutions that address the full range of doctrinal, organizational, training, logistical, personnel and facilities challenges, rather than relying solely on developing technology solutions.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to make greater use of the expertise in JT&E as part of the larger drive to improve capabilities development and requirements generation for the Department. Furthermore, the committee believes that the JT&E program is a critical enabler for weapon systems acquisition reform, especially as it supports analysis of alternatives that explore solutions beyond the development of new technologies. The committee also recognizes that if JT&E is leveraged appropriately in the acquisition process, it could be used to either obviate the need for some technology development, or in other cases provide additional refinement of the upfront requirements development.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would establish the amounts authorized to be appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2011.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Report Requirements for Replacement Program of the Ohio-Class Ballistic Submarine

This section would convey the sense of Congress that sea-based strategic deterrence provided by Navy ballistic missile submarines have been essential to the national security of the United States and that the Ohio-class submarines should be replaced with a new class of submarine designed to ensure there are no gaps in our current strategic deterrence capability. This section would further express the sense of Congress that prior to requesting over one billion dollars in research and development funding to develop a replacement for the Ohio-class submarine in advance of a milestone A decision, the Department of Defense should have made available to Congress the guidance issued with regard to the conduct of an analysis of alternatives and the results of such an analysis of alternatives. Lastly, this section would restrict the obligation of more than 50 percent of authorized funds for this development program until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees outlining the guidance associated with, and results of an analysis of alternative capabilities, the cost and sched-

ule projections for each alternative capability, and the time needed to develop and deploy each alternative capability, along with the reasoning associated with the decision to replace the current sea-based strategic deterrent force with a new class of ships designed to carry the current weapons system.

Section 212—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Program

This section would limit the obligation of amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2011 for research, development, test and evaluation for the F–35 Lightning II program to 75 percent until 15 days after the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that all funds made available for the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the F–35 Lightning II have been obligated.

Section 213—Inclusion in Annual Budget Request and Future-Years Defense Program of Sufficient Amounts for Continued Development and Procurement of Competitive Propulsion System for F–35 Lightning II Aircraft

This section would amend chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section 236 that would require that the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each annual budget and each Future Years Defense Program for fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter, submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, include amounts necessary for the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the F–35 Lightning II. This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2012 or any year thereafter for research, development, test, and evaluation and procurement be obligated and expended in sufficient annual amounts for the continued development and procurement of two options for the F–35 Lightning II propulsion system in order to ensure the development and competitive production of the F–35 Lightning II propulsion system. Additionally, this section would amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by striking section 213.

Section 214—Separate Program Elements Required for Research and Development of Joint Light Tactical Vehicle

This section would establish separate and distinct program elements in Army, research, development, test and evaluation, and in Navy, research, development, test, and evaluation accounts for the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program, beginning in fiscal year 2012.

The committee supports the JLTV program. The committee recognizes the JLTV program is a required and ambitious attempt to replace high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles across the Army, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Special Operations Forces. The committee is aware the current JLTV acquisition strategy implements an incremental approach to development and the program is

approximately 18 months into a 36 month development effort. The committee notes initial competitive prototype testing will begin in fiscal year 2010. The committee supports this incremental and competitive prototype approach and believes the JLTV program is too important to fall victim to cost growth and unnecessary schedule delays that have plagued other Department of Defense major defense acquisition programs that entered into the Engineer Manufacturing and Development phases prematurely.

The committee notes JLTV investment to date is approximately $298.5 million but projected investment in JLTV for fiscal years 2011–15 will be at least $9.7 billion. Therefore, the committee believes a program of this capacity and scope requires extensive oversight, and the establishment of a separate and distinct program element would provide the congressional defense committees with increased transparency into the program, as well as allow for more effective oversight.

SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Section 221—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Missile Defenses in Europe

This section would limit the availability of funds for construction and deployment of either medium-range or long-range missile defense systems in Europe until: (1) any nation hosting such a system has signed and ratified a missile defense basing agreement and status of forces agreement authorizing deployment; and (2) 45 days have elapsed following the receipt by the congressional defense committees of the report on the independent assessment of alternative missile defense systems in Europe required by section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

This section would also repeal and restate a modified version of section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to add a limitation on medium-range missile defense interceptors, such as the "Aegis Ashore" concept proposed by the Administration as part of the "Phased Adaptive Approach" announced on September 17, 2009, to the limitation imposed by existing law on acquisition (other than for initial long-lead procurement) or deployment of operational interceptors of a long-range missile defense system in Europe. The limitation would be removed when the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report certifying that the proposed interceptor to be deployed as part of such a missile defense system has demonstrated, through successful, operationally realistic flight testing, a high probability of working in an operationally effective manner and that such missile defense system has the ability to accomplish the mission.

Section 222—Repeal of Prohibition of Certain Contracts by Missile Defense Agency With Foreign Entities

This section would repeal the ban on use of Department of Defense funds to contract with a foreign government or foreign firm on research, development, test, or evaluation related to missile de-

fense, as required by section 222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100–180).

Repealing this section would eliminate unnecessary impediments to allow the Missile Defense Agency to collaborate more closely with our friends and allies to defend against global missile threats as called for in the Administration's Ballistic Missile Defense Review.

Section 223—Phased, Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense in Europe

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the phased, adaptive approach to missile defense in Europe. The section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees assessing the report of the Secretary. Finally, the section would prevent obligation of more than 95 percent of funds available for Defense-Wide Operations and Maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of Defense until the date on which the report required of the Secretary is submitted to the congressional defense committees.

Section 224—Homeland Defense Hedging Policy

This section contains five findings concerning missile defense threats from the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Administration's phased, adaptive approach to missile defense, and hedges against unforeseen circumstances.

Further, this section would make it the policy of the United States government to:

(1) Field missile defense systems in Europe that provide protection against medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missile threats consistent with NATO policy and the phased, adapted approach, and have been confirmed to perform the assigned mission after successful, operationally-realistic testing;

(2) Field missile defenses to protect the territory of the United States pursuant to the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–38) and to test those systems in an operationally realistic manner;

(3) Ensure that the Standard Missile–3 Block IIA interceptor planned for Phase 3 of the phased, adaptive approach for missile defense is capable of addressing intermediate-range ballistic missiles launched from the Middle East, and that the Standard Missile–3 Block IIB interceptor planned for Phase 4 of such approach is capable of addressing intercontinental ballistic missiles launched from the Middle East; and

(4) Continue the development and testing of the two-stage ground-based interceptor to maintain it (1) as a means of protection in the event that: the intermediate-range ballistic missile threat to North American Treaty Organization allies in Europe materializes before the availability of the Standard Missile–3 Block IIA interceptor; the intercontinental ballistic missile threat to the United States that cannot be countered with the existing ground-based missile defense system materializes before the availability of the Standard Missile–3 Block IIB interceptor; or technical challenges or schedule delays af-

fect the Standard Missile–3 Block IIA interceptor or the Standard Missile–3 Block IIB interceptor; and (2) as a complement to the missile defense capabilities deployed in Alaska and California for the defense of the United States.

Section 225—Independent Assessment of the Plan for Defense of the Homeland Against the Threat of Ballistic Missiles

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to contract with an independent entity to conduct an assessment of Department of Defense plans for defending the territory of the United States against the threat of attack by ballistic missiles, including electromagnetic pulse attacks, as such plans are described in the Ballistic Missile Defense Review submitted to Congress on February 1, 2010, and the report submitted to Congress under Section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 226—Study on Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities of the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to conduct a joint capabilities mix study on the ballistic missile defense capabilities of the United States and submit a report on the results to the congressional defense committee on or about the time of the budget submission for fiscal year 2012.

Section 227—Reports on Standard Missile System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the standard missile system, particularly with respect to Standard Missile–3 Block IIA and Standard Missile-3 Block IIB, no later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each 180-day period thereafter.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Section 231—Report on Analysis of Alternatives and Program Requirements for the Ground Combat Vehicle Program

This section would limit the Secretary of the Army from obligating more than 50 percent of fiscal year 2011 research and development funding for the Army Ground Combat Vehicle program until certain program documentation is provided to the congressional defense committees.

Section 232—Cost Benefit Analysis of Future Tank-Fired Munitions

This section would require the Secretary of the Army, by March 15, 2011, to submit a cost benefit analysis of future options for developing tank-fired munitions.

Section 233—Annual Comptroller General Report on the VH–(XX) Presidential Helicopter Acquisition Program

This section would require the Comptroller General to conduct an annual review of the VH–(XX) Presidential Helicopter acquisition program, during the period from 2011 to 2018, and provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1 of every year during the reporting period.

Section 234—Joint Assessment of the Joint Effects Targeting System

This section requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to form a joint assessment team to review the joint effects targeting system and report back to the congressional defense committees on the team's findings.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 241—Escalation of Force Capabilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and in consultation with the Executive Agent for Non-Lethal Weapons, to carry out a program to operationally test and evaluate counter-personnel non-lethal weapons and report to the congressional defense committees on matters affecting the fielding of such capabilities.

This section would direct the Secretary to provide a dedicated procurement line item in future defense budget submissions for non-lethal weapons.

Section 242—Pilot Program to Include Technology Protection Features During Research and Development of Defense Systems

This section would allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to establish a pilot program in order to develop technology protection features during the research and development phases for any DOD system. Features that might be included in this pilot would include technology and engineering design activity, such as capability differentials, anti-tamper, system assurance and software assurance.

Section 243—Pilot Program on Collaborative Energy Security

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, to carry out a collaborative energy security pilot program involving one or more partnerships between one military installation and one Department of Energy laboratory for the purpose of evaluating and validating secure microgrid components and systems for deployment.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $283.1 billion in operation and maintenance (O&M) funds to ensure that the Department of Defense can train, deploy, and sustain U.S. military forces. The fiscal year 2011 O&M request includes $167.9 billion in the base budget

and $115.2 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). Some 37 percent of the total request is for OCO. The fiscal year 2011 request represents a $17.8 billion increase above the fiscal year 2010 request, including an increase of $11.5 billion in the base budget request.

The committee commends the Department for applying additional resources to the readiness accounts in fiscal year 2011 but notes that overall readiness remains tenuous. Repeated deployments, with limited dwell time, have reduced the ability of the forces to train across the full spectrum of conflict, increasing risk to national security if the military had to respond quickly to emergent contingencies. Because units are focused on deployment to the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan ahead of all other missions, skills not required for the fights in Iraq and Afghanistan have atrophied. It will take time to restore these skills once sufficient dwell time at home station is available.

The readiness levels of most non-deployed Army units remain low, due to a combination of equipment and personnel shortfalls and a lack of time to train. Like the Army, the Navy's next-to-deploy forces are reporting high levels of readiness, but this also comes at the expense of the non-deployed forces that experience fewer training opportunities as resources are prioritized toward meeting Global Force Management demands. Navy requirements to support non-standard missions and requests for individual augmentees continue to grow, reducing opportunities for Navy sailors and officers to train for core missions with a full complement of personnel.

The Marine Corps is experiencing equipment usage rates as much as seven times greater than peacetime rates, reducing the expected lifespan of gear. The pace and nature of ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have adversely affected Marine Corps readiness, as evidenced in the Marine Corps' overall readiness assessment, the reported readiness of next-to-deploy and non-deployed Marine units, and in the service's assessed ability to perform key warfighting functions. Non-deployed units are being used to satisfy equipment needs for deployed and next-to-deploy units.

The Air Force's overall readiness has remained at a relatively high level compared to the other services because it adopted a rotational model for deployment several years ago. However, Air Force readiness levels have declined significantly since 1995. While the Air Force maintained the highest readiness of all the services between 2004 and 2008, its readiness has declined since October 2008. Operational tempo, support of emergent mission sets, and an aging aircraft fleet remain the Air Force's top readiness concerns.

The budget request continues efforts begun in fiscal year 2010 to address readiness shortfalls by increasing training funding for all the active-duty forces. The fiscal year 2011 budget request contained funds to continue reset of equipment damaged or worn out through nine years of continuous combat operations. The committee notes, however, that the amount of the Army's depot maintenance budget request contained in the base budget remains alarmingly low (at 11.4 percent). The committee has the same concern for Marine Corps depot maintenance, where 86 percent of the total fiscal year 2011 budget request is contained in the OCO request.

With the fiscal year 2011 budget request, the Navy attempts a course correction to restore flying-hour funding in order to more correctly fund operational requirements and meet training goals for the Navy and Marine Corps. The committee notes, however, that the budget request contained a decrease in funding for Fleet Replacement Squadrons to 84 percent of the requirement against a goal of 94 percent, which Navy officials said represented "the best balance of resources to requirements." While the Air Force budget request represents a 7.3 percent increase over last year's request, a large portion of the increase can be attributed to inflation and cost growth, particularly driven by fuel prices.

To reduce budgetary risk to readiness in areas where the services have identified unfunded requirements, the committee recommends funding above the levels contained in the budget request. These areas include: Navy ship and aviation depot maintenance, naval aviation flight training, Air Force weapon system sustainment and support equipment, Army base operating services, Army Reserve depot maintenance, and contract and performance management and training.

As operations in Iraq and Afghanistan are expected to draw down over the next two fiscal years, the committee anticipates a realignment of funding from the Department's OCO request to the services' O&M base budgets. The committee understands that equipment reset and drawdown requirements will remain relatively high and steady for a number of succeeding years but expects the Department to migrate these baseline operations and sustainment costs to the O&M base budget in order to better represent the normalized budget requirements for the required force structure.

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
LAND FORCES				
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,087,321	32,700	1,120,021
	Army Vehicle Repair Parts Shortfall		[32,700]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	114,448	1,700	116,148
	Army Vehicle Repair Parts Shortfall		[1,700]	
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	773,540	10,900	784,440
	Army Vehicle Repair Parts Shortfall		[10,900]	
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	794,806		794,806
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,399,332		1,399,332
060	AVIATION ASSETS	897,666	3,200	900,866
	UAS Branch Concept Development		[3,200]	
LAND FORCES READINESS				
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,520,995		2,520,995
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	596,117	-5,000	591,117
	Army Capabilities Integration Center		[-5,000]	
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	890,122		890,122
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,563,566	502,500	8,066,066
	Fort Bliss Data Center		[2,500]	
	Program Increase		[500,000]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	2,500,892	256,000	2,756,892
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[256,000]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	390,004		390,004
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	167,758		167,758
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	0		0
160	RESET	0		0
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	464,851		464,851
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**20,161,418**	**802,000**	**20,963,418**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS				
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	333,266		333,266
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	102,240		102,240
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	5,736		5,736
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**441,242**		**441,242**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING				
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	129,902		129,902
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	74,705		74,705
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	63,223		63,223
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	479,343		479,343
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	1,082,517		1,082,517
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,046,124		1,046,124
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	163,607		163,607
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	695,200		695,200

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	544,014	1,500	545,514
	Diversity Outreach for Recruiting and Retention at West Point		[1,500]	
300	EXAMINING	153,091		153,091
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	241,170		241,170
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	220,771		220,771
330	JUNIOR ROTC	175,347		175,347
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**5,069,014**	**1,500**	**5,070,514**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES				
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	587,952		587,952
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	669,853		669,853
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	503,876		503,876
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	435,020		435,020
SECURITY PROGRAMS				
340	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,030,355	-20,000	1,010,355
	Army G-2 Biometrics		[-20,000]	
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
390	ADMINISTRATION	912,355		912,355
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,528,371	-26,000	1,502,371
	GNEC Reprogramming Offset		[-26,000]	
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	368,480		368,480
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	261,829	5,756	267,585

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	Social Work Center for Soldiers and Military Families		[956]	
	The National Organization on Disability Pilot Program for Wounded Warriors		[4,800]	
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,145,902		1,145,902
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	205,967		205,967
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	168,664		168,664
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS				
460	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	462,488		462,488
470	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	19,179		19,179
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**8,300,291**	**-40,244**	**8,260,047**
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS				
999	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	-503,000	-503,000
	Fuel Reduction		[-28,000]	
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-475,000]	
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	**0**	**-503,000**	**-503,000**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**33,971,965**	**260,256**	**34,232,221**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,429,832		4,429,832
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	81,345	111,000	192,345
	Program Increase		[111,000]	
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	38,932	6,600	45,532

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	Navy Engineering Technical Service/ Contractor Engineering Technical Service		[6,600]	
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	100,485		100,485
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	355,520		355,520
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,221,410	74,000	1,295,410
	Program Increase		[74,000]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	27,448		27,448
BASE SUPPORT				
270	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	820,507		820,507
280	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,900,386	137,000	2,037,386
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[137,000]	
290	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,502,857		4,502,857
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT				
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	615,069		615,069
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	89,340		89,340
140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	177,397		177,397
150	WARFARE TACTICS	416,068		416,068
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	316,525		316,525
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,083,618	38,900	1,122,518
	Navy Expeditionary Combat Command Integrated Logistics Overhaul and Equipment Reset		[38,900]	
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	165,985		165,985
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,836		2,836
200	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	208,250		208,250
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	274,071		274,071
SHIP OPERATIONS				
080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,696,913		3,696,913

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	728,983		728,983
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,761,670	34,000	4,795,670
	Program Increase		[34,000]	
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,344,844		1,344,844
	WEAPONS SUPPORT			
220	CRUISE MISSILE	130,219		130,219
230	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,138,418		1,138,418
240	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	89,184		89,184
250	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	459,561		459,561
260	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	366,751		366,751
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**29,544,424**	**401,500**	**29,945,924**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS			
310	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,593		7,593
320	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	177,482	4,000	181,482
	Navy Ship Disposal Program		[4,000]	
	MOBILIZATION PREPARATION			
330	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	70,990		70,990
340	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,707		2,707
350	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	23,845		23,845
	READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCE			
300	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	424,047		424,047
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**706,664**	**4,000**	**710,664**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
ACCESSION TRAINING				
360	OFFICER ACQUISITION	141,057		141,057
370	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,853		10,853
380	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	143,504		143,504
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
390	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	533,004		533,004
400	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,538,171		1,538,171
410	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	162,844		162,844
420	TRAINING SUPPORT	171,153		171,153
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
430	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	261,287	635	261,922
	Naval Sea Cadet Corps		[635]	
440	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	145,560		145,560
450	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	109,865		109,865
460	JUNIOR ROTC	50,369		50,369
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,267,667**	**635**	**3,268,302**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS				
680	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
690	JUDGEMENT FUND	0		0
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
700	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	614,275		614,275
INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS				
610	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	549,484		549,484

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
540	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	230,294		230,294
550	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0		0
560	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	259,990		259,990
570	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	868,069		868,069
580	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	55,217		55,217
590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	19,053		19,053
600	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	77,702		77,702
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
470	ADMINISTRATION	829,010		829,010
480	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	7,632		7,632
490	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	118,838		118,838
500	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	194,775		194,775
510	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	282,580		282,580
520	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	503,067		503,067
530	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS				
670	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	5,567		5,567
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**4,615,553**		**4,615,553**
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS				
999	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	-564,000	-564,000
	Fuel Reduction		[-49,000]	
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-515,000]	
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	**0**	**-564,000**	**-564,000**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**38,134,308**	**-157,865**	**37,976,443**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	BASE SUPPORT			
070	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	594,904	66,000	660,904
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[66,000]	
080	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,206,137		2,206,137
	COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT			
060	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	0		0
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	745,678		745,678
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	658,616		658,616
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	78,891		78,891
	USMC PREPOSITIONING			
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	72,344		72,344
050	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	0		0
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**4,356,570**	**66,000**	**4,422,570**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING			
090	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,096		16,096
100	OFFICER ACQUISITION	420		420
	BASE SUPPORT			
180	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	0		0

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
190	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	0		0
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
110	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	91,197		91,197
120	FLIGHT TRAINING	0		0
130	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	32,379		32,379
140	TRAINING SUPPORT	319,742		319,742
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	233,663		233,663
160	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	61,980		61,980
170	JUNIOR ROTC	19,497		19,497
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**774,974**		**774,974**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
BASE SUPPORT				
240	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	0		0
250	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	0		0
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
200	SPECIAL SUPPORT	0		0
210	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	29,569		29,569
220	ADMINISTRATION	341,657		341,657
230	ACQUISITION & PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	87,570		87,570
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**458,796**		**458,796**
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS				
999	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	-88,000	-88,000

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	Fuel Reduction		[-4,000]	
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-84,000]	
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	**0**	**-88,000**	**-88,000**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**5,590,340**	**-22,000**	**5,568,340**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,261,115	22,000	4,283,115
	Support Equipment		[22,000]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	2,995,278	75,900	3,071,178
	Battlefield Airmen Equipment		[19,300]	
	Distributed Ground Common Station Integrated Collective Command and Control Processing, Exploitation and Dissemination System		[55,000]	
	Joint Terminal Attack Controller Modeling and Simulation		[1,600]	
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,573,602	3,500	1,577,102
	Barry M. Goldwater Range Sensor Training Area		[3,500]	
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,189,481	133,312	2,322,793
	Air Force Amended Budget Submission		[-16,688]	
	Weapons System Sustainment		[150,000]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,556,234	154,000	1,710,234
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[154,000]	
060	BASE SUPPORT	3,088,003		3,088,003

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
COCOM				
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	797,754		797,754
140	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	233,021		233,021
COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS				
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,511,243		1,511,243
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	1,035,291		1,035,291
090	JCS EXERCISES	0		0
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	595,028		595,028
SPACE OPERATIONS				
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	342,355		342,355
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	811,022		811,022
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**20,989,427**	**388,712**	**21,378,139**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS				
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,975,663		2,975,663
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	158,647	52,800	211,447
	BEAR Expeditionary Airfield Resources		[52,800]	
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	140,286		140,286
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	348,231		348,231
190	BASE SUPPORT	683,286		683,286
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**4,306,113**	**52,800**	**4,358,913**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING				
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	114,403		114,403

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	28,195		28,195
220	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	90,453		90,453
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	411,570		411,570
240	BASE SUPPORT	902,323		902,323
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	510,065		510,065
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,012,816		1,012,816
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	221,553		221,553
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	126,784		126,784
290	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	619	2,064	2,683
	Diversity Outreach for Recruiting and Retention at the Air Force Academy		[2,064]	
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	150,222		150,222
310	EXAMINING	409		409
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	172,643		172,643
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	208,872		208,872
340	JUNIOR ROTC	77,692		77,692
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**4,028,619**	**2,064**	**4,030,683**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0		0
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,110,471		1,110,471
360	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	949,018		949,018
370	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	7,365		7,365

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
380	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	368,349		368,349
390	BASE SUPPORT	1,363,230		1,363,230
SECURITY PROGRAMS				
440	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,159,342		1,159,342
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
400	ADMINISTRATION	657,268		657,268
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	693,379		693,379
420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,152,877		1,152,877
430	CIVIL AIR PATROL	22,848		22,848
SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS				
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	36,206		36,206
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**7,520,353**		**7,520,353**
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS				
999	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	-603,500	-603,500
	Fuel Reduction		[-90,000]	
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-513,500]	
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	**0**	**-603,500**	**-603,500**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**36,844,512**	**-159,924**	**36,684,588**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	420,940		420,940
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,944,330		3,944,330

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**4,365,270**		**4,365,270**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	145,896		145,896
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	97,633		97,633
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**243,529**		**243,529**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
	DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
050	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	156,043	200	156,243
	I-CANI E-File Program		[200]	
070	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	143,441		143,441
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	486,143	1,000	487,143
	DCAA General Counsel		[1,000]	
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,112,849		1,112,849
100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	1,593		1,593
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	824,153		824,153
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,384,450		1,384,450
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	42,404		42,404
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	448,043	5,200	453,243
	Procurement Technical Assistance Program		[5,200]	
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	255,878		255,878
170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	24,155		24,155
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	683,853		683,853

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
190	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	518,743		518,743
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	37,624		37,624
210	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	463,522		463,522
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,514,537	69,000	2,583,537
	Defense Impact Aid		[65,000]	
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[4,000]	
240	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	50,811		50,811
250	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	2,245,300	157,300	2,402,600
	Corrosion Prevention and Mitigation		[3,600]	
	Critical Language Training; San Diego State University		[3,500]	
	Fort Hood Follow-on Review Implementation Fund		[100,000]	
	Industrial Base Fund		[30,000]	
	Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs		[5,000]	
	Office of Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analysis		[4,000]	
	Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI)		[10,000]	
	ROTC and Reserve Component Strategic Language Hub Pilot		[1,200]	
260	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	604,130		604,130
270	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,977,425		13,977,425
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**25,975,097**	**232,700**	**26,207,797**
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS				
999	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	0	-616,000	-616,000
	Fuel Reduction		[-4,000]	
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		[-612,000]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	**0**	**-616,000**	**-616,000**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**30,583,896**	**-383,300**	**30,200,596**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,282		1,282
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	12,413		12,413
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	460,814		460,814
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	168,020		168,020
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	555,944		555,944
060	AVIATION ASSETS	70,378		70,378
	LAND FORCES READINESS			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	391,326		391,326
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	108,093		108,093
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	136,854	38,000	174,854
	Program Increase		[38,000]	
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	577,146		577,146
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	234,486	25,000	259,486
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[25,000]	
120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,716,756**	**63,000**	**2,779,756**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	12,717		12,717
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
140	ADMINISTRATION	74,685		74,685
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,797		3,797
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	9,245		9,245
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	61,877		61,877
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**162,321**		**162,321**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	**2,879,077**	**63,000**	**2,942,077**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	599,649		599,649
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	13,209		13,209
030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,668		2,668
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	140,377		140,377
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	309		309
BASE SUPPORT				
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	56,046		56,046
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	81,407	6,000	87,407
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[6,000]	
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	131,988		131,988
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT				

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,882		15,882
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	140,186		140,186
SHIP OPERATIONS				
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	65,757		65,757
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	587		587
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	91,054	1,000	92,054
	Program Increase		[1,000]	
WEAPONS SUPPORT				
110	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,492		5,492
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,344,611**	**7,000**	**1,351,611**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS				
200	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
210	JUDGMENT FUND	0		0
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
190	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,551		3,551
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
150	ADMINISTRATION	3,276		3,276
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	13,698		13,698
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,628		2,628
180	OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	0		0
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**23,153**		**23,153**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	**1,367,764**	**7,000**	**1,374,764**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
BASE SUPPORT				
040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	38,762	2,000	40,762
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[2,000]	
050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	99,924		99,924
EXPEDITIONARY FORCES				
010	OPERATING FORCES	104,566		104,566
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	16,392		16,392
030	TRAINING SUPPORT	0		0
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**259,644**	**2,000**	**261,644**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
BASE SUPPORT				
100	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	0		0
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	0		0
070	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	835		835
080	ADMINISTRATION	15,871		15,871
090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,884		8,884
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**25,590**		**25,590**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	**285,234**	**2,000**	**287,234**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE				

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,275,407	1,043	2,276,450
	Air Force Amended Budget Submission		[1,043]	
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	111,742		111,742
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	415,687	2,749	418,436
	Air Force Amended Budget Submission		[2,749]	
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	88,822	7,000	95,822
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[7,000]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	277,985		277,985
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**3,169,643**	**10,792**	**3,180,435**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
060	ADMINISTRATION	80,526		80,526
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	24,353		24,353
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	19,716		19,716
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,071		6,071
100	AUDIOVISUAL	726		726
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**131,392**		**131,392**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**3,301,035**	**10,792**	**3,311,827**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
LAND FORCES				
010	MANEUVER UNITS	807,193	1,821	809,014
	Mobile C3 & Asset Tracking Equipment		[1,821]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	166,474		166,474
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	607,567		607,567
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	249,930		249,930
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	35,657		35,657
060	AVIATION ASSETS	838,895		838,895
LAND FORCES READINESS				
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	570,119	1,900	572,019
	100 Meter Indoor Small Arms Range		[1,900]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	121,980		121,980
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	380,789		380,789
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	933,514		933,514
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	621,843	48,000	669,843
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[48,000]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	540,738		540,738
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	0	4,100	4,100
	North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers		[1,600]	
	Our Military Kids		[1,000]	
	Washington National Guard Employment Enhancement Project		[1,500]	
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**5,874,699**	**55,821**	**5,930,520**

BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
140	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	17,771		17,771
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
150	ADMINISTRATION	183,781		183,781
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	48,188		48,188
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,020		8,020
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	440,245		440,245
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**698,005**		**698,005**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	**6,572,704**	**55,821**	**6,628,525**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,519,452	6,073	3,525,525
	Air Force Amended Budget Submission		[6,073]	
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	762,937	1,100	764,037
	F-16CM and AH-64D Digital Communications Bridge		[1,100]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	598,779	6,823	605,602
	Air Force Amended Budget Submission		[6,823]	
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	315,210	25,000	340,210
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[25,000]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	668,176		668,176
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**5,864,554**	**38,996**	**5,903,550**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
060	ADMINISTRATION	41,930		41,930
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	34,659		34,659
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**76,589**		**76,589**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	**5,941,143**	**38,996**	**5,980,139**
MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS				
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	14,068		14,068
020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	108,032		108,032
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	522,512		522,512
040	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	217,561	12,000	229,561
	Training and Recertification		[12,000]	
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	444,581		444,581
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	304,867		304,867
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	502,653		502,653
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	10,744		10,744
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	276,546	20,000	296,546
	Environmental Restoration at Culebra Island Puerto Rico		[5,000]	
	Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites		[15,000]	
100	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000	-5,000	0
	Program Reduction		[-5,000]	
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,406,564**	**27,000**	**2,433,564**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	Total, Title III	**167,878,542**	**-258,224**	**167,620,318**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2011 amended budget request:

Operation and Maintenance, Army Adjustments:	
BA 1 Army Vehicle Repair Parts Shortfall	+45.3
BA 1 UAS Branch Concept Development	+3.2
BA 1 Army Capabilities Integration Center	(5.0)
BA 1 Fort Bliss Data Center	+2.5
BA 1 Base Operations Support Program Increase	+500.0
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+256.0
BA 3 Diversity Outreach for Recruiting & Retention at West Point	+1.5
BA 4 Army G–2 Biometrics	(20.0)
BA 4 GNEC Reprogramming Offset	(26.0)
BA 4 Social Work Center for Soldiers & Military Families	+1.0
BA 4 The National Organization on Disability Pilot Program for Wounded Warriors	+4.8
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction	(28.0)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate	(475.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Adjustments:	
BA 1 Fleet Air Training Program Increase	+111.0
BA 1 Navy Engineering Technical Service/Contractor Engineering Technical Service	+6.6
BA 1 Aircraft Depot Maintenance Program Increase	+74.0
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+137.0
BA 1 NECC Integrated Logistics Overhaul & Equipment Reset	+38.9
BA 1 Ship Depot Maintenance Program Increase	+34.0
BA 2 Navy Ship Disposal Program	+4.0
BA 3 Naval Sea Cadet Corps	+0.6
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction	(49.0)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate	(515.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Adjustments:	
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+66.0
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction	(4.0)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate	(84.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Adjustments:	
BA 1 Support Equipment	+22.0
BA 1 Battlefield Airmen Equipment	+19.3
BA 1 Distributed Ground Common Station Integrated Collective Command & Control Processing, Exploitation, & Dissemination System	+55.0
BA 1 Joint Terminal Attack Controller Modeling & Simulation	+1.6
BA 1 Barry M. Goldwater Range Sensor Training Area	+3.5
BA 1 Air Force Amended Budget Submission	(16.7)
BA 1 Weapons System Sustainment	+150.0
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+154.0
BA 2 BEAR Expeditionary Airfield Resources	+52.8
BA 3 Diversity Outreach for Recruiting & Retention at the Air Force Academy	+2.1
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction	(90.0)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate	(513.5)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide Adjustments:	
BA 4 I-CAN! E-File Program	+0.2
BA 4 DCAA General Counsel	+1.0
BA 4 Procurement Technical Assistance Program	+5.2
BA 4 Defense Impact Aid	+65.0
BA 4 Department of Defense Education Activity Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+4.0
BA 4 Corrosion Prevention & Mitigation	+3.6
BA 4 Critical Language Training, San Diego State University	+3.5
BA 4 Fort Hood Follow-on Review Implementation Fund	+100.0
BA 4 Industrial Base Fund	+30.0
BA 4 Office of Performance Assessment & Root Cause Analysis	+4.0
BA 4 Readiness & Environmental Protection Initiative	+10.0
BA 4 ROTC & Reserve Component Strategic Language Hub Pilot	+1.2
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction	(4.0)

Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate	(612.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Depot Maintenance Program Increase	+38.0
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+25.0
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+6.0
BA 1 Ship Depot Maintenance Program Increase	+1.0
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%.	+2.0
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Primary Combat Forces Air Force Amended Budget Submission	+1.0
BA 1 Depot Maintenance Air Force Amended Budget Submission	+2.8
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+7.0
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard Adjustments:	
BA 1 Mobile C3 & Asset Tracking Equipment	+1.8
BA 1 100 Meter Indoor Small Arms Range	+1.9
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+48.0
BA 1 North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers	+1.6
BA 1 Our Military Kids	+1.0
BA 1 Washington National Guard Employment Enhancement Project	+1.5
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard Adjustments:	
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100%	+25.0
BA 1 Aircraft Operations Air Force Amended Budget Submission	+6.1
BA 1 F–16CM & AH–64D Digital Communications Bridge	+1.1
BA 1 Depot Maintenance Air Force Amended Budget Submission	+6.8
Miscellaneous Appropriations Adjustments:	
Acquisition Workforce Training & Recertification	+12.0
Environmental Restoration at Culebra Island, Puerto Rico	+5.0
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	+15.0
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund Program Reduction	(5.0)

Base Operations Support

The budget request contained $7.6 billion for Army Base Operations Support

The committee believes that the implementation of the budget request for Base Operations Support could cause a deleterious impact on Army garrison operations and negatively affect the Army Family Covenant. The Army addressed a similar issue in a reprogramming request during the execution of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act 2010 (Public Law 111–118).

The committee recommends $8.1 billion, an increase of $500.0 million for Army Base Operations Support.

C–130 Force Structure Adjustments

The budget request included funds to move C–130 aircraft from the Air Force reserve components to the active-duty Air Force. The committee understands that after the fiscal year 2011 budget request was submitted to Congress, the Air Force decided to reverse that plan and now intends to keep the C–130s in the reserve components. In addition, the budget request called for the retirement of six C–130s from the Puerto Rico Air National Guard (ANG). The committee understands that under the Air Force's revised force structure plan, the six C–130s in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will not be retired in fiscal year 2011 and that adequate funds exist in the ANG program to operate these aircraft into fiscal year 2012.

Based on the Air Force's decision, the committee recommends changes to the original budget request that retain the C–130 aircraft in the reserve components. The adjustments include the

transfer of funds from active-duty and reserve components for aircraft operations and depot maintenance funding to accommodate the air reserve components' retention of 12 C–130H aircraft for the Formal Training Unit at Little Rock Air Force Base.

Corrosion Control and Prevention

The budget request contained $7.2 million for prevention and mitigation of corrosion of military equipment and infrastructure through projects directed by the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Despite the validated 50-to-1 return on investment from the more than 160 projects implemented through the corrosion office, the budget request, even with an additional $4.8 million funded in other accounts, falls far short of the known requirement of $47.0 million as reported by the Government Accountability Office in its annual review of the corrosion prevention and control budget submission. The committee is disappointed that, in the face of demonstrated successes by the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight, the Department has not adequately resourced this requirement.

The committee is aware that the Air Force's F–22 Raptor fleet was grounded in February 2010 for corrosion on ejection seat rods; a situation the committee understands was a known problem due to poorly designed drainage in the cockpit. In light of this problem, the committee awaits the congressionally directed report of the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight assessing the corrosion control and mitigation lessons learned from the F–22 Raptor program as applied to the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter program. The committee believes that corrosion control and prevention should be a part of the lifecycle management and support strategy required for major weapon systems under section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

The committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would add reporting requirements to the annual report submitted to Congress by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

The committee recommends $10.8 million, an increase of $3.6 million, for the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight.

Defense Contract Audit Agency General Counsel

The budget request contained $486.1 million for the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) but contained no funds for an Office of General Counsel for DCAA. The committeenotes that the Government Accountability Office recommended the creation of an independent Office of General Counsel for DCAA in testimony before the Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform and that legislation establishing such an office, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010), has passed the House of Representatives.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million for an Office of General Counsel within DCAA.

Environmental Restoration at Formerly Used Defense Sites

The budget request contained $276.5 million for environmental restoration at formerly used defense sites.

The committee is aware that 4,705 sites were listed in the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) environmental restoration inventory in fiscal year 2008, including sites eligible for the installation restoration program, the military munitions response program, and the building demolition and debris removal program. The committee is aware that the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers estimated the cost to complete all FUDS cleanup efforts at $16.2 billion in fiscal year 2008, reflecting decades of additional work at the current rate of expenditure.

The committee recommends $296.5 million, an increase of $20.0 million for environmental restoration, formerly used defense sites, including $15.0 million for environmental restoration, formerly used defense sites, and $5.0 million for environmental restoration at Culebra Island, Puerto Rico.

Execution of Readiness Funding

The committee is concerned about the ability of the military services and Department of Defense (DOD) agencies to execute their operation and maintenance (O&M) budgets completely each year. The committee bases its concern upon the budget review analysis on unobligated and unexpended balances provided annually to the committee by the Government Accountability Office (GAO). The analysis provided for the review of the fiscal year 2011 budget request included execution data for fiscal year 1999 through fiscal year 2009, therefore covering both peacetime and wartime execution trends. The highest levels of unobligated balances range from 87.0 to 25.7 percent in some accounts. From fiscal years 2000 to 2004, the average level of unexpended balances in the services' O&M accounts ranged from a high of 4.14 percent to a low of 1.32 percent.

The committee is concerned with under-execution in O&M accounts that appears to have a direct relationship to current warfighting requirements. Among these are combat support forces, combat/weapons systems, aircraft depot operations support, and operating forces. While the committee understands that obligation rates are dependent upon the timely receipt of funding, particularly supplemental appropriations, GAO's analysis accounts for congressional adjustments.

As evidence of its concern about the Department's ability to properly identify its budget requirements, the committee has included in this title a provision that would inventory and evaluate the modeling and simulation tools used by the Department to develop and analyze the annual budget submission and to support decision-making inside the budget process.

The committee recommends undistributed reductions of between 2 and 1 percent of the services' and the DOD-wide fiscal year 2011 O&M base budgets for unobligated balance estimates, based on GAO's analysis. In implementing the reductions, the committee encourages the services and the Department of Defense to focus on those areas that appear, from GAO's analysis, to be the most problematic. Furthermore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of

Defense, Comptroller to examine the Department's budget process and execution rates, identify causes for chronic and historical under-execution, and issue guidance that would enable all components and agencies of the Department of Defense to fully execute their O&M budget allocations annually. The committee directs the Comptroller to report the findings of this examination to the congressional defense committees with the budget documents submitted for the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

Industrial Base Fund

The budget request contained no funds for an Industrial Base Fund. The committee notes that legislation which has passed the House of Representatives, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010), creates an Industrial Base Fund to support the monitoring, assessment, and enhancement of the industrial base.

The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million for the Industrial Base Fund.

Office of Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analysis

The budget request contained $231.8 million for the activities of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics including $13.3 million for the Office of Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analysis (PARCA). The committee notes that legislation which has passed the House of Representatives, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010), would substantially expand the mission of PARCA leading to a need for additional resources to carry out PARCA's mission.

The committee recommends $17.3 million, an increase of $4.0 million for PARCA.

Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative

The budget request contained $39.8 million for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI).

The committee expects the secretaries of the military departments to use the authority and funding available through REPI to partner with public and private entities to establish protective buffer zones around military installations that have impending encroachment pressures. The committee recognizes the benefits of REPI, including its ability to enhance military readiness, increase protection of key military spaces and natural habitats, foster public safety standards, and encourage economic growth.

The committee recommends $49.8 million, an increase of $10.0 million, for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative.

Training and Recertification of the Acquisition Workforce

The budget request contained $217.6 million for the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund. The committee notes that legislation establishing new requirements for training and recertification of the acquisition workforce, the Imple-

menting Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010), has passed the House of Representatives. The Department's compliance with these requirements will require additional resources for training throughout the Department's acquisition workforce.

The committee recommends $229.6 million, an increase of $12.0 million, to allow the Department to fund this additional training.

ENERGY ISSUES

Department of Defense Alternative Fuel Use

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to enhance energy security by reducing demand, increasing efficiency, and diversifying supply by adopting alternative energy technologies. The committee is aware that certifying alternative fuels for use is among the Department's energy security initiatives, and that the military services are pursuing different fuel alternatives. For example, the Department of the Air Force is working to complete certification of a Fischer-Tropsch fuel blend in fiscal year 2011 and a hydro-processed renewable jet fuel in fiscal year 2012. In addition, the Department of the Navy is evaluating use of biofuels for aviation and maritime purposes and intends to deploy a "Green Strike Group" using these biofuels by 2016.

The committee recognizes that, through its efforts, the Department of Defense has the opportunity to enhance energy security and reduce its reliance on petroleum-based fuels. The committee encourages the Department to continue its efforts to increase energy independence. The committee directs the Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs, within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on whether existing contracting authorities for alternative fuels are adequate to meet the Department of Defense's needs.

National Security Impacts of Petroleum Refining

The committee remains concerned about the vulnerability of the Department of Defense to shortages in petroleum availability. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide a briefing to the committee on the significance of a robust domestic petroleum refining industry to the national security of the United States by October 31, 2010. In particular, the brief should examine the degree to which there is a connection between the domestic refining sector and U.S. military readiness, and identify any national security concerns that may be associated with reductions in domestic refining capacity.

WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

Army Cooperative Arrangements

The Department of Defense, in its submission of legislative proposals to Congress, proposed amending section 4544 of title 10, United States Code, to: remove the limitation of eight public-pri-

vate partnerships; remove the sunset provision now scheduled for September 30, 2014; and allow multi-year contracting for greater than five years. The committee has not included this proposed provision in this Act because the committee has not yet received the analysis required by section 328 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). This analysis is essential to the committee making an informed decision regarding the Department's legislative proposal concerning the cooperative arrangements addressed in section 4544 of title 10, United States Code.

Contractor Support to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization

The committee acknowledges the gradual expansion of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) but notes that such growth appears to include activities that may be beyond the scope originally intended, and ultimately approved, for the organization to defeat improvised explosive devices and associated networks. While the committee generally supports using contractor expertise in non-operational support and other service support type roles, the committee is concerned that the utilization of contractor personnel to fulfill and perform traditional military functions that may be inherently governmental is fraught with risks.

Specifically, the committee is concerned that JIEDDO may be establishing a cadre of contractor personnel to provide direct support to military operations as an offset to fill uniformed personnel vacancies at the combatant commands. The committee notes that this concept was not included in the original charter governing JIEDDO and may be facilitating the expansion of JIEDDO beyond its core mission. The committee believes that normal personnel procedures pursuant to the joint manning document process are in place to provide such capacity and support from military and federal civilian personnel.

In response to the above stated concerns and pursuant to the stated goals, aspirations, and limitations for JIEDDO, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, by January 31, 2011, to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on JIEDDO's use of contractors. The briefing should identify all areas of support provided by contractors and contractor employees, including support of core missions and operations and support to combatant commands. The briefing also should include an assessment of whether JIEDDO missions being performed by the contractor workforce are appropriate, including an analysis of contractor support requirements compared to performance of inherently governmental tasks, and a detailed assessment of the projected contractor workforce needs across the Future Years Defense Plan.

Submarine Maintenance Workload

The committee appreciates the efforts by the Department of the Navy to stabilize workloads at the nation's public shipyards. However, the committee notes this is occurring at the same time that elements of the shipbuilding industrial base are facing workforce reductions. This is especially the case in the submarine industrial

base, where maintenance and repair work that has helped sustain the industrial base between construction workload peaks has declined.

While the committee shares the Navy's commitment to long-term stability at the public shipyards, the committee remains concerned about the near-term impact on the submarine industrial base, which continues to experience cyclical workload demands at the same time it needs to prepare for increased Virginia-class production. Specifically, while the recent initiative to extend operating intervals for Los Angeles-class (SSN–688) submarines has had the positive effect of increasing operational availability for the fleet and decreasing maintenance and lifecycle costs, this initiative has translated into decreased maintenance opportunities for private shipyards.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by September 30, 2010, on the Navy's plan to mitigate gaps in the private-sector submarine industrial base workload, including a plan to retain a critically skilled workforce.

Use of Temporary Shipyard Workforce for Nuclear Maintenance

According to the final environmental impact statement for the proposed homeporting of additional surface ships at Naval Station Mayport, Florida, homeporting of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier (CVN) would result in "temporary surges of maintenance employees associated with the three-year depot-level maintenance cycle for the CVN." The committee is concerned about the impact the addition of depot-level workload at Mayport would have on the sustainability, efficiency, capabilities, and stability of the fly-away teams from the nuclear propulsion depot maintenance workforce used under the Navy's "One Nuclear Shipyard" concept. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2011, of the readiness and cost impacts of CVN homeporting and maintenance at Naval Station Mayport on the U.S. nuclear power-plant depot maintenance workforce.

Readiness Issues

Air Force's Ability To Train on Core Mission Competencies

In order to meet the demands of ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Department of Defense has relied heavily upon combat and support capabilities within the Air Force. Given the nature of these operations, some units have been tasked to perform missions other than their primary core missions. For example, F–16 aircraft pilots have frequently been flying close air support missions rather than the aircraft's primary air-to-ground strike missions. As a result, the Air Force has made adjustments as necessary to shift the focus of training to the types of missions expected to be needed to support current operations. Continuous demand and high operational tempo have left units with little time to train on primary mission tasks.

The committee is concerned about the potential implications of this shift in focus on the Air Force's ability to train for a broader spectrum of missions and the potential degradation of core mission capabilities. Aware of the Government Accountability Office's prior work on Air Force readiness issues, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Air Force's ability to train on core mission capabilities and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of its review. This review should:

(1) Identify the types of missions the Air Force is performing to support ongoing operations and assess the nature and extent of training for these missions;

(2) Determine the extent to which units' current training differs from their traditional core mission training and the extent to which affected personnel are able to maintain qualifications or currency in their career fields/specialties;

(3) Identify the nature and extent of Air Force readiness reporting on core mission capabilities; and

(4) Review the Air Force's plans to address any gaps in training or degradation in Air Force core capabilities.

Analysis of the Use of Commercial F–5 Aggressor Aircraft for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps Pilot Training

The committee is aware that the military departments have used different platforms for adversarial air-to-air pilot training missions that closely mirror enemy threat aircraft. Since the mid–1970s, the Navy has been using F–5 aggressor aircraft, which are flown by a mix of reserve and active-duty aviators. To determine whether the capability of the military services to conduct air-to-air pilot training could be enhanced by using adversary aircraft support provided by commercial firms, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an analysis of the feasibility and advisability of using F–5 aircraft provided by commercial firms as adversaries for air-to-air training missions. The analysis should include the following:

(1) The potential cost to the federal government to contract for such a program, including a comparison of the equivalent costs to accomplish the same pilot training through use of assets organic to the military departments;

(2) A comparison of the cost per flying hour for flying adversarial training missions by the military departments versus expected cost per flying hour for F–5s operated by commercial firms;

(3) The number of adversarial missions flown annually by organic aircraft including, but not limited to, F–15s, F–16s, F–18s, and F–22s, and an assessment of the impact of flying such missions on the Department's flying hour programs and on aircrew proficiency and training requirements;

(4) The number of military service members engaged as aircrew and maintenance personnel to support the missions identified in (3);

(5) An assessment of the costs for maintenance and training for personnel associated with commercial firms that would operate the F–5 aggressor aircraft;

(6) An assessment of the ability of the F–5 to replicate fourth- and fifth-generation threats in support of F–22 and F–35 training;

(7) An assessment of whether existing F–5 aircraft, and the associated logistical requirements such as spare parts and engines, are readily available to commercial firms in quantities sufficient to provide adequate air-to-air training;

(8) An assessment of whether such a program could help in the preservation of the useful service life of military aircraft fleets;

(9) An assessment of Federal Aviation Administration airworthiness requirements and aircrew certification processes to ensure safety of flight for such operations;

(10) An assessment of government liability, insurance requirements, or other legal impediments; and (11) Any other data that the Secretary determines is appropriate in evaluating the potential for an F–5 training program to be operated by commercial firms.

The committee directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of the analysis within 30 days of completion of the report.

Availability of Full-Time Trainers in the Army

The committee is aware that the Army has had to deploy a significant number of personnel typically assigned to training positions to support the needs of ground commanders in ongoing contingency operations. In February 2010, the Commander of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command cited a significant decline in the total number of trainers assigned to his command, as well as an increased reliance upon contracted civilian rather than military trainers.

The committee is concerned about the Army's ability to provide the necessary personnel to train U.S. soldiers as well as to support the demands of ongoing operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the availability of full-time trainers in the Army and report the results of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This review should evaluate:

(1) The ratio of full-time trainers to trainees;

(2) Changes in manning authorizations for trainers over time;

(3) The extent to which the Army has experienced challenges in filling its training positions;

(4) Any measures the Army has taken to address these challenges, including the extent to which the Army has shifted its instructor/trainer force from uniformed service personnel to civilians or contractors; and

(5) The extent, if any, that U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command officials have assessed the impact of any increased reliance on civilians or contractors on the quantity or quality of the training they are able to provide to their trainees.

Aviation Assets for National Guard

The committee is concerned about the force structure changes in the Department of Defense over the past several years, and in particular, its potential impact on the readiness levels of the national guard. Of particular concern is the potential impact from the drawdown of mobility assets that are used by the national guard to support its homeland defense mission and enable quick delivery of cargo and troops. The committee remains concerned that national guard units will have a hollow force structure and their immediate tactical requirements will continue to be unfilled without a coherent recapitalization plan. The lack of such a plan could leave a gap in the national guard's ability to meet its requirements to support U.S. Northern Command and to provide critical support during emergencies within the designated Federal Emergency Management Agency regions of the United States and its territories.

The committee notes that the recently released "Mobility Capabilities and Requirements Study 2016" recommends a tactical airlift force structure without consideration for the direct support mission needs of the Department of the Army and without express consideration of airlift force structure and basing requirements to meet the national guard's title 32, United States Code, responsibilities. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Air National Guard, to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the Department's tactical airlift force structure and requirements by November 1, 2010. The briefing should describe, at a minimum:

(1) The number and type of fixed-wing aircraft needed to meet the tactical airlift requirements of the Department of Defense, to include the direct support mission needs of the Army;

(2) The number and type of fixed-wing aircraft needed to fulfill the national guard's title 32 missions, as well as the additional missions assigned to it in the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review;

(3) A detailed cost analysis of using Army and Air Force mobility assets to provide direct support airlift to the Army and to meet the national guard's title 32 mission requirements; and

(4) Tactical Army and Air Force airlift force structure composition by numbers that best fulfills the requirements in (1) and (2) in the most cost-effective and efficient manner.

Completion of Annual Training Requirements for Army and Marine Corps

The committee recognizes that, as a result of the high pace of overseas contingency operations and demand for ready forces, the Army and Marine Corps have experienced decreased dwell time between deployments. The committee understands that both services have annual training requirements that all active component forces are required to complete in addition to pre-deployment training requirements that apply to all forces deploying to the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. However, in light of decreased dwell times, the committee is concerned that forces may not be completing the required annual training prior to going to the Combat Training Centers or other locations for pre-deployment

training and, therefore, are spending some of their time at the centers training on tasks that should have been completed at home station. Given the services' plans to expand training to prepare forces for a fuller spectrum of operations, the committee believes it will be even more critical for individuals and units to accomplish these annual training requirements.

In view of the Government Accountability Office's prior training evaluations, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Army's and the Marine Corps' ability to complete home station training requirements and to report the results of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This review should evaluate:

(1) The nature of annual training requirements that active component combat arms and combat support forces are required to complete at home station;

(2) The extent to which forces are completing established training requirements, to include the extent to which units are required to validate completion of the tasks and demonstrate proficiency at home station prior to training at a Combat Training Center or other locations; and

(3) Any factors affecting the ability of forces to complete training, such as the availability of personnel and equipment, and the impact, if any, on training at the Combat Training Centers or other locations, if home station training cannot be fully completed.

Criticality of Pre-Deployment Language Training

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense is updating its strategic plan to meet the needs for enhanced language skills, cultural awareness, and regional expertise. However, the committee is concerned about pre-deployment language training for general-purpose troops deploying to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in light of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) commander's objectives and requirements expressed in his four-point initiative to overcome the language challenges in Afghanistan.

The committee commends the Department and the military services for their endeavors to address this issue and to provide the appropriate proficiency level for deployable forces to Afghanistan. While supportive of these efforts, the committee is concerned with the lack of standardization of policies regarding the level of emphasis on unit-level language training during the pre-deployment training phase. While the committee understands the pressures and the challenges of available time for pre-deployment training, the committee encourages the military services to recognize that language skills should be considered a high priority and critical when planning for deployment.

The committee directs the Department and military services to review their language training priorities and program requirements concerning the language barrier and mission in Afghanistan. Upon completion of this review, the committee directs the Department to brief the House Armed Services Committee on the findings and conclusions no later than September 1, 2010.

F–35 Lightning II Aircraft and National Guard

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in conjunction with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to determine the requirement for concurrent and proportional fielding of F–35 Lightning II aircraft in the reserve component and report the findings to the congressional defense committees not later than January 1, 2011.

Language, Cultural Awareness, and Regional Expertise

Recent operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan have highlighted the need for today's military establishment to be trained and ready to engage the world with an appreciation of diverse cultures, and to communicate directly with local populations. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has recognized the need to place more emphasis on enhancing foreign language, regional expertise, and cultural awareness capabilities, and has undertaken numerous initiatives to do so. While there is general agreement that some level of foreign language skills, regional expertise, and cultural awareness is important for today's military, determining the optimal proficiency levels and how to distribute such capabilities throughout the general-purpose forces (meaning military personnel who are neither language professionals nor regional experts) is more difficult. Training general-purpose forces in language, regional expertise, and cultural awareness prior to deployment is largely the responsibility of the military services.

The Government Accountability Office has previously reported on actions needed to improve the effectiveness of the Department's language and regional proficiency transformation efforts. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the services' language, regional expertise, and cultural awareness training plans as they apply to the general purpose forces and report the results of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. Because of the continued presence of the Army and Marine Corps in Iraq and Afghanistan, where their missions typically require close contact with foreign populations, this review should focus on the ground forces. This review should include an assessment of the extent to which the Army and Marine Corps have:

(1) Defined training requirements for language proficiency, regional expertise, and cultural awareness;

(2) Integrated these areas into pre-deployment training and other joint exercises, and developed any metrics to evaluate success;

(3) Faced challenges, if any, in implementing these plans; and

(4) Incorporated lessons learned from ongoing operations into training programs.

Review of Army and Marine Corps Readiness Reporting

In recent years, the military services have directed several changes in the ways they report unit readiness. Specifically, the Army has updated its readiness reporting policy and has directed its units to provide additional information concerning its abilities

to perform directed or assigned missions as well as its core missions. The Army reports this information in its readiness reporting system that feeds information to the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS). Leveraging the Army's approach, the Marine Corps has recently developed its own system in order to collect and analyze readiness data to feed information to DRRS.

To better understand the extent to which these changes will help the military services capture data more accurately on the readiness of their respective forces, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review Army and Marine Corps readiness reporting processes and to report the results of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This review should:

(1) Assess any changes that the Army and Marine Corps have made to their approach to reporting readiness;

(2) Identify the steps that units have taken to implement the directed readiness reporting changes, including the extent to which units are consistently reporting their readiness;

(3) Determine the extent to which the Army and Marine Corps have aligned these changes with existing strategies for training and deploying forces, such as the Army's Force Generation cycle;

(4) Assess the impact of these changes on the content of readiness information available to decision-makers within the Department of Defense and Congress; and

(5) Assess the impact, if any, on development and fielding of DRRS.

Ship Maintenance Industrial Base Support

The committee is concerned that the Navy's recommendation to homeport a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier (CVN) at Naval Station Mayport (NAVSTA Mayport), Florida, could result in the relocation of a critical warfighting asset to a region that may lack the ship maintenance industrial base necessary to meet the specialized repair, maintenance, and related readiness requirements of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. Even though the Navy plans to build the necessary facilities at considerable cost, no plan has been presented to address the lack of a trained, highly skilled workforce necessary to staff those facilities and maintain these complex systems. As a result, the committee understands that implementation of the Navy's recommendation would require maintenance teams from other nuclear-powered aircraft carrier homeport locations to be sent to NAVSTA Mayport temporarily to support maintenance requirements, potentially at significant additional cost.

Additionally, the committee is aware that the existing private ship maintenance assets located in the Jacksonville, Florida, region has evolved to support the current fleet of non-nuclear-powered ships at NAVSTA Mayport. Under current ship retirement plans, these private ship maintenance capabilities will face severe work reductions, placing their continued existence in jeopardy. The committee does not believe that placing a critical warfighting asset at a location with inadequate maintenance support capabilities, implementing a recommendation that could result in significantly increased ship maintenance costs, or allowing the nation's ship maintenance industrial base to erode are acceptable outcomes.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 15, 2010, on the ability of the private ship maintenance industrial base in northeast Florida to support nuclear-powered aircraft carrier maintenance requirements, the likely costs to the Navy that could result from establishing such maintenance capabilities within the local industrial base, and the impacts on costs and workforce scheduling that could result if the Navy must provide the maintenance workforce from another nuclear-powered aircraft carrier homeport location. In addition, the Secretary is directed to submit a copy of the report to the Comptroller General of the United States concurrent with submission to the congressional defense committees.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide an assessment of the report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after receiving the report by the Secretary of the Navy. The assessment should:

(1) Review the Navy's report for thoroughness and completeness;

(2) Assess the ability of the northeast Florida industrial base to develop capabilities to support nuclear-powered aircraft carrier maintenance requirements;

(3) Assess how, over a 10-year budget window, the construction of CVN maintenance facilities at NAVSTA Mayport will affect CVN maintenance costs, including recurring and non-recurring costs; and

(4) Assess whether homeporting a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier at NAVSTA Mayport would provide sufficient workload to allow the local ship repair industrial base to remain viable in light of current ship retirement plans.

Ship Material Readiness

The committee notes that reduced manning on many Navy surface combatant ships has added risk to achieving expected service life, as stated in the Secretary of the Navy's February 1, 2010, report to Congress on Surface Ship Material Readiness. Based on preliminary work by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) the committee is aware that the Navy has reduced enlisted requirements, authorizations, and on-hand personnel levels for its cruisers and destroyers since 1991 but lacks a sound analytical basis for some of these reductions. GAO also noted that shipboard requirements, including force protection and anti-terrorism and ballistic missile defense missions, have grown since the Navy began reducing crew sizes. According to GAO, in-port and underway maintenance and preservation requirements have remained steady as crew sizes have declined. While some Navy officials have noted that automation can reduce underway watch-station requirements, GAO reported it can sometimes increase maintenance requirements.

The committee is also aware of a Department of the Navy Naval Inspector General report dated July 2, 2009, which states, "Relative to other warfare communities, interviews with surface commands continue to reveal significant distress in meeting material and operational readiness requirements." Among the factors cited as contributing to this situation were: a shortage of funding (to the

point that sailors are spending their own money to purchase required tools and supplies to meet operational and certification requirements); manning challenges; reduced training opportunities; deferred maintenance; and greater demands from the Inter-deployment Readiness Cycle.

The committee recognizes the stresses that the increased operational tempo of overseas contingency operations has placed on the Navy's surface combatant fleet and acknowledges that the Navy is taking steps in the fiscal year 2011 budget request to address some of the issues cited above, particularly in the areas of steaming days and deferred maintenance. However, the committee agrees with GAO that the Navy lacks the reliable data it needs to effectively evaluate the impact of the changes it has made to its manning requirements and training programs and how these changes have contributed to declining ship material readiness.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit with the fiscal year 2012 budget documents a report that describes the impact of changes in training and reductions in crew size has on the material readiness of its ships, including the ships' ability to perform required maintenance tasks and pass required inspections; any projected effects on the lifespan of individual ships; and any effects on overall reported readiness. The report should include a discussion of the methodology, including metrics, which the Navy used to make this assessment, and based on the results, any adjustments in training and manning that the Navy plans to make to address its findings. The report also should include steps the Navy has taken to establish a stringent tool-control program, through appropriate commands, for all surface combatant ships similar to the tool-control program that exists for aviation squadrons, and describe the funding required to implement such a program.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States, within 60 days of receipt of the fiscal year 2012 budget documents, to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on its assessment of the completeness of the report submitted by the Secretary of the Navy and describing the status of the actions taken by the Navy to establish the tool-control program. Further, the committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a follow-on report to the congressional defense committees that assesses the reasonableness of the Navy's methodology and conclusions and that assesses the impact of the tool-control program established for Navy surface combatant ships within 120 days of receipt of the fiscal year 2012 budget documents.

Simulation Training for F–35 Joint Strike Fighter

The committee is concerned that the requirements for the flight simulation devices under development for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter may not wholly represent the training needs of the participating military departments. The committee believes that any flight simulator developed for the F–35 program should fully comply with service requirements in order to preclude a costly retrofit if needed capabilities are not resident in initial design. The committee is aware of the growing reliance on distributed training networks, such as the Air Force's Distributed Mission Operations, and

believes that the F–35 Joint Program Office should consider the military departments' desires to operate F–35 flight simulators in a distributed network with other aircraft simulators. Utilizing the F–35 flight simulators in such a fashion would improve the combat skills training and overall readiness of the military forces to operate in an increasingly complex and integrated combat environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to re-examine and, if necessary, refine the requirements for F–35 flight simulation devices. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide written notification of compliance to the congressional defense committees, by December 1, 2010, detailing the agreed-upon requirements and include an explanation of any changes made to existing F–35 flight simulator device requirements, and the impact on training and readiness.

Surface Ship Life Cycle Management

The committee applauds the Navy for establishing the Surface Ship Life Cycle Management (SSLCM) Activity and for undertaking the Surface Ship Service Life Assessment Pilot Program. Both efforts are aimed at ensuring the Navy's surface combatant ships achieve their intended service life, which is a key underpinning of the Navy's 30-year shipbuilding plan. The committee notes that in the past, the surface ship class maintenance plans have not been as detailed, nor have they been maintained with the same technical rigor as those for aircraft carriers and submarines. The committee agrees with the Navy's assessment that the Planned Maintenance philosophy of the past decade, with limited time spent in depot availability periods coupled with multiple pier-side continuous maintenance availabilities, has added risk to the Navy's ability to obtain expected service life from the fleet. Through the pilot program's inputs into the SSLCM Activity, the committee understands the Navy will have an analytical basis on which to better focus maintenance and repair decisions and funding, and establish risk-based measures of criticality for deficiencies that may arise in the future.

Training for Global Ballistic Missile Defense

Each military service is responsible for missile defense training on the individual missile defense assets which the service owns and operates. For example, the Navy is responsible for Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense training and the Army for Theater High Altitude Area Defense training. However, missile defense operations are global and inherently joint. The effectiveness of the global ballistic missile defense system is dependent upon the synchronization of these individual assets across each military service, and the committee believes that missile defense training must be similarly synchronized.

The committee is concerned that current individual service training programs for missile defense do not fully reflect the global and joint nature of ballistic missile defense system operations. The committee further observes that no single entity has clear responsibility for joint missile defense training. The committee believes that

gaps in joint missile defense training, from the lowest sensor or shooter operator level to the highest levels of decision-making on combatant command (COCOM) staffs, must be identified and rectified.

The committee therefore directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011, that contains the following:

(1) A description of existing missile defense training and education, including training of COCOM staffs and service component staffs;

(2) An assessment of the synchronization and standardization across existing training programs, including best practices; and

(3) Recommendations for training improvements, including recommended roles and responsibilities, organizational models, resources, and facilities required for joint missile defense training.

OTHER MATTERS

Air Force Food Transformation Initiative

The committee is aware that the Air Force has undertaken an initiative to transform its food service operations, including dining facilities, flight kitchens, snack bars, and catering services. This will be conducted through a two-phased pilot program that will encompass 12 military bases, beginning with six bases in October 2010, and then six months later, incorporating the remaining six bases. The plan ultimately is to include all 78 Air Force bases in the initiative. The initiative will affect both appropriated funded facilities and non-appropriated funded (NAF) facilities.

The committee understands that while no civilian or military personnel employed at the appropriated funded facilities will be affected, NAF employees either could be reassigned to another position or have their employment terminated. Furthermore, prime contracts currently held by Ability One (a non-profit entity that provides employment opportunities for the blind and severely disabled) will be brought under the new initiative. The committee is concerned that this initiative is being converted from performance by government employees to contractor employees without a public-private competition being conducted. Furthermore, the committee believes that all NAF employees and Ability One employees should have the "right of first refusal" for any positions for which they would be eligible that are available under the initiative.

The committee recognizes that improving food service at Air Force bases is an important objective. However, the committee does not believe that the Air Force has provided an adequate rationale for its food transformation strategy, which is expected to result in an increase in food service fees to military personnel. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Air Force to restrict this initiative to the six initial bases and conduct a thorough review of how it is meeting objectives before any additional bases are brought under the initiative. The Secretary should provide a written notification of compliance to the congressional defense committees within 30 days after completion of the review. In addition, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to

undertake a comprehensive review of the initiative as implemented at the first six bases and report its findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees within six months after the award of the initial contract. The Comptroller General's review should address the following questions:

(1) How has the initiative achieved the Air Force objectives to improve food quality, increase the customer base, and expand hours at dining facilities?

(2) Is the concept of a single food service provider to serve appropriated funded dining facilities, non-appropriated funded facilities, and catering requirements a viable solution? Are there other models that could be considered?

(3) Since both appropriated funded facilities and non-appropriated funded facilities now will be managed by a single contractor, what impact will this have on the appropriated funded facilities (including funding for military construction and the purchase of food and supplies)? What impact will this have on NAF facilities and profits?

(4) How effective is the food service officer in managing the contract? What were the challenges in implementing the contract?

(5) Was there adequate competition for the contract?

(6) How were efficiencies achieved under the initiative, without impacting the appropriated funded facilities?

(7) What was the percentage increase in food service fees paid by military personnel as compared to food service expenses paid before the initiative took effect?

(8) What impact has the initiative had on civilian (including NAF employees) and military personnel, and employees of Ability One? How many Ability One and NAF employees were employed by the prime contractor? How were small businesses and their employees impacted?

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force not to move forward with expanding the pilot program to the additional six bases until 90 days after the Comptroller General has submitted the report to the congressional defense committees.

Army Post Laundry Facilities

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Army requested legislative authority in fiscal year 2011, to allow money received for work performed at Army-owned and Army-operated post laundries to cover the cost of operating and maintaining these laundry facilities. While the committee cannot provide the requested legislative relief due to mandatory spending limitations, the committee believes the Army should adequately fund the operating requirements of the post laundries and not rely on proceeds from the laundries to keep the operations solvent. The committee understands that in past years approximately $3.0 million in proceeds from the laundry operations were applied annually toward operations and maintenance of the four Army post facilities, and that absent the requested legislation, these funds will not be available to pay these costs. The committee expects the Army to cover this shortfall using some of the additional Base Operations Support (BOS) funding authorized in title 3 of this Act. Beginning in fiscal year 2012, the

committee expects the Army to budget in BOS for this requirement.

Army Reporting Requirements

As part of the annual national defense authorization acts, the committee tasks Army officials with new reporting requirements covering a wide range of issues. The committee understands that these reports require a significant amount of time and effort for the Department of the Army to produce. In addition, the committee understands that the need for some of the reports may wane over time as policies shift, and that some reports overlap, in terms of subject matter, with other established reporting requirements.

Therefore, in order to streamline communications between the Department of the Army and Congress, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, by September 1, 2010, to provide a list of existing reporting requirements that the Secretary believes Congress should repeal or modify in future national defense authorization acts.

Human Terrain System

The committee remains supportive of the Human Terrain System (HTS) developed and executed by the Army to leverage social science expertise to support operational commanders in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. However, the committee is increasingly concerned that in the rush to respond to operational requirements in two theaters of conflict while simultaneously optimizing and institutionalizing HTS capability, the Army has not sufficiently addressed key concerns of the social science community. The committee understands that it may not be possible to fully address all of their concerns, but if HTS continues to rely heavily on the participation of social scientists as part of the Human Terrain Teams, to have long-term viability among the research community, then those researchers must have a voice in the evolution of HTS capability.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to develop a broad range of opportunities to leverage social science expertise to support key missions for the Department, including irregular warfare, counterinsurgency, and stability and reconstruction operations. The committee also encourages the social science research community to actively engage the Department to help shape future cooperative activities in ways that are productive and mutually beneficial.

National Guard Support for Charitable Organizations

The committee is aware that section 508 of title 32, United States Code, provides authority for members and units of the national guard to provide certain services to youth and charitable organizations under certain conditions. The committee notes that the existing authority allows the Secretary of Defense to designate youth or charitable organizations as eligible to receive assistance. The committee believes that opportunities to engage with and observe national guard members conducting required training would be of particular benefit to organizations, such as Reach for Tomorrow, that are aimed at improving individual performance and

achieving academic and personal excellence of junior and senior high school students. The committee encourages the Secretary to exercise this authority when appropriate and consider such organizations for eligibility under this section.

Notification of Use of Authority To Expedite Background Investigations

Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1564 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to use expedited procedures for completing background investigations for the granting of security clearances for military personnel who have been retired or separated for a physical disability pursuant to chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code. As the committee notes, this will facilitate the transition from a military to a federal civilian career for these individuals. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report by letter to the congressional defense and intelligence committees, by February 1, 2011, and annually thereafter through 2015, the number of background investigations performed under this authority.

Operation and Support Costs for Non-Standard Items of Equipment

The committee is aware that operation and support (O&S) costs can constitute up to 70 percent of the lifecycle cost to the government for a weapon system. Because O&S costs are by far the largest percentage of cost in a system's lifespan from research and development to disposal, the committee is concerned that the military departments may not be planning sufficiently for the O&S costs that will be incurred when non-standard items, such as those fielded under rapid fielding initiatives or in response to Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statements, migrate to programs of record.

First among these are the Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicle and its smaller variant, the Military All-Terrain Vehicle. The committee understands that O&S costs for these vehicles alone are expected to average at least $2.0 billion per year. Other systems include equipment fielded for operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan such as jammers, radios, armor kits, Aerostats, mine rollers, unmanned aerial systems, MC–12 Project Liberty aircraft, and counter rocket, artillery, sniper, and mortar systems, among hundreds of others.

The committee recommends the Department of Defense and the military departments take action to ensure that these systems are in compliance with section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) which requires development of a comprehensive lifecycle management plan and product support strategy for each major weapon system.

Private Security Guards Functions To Be Performed by Civilian Employees

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is reducing its reliance on the use of private-sector security guards, pursuant to section 332 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). Additional restrictions on the use of private security guards were further enacted as amendments to

Section 332 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (109–364) and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee notes that nothing in the law requires the Department to use military personnel in these positions, especially during these times of increased operational tempo. The committee, therefore, directs the Department to review its guidance with regard to the conversion of the private sector security guard positions and include prioritization of the use of civilian employees to fill those positions. The committee further directs the Department to provide a written letter of compliance by October 1, 2010 to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee with details of that review.

Sale of Arsenal Products Outside the Department of Defense

The Department of Defense submitted a legislative proposal that would amend section 2563 of title 10, United States Code, to enable the arsenals to sell their products and services outside the Department of Defense. The Department noted in its comments accompanying the requested provision that, "Those facilities that have made effective use of section 2563 authority and built substantial partnerships have reduced the cost of products; obtained private sector investment in government facilities; and enhanced readiness by improving quality and timeliness of industrial facilities."

The committee notes that the partnerships fostered by section 2563, of title 10, United States Code, because they are related to the core capabilities of the arsenals and other industrial facilities and therefore enhance military readiness, are characteristic of those which the committee had desired to see developed through the Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI). The committee is open to reconsidering the Department's request to amend section 2563 of title 10, United States Code, after the Secretary of the Army provides the report required elsewhere in this Act regarding ASPI improvement.

Security Clearance Reform

The Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team (JSSRT) issued a report in February 2010, outlining its strategic framework for moving forward with reforming the security clearance process. JSSRT was formed to transform and modernize the security clearance process across the federal government, and includes personnel from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Office of Personnel Management. The intent of the transformation effort is to promote reciprocity, eliminate the continuing backlog for processing requests, and reduce unnecessary investigation requests. The framework outlined in the February 2010 JSSRT report highlights potential performance measures, a communications strategy, roles and responsibilities, and areas to develop metrics to measure the quality of security clearance investigations and adjudications.

The committee notes that significant progress has been made on a number of initiatives as a result of increased resources, improvements in policy, and changes to antiquated information technology

systems. However, the committee is concerned that security clearance processing remains on the high-risk list of the Government Accountability Office. While the committee further notes that JSSRT's February 2010 strategic framework highlights significant progress on behalf of the executive branch to approve initial requests for personnel security clearances in a timely manner, the committee continues to believe that it will be imperative for the executive branch to demonstrate the ability to sustain that progress, and also incorporate quality into every step of the process through measures that can be readily defined and quantified.

Supply Chain Management

The committee is aware improvements to supply chain management within the Department of Defense (DOD) have been slower than desired. The Government Accountability Office has placed the Department's supply chain management on its high risk list because of long standing problems, due in part to the lack of a complete and accurate inventory of all the Department's assets. Having an accurate inventory not only improves supply chain management, but provides benefits to the warfighter, enhances mission planning and budgeting, and improves the financial auditing within the Department. The committee notes that one tool that could facilitate improvements in the Department's supply chain management is the enhanced use of item unique identifiers. The committee, therefore, believes that full implementation of the Department's Item Unique Identification (IUID) policy, issued in 2008, would help the Department correct some of its supply chain management problems.

The committee further notes that the Department has been successful in implementing its IUID policy with regard to new systems, but has been less successful within the logistics community in marking legacy property with IUID tags. The committee recognizes that the costs of retrofitting existing equipment inventories with IUID tags could be substantial, and that the Department is developing a business case that would support the need for future investments to be made in this area. The committee encourages the Deputy Chief Management Officer to review this business case to determine how IUID policy factors into the Department's strategy for improved supply chain management and improved financial accountability of its assets.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $167.6 billion in operation and maintenance funding for the military departments and defense-wide activities.

SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 311—Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minnesota

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than $5,611,671 in fiscal year 2011 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund. This transfer is to satisfy reimbursement to the Environmental Protection Agency for costs incurred by the Agency at the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant.

Section 312—Payment to Environmental Protection Agency of Stipulated Penalties in Connection With Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than $153,000 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund established under subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. This transfer is to satisfy a stipulated penalty against Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, for failure of the Navy to sample certain monitoring wells in a timely manner.

Section 313—Testing and Certification Plan for Operational Use of an Aviation Biofuel Derived From Materials That Do Not Compete With Food Stocks

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a testing and certification plan for operational use of a biofuel that is derived from materials that do not compete with food stocks.

Section 314—Report Identifying Hybrid or Electric Propulsion Systems and Other Fuel-Saving Technologies for Incorporation into Tactical Motor Vehicles

This section would require the secretary of each military department to submit to Congress a report identifying hybrid or electric propulsion systems and other vehicle technologies that reduce consumption of fossil fuels and are suitable for incorporation into the current fleet of tactical motor vehicles of each armed force under the jurisdiction of the secretary.

SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

Section 321—Technical Amendments to Requirement for Service Contract Inventory

This section would amend paragraph (c) of section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, to make technical corrections to the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual inventory of services performed by contractors. This section would clarify that the responsibility for the development of the inventory should reside with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, who would be supported by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The committee believes that the inventory has much broader applicability than just as an acquisi-

tion tracking tool; the inventory can facilitate the Department of Defense's human capital planning and its efforts to determine the right mix of military personnel, civilian employees, and contractors. It also is a valuable tool for budgeting purposes.

This section also would clarify that information on full time equivalents derived from actual direct labor hours and not estimates should be used in the development of the Department's inventories.

Section 322—Repeal of Conditions on Expansion of Functions Performed Under Prime Vendor Contracts for Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair

This section would repeal section 346 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) as amended by section 336 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

The committee notes that section 346 of Public Law 105–261 and section 336 of Public Law 106–65 were intended to give Congress additional oversight on the then-emerging concept of prime vendor support (PVS) strategies for depot-level maintenance and repair. Congress' intention was for the provisions to apply only to PVS for depot-level maintenance and repair. The committee understands, however, that the provisions, as written, have recently been interpreted as applying to any prime-vendor contract, including medical, electronic commerce, and industrial prime-vendor contracts, as well as to performance-based logistics contracts. Because these concepts are now established contracting mechanisms within the Department of Defense, the committee understands the reporting requirements of section 346 of Public Law 105–261 have created an undue burden on the Department of the Defense and the military departments.

Section 323—Pilot Program on Best Value for Contracts for Private Security Functions

This section would create a three-year pilot program within the Department of Defense to implement a "best value" procurement standard for private security contracts in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section also would require the contracting officer to provide a written justification for each "best value" contract awarded under this pilot program. Contracts awarded under this pilot program would continue until the end of their performance period, irrespective of whether the pilot program has been terminated. The Secretary of Defense would have the discretion to continue with a best-value program for private security contracts following termination of the best-value pilot program at the end of fiscal year 2013. The committee recognizes that such authority already exists in the Federal Acquisition Regulations but is rarely used; this section would facilitate the authorities for best-value contracts in these circumstances. Furthermore, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, by January 15 of each year until 2013, to the congressional defense committees identifying the contracts awarded under this pilot program and the considerations, other than cost, in the award of such contracts. The committee notes that nothing in this section

is intended to affect contracts for private security functions that are awarded through the Department of State.

Section 324—Standards and Certification for Private Security Contractors

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to issue policy guidance requiring the establishment of a third-party certification process for specified operational and business practice standards to which private security contractors must adhere as a condition for selection for defense contracts for the performance of private security functions. In addition, all private security contractor employees who are required to carry weapons in the performance of their duties under a defense contract would be required to obtain basic weapons training certification from a reputable certifying body as a requirement of that contract. This section would not apply to intelligence activities.

Section 325—Prohibition on Establishing Goals or Quotas for Conversion of Functions to Performance by Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from establishing numerical goals or quotas for the conversion of Department of Defense functions to performance by civilian employees unless such goals or quotas are based on the requirements outlined in section 235, section 2330a, or section 2463 of title 10, United States Code. The section also would require that the Secretary use the Department's costing methodology guidance (Directive-type Memorandum 09–007, Estimating and Comparing Full Costs of Civilian and Military Manpower and Contractor support) or successor guidance in making such conversion decisions. The secretaries of the military departments may issue supplemental guidance to assist in decisions affecting their department. The Secretary of Defense would be required to provide to the congressional defense committees, by December 31, 2010, a report on the decisions to convert positions to civilian employee performance during fiscal year 2010. The Comptroller General would be required to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees of the Secretary's report 120 days after the Secretary's report is submitted.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Section 331—Revision to Reporting Requirement Relating to Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums

This section would modify section 489 of title 10, United States Code, and require a biennial report on the condition of military museums rather than the current requirement to submit annual reports. Furthermore, this section would delete the requirement to submit the organizational structure of the reported museums.

Section 332—Additional Reporting Requirements Relating to Corrosion Prevention Projects and Activities

This section would amend section 2228(e) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 371 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to

add a requirement that the annual report submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense on the funding provided for corrosion mitigation and control include the annual corrosion reports submitted by the military departments to the Office of the Secretary of Defense in compliance with section 903(b)(5) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The reports submitted by the military departments would be part of the review by the Comptroller General of the United States required in section 371(e)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). This section would also amend section 2228(e)(C) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the report submitted by the Secretary include the funding requirement and funding provided for the previous fiscal year.

Section 333—Modification and Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements

This section would amend section 323 and repeal section 349 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to eliminate out-of-date reporting requirements. This section would also repeal section 355 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to eliminate a redundant ground forces readiness reporting requirement.

Section 334—Report on Air Sovereignty Alert Mission

This section would require the Commander of United States Northern Command, in consultation with the Director of the National Guard Bureau, to report by March 1, 2011, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the Air Sovereignty Alert mission and Operation Noble Eagle. The report shall include the status of implementation of the recommendations made in the Government Accountability Office report entitled "Actions Need to Improve Management of Air Sovereignty Alert Operations to Protect U.S. Airspace."

Section 335—Report on the SEAD/DEAD Mission Requirements for the Air Force

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the feasibility and desirability of designating the Suppression of Enemy Air Defenses/Destruction of Enemy Air Defenses mission as a responsibility of the Air National Guard. In preparing the report, the Secretary shall consult with the Director of the National Guard Bureau, who shall be authorized to provide independent comment and analysis on the report.

SUBTITLE E—LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY

Section 341—Permanent Authority to Accept and Use Landing Fees Charged for Use of Domestic Military Airfields by Civil Aircraft

This section would add section 2697 of title 10, United States Code, and authorize the secretary of a military department to impose landing fees for use by civil aircraft at domestic military airfields for the purpose of funding operation and maintenance of such airfields.

Section 342—Improvement and Extension of Arsenal Support Program Initiative

This section would amend section 341 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to: repeal two functions of the Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI), to disestablish the ASPI-related loan guarantees which the committee understands have never been utilized, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to extend ASPI through fiscal year 2012, to require the Secretary to prioritize the remaining nine functions of the ASPI, and to require the Secretary to submit a report to Congress on the ASPI priorities prior to the extension of authority taking effect.

The committee remains concerned that the arsenals have had limited success in attracting ASPI tenants that enhance their core manufacturing mission and related workforce skills, as reported by the Government Accountability Office in November 2009 (GAO–10–167R). Instead, in the committee's view, ASPI has become an expensive means of managing arsenal overhead. According to the Congressional Budget Office, Congress has directed some $89.4 million to ASPI through September 2009, with a return on capital, defined as savings divided by invested capital, of less than 2 percent.

Accordingly, this section would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to Congress within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act that would address the three recommendations included in GAO–10–167R, namely:

(1) Distinguish the Army's highest priorities from among the ASPI purposes as part of an overall strategy to achieve its desired results;

(2) Establish performance goals for the ASPI program; and

(3) Establish outcome-focused performance measures to assess the program the Army has made toward addressing the purpose of ASPI.

Section 343—Extension of Authority To Reimburse Expenses for Certain Navy Mess Operations

This section would amend section 1014 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) by extending until September 30, 2012, the authority of the Navy to purchase meals on behalf of embarked members of non-governmental organizations, host and partner nations, joint services, and U.S. Government agencies and foreign national pa-

tients treated on Navy ships and their escorts during the Navy's execution of humanitarian and civic assistance missions.

Section 344—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Army Human Terrain System

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from obligating more than 50 percent of the remaining funds for the Army Human Terrain System (HTS) until several documents are submitted to the congressional defense committees. These documents include: the independent assessment of HTS called for by the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010; a validation of all HTS requirements, including any prior joint urgent operational needs statements; and certification that policies, procedures, and guidance are in place to protect the integrity of social science researchers participating in HTS, including ethical guidelines and human studies research procedures.

Section 345—Limitation on Obligation of Funds Pending Submission of Classified Justification Material

This section would limit the obligation of operation and maintenance funds for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, in budget activity 4, to not more than 90 percent until 15 days after the information cited in the classified annex accompanying this Act relating to the provision of classified justification material to Congress is provided to the congressional defense committees.

Section 346—Limitation on Retirement of C–130 Aircraft From Air Force Inventory

This section would prohibit retirement of any C–130 aircraft from the Air Force inventory until the Director of the Air National Guard, the Commander of Air Force Reserve Command, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force submit a written agreement to the Congressional defense committees describing the terms of the temporary transfer of C–130 aircraft from the reserve component to the active component.

Section 347—Commercial Sale of Small Arms Ammunition in Excess of Military Requirements

This section would require the Department of Defense to make available for commercial sale small arms ammunition and ammunition components. The section also would require the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance implementing this section within 90 days after date of enactment of this act. The Secretary shall submit a letter of compliance to the congressional defense committees within 15 days of issuing the guidance.

Section 348—Limitation on Air Force Fiscal Year 2011 Force Structure Announcement Implementation

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2011 funds for the purpose of implementing the Air Force fiscal year 2011 Force Structure Announcement until 45 days after the Secretary of the Air Force provides the Senate Committee on

Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a detailed report on the follow-on missions for bases affected by the 2010 Combat Air Forces restructure and certifies that the Air Sovereignty Alert mission will be fully resourced with required funding,personnel, and aircraft.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 351—Expedited Processing of Background Investigations for Certain Individuals

This section would amend section 1564, title 10, United States Code, which provides for the use of expedited procedures for completing background investigations for the granting of security clearances in certain circumstances. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use this authority to assist the transition to a civilian career for military personnel who have been retired or separated for a physical disability pursuant to chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code. The committee notes that there is a strong demand by government agencies for individuals with high-level security clearances which few military personnel possess. Expediting security clearance processing would facilitate the hiring of individuals who have had their military careers cut short due to a physical disability. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, in prescribing the procedures to implement this authority, to determine whether spouses of these particular individuals also should be covered.

Section 352—Adoption of Military Working Dogs by Family Members of Deceased or Seriously Wounded Members of the Armed Forces Who Were Handlers of the Dogs

This section would amend section 2583(c) of title 10, United States Code, to allow an immediate family member of a military dog handler who was either killed in action, died of wounds received in action, or who received a medical discharge, to adopt the handler's military working dog.

Section 353—Revision to Authorities Relating to Transportation of Civilian Passengers and Commercial Cargoes by Department of Defense When Space Unavailable on Commercial Lines

This section would amend section 2649 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transport civilian passengers and commercial cargoes on vessels operated by the Department of Defense, when such transportation is not commercially available. This section would expand the means by which transportation may be provided to include vehicles and aircraft operated by the Department. In addition, when such transportation is provided in response to an emergency, disaster response, or humanitarian request, this section would credit any amounts received in reimbursement to the appropriation, fund, or account incurring the expense of providing the transportation. Furthermore, for a five-year period, this section would allow the transportation of allied personnel for purposes of responding to contingencies or disasters. This section also would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report on the use of this authority to the Senate

Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. To ensure uniformity in interpretation, section 2648 of title 10, United States Code, would be amended to clarify that transportation on vessels under that statute also would include vehicles and aircraft operated by the Department of Defense.

Section 354—Technical Correction to Obsolete Reference Relating to Use of Flexible Hiring Authority To Facilitate Performance of Certain Department of Defense Functions by Civilian Employees

This section would make a technical correction to section 2463 of title 10, United States Code, by striking an obsolete reference to the Department of Defense National Security Personnel System.

Section 355—Inventory and Study of Budget Modeling and Simulation Tools

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to perform an inventory of modeling and simulation tools used by the Department of Defense to develop and analyze the annual budget submission and to support decision making inside the budget process. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to contract with a federally funded research and development center to examine the requirements for, and capabilities of, modeling and simulation tools used by the Department of Defense to support the annual budget process. This study would leverage the inventory performed by the Comptroller General as the starting point for an examination of the efficacy and sufficiency of modeling and simulation tools used by the Department in support of the budget process.

Section 356—Sense of Congress Regarding Continued Importance of High-Altitude Aviation Training Site, Colorado

This section would express the sense of Congress that the High-Altitude Aviation Training Site in Gypsum, Colorado, is a critical element of Department of Defense aviation training activities, and that the Department of Defense should take all appropriate measures to prevent encroachment on the training site that would negatively impact training activities.

Section 357—Department of Defense Study on Simulated Tactical Flight Training in a Sustained G Environment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the effectiveness of simulated tactical training in a sustained g environment. The committee notes that the section is intended to evaluate the potential military applications of centrifuge motion platform simulators, which would enable pilots to experience g-forces associated with flight in an advanced flight simulator. Upon completion of the study, the Secretary would submit the results to the congressional defense committees.

Section 358—Study of Effects of New Construction of Obstructions on Military Installations and Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to assess military installations and operations and determine areas that are

vital to the national defense and training missions. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to designate a single organization to coordinate hazard determinations with the Secretary of Transportation.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for proposing to increase the authorized end strength of the active duty Army to 569,400 in the fiscal year 2011 budget request. The committee believes this effort will continue to assist the Army with managing of the force, increasing readiness and dwell time for soldiers. The committee also recognizes the Secretary's efforts to support an increase in the Air Force end strength in order to support its growth in Nuclear Enterprise, Irregular Warfare/Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance, aircraft maintenance, acquisition, cyber warfare and medical fields, as well as the Navy's additional manpower requirements for 4,400 personnel to fill individual augmentees assigned to overseas contingency operations to execute non-traditional Navy missions, such as provisional reconstruction teams, detainee operations, civil affairs training, counter IED and combat support functions. However, the committee remains concerned that these increases may not be sufficient to meet both the increased operational tempo and the increasing support requirements that are being generated by a nation that has been at war for over eight years.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for active duty personnel of the armed forces as of September 30, 2011:

Service	FY 2010	FY 2011		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2011 Request	FY 2010 Authorized
Army	562,400	569,400	569,400	0	7,000
Navy	328,800	328,700	328,700	0	−100
USMC	202,100	202,100	202,100	0	0
Air Force	331,700	332,200	332,200	0	500
DOD	1,425,000	1,432,400	1,432,400	0	7,400

Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum active duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2011. The committee recommends 547,400 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Army, 324,300 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Navy, 202,100 as the

minimum active duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 332,200 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Air Force.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Selected Reserve personnel, including the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves, as of September 30, 2011:

Service	FY 2010	FY 2011		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2011 Request	FY 2010 Authorized
Army National Guard	358,200	358,200	358,200	0	0
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	65,500	65,500	65,500	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	106,700	106,700	106,700	0	0
Air Force Reserve	69,500	71,200	71,200	0	1,700
DOD Total	844,500	846,200	846,200	0	1,700
Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 2011:

Service	FY 2010	FY 2011		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2011 Request	FY 2010 Authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	32,060	32,060	0	0
Army Reserve	16,261	16,261	16,261	0	0
Naval Reserve	10,818	10,688	10,688	0	−130
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,555	14,584	14,584	0	29
Air Force Reserve	2,896	2,992	2,992	0	96
DOD Total	78,851	78,846	78,846	0	−5

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2011:

Service	FY 2010	FY 2011		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2011 Request	FY 2010 Authorized
Army National Guard	27,210	27,210	27,210	0	0
Army Reserve	8,395	8,395	8,395	0	0
Air National Guard	22,313	22,394	22,394	0	81
Air Force Reserve	10,417	10,720	10,720	0	303
DOD Total	68,335	68,719	68,719	0	384

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2011 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2011:

Service	FY 2010	FY 2011		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2011 Request	FY 2010 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	2,520	2,520	0	920
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	3,555	3,555	0	920

This section would establish limits for fiscal year 2011 on the number of non-dual status technicians authorized for the Army and Air Force Reserve Components. The Department of Defense request for fiscal year 2011 included an increase in the statutory limit on non-dual status technicians for the Army National Guard from 1,600 to 2,520, a more than 55 percent increase. Further discussions with the Department informed the committee that the national guard believes the size of the Army's required non-dual status technician force should be 5,000, a more than 300 percent increase over the current statutory limit. The rationale provided for such an increase was that more non-dual status technicians, who do not deploy, are needed at state headquarters in order to backfill dual-status technicians who frequently deploy, disrupting support to national guard units. The committee understands that some growth will be required in the number of non-dual status technicians in order for the Army and Air Force reserve components to sustain effective performance as an operational reserve.

To better define the overall requirements, the National Defense Authorization Act for 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days of enactment, that included an assessment on the requirements of the national guard for non-dual status technicians. The committee has yet to receive the report. Furthermore, the Department provided data to the committee indicating that the use of temporary wartime authority to waive all end strength limitations, as well as temporary hiring authority, had allowed the number of national guard non-dual status technicians in fiscal year 2010 to increase by nearly 2,200. Given the wartime authorities, as well as permanent temporary hiring authorities provided elsewhere in this Act, the committee would have preferred to receive and assess the required report from the Secretary of Defense before establishing a new statutory limit for national guard non-dual status technicians, but did not want to hinder the ability of states to meet continuing wartime requirements. The committee will continue to evaluate those requirements following receipt of the required report from the Secretary of Defense.

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of reserve component personnel who may be on active duty or full-time national guard duty during fiscal year 2011 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by sections 401 or 412.

Service	FY 2010	FY 2011		Change from	
	Authorized	Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2011 Request	FY 2010 Authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Naval Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $138,540,700,000 to be appropriated for military personnel. This authorization of appropriations reflects both reductions and increases to the budget request for military personnel that are itemized below:

Title IV - Military Personnel

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
MILITARY PERSONNEL	**138,540,700**	**0**	**138,540,700**
Aid and Attendance Care Assistant Payment (sec. 605)		[1,000]	
Aviation Continuation Pay for Interservice Transfers (sec. 617)		[1,000]	
Elimination of the Age Requirement for Health Care Benefits for Reservists (sec. 643)		[15,000]	
Enhanced Military Pay Raise (sec. 601)		[380,000]	
Family Separation Allowance Increase (sec. 604)		[78,000]	
Heroes and Healthy Families - Mental Health Support for Active Duty Military Personnel		[1,500]	
Hostile Fire/Imminent Danger Pay Increase (sec. 618)		[3,000]	
Officer Uniform Allowance Increase (sec. 603)		[4,000]	
Personalized Career Development Counseling for Military Spouses (sec. 583)		[1,000]	
Pilot Program--Alternative Career Track for Officers (sec. 661)		[2,000]	
Retention of Enlistment, Reenlistment, and Student Loan Benefits Received by Military Technicians (sec. 672)		[15,000]	
Unobligated Balances		[-501,500]	

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee continues its efforts to provide flexibility to the Department of Defense to manage the total force using authorities that protect critical skills and enhance the quality of the force. For example, the committee has included a series of provisions that would provide new benefits and rights to reserve military civilian technicians.

The committee also recognizes the selfless sacrifices that our military men and women and their families are making on behalf of the nation and has recommended the inclusion of provisions that would improve the overall well being and readiness of the force. For example, the committee has included provisions that would improve the management of warrant officers, enhance the responsiveness of the boards authorized to correct military records, and promote programs that assist military families. Additionally, the committee includes a provision that would modify the authority to conduct the Military Spouse Career Advancement Accounts (MyCAA) to include a pilot program for comprehensive career development counseling for military spouses.The committee again recommends additional funding to help local educational agencies that are providing support to military children by including $65.0 million for local educational agencies that are heavily impacted by the attendance of military dependents, and continued funding for family assistance centers across the nation to support reserve families. The committee also encourages the recognition of the contributions of military spouses and children of members who are serving or have served in combat by including a provision that would authorize a lapel button to be worn by these family members.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Army Freedom Team Salute Program

The committee is concerned about the Army's decision to terminate the Freedom Team Salute program. Since its beginnings in 2005, Freedom Team Salute has recognized and honored the services of more than 2.3 million parents, spouses, employers, supporters, and Army veterans. Freedom Team Salute commemorates the service of our veterans and loved ones through an inexpensive commendation package that includes an official Army Lapel Pin, an Army decal, a certificate of appreciation and letter of thanks signed by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff, Army.

The committee understands that there is no other program that supports veterans in the same way as the Freedom Team Salute program, which the committee believes is a valuable and enriching effort in support of Army veterans. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review funding options for reinstating the Freedom Team Salute program and to report the findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by May 1, 2011. The committee recommends that if the program is reinstated, the Army monitor the cost and efficiency of the program to ensure

that it is funded in a responsible manner and that it achieves its intended results in a cost effective manner.

Award of Prisoner-of-War Medal to Service Members Held at Wauwilermoos, Switzerland

Section 1128 of title 10, United States Code, requires the secretary concerned to issue a prisoner-of-war medal to any service member taken prisoner and held captive under four broad conditions, including by foreign armed forces that are hostile to the United States, under comparable circumstances to those under which persons have generally been held captive by enemy armed forces.

The committee understands that during World War II, airmen forced to make emergency landings in the neutral Swiss Confederation were interned under generous circumstances, some in hotels, and given strict instructions not to attempt to escape so that Switzerland could maintain its neutrality. Some service members who attempted to escape were transferred to Wauwilermoos, a facility in which, as documentation has indicated, internees were held under extremely inhumane conditions. The committee also understands that two service members have been awarded the prisoner-of-war medal for their internment at Wauwilermoos.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the rationale for awarding the prisoner-of-war medal to some Wauwilermoos internees and not to others, and to provide a written summary of the review and its conclusions to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2011.

The committee directs the Secretary to award the prisoner-of-war medal to those Wauwilermoos internees, who upon review, the Secretary determines to be entitled to the award.

Committee's Concerns With the DOD Report on Child Custody and Database To Track the Number of Cases Involving Child Custody Disputes of Members of the Armed Forces

The committee received from the Department of Defense a report to Congress on child custody litigation involving service members of the armed forces required by section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–288). The report was to include an evaluation "on all known reported cases since September 2003 involving child custody disputes in which the service of a member of the Armed Forces was an issue in the custody dispute" as well as address a number of issues; to include a statement of the total number of cases in which members of the Armed Forces have lost custody of a child as a result of deployment, and the litigation history of all available reported cases involving child custody disputes. The committee is concerned the Department limited the scope of the report to cases where military service was the sole factor in determining custody instead of cases where it was an issue in the custody dispute.

The committee is aware that during a hearing held by the House Veteran's Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity in February 2010, the Department of Defense (DOD) witness testified that the department had to "resort to anecdotal data" in the course of preparing the report mandated by the National Defense Author-

ization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. The report discusses the challenges faced with gathering data through available case law research tools and the limited information to conduct detailed research required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. From this, the committee concludes that there is not sufficient data available to ascertain the full scope of how many members of the Armed Forces experience the loss of child custody as a result of their service. Although the committee is encouraged with the Department's efforts to encourage states to change their laws to better support service members and its efforts to better educate service members who may have potential child custody issues; the committee continues to support the need for Congressional legislation to provide maximum protection for our service members and their children, who, while deployed, remain at risk of having that deployment used against them to determine or change child custody arrangements.

The committee also remains concerned about the absence of a database on which to assess the impact of deployments on child custody arrangements and the adequacy of family care plans; but is encouraged by the data call the department has begun to better assess the scope of the issue. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop and maintain a database to track the number of cases involving child custody disputes of a member of the Armed Forces, and directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the outcome of the data call referenced in the report to congress on Child Custody Litigation involving service members of the Armed Forces, to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House.

Fit, But Unsuitable Separations

The committee is concerned that it is still possible that a service member could be found fit for continued service by a Physical Evaluation Board, but subsequently be deemed unsuitable for continued service due to the same medical condition that prompted the medical evaluation. The committee views this action as fundamentally unfair and inconsistent with the disability evaluation system reforms that have been enacted in recent years. The committee is aware that the military departments are considering changes to this practice, but there is no evidence that a decision has been made to implement a standardized policy within the Department of Defense.

Accordingly, the committee directs Secretary of Defense to examine the use of and justification for the "fit, but unsuitable" separation process within the military departments and to report the findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by May 1, 2011.

Military Leave for Training

The committee is concerned that the number of military leave days afforded to reserve component members under section 6323(a)(1) of Title 5 United States Code may not be sufficient to accomplish the required training as the reserve component transitions to an operational reserve. Current law authorizes 15 days per

fiscal year for active duty, inactive-duty training, funeral honors or engaging in field training. This was sufficient under the former paradigm of training on one weekend a month and two weeks during the summer. Reserve component members now are required to conduct more training to increase readiness for deployment. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Defense to review the impact and feasibility of increasing the number of military leave days authorized under section 6323(a)(1) of Title 5 United States Code and report on the outcome of the review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2011.

Report on Medal of Honor Award Process

The committee remains concerned with the minimal amount of Medal of Honors awarded for acts of gallantry during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, especially the lack of living recipients. The committee believes it is important to have living Medal of Honor recipients from current conflicts to inspire our nation, while honoring those men and women who have dedicated themselves to the defense of our country. The committee notes that the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 directed the Secretary of Defense to review the current trends in awarding the Medal of Honor to identify whether there is an inadvertent subjective bias amongst commanders that has contributed to the low numbers of awards of the Medal of Honor. In addition, the Secretary of Defense was directed to survey military leaders, both officers and noncommissioned officers, to the lowest level of command to determine if there is a trend of downgrading awards taking place for medals related to acts of valor and gallantry. The committee notes that the Department of Defense informed the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by letter that the report would not arrive by the March 31, 2010, deadline. The committee acknowledges that the Department indicated that the report will be submitted by July 31, 2010, and encourages the Secretary of Defense to complete its review and report its findings on the Medal of Honor as expeditiously as possible.

Retention of Military Technicians Who Lose Dual Status in the Selected Reserve Due to Combat-Related Disability

The committee commends the National Guard Bureau for its implementation of section 511 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which provides the authority enabling military technicians (dual status) to continue to be employed as technicians when the loss of their military membership in the Selected Reserve is the result of a combat-related disability. However, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not issued guidance to ensure the reserve component is implementing the statute uniformly. The committee urges the Department to issue instructions to the reserve components.

Review of Hispanic American Service Cross Recipients From World War I

The committee notes that section 552 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), required the Secretary of each military department to review, among others, the service records of each Hispanic American war veteran who was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, or the Air Force Cross before the date of the enactment of that Act, to determine whether that veteran should be awarded the Medal of Honor. The committee understands that the review occurred for Hispanic American service cross recipients from World War II and later periods based on the conference report (H. Rept. 107–333) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

The committee believes that the statutory authority to conduct a review for Hispanic American service cross recipients to those from World War I exists in the underlying law, and directs the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to expand their reviews of Hispanic American service cross recipients to those awarded from January 2, 1918, to December 6, 1941. The committee directs the secretaries to provide written notification of compliance to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Review of the House Committee on Armed Services Report on Professional Military Education

The committee desires the views of the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff', and the uniformed chiefs of the military services on the April 2010 Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation's unanimous and bipartisan report "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel."

This report examined officer in-residence professional military education (PME) as a critical investment in the most important element of our military, people. The report concluded that the United States cannot afford to be complacent when it comes to producing leaders capable of meeting significant challenges, whether at the tactical, operational, or strategic levels of warfare, and that as a matter of national security, the country's continuing investment in the PME system must be wisely made. The report further found that today's PME system is basically sound; there are areas, however, that need improvement.

The committee intends to work with the Department of Defense and the military services on PME on a continuing basis. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the uniformed chiefs of the military services to review the House Committee on Armed Services' report on professional military education and provide their individual views on the report's findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2010.

Transferability of Individualized Education Programs

The committee notes that military families face frequent moves when the parent in the uniformed services is assigned to a new duty location. These frequent moves create additional challenges for children with special needs to receive the care they need. The committee encourages local educational agencies to recognize and, to the extent practicable, adhere to the individualized education program that was previously developed for these children.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

Section 501—Age for Health Care Professional Appointments and Mandatory Retirements

This section would authorize medical providers being considered for regular appointments to be exempted from the requirement that they be commissioned prior to age 42 so that they may be retired with 20 years of service by age 62. This section would also expand the category of officers below the grade of brigadier general, or rear admiral (lower half) in the Navy, who are exempt from the requirement to retire upon reaching age 62 to include not only physicians, dentists and nurses, but also other medical providers if they are providing health care, performing clinical duties, or performing health care-related administrative duties.

Section 502—Authority for Appointment of Warrant Officers in the Grade of W–1 by Commission and Standardization of Warrant Officer Appointing Authority

This section would clarify that appointments in the regular grade of W–1, the secretary of a military department may provide by regulation that appointments be made by commission and that the President shall make such appointments within the military departments. This section would also specify that appointments in permanent reserve warrant officer grades would be made in the same manner as prescribed for regular warrant officer grades.

Section 503—Nondisclosure of Information From Discussions, Deliberations, Notes, and Records of Special Selection Boards

This section would clarify that proceedings of special selection boards convened by the secretary of the military department concerned to consider the promotion of active-duty list or reserve active-status list officers may not be disclosed to any person not a member of the board, except as authorized or required to process the report of the board.

Section 504—Administrative Removal of Officers From List of Officers Recommended for Promotion

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to administratively remove an officer from a promotion list if the officer is discharged or dropped from the rolls, transferred to retired status, or found to have been erroneously included in a zone of consideration. This section would apply the same standards to officers serving on

the active-duty list and reserve officers serving on the active-status list.

Section 505—Eligibility of Officers To Serve on Boards of Inquiry for Separation of Regular Officers for Substandard Performance and Other Reasons

This section would amend sections 1187 (active duty) and 14906 (reserves) of title 10, United States Code, to expand the pool of officers eligible to serve on officer discharge boards. This section would require all board members to be senior in rank or grade to the officer being considered for separation who is referred to as the respondent. For respondents below the grade of major or lieutenant commander, the board president would have to be in or above the grade of major or lieutenant commander. For respondents in or above the grade of major or lieutenant commander, the board president would have to be above the grade of lieutenant colonel or commander. Current law requires that all board members, regardless of the respondent's grade, must be in a grade above major or lieutenant commander, with the board president being above the grade of lieutenant colonel or commander.

Section 506—Temporary Authority To Reduce Minimum Length of Active Service as a Commissioned Officer Required for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer

This section would amend sections 3911(b), 6323(a)(2), and 8911(b) of title 10, United States Code, to provide the secretaries of the military departments renewed authority to approve the voluntary retirement at 20 years of service for officers with 8 years commissioned service instead of 10 years, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2013.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Reserve Components

This section would amend section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, to require individual preseparation counseling already available for service members whose discharge from active duty is anticipated as of a specific date be made available to members of the reserve component.

Section 512—Military Correction Board Remedies for National Guard Members

This section would clarify the policy for members serving in a reserve component under the jurisdiction of the secretary concerned, to include members of the national guard, fall within the jurisdiction of the board operated by the secretary to correct military records and should benefit from the decision of the board.

Section 513—Removal of Statutory Distribution Limits on Navy Reserve Flag Officer Allocation

This section would amend section 12004 of title 10, United States Code, by removing the statutory distribution limits for Navy Re-

serve flag officers and would allow for flexible management as currently afforded to the other military services.

Section 514—Assignment of Air Force Reserve Military Technicians (Dual Status) to Positions Outside Air Force Reserve Unit Program

This section would amend section 10216(d) of title 10, United States Code, authorizing the assignment of Air Force Reserve military technicians (dual status) outside of a unit program. This section would also limit the number allowed for assignment outside of a unit program to no more than 50 at the same time.

Section 515—Temporary Authority for Temporary Employment of Non-Dual Status Military Technicians

This section would amend section 10217 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force to employ, on a temporary basis, a non-dual status technician to fill a vacancy created by the mobilization of a military technician (dual status) who occupies a position under section 10216 of title 10, United States Code. The duration of temporary employment would not exceed the length of the mobilization period of the military technician (dual status) or two years, whichever is shorter. The authority to hire a person under this section would expire two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 516—Revised Structure and Functions of Reserve Forces Policy Board

This section would amend section 10301 of title 10, United States Code, to revise the membership and operating framework of the Reserve Forces Policy Board so that it might provide independent advice and recommendations directly to the Secretary of Defense on matters affecting the reserve components. This section would reduce the membership of the board from 24 members to 20 members, 18 of whom would be voting members. This section would also require a senior enlisted member from one of the reserve components to serve on the board as a non-voting member to be an adviser on enlisted matters to the board chairman.

Section 517—Merit Systems Protection Board and Judicial Remedies for National Guard Technicians

Section 7701, title 5, United States Code, outlines procedures for federal civilian employees to appeal personnel grievances to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB). However, under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, appeals of adverse personnel actions by national guard technicians may not be made beyond the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned. This section would extend the right to file MSPB appeals to national guard technicians.

SUBTITLE C—JOINT QUALIFIED OFFICERS AND REQUIREMENTS

Section 521—Technical Revisions to Definition of Joint Matters for Purposes of Joint Officer Management

This section would amend section 668 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the definition of "joint matters." This technical change reverts to the original Goldwater-Nichols terminology "integrated military forces" vice the current term "multiple military forces" in the joint matters definition. This section would emphasize that joint matters is about integration of forces throughout the planning and operations process. This section would also amend (a)(1) to provide clarity to the definition of joint matters to reflect that an officer only has to participate in any one joint activity to be considered participating in joint matters.

The change to subsection (a)(2) would allow for joint credit when military forces are integrated throughout planning and operations together or when one or multiple military forces operate with U.S. departments and agencies, military forces from other countries, or non-governmental persons or entities. As currently written, an officer involved in operations with other U.S. armed forces still needs to work with an agent from one of the organizations in subsection (a)(2)(A)–(C) to qualify for joint credit.

Section 522—Changes to the Process Involving Promotion Boards for Joint Qualified Officers and Officers With Joint Staff Experience

This section would amend section 612 of title 10, United States Code, to comport with the standard in section 619a of title 10, United States Code, which allows the Secretary of Defense to waive joint qualified officer (JQO) requirements for officers in the science and technology (S&T) field and professional officers. These S&T and professional officers may now be designated as JQO's through the experience path.

This section would also amend sections 615 and 618 of title 10, United States Code, to comport with changes to section 662 of title 10, United States Code, enacted by the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). This section would update promotion board requirements for joint information and after action reports to match the new joint promotion objectives.

SUBTITLE D—GENERAL SERVICES AUTHORITIES

Section 531—Extension of Temporary Authority To Order Retired Members of the Armed Forces to Active Duty in High-Demand, Low-Density Assignments

This section would extend the authorities in section 688a(f) of title 10, United States Code, from December 31, 2010, to December 31, 2012. This section would also require the Secretary of the Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by April 1, 2011, containing an assessment of the need to extend the authority beyond December 31, 2012, and a plan, if appropriate, to eliminate

the use of recalled retirees and, instead, to increase active duty manpower to meet future high demand, low-density requirements.

Section 532—Correction of Military Records

This section would require boards for the correction of military records, discharge review boards, and disability retirement and separation review boards operated under the jurisdiction of the secretaries of the military departments to ensure that the documents announcing decisions of the boards convey the findings and conclusions of the board in an itemized and orderly fashion with specific attention to each issue presented by the member in regard to that member's case. This section would also require that disability retirement and separation review boards be made available to enlisted members as well as officers. The section would also extend from December 31, 2010, to December 31, 2013, the personnel limitation that the manpower levels within the service review agencies of the military departments shall not be reduced below the manpower levels that existed on January 1, 2002, unless the secretary of the military department reports the scope and purpose of the reduction and a 90-day period elapses.

Section 533—Modification of Certificate of Release or Discharge From Active Duty (DD Form 214) To Specifically Identify a Space for Inclusion of Email Address

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to modify the DD Form 214, Certificate or Release or Discharge from Active Duty, to include a specific field on the form in which a service member may include his or her email address.

Section 534—Recognition of Role of Female Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Review of Military Occupational Specialties Available to Female Members

This section is a sense of Congress that honors women who have served, and women who are currently serving, as members of the armed forces and encourages people in the United States to recognize the service and achievements of female members of the armed forces and female veterans. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of military occupational positions available to female members and the collocation policy and other policies and regulations to determine whether changes are needed, including legislative change, if necessary, to enhance the ability of women to serve in the armed forces.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY JUSTICE AND LEGAL MATTERS

Section 541—Continuation of Warrant Officers on Active Duty To Complete Disciplinary Action

This section would authorize the secretary of the military department concerned to continue a warrant officer on active duty and delay a pending separation or retirement without prejudice until any action to consider trying the member by court-martial has been completed.

Section 542—Enhanced Authority To Punish Contempt in Military Justice Proceedings

This section would amend article 48 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice by expanding the authority by which a military judge may punish contempt in military proceedings.

Section 543—Limitations on Use in Personnel Action of Information Contained in Criminal Investigative Report or in the Index Maintained for Law Enforcement Retrieval and Analysis

This section would prohibit the use of information related to the titling or indexing of a member of the armed forces contained in any Department of Defense criminal investigative report in connection with any personnel action involving the member. This section would provide exceptions to the prohibition in connection with law enforcement activities; in a judicial or administrative action involving an alleged offense referenced in the criminal investigative report or index; or in a personnel action if the member has been adjudged guilty of the alleged offense as the result of a military nonjudicial or judicial action; or as a result of a civilian judicial proceeding, and the record of the proceedings is presented in connection with the personnel action; and the member has the opportunity to present additional information in response to the record of the proceedings.

Section 544—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces Deployed in Support of a Contingency Operation

This section would amend title 2 of the Service Members Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 535a) by preventing a court from permanently altering a custody order while a service member is deployed, unless evidence shows a temporary order is in the best interest of the child. This section would also require the pre-deployment order to be reinstated when a service member returns from deployment, unless evidence shows reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child, and prohibits courts from using deployment or the possibility of deployment against a service member when determining the best interest of a child.

Section 545—Improvements to Department of Defense Domestic Violence Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement recommendations contained in the report of the Comptroller General of the United States titled "Status of Implementation of GAO's 2006 Recommendations on the Department of Defense's Domestic Violence Program" (GAO–10–577R).

Section 546—Public Release of Restricted Annex of Department of Defense Report of the Independent Review Related to Fort Hood Pertaining to Oversight of the Alleged Perpetrator of the Attack

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to release publicly the restricted annex of the Department of Defense Report of the Independent Review Related to Fort Hood, dated January 2010. This section would also exempt parts of the restricted annex

from public release, except: if the Secretary determines that if disclosed the materials may imperil any criminal investigation or prosecution related to the attack; and in accordance with section 1102 of title 10, United States Code, the memorandum summarizing the results of the medical quality assurance records relating to the care provided patients by the alleged perpetrator of the attack.

SUBTITLE F—MEMBER EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 551—Repayment of Education Loan Repayment Benefits

This section would amend sections 2171 and 16301 of title 10, United States Code, conforming payments made under those sections to the same repayment provisions currently in place for other bonus and incentive programs under section 303a of title 37, United States Code. This section would allow the secretary concerned to disburse a final education loan repayment with the settlement of service member's final military pay account when that service member is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty.

Section 552—Active Duty Obligation for Graduates of the Military Service Academies Participating in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program

This section would require graduates of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy to serve the full period of the active duty service obligation associated with their military academy attendance notwithstanding that their participation in the Health Professions Scholarship Program requires them to resign their regular commission and serve as a reserve officer.

Section 553—Waiver of Maximum Age Limitation on Admission to Service Academies for Certain Enlisted Members Who Served During Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to waive the maximum age limitation for admission to a military service academy from 23 to 26 for an otherwise qualified enlisted member of the armed forces who was prevented from being admitted to the academy before the member reached the maximum age as a result of service in the theaters of operation for Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

Section 554—Report of Feasibility and Cost of Expanding Enrollment Authority of Community College of the Air Force To Include Additional Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force, to report to Congress within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act the feasibility and the cost of expanding eligibility for enrollment in Community College of the Air Force to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard.

SUBTITLE G—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION

Section 561—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $50.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that have military dependent students comprising at least 20 percent of the students in average daily attendance during a year. This section would also provide $15.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that experience significant increases and decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to the military force structure changes, the relocation of military forces from one base to another, and from Base Closures and Realignments. The committee recommendation continues its effort to ensure that local school districts with significant concentration of military students continue to receive the support necessary to provide for military families and their dependents.

Section 562—Enrollment of Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces Who Reside in Temporary Housing in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools

This section would amend section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense the discretion to prescribe regulations that would permit certain dependents who reside in temporary housing in lieu of permanent living quarters on a military installation the ability to attend Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools.

SUBTITLE H—DECORATIONS, AWARDS, AND COMMEMORATIONS

Section 571—Notification Requirement for Determination Made in Response to Review of Proposal for Award of a Medal of Honor Not Previously Submitted in Timely Fashion

This section would amend section 1130 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit the discussion and rationale regarding favorable recommendations to award the Medal of Honor to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the Member of Congress requesting the review.

Section 572—Department of Defense Recognition of Spouses of Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to design, commercially license to manufacture, and sell a spouse-combat-veteran lapel button to recognize the contributions to national defense and the personal sacrifices made by the spouses of combat veterans. This section would also express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should widely announce the availability of the lapel button and should encourage commanders to conduct ceremonies recognizing the support provided by spouses of military members where service members can present these lapel buttons to their family members.

Section 573—Department of Defense Recognition of Children of Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to design, commercially license to manufacture, and sell a children of military service members commemorative lapel button to recognize the contributions to national defense and the personal sacrifices made by the children of military veterans. This section would also express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should widely announce the availability of the lapel buttons and should encourage commanders to conduct ceremonies recognizing the support provided by children of military members where service members can present these lapel buttons to their family members.

Section 574—Clarification of Persons Eligible for Award of Bronze Star Medal

This section would clarify section 1133 of title 10, United States Code, to restrict award of the Bronze Star medal to only those members of a military force who were: (1) serving in a geographic area in which hostile fire/imminent danger pay or hazardous duty pay was authorized at the time events occurred for which the medal would be awarded; or (2) in receipt of hostile fire/imminent danger pay or hazardous duty pay as a result of the events for which the medal would be awarded.

Section 575—Award of Vietnam Service Medal to Veterans Who Participated in Mayaguez Rescue Operation

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to award the Vietnam Service Medal to veterans as a substitute for the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal that had been awarded for participation in the operation to rescue the SS *Mayaguez* during the period May 12 through May 15, 1975.

Section 576—Authorization for Award of Medal of Honor to Certain Members of the Army for Acts of Valor During the Civil War, Korean War, or Vietnam War

This section would waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code and authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to: (1) Alonzo H. Cushing, who served in the United States Army during the Civil War; (2) John A. Sipe, who served in the United States Army during the Civil War; (3) Chaplain Emil J. Kapaun, who served in the United States Army during the Korean war; and (4) Robert L. Towles, who served in the United States Army during the Vietnam war.

Section 577—Authorization and Request for Award of Distinguished-Service Cross to Jay C. Copley for Acts of Valor During the Vietnam War

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Distinguished-Service Cross to Jay C. Copley, who served in the United States Army during the Vietnam war. This section would waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 578—Program To Commemorate 60th Anniversary of the Korean War

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish and conduct a program to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Korean war and to coordinate and support the Korean war commemorative programs and activities of the federal government, state and local governments, and other persons and organizations that support the commemorative objectives specified in this section.

SUBTITLE I—MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

Section 581—Appointment of Additional Member of Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council

This section would expand the membership of the Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council to include a spouse of a general or flag officer, and clarifies the appointment options for the enlisted representation.

Section 582—Director of the Office of Community Support for Military Families With Special Needs

This section would make a technical clarification to section 1781(c) of title 10, United States Code, as enacted by section 563 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 583—Pilot Program of Personalized Career Development Counseling for Military Spouses

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program designed to provide career development counseling to, between 75 and 150, spouses of active duty service members, under the spouse tuition assistance authority in section 1784a of title 10, United States Code. The pilot program would include the development of strategies, step-by-step guidelines, and customizable milestones to: (1) promote comprehensive, introspective review of personal skills, experience, goals, and requirements with a view to developing a personalized plan for career development; (2) identify career options that are portable, personally rewarding, and compatible with personal strengths, skills, and experience; (3) instruct and encourage the use of sound personal and professional management practices; and (4) plan career attainment progression objectives and measure progress.

This section would require the Secretary to make available at least one career counselor in each of the three geographic areas required by the pilot program. This section would also require the Secretary to consider methods to incentivize careers in critical civilian specialties needed in the Department of Defense, such as mental health, social work, and family welfare among others.

Section 584—Modification of Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program

This section would amend section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by authorizing service and state based programs to provide access to service members and their families of all components. This section

would also require a process for evaluating the effectiveness of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program, and provide information on employment opportunities during the post-deployment reconstitution phase. This section would also include resiliency training programs to the outreach services provided under the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program.

Section 585—Importance of Office of Community Support for Military Families With Special Needs

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs is the best structure to determine what medical, educational, and other support services are required by military families with children who have a medical or educational special need and to ensure that those services are made available to those families. This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense allocate a separate line of funding to the Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs, effective with the Program Objective Memorandum to be issued for fiscal year 2012.

Section 586—Comptroller General Report on Department of Defense Office of Community Support for Military Families With Special Needs

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the progress made in implementing the Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs.

Section 587—Comptroller General Report on Exceptional Family Member Program

This section requires the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the Exception Family Member Program of the Department of Defense and to report the findings of the assessment to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 588—Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Military Spouse Employment Programs

This section requires the Comptroller General of the United States to review all Department of Defense spouse employment programs, and to report the findings of the review, including any recommendations for improving such programs, to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011.

Section 589—Report on Department of Defense Military Spouse Education Programs

This section requires the Secretary of Defense to review all Department of Defense education programs designed to support spouses of members of the armed forces. The Secretary is required to report the findings of the review, including any recommendations for improving such programs, to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE J—OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Establishment of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Units for Students in Grades Above Sixth Grade

This section would amend section 2031 of title 10, United Sates Code, to allow the establishment of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) units at public and private secondary educational institutions that permit enrollment of students in the corps who are in a grade above the sixth grade. Any unit established under this authority must meet similar requirements of the JROTC program, and the service secretary who establishes a program under this authority must conduct a review of the program, and report on the impacts, if any, the program may have on the operations of JROTC in secondary educational institutions.

Section 592—Increase in Number of Private Sector Civilians Authorized for Admission to National Defense University

This section would authorize the change in the number of private sector civilians authorized for admission to the professional military education program at the National Defense University from 20 to 35.

Section 593—Admission of Defense Industry Civilians To Attend United States Air Force Institute of Technology

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to permit defense industry employees to receive instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology. This section limits enrollment to 125 defense industry employees at any one time, on a space available basis, and requires the students be charged tuition for enrollment.

Section 594—Date for Submission of Annual Report on Department of Defense STARBASE Program

This section would amend section 2193b of title 10, United States Code, to extend the annual STARBASE program report deadline from 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, to March 31st of each year.

Section 595—Extension of Deadline for Submission of Final Report of Military Leadership Diversity Commission

This section would extend the period authorized for the Military Leadership Diversity Commission for completing deliberations before submitting its final report from 12 months to 18 months.

Section 596—Enhanced Authority for Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense and Coast Guard Civilian Employees and Their Families To Accept Gifts From Non-Federal Entities

This section would amend chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, by incorporating an expanded version of section 8127 included in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations authorizing eligible members of the armed forces, eligible civilians, their families and survivors, to accept gifts from nonprofit organizations, private parties, and other sources outside the Department of Defense. Eligible service members and civilians include those who incurred an injury or illness: as a direct result of armed conflict; while engaged in hazardous service; in the performance of duty under conditions simulating war; through an instrumentality of war; in an operation or area designated as a combat operation or combat zone by the Secretary of Defense; or under other circumstances determined by the Secretary to warrant similar treatment. This section would prohibit the acceptance of gifts from foreign governments, international organizations, or their agents. This section would also repeal section 8127 of Public Law 109–148.

Section 597—Report on Performance and Improvements of Transition Assistance Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, to prepare a report on the Transition Assistance Program (TAP). This section would require that the report include: an analysis of the rates of post-separation employment rates compared to the general population; a summary of the evolution and development of TAP; a description of efforts to transform the TAP model from an end-of-service transition model to a life-cycle model; an analysis of current and future challenges separating members face when entering the civilian workforce, including surveys; and recommendations, including legislative recommendations, that the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate to improve TAP. The report would be required to be submitted within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 598—Sense of Congress Regarding Assisting Members of the Armed Forces To Participate in Apprenticeship Programs

This section would express the sense of Congress that commanders of units of the armed forces should make every effort to permit members of the armed forces who are assigned to the unit, but who are in the process of being separated or released from active duty, to participate in an apprenticeship program that is registered under the National Apprenticeship Act (29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.).

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that robust and flexible compensation programs are central to maintaining a high quality, combat ready force in the ninth year of war. Accordingly, the committee recommends an across-the-board pay raise of 1.9 percent, one-half of one percent above pay raise levels in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index (ECI). This would be the 12th consecutive year that the pay raise would exceed the ECI

level and would result in an average cumulative pay increase of 60 percent over the last 12 years.

The committee recognizes that compensation of service members while serving in a combat zone has been eroded by inflation since the beginning of combat operations in the Republic of Iraq. Accordingly, the committee recommends increases to hostile fire pay.

The committee believes that more needs to be done to benefit military families. For example, the committee includes provisions that would authorize an increase in the family separation allowance and expansion of basic allowance for housing policy to include payment to both members of a dual-military family when one member is assigned to sea duty.

The committee notes that the benefits provided to wounded warriors and their loved ones needs to be further updated. The committee recommends a new payment to severely disabled service members to facilitate the employment of caregivers required by the service member, to include movement of household goods, if necessary. The committee also included a pilot program that would examine the effect of longer officer careers on the ability of the services to provide for the education and career broadening assignments that are critical to the development of well-rounded military leaders.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Career Retention Bonus

The committee is concerned that service members are not being provided appropriate counseling and information before they decline or accept the $30,000 career retention bonus upon reaching 15 years of service. Acceptance of the bonus requires service members to participate in a retirement program that offers reduced benefits that could result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars in benefits over the lifetime of the service member. The committee understands that the Center for Naval Analysis has devoted considerable research into this matter and would be positioned to provide valuable information on what can be done to ensure that service members receive the information necessary to make well informed decisions about the career retention bonus. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to initiate an education program to improve the counseling and information provided to service members before they make a decision about the career retention bonus.

Critical Language and Cultural Training of Special Operations Forces

United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) deploys personnel to over 70 countries around the world and in every geographic combatant command. Personnel assigned to USSOCOM carry out unconventional warfare, foreign internal defense, civil affairs operations, and security force assistance; all of which require deep language and culture expertise. Among the many skills required to carry out their missions is the ability to personally interact and collaborate with indigenous populations. Often in isolated locations, these missions succeed or fail based upon the operator's knowledge of the population's cultural sensitivities. The committee

is aware that United States Special Operations Forces (USSOF) that require language skills are initially trained to the Department's 1/1 proficiency standard; however, the committee is concerned there is no mechanism in place, across all the services, to ensure this standard is maintained on a regular basis. Furthermore, the services do not consistently provide USSOF personnel Foreign Language Proficiency Pay (FLPP) for sustaining a 1/1 or 1/+ standard, potentially contributing to the attrition of language skills.

While the committee understands that the services provide its respective USSOF personnel FLPP once they reach the much more developed 2/2 certification, the committee encourages the services to provide FLPP to USSOF personnel at the 1/1 and 1/+ level.

The committee understands that in order to educate its personnel regarding cultural sensitivities, USSOCOM provides advanced cultural immersion training and recruits first-generation individuals with particular cultural backgrounds. The committee also recognizes USSOCOM's use of the Military Accessions Vital to National Interest program and the Afghanistan-Pakistan Hands program to fill its ranks with culturally astute personnel; however, the committee is aware that there are obstacles to USSOCOM's full utilization of these programs. The committee directs the Commander, USSOCOM to provide a briefing, by September 1, 2010, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on USSOCOM's objectives, strategies, and challenges regarding cultural immersion programs.

Local Procurement of Fresh Meat, Poultry, Seafood, Fish, and Produce by Commissary and Exchange Stores

The committee believes more can be done to purchase fresh meat, poultry, seafood, fish, and produce from local markets within 150 miles of commissary and exchange stores. The committee recognizes the benefits of the "Green the Capitol" initiative and believes such a program at commissaries and exchanges at military installations may prove beneficial and environmentally responsible.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess how the Defense Commissary Agency and the exchange services procure fresh meat, poultry, seafood, fish, and produce for resale. This section should: calculate an estimate of the percentage of those goods raised, produced, or caught within 150 miles of the resale stores; determine if those methods of procurement can be changed to increase local procurement rates; determine the fiscal implications of such a change, to include cost savings of reduced transportation distances; determine the implications for patrons of such a change; and provide a recommendation on initiating a program to increase local procurement of fresh meat, poultry, seafood, fish, and produce. The committee directs the Secretary to report the findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by May 1, 2011.

Procurement of Locally Caught Seafood and Fresh-Water Fish by Commissaries

The committee is concerned that commissary stores do not procure locally caught seafood and fresh-water fish for sale within the United States. The committee believes that store managers should be providing such fresh seafood and fresh-water fish on a regular and recurring basis to commissary patrons.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to require commissary stores operated by the Defense Commissary Agency in the United States to procure fresh seafood and fresh-water fish from local sources and sell it on a regular and recurring basis. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the record for commissary stores regarding the procurement of locally caught seafood and fresh-water fish in the United States during the period beginning on January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2011, and to report the findings and recommendations concerning the procurement of locally caught seafood and fresh-water fish in the future, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2012.

Reserve Retirement

The committee understands that a Department of Defense legal review of section 647 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), has determined that the increments of 90 days of active duty that were intended to reduce the age at which reserve members may begin to receive retired pay below age 60 must be wholly earned within the same fiscal year. The committee believes that this interpretation of the law is incorrect.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the issues involved and seek the counsel of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services to obtain the information needed to make an informed decision. The committee directs the Secretary to report the findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2011.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Fiscal Year 2011 Increase in Military Basic Pay

This section would increase basic pay for members of the uniform services by 1.9 percent effective January 1, 2011. This raise would continue to fulfill Congress' commitment to keep pay raises for the uniformed services ahead of private sector pay raises. Accordingly, the gap between pay increases for the uniformed services and private sector employees during fiscal year 2011 would be reduced from approximately 2.4 percent to 1.9 percent.

Section 602—Basic Allowance for Housing for Two-Member Couples When One or Both Members Are on Sea Duty

This section would authorize military members to receive a basic allowance for housing while on sea duty when married to another military member, regardless of the other member's sea duty status, pay grade, or sponsorship of dependents, if each member would otherwise be entitled to receive a basic allowance for housing.

Section 603—Allowances for Purchase of Required Uniforms and Equipment

This section would increase the initial clothing allowance that may be paid to an officer upon entering service from $400 to $500, and the additional allowance that may be paid to an officer upon subsequent entries on active duty of 90 days or longer from $200 to $250. This section would also authorize the secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in the case of the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service of the Navy, to increase the initial clothing allowance paid to an officer above the $500 cap established in this section. The committee believes that the secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security should be authorized to determine if the initial clothing should be increased above $500 to more accurately reflect the value of the uniforms that officers are required to purchase upon entering service.

Section 604—Increase in Amount of Family Separation Allowance

This section would authorize an increase in the family separation allowance from $250 per month to $285 per month to compensate for an erosion of value due to inflation.

Section 605—One-Time Special Compensation for Transition of Assistants Providing Aid and Attendance Care to Members of the Uniformed Services With Catastrophic Injuries or Illnesses

This section would amend section 439 of title 37, United States Code, as established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), to authorize the secretaries concerned to pay a one-time special compensation, not to exceed $3,500, to a service member with a combat related catastrophic injury or illness for the transition of assistants providing aid and attendance care.

Section 606—Expansion of Definition of Senior Enlisted Member to Include Senior Enlisted Member Serving Within a Combatant Command

This section would increase the rate of pay of individuals designated as the senior enlisted members of the combatant commands to match the pay provided to the Sergeant Major of the Army, the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, the Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard, and the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Section 607—Ineligibility of Certain Federal Civilian Employees for Reservist Income Replacement Payments on Account of Availability of Comparable Benefits Under Another Program

This section would clarify that a member of a reserve component would not be eligible for income replacement payments under section 910(b) of title 37, United States Code, if the member is also a civilian employee of the federal government entitled to a differential payment under section 5538 of title 5, United States Code, or another comparable program established for employees of the federal government.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, and income replacement payments until December 31, 2011.

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, the accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, the special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties until December 31, 2011.

Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending a period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2011.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the authority for the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health professions incentive pay and bonus authorities, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incen-

tive pay or proficiency bonus, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units until December 31, 2011.

Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between armed forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates until December 31, 2011.

Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses

This section would extend the authority for the health professions referral bonus and the Army referral bonus until December 31, 2011.

Section 617—Treatment of Officers Transferring Between Armed Forces for Receipt of Aviation Career Special Pay

This section would require that officers who transfer from one armed force to another armed force would receive the same aviation career special pay as other officers in the gaining armed force with the same number of years of aviation service performing similar aviation duties in the same weapon system, notwithstanding any additional active duty service obligation incurred as a result of the transfer. This section would also require, until December 31, 2015, the secretary concerned to pay aviation career special pay to an officer who transferred or transfers from one armed force to an armed force under the jurisdiction of the secretary until the officer has received a comparable level of benefits with other similarly situated officers. In calculating the number of years of benefits, the secretary concerned would include any year that the officer received aviation career special pay before the transfer.

Section 618—Increase in Maximum Amount of Special Pay for Duty Subject to Hostile Fire or Imminent Danger or for Duty in Foreign Area Designated as an Imminent Danger Area

This section would authorize an increase in hostile fire and imminent danger pay from $225 per month to $260 per month to compensate for an erosion of value due to inflation.

Section 619—Special Payment to Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense Killed or Wounded in Attacks Directed at Members or Employees Outside of Combat Zone, Including Those Killed or Wounded in Certain 2009 Attacks

This section, for the purposes of all federal laws, regulations, and policies, would treat service members and Department of Defense civilian employees killed or wounded in the attack at Fort Hood,

Texas on November 5, 2009, and the attack at the recruiting station in Little Rock, Arkansas on June 1, 2009, as having been killed or wounded as a result of an act of an enemy of the United States in a combat zone or while serving with Armed Forces in a contingency operation.

This section would further amend title 37, United States Code, to add a new authority retroactive to November 6, 2009, that would provide special compensation to service members and DOD civilians attacked by an individual whom the Secretary of Defense determines to have knowingly targeted that member or civilian on account of that service member's service or that civilian's employment or affiliation with the DOD. The amount of the compensation would be equal to that of service members and civilians killed or wounded in the combat theater or while serving with Armed Forces in a contingency operation.

This section also would assert that nothing in the provision would be construed to prohibit, authorize, or require the award of the Purple Heart.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 631—Extension of Authority To Provide Travel and Transportation Allowances for Inactive Duty Training outside of Normal Commuting Distances

This section would extend until December 31, 2011, the authority for the secretary concerned to reimburse an eligible member of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve for travel expenses for travel to an inactive duty training location to perform inactive duty training when the member is required to commute a distance from the member's permanent residence to the inactive duty training location that is outside the normal commuting distance.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consider revising the requirements of the outside the local commuting distance" definition used in paragraph U7160 of the Joint Federal Travel Regulation implementing section 408a of title 37, United States Code, to provide for reimbursement in extraordinary circumstances in which travel by means other than land vehicle is not practicable.

Section 632—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Attendance of Designated Persons at Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Events

This section would amend chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, by adding a new section to authorize travel and transportation for designated persons to travel to qualifying Yellow Ribbon events.

Section 633—Mileage Reimbursement for Use of Privately Owned Vehicles

This section would amend sections 5704 and 5707 of title 5, United States Code, to conform the mileage reimbursement rate for privately owned vehicles established by the Administrator of General Services to the rate established by the Internal Revenue Service. This section would also eliminate the requirement that the periodic review of the cost of travel conducted by the Administrator of the General Services include privately owned vehicles. Review of

privately owned airplanes and privately owned motorcycles, however, would still be required to be included in the Administrator's periodic investigations. This section would apply to all federal government employees and members of the uniformed services traveling on behalf of the federal government in a privately owned automobile, by establishing a consistent rate that provides adequate compensation for employees who perform temporary duty travel.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Section 641—Elimination of Cap on Retired Pay Multiplier for Members With Greater Than 30 Years of Service Who Retire for Disability

This section would authorize service members who serve on active duty for more than 30 years and who are retired with a disability to retain their eligibility to receive a retired pay multiplier based on their years of service that would result in a benefit that is greater than the 75 percent cap imposed on disability retirements.

Section 642—Equity in Computation of Disability Retired Pay for Reserve Component Members Wounded in Action

This section would require that the calculation of retired pay for reserve component service members who are retired or placed on the temporary disability retired list be based on the member's total years of service in lieu of active duty years of service when the retirement is based on a disability incurred under circumstances for which the member was awarded the Purple Heart.

Section 643—Elimination of the Age Requirement for Health Care Benefits for Non-Regular Service Retirees

This section would authorize reserve members entitled to retired pay who are under the age of 60 to receive health care benefits authorized for other service members entitled to retired pay.

Section 644—Clarification of Effect of Ordering Reserve Component Member to Active Duty To Receive Authorized Medical Care on Reducing Eligibility Age for Receipt of Non-Regular Service Retired Pay

This section would ensure that reserve members ordered to active duty to receive medical care for wounds, injuries, or illness incurred while serving under circumstances that would allow such active service to be the basis for entitlement to retired pay before age 60 receive appropriate credit for the purposes of calculating the age at which members would be entitled to retired pay.

Section 645—Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Recipients of Pre-Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Affected by Required Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation

This section would authorize surviving spouses of retirees who died before the implementation of the Survivor Benefit Program to receive payments under the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance

at the same level of benefit paid to surviving spouses of retirees that participated in the Survivor Benefit Plan. This section would also require that the spouses be eligible to receive payments under the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation program operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs. This section would also authorize retroactive payment of benefits beginning on October 1, 2008, and would terminate all eligibility for payments on September 30, 2017.

Section 646—Payment Date for the Retired and Retainer Pay

This section would require military retired and retainer pay to be paid on the first day of each month instead of the first business day of the month. The committee intends that the mandate to pay on the first day of the month will require that payment processes be installed to ensure payment before the first day of the month when the first day of the month occurs on a weekend or holiday so as to avoid the delay of payments after the first of the month that now occurs under the current system.

SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Section 651—Shared Construction Costs for Shopping Malls or Similar Facilities Containing a Commissary Store and One or More Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Activities

This section would clarify that the Secretary of Defense may designate the Defense Commissary Agency to manage construction programs using funds derived from commissary surcharge accounts and to receive funds from nonappropriated fund instrumentalities when the Defense Commissary Agency is designated to manage joint construction programs that include such instrumentalities.

Section 652—Addition of Definition of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Telephone Services for Use in Contracts To Provide Such Services for Military Personnel Serving in Combat Zones

This section would clarify that the competitive contracting requirements for procuring personal telephone services in combat zones established in section 885 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), applies to unofficial calling centers provided by a nonappropriated fund activity and does not apply to wireless cell phone services.

Section 653—Feasibility Study on Establishment of Full Exchange Store in the Northern Mariana Islands

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a full-service exchange store to support the members and dependents within the military community residing in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SUBTITLE F—ALTERNATIVE CAREER TRACK PILOT PROGRAM

Section 661—Pilot Program to Evaluate Alternative Career Track for Commissioned Officers To Facilitate an Increased Commitment to Academic and Professional Education and Career-Broadening Assignments

The committee continues to be concerned about the widely accepted notion among military leaders, and often acknowledged in personnel management studies, that officer careers are not adequately designed to provide for the education and career broadening assignments that are critical to the development of well-rounded modern military leaders. The committee believes that the complex international environment confronting the U.S. military requires the officer corps to not only be proficient in conventional warfare from a specific service perspective, but to also develop a broad knowledge of the roles of the other services, allied military forces, civilian government agencies, intergovernmental organizations, and nongovernmental agencies, as well as a strategic knowledge of politics and economics. This extensive, but justifiable mission may not be executable within the traditional time periods and career gates that were established in a previous era for a different international environment. Career paths should provide the time, experience, and intellectual development to generate the comprehensive knowledge and well-grounded grasp of strategic affairs. This holistic vision of officer development requires a diverse and flexible career path that does not exist in today's personnel system that is marked by mandatory retirement standards and a rigid up-or-out policy.

This section would authorize an active duty pilot program to provide a select cadre of volunteers the opportunity to participate in a separate career track marked by expanded career opportunities extending over a longer career. The secretaries of the military departments, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, would offer officers with between 13 and 18 years of service the opportunity to participate in the alternative career track. This section would require participating officers to agree to an additional active duty service obligation of at least five years and to accept further active duty service obligations, as determined by the secretary of the military department, as a result of entry into education programs, selection for career broadening assignments, acceptance of additional special and incentive pays, or selection for promotion, each to be served concurrently with existing active duty service obligations. This section would also authorize the secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to establish separate basic pay and special and incentive pay and promotion systems unique to the officers participating in the alternative career track without regard to the requirements of titles 10 and 37, United States Code, thus allowing officers to be compensated at higher rates and promoted ahead of their contemporaries to ensure that participating officers are provided adequate incentives. This section would authorize each secretary of a military department to select up to 50 officers annually to participate in the alternative career track. The committee envisions that officers selected for the alternative career track would reflect diversity in job specialties to ensure that support functions,

as well as operational missions, benefited from the assignment of officers selected to serve longer careers. The secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, would be authorized to establish separation and retirement policies for officers serving in the alternative career track without regard to grade and years of service requirements established in title 10, United States Code. Participants serving in grades below brigadier general, or rear admiral (lower half) in the Navy, would serve without regard to the limits on the numbers of officers in those grades established in title 10, United States Code. Participants serving in grades above colonel, or captain in the Navy, and below the grade of lieutenant general, or vice admiral in the Navy, would be counted for the purposes of general and flag officer limits on grade and total number of such officers when serving in a military position, but would be excluded from limits on grade and total number of such officers when serving in positions not typically occupied by a military officer. Officers serving in grades lieutenant general, or vice admiral in the Navy, and general, or admiral in the Navy, would be counted for the purposes of general and flag officer limits on grade and total number of such officers in title 10, United States Code. The secretaries of the military departments would retain the authority to involuntarily return officers to the standard career path where the officer would retain the grade, date-of-rank, and basic pay table earned while a participant in the alternative career track, but would revert to the special and incentive pay authorities established in title 37, United States Code. The committee believes that participants should be groomed to meet the requirements to become joint qualified.

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to operate the pilot program for not more than 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act. The secretaries of the military departments would be authorized to begin the program at any time: (1) before the expiration of a five-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and (2) 120 days after reporting the detailed program structure of the alternative career track, associated personnel policy decisions, implementing instructions and regulations, and a summary of specific laws that would be waived, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. The secretary of the military department, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, would be authorized to terminate the pilot program at any time. This section would require the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense, to report, the reasons for terminating the pilot program to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than 90 days after terminating the pilot program. The secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, would be authorized to recommend changes to the pilot program at any time by reporting their findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services and waiting for 120 days to elapse. This section would also require the secretaries of the military departments, in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense, during the pilot program to annually report his findings and recommendations concerning the progress of the

pilot program to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 671—Participation of Members of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program in Active Duty Health Profession Loan Repayment Program

This section would expand the pool of eligible participants for the Active Duty Health Professions Loan Repayment Program (ADHPLRP) to include members participating in the Health Professions Scholarship Program (HPSP) when the duration of the HPSP scholarship is less than is required to complete the normal length of the course of study required for the specific health profession. Current law restricts the use of ADHPLRP by HPSP participants to those who are fully-qualified or in their last year of study or specialty training.

Section 672—Retention of Enlistment, Reenlistment, and Student Loan Benefits Received by Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would bar the secretary concerned from requiring service members employed as dual status military technicians to repay enlistment, reenlistment, or affiliation bonuses, or to terminate participation in an educational loan repayment program that were paid or began during service that preceded the military technician employment period.

Section 673—Cancellation of Loans of Members of the Armed Forces Made From Student Loan Funds

This section would define, for the purposes of eligibility for student loan cancellation for public service under section 1087ee of title 20, United States Code, that a "year of service" is equal to deployments of six months or longer in hostile fire or imminent danger zones (or less than six months in the case the service member was discharged or released from active duty due to an injury or disability incurred or aggravated by his or her service).

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Defense Health Program to support operational requirements, accessibility, and quality health care provided to service members. After nine years of conflict, the military health system has had difficulty meeting current demands, as evidenced by the continued shift from the direct care system to the purchased care system. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not adapting its approach to recruit and retain military medical providers quickly enough to maintain capability during changing circumstances. The committee commends the Department of Defense for fully funding the Defense Health Program to help meet the demands placed on the military health system.

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense did not propose many of the objectionable proposals of years past, such as: onerous TRICARE fee increases that place the burden of improving the system on beneficiaries; efficiency wedges that cut the health care budgets of the services without sound underlying analytics; and the conversion of military medical positions to civilian medical positions. However, the committee is concerned that the budget request did not contain sufficient transformative steps to address the growing costs of providing health care to Department of Defense beneficiaries. The committee notes that little, if any, progress has been made towards the development of a comprehensive, multi-faceted strategy for moving the military health system forward. The committee is encouraged that the Secretary of Defense continues to express a willingness to engage in a thoughtful dialogue with Congress to develop this comprehensive strategy, but notes that this dialogue has not yet begun.

For the past few years, Congress has encouraged the Department of Defense to improve the health status of the beneficiary population and improve the cost-effectiveness of the care provided to beneficiaries by adopting proven practices. The Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), contained many initiatives to improve preventive and wellness care, but 18 months after it was signed into law, the committee is still waiting for most of these provisions to be fully implemented. The committee notes that Public Law 110–417 also gave the Department of Defense great latitude and authority to conduct demonstration projects to test other methods of improving the health of beneficiaries while reducing costs, but has not made use of that authority.

The committee is concerned that substandard or unacceptable behavior displayed by students and residents during training programs for military Medical Corps officers may not be completely documented in official military personnel records. The committee believes that military Medical Corps officers and trainees must meet high standards of both clinical skill and military leadership.

The committee is concerned that when the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs pursue joint or combined health care operations, an insufficient amount of joint strategic analysis and planning is done. The committee therefore encourages the Departments to develop a strategic planning framework for future projects. The committee also notes that, neither it, nor the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, have been provided with appropriate notification of health care facilities that have been considered for joint or combined operations.

The committee notes that in cases of dependents of a member or a former member who are ineligible to receive care under TRICARE, the Department of Defense currently expects the managed care support contractor and civilian source of medical care to recoup the costs of the care provided. The committee believes that in cases in which a civilian source of medical care provided services in good faith and followed proper identification procedures to determine eligibility, those civilian medical providers should not be financially penalized. The current policy may serve as a disincentive for civilian sources of medical care to participate in the TRICARE program.

The committee remains committed to ensuring that wounded warriors receive the care, rehabilitation, and support they need and deserve. The committee also remains concerned that there are still not enough mental health resources to fulfill the needs of our service members and their families, and will continue to provide vigilant oversight to improve the mental health care available to Department of Defense beneficiaries.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Comparative Cognitive Test Study

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comparison study on the effectiveness and reliability of various computerized test batteries when used as pre- and post-deployment assessment tools for neurocognitive functioning. The purpose of the study is to obtain evidence-based outcomes of various neurocognitive assessment tools to aid in the detection of brain injuries when a service member returns from deployment. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the comparison test to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2011.

Comparative Effectiveness of Neuroimaging Modalities on the Detection of Traumatic Brain Injury

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report that evaluates the comparative effectiveness of neuroimaging modalities as imaging biomarkers for the detection of mild, moderate, and severe traumatic brain injuries. The neuroimaging modalities to be evaluated should include, but be not limited to, the following:

(1) Transcranial Doppler Ultrasound
(2) Computed Tomography (CT)
(3) Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)
(4) Single Photon Emission Computed Tomography (SPECT)
(5) Positron Emission Tomography (PET)

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2012.

Continuation of Health Insurance for Reservists on Active Duty

Section 704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) authorized the Secretary of Defense to pay a stipend to a member of the reserve components ordered to active duty for the purpose of maintaining civilian health care coverage for a dependent whom the Secretary determines to possess a special health care need that would be best met by remaining in the member's civilian health plan. The committee is aware that there are dependents with special health care needs that may be in the middle of treatment or about to begin the process of treatment, and that continuation in the member's civilian health plan would be advantageous to the continuity of care for such a dependent. The committee believes that individuals in such unique and special circumstances should have the ability to receive a well-planned transfer from their civilian plan to TRICARE. Currently, active duty dependents who have special health care needs and must transfer from one region to another are highlighted from

one managed care contractor to another to ensure a smooth transition. The committee believes such transfers should also be afforded to similarly situated reserve dependents.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act on the extent to which the authority under section 704 of Public Law 110–181 has been used. The report should also include a description of the process to be used to ensure the smooth transition of dependents with special health care needs from their civilian health care plan to TRICARE.

Delays in Awarding New TRICARE Contracts

The committee notes the delays that have characterized the current efforts to award the next round of TRICARE support contracts, known as T3. This process has incurred multiple delays before being awarded, and the current award is in doubt after the Government Accountability Office sustained the protests in two of the three TRICARE regions due to serious shortcomings in the proposal evaluation. The committee is concerned that these delays which are the result of inadequate processes by the TRICARE Management Activity will hamper Department of Defense efforts to improve the health care provided to beneficiaries, while gaining control over health care costs.

The committee is concerned, as discussed in a related item of special interest in Title VIII of this Act, that the acquisition expertise of the TRICARE Management Activity may not be sufficient to support the broad range of acquisition activities needed to support the military health system. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to ensure that effective acquisition management personnel, structure, processes, and oversight are put in place to support the provision of health care by the Department of Defense.

Development of Non-Addictive Topical Pain Therapeutics

The committee remains concerned about chronic and acute pain management and the deleterious effects of improperly managed pain on service members and veterans. The committee has acted previously by requiring in section 711 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) that the Secretary of Defense develop and implement a comprehensive policy on pain management by the military health care system. The committee is aware of reports of prescription pain medication misuse by members of the armed forces. Prescription painkiller misuse can impact the quality of life for service members and their families. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the pain management infrastructure being stood up by the Department of Defense to evaluate the potential role of emerging pain therapeutics, to include topical analgesic formulations, in order to provide our men and women in uniform with effective means of pain management. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on this evaluation to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2011.

Exposure Registry Feasibility Study

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the feasibility of establishing an active registry for each incidence of exposure of occupational and environmental chemical hazards, to include waste disposal, during conflicts, to monitor possible health risks and provide necessary treatment to those exposed. The report should discuss processes in which service members exposed to toxic chemicals could be included on the registry and procedures to provide medical examinations to service members who are eligible to be included on the registry. The report should also seek to leverage existing medical surveillance systems. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2011.

Feasibility of TRICARE Prime in Certain Commonwealths and Territories of the United States

The committee is aware that TRICARE Prime is not currently available as an option for Department of Defense beneficiaries in certain commonwealths and territories of the United States. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study examining the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of offering TRICARE Prime in the Territory of Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, the Territory of American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands and to submit a report on the study to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

Former Military Medics and Corpsmen

The committee notes the large number of military medics and corpsmen, many with combat experience, that leave the military and rejoin civilian communities every year. The committee encourages federal, national, and state emergency medical technician certification authorities to take into account the medical coursework and training received by former military medics and corpsmen when developing certification tests and standards.

Genitourinary Trauma in the Military

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the current state of medical training and research for genitourinary trauma within the Department of Defense to determine if there are any deficits with regard to the care that can be provided in combat zones. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report on this review to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Health Information Technology Interoperability Between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs

Section 1635 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the establishment of an interagency program office to implement, by September 20, 2009, electronic health record systems or capabilities that allow for full interoperability of personal health care information between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The committee notes that the interagency program office has been unsuccessful in developing or adopting effective standards to enable full interoperability of electronic health records, despite significant funding increases and leadership from the Administration. The committee notes that the requirements of section 1635 will not be fulfilled until electronic health record systems or capabilities that allow for full interoperability of personal health care information between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for all service members are in operation.

Medical Technology and Spectrum Sharing

The committee is aware of new technologies that assist wounded warriors, such as those who have paralyzed or impaired limbs, or other traumatic injuries, to reanimate their injured limbs and muscle tissue. Such technologies utilize micro-stimulators that are controlled by low-powered radio frequencies. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to take into account the medical benefits of these new technologies for active duty service members as part of spectrum sharing decisions. The committee also directs the Secretary to submit a report on any spectrum sharing issues for parts of the spectrum under the control of the Department of Defense related to micro-stimulators to the congressional defense committees within one year of the date of enactment of this Act.

Medical Training for Chemical-Biological Casualties

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate all medical training programs for chemical and biological casualties. The committee directs the Secretary to use a comprehensive set of metrics in evaluating the efficacy of current training models. The committee also directs the Secretary to submit a report on these evaluations to the congressional defense committees within one year of the date of enactment of this Act.

Outreach Tools Using an Interactive Virtual Agent

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has considered using interactive virtual agents on either websites or standalone computers to help reduce barriers to individuals seeking mental health care. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on all health care related projects or programs that use an interactive virtual agent not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Pre-Deployment Counseling for Unmarried Service Members With Dependent Children

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of establishing a pre-deployment counseling and services advisory panel. The study should include the practicality of appointing, from among individuals in the private sector qualified for such purpose, a panel of individuals to: review the pre-deployment counseling and services provided by the military departments to unmarried members of the Armed Forces with dependent children; identify best practices among such counseling and services; and

recommend such improvements in such counseling and services (including improvements in such best practices) as the panel considers appropriate. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2011.

Study on the Treatment of Service Members of the Active and Reserve Component for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report evaluating the barriers to treatment for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder for service members of both the active and reserve components within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. The report may use timely information developed in the preparation of other reports currently being prepared for or previously submitted to Congress. The report should, at a minimum, address the following:

(1) An overview of current programs in place to identify and provide treatment for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder to service members.

(2) An overview of outreach programs currently in place to educate service members of the signs of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, available treatment programs, options for treatment, and support groups.

(3) An overview of programs currently in place to reach out to families, including children, of both the active and reserve components to educate them of the signs of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and to provide support to families coping with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

(4) An assessment of barriers to service members receiving treatment for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, including an assessment of the effects stigma, privacy, and career advancement concerns play in service members not receiving treatment.

(5) An assessment and identification of other factors that may deter service members from seeking treatment for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

(6) An assessment of the effectiveness of current programs and policies.

(7) Recommendations for improvements to outreach and educational policies and programs.

(8) Recommendations for improvements to family outreach and treatment programs.

(9) Recommendations for improvements to existing programs or for new programs needed to expand and improve identification and treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Suicide and the Individual Ready Reserve

The committee notes the challenges members of the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) face in obtaining support services when not mobilized. The committee also notes that suicide rates are rising across the services and reserve components. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consider the feasibility and potential benefit of a program that would ensure that members of the

IRR who have served at least one tour in either the Republic of Iraq or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and who are not assigned to units that drill regularly, receive at minimum, quarterly counseling calls from properly trained personnel to determine the IRR member's emotional, psychological, and medical needs so long as the covered service member is in the IRR.

TRICARE Outpatient Prospective Payment System

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense began implementation of the TRICARE Outpatient Prospective Payment System (OPPS) in May 2009, to bring its reimbursement rates for hospital outpatient services into alignment with Medicare rates, as required by section 1079 of title 10, United States Code. The committee notes that although the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services began using a similar prospective payment system for outpatient care under Medicare in August 2000, the Department of Defense delayed implementing the system until the Medicare transition to OPPS was complete. The committee notes that the new TRICARE OPPS will change reimbursement rates for hospital outpatient services. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to closely monitor implementation of TRICARE OPPS to ensure that it does not unintentionally decrease access to health care for military beneficiaries.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—IMPROVEMENTS TO HEALTH BENEFITS

Section 701—Extension of Prohibition on Increases in Certain Health Care Costs

This section would prohibit the Department of Defense from increasing the premium and copayment for TRICARE Prime, the charge for inpatient care for TRICARE Standard, and the premium for TRICARE Standard for members of the Selected Reserve until September 30, 2011.

Section 702—Extension of Dependent Coverage Under TRICARE

This section would amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to allow TRICARE beneficiaries to extend health care coverage to dependent children up to age 26 so that TRICARE beneficiaries would have the same ability to extend coverage to dependent children afforded to others as a result of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148).

Section 703—Survivor Dental Benefits

This section would make dependent survivors eligible to enroll in the TRICARE dental program even if they were not enrolled prior to the death of their sponsor.

Section 704—Aural Screenings for Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require members of the armed forces to receive pre- and post-deployment aural screenings.

Section 705—Temporary Prohibition on Increase in Copayments Under Retail Pharmacy System of Pharmacy Benefits Program

This section would limit the cost-sharing requirements for drugs provided through the TRICARE retail pharmacy program to amounts not more than $3 for generic drugs, $9 for formulary drugs, and $22 for non-formulary drugs. The cost-sharing schedules established by this section would end September 30, 2011.

SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

Section 711—Administration of TRICARE

This section would add a subparagraph to section 1073 title 10, United States Code, that states that except as otherwise provided in chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense has sole responsibility for administering the TRICARE program.

Section 712—Updated Terminology for the Army Medical Service Corps

This section would update section 3068 of title 10, United States Code, to ensure the statutory description of the Army Medical Service Corps accurately reflects the current structure and organization of the corps.

Section 713—Clarification of Licensure Requirements Applicable to Military Health-Care Professionals Who Are Members of the National Guard Performing Duty While in Title 32 Status

This section would clarify that national guard medical personnel serving in a title 32, United States Code, status while responding to actual or potential disasters are authorized to practice their profession in any location authorized by the Secretary of Defense regardless of local licensing restrictions. With the expansion of authority under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, the national guard, for example, may be authorized by the Governor, with concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, to evacuate hospitals and nursing homes in advance of a major hurricane, but current law may not protect the national guard medical care providers from licensing issues.

Section 714—Annual Report on Joint Health Care Facilities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees, concurrent with the annual submission of the President's budget, a report on which Department of Defense or Department of Veterans Affairs health care facilities are being considered for joint, combined, or any other type of operation where one of the departments will be operating in or with the other department's health care facility.

Section 715—Improvements to Oversight of Medical Training for Medical Corps Officers

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to perform a review of training programs for military Medical Corps officers to ensure that their academic and military performance has been properly documented in their military personnel records. This section would also require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on these reviews within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 716—Study on Reimbursement for Costs of Health Care Provided to Ineligible Individuals

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the cost incurred by the government on behalf of individuals ineligible to receive care under the TRICARE program. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the study within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, as well as any recommendations for legislative action required to address any findings of the study.

Section 717—Limitation on Transfer of Funds to Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Project

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report providing notice of any proposed transfer of funds to the Joint Department of Defense–Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 718—Enterprise Risk Assessment of Health Information Technology Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an Enterprise Risk Assessment Methodology study of all Department of Defense health information technology programs.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 721—Improving Aural Protection for Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to examine methods to improve aural protection for members of the armed forces.

Section 722—Comprehensive Policy on Neurocognitive Assessment by the Military Health System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a comprehensive policy on neurocognitive assessment for deployed members of the armed forces.

Section 723—National Casualty Care Research Center

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a National Casualty Care Research Center.

Section 724—Report on Feasibility of Study on Breast Cancer Among Female Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility of conducting a case-control study on the incidence of breast cancer among female service members who served in either Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Section 725—Assessment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder by Military Occupation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of post-traumatic stress disorder incidence by military occupation.

Section 726—Visiting NIH Neuroscience Fellowship Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to be known as the Visiting National Institutes of Health Senior Neuroscience Fellowship Program at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Defense Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

OVERVIEW

On March 17, 2009, the committee appointed a Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform from among members of the committee to carry out a comprehensive review of the defense acquisition system. The review was motivated by the committee's general sense that the Department of Defense's (DOD's) acquisition system was not responsive enough to today's mission needs, not rigorous enough in protecting taxpayers, and not disciplined enough in the acquisition of weapons systems for tomorrow's wars. The panel's review largely substantiated the committee's concerns. The committee notes that the House of Representatives has already passed legislation, unanimously supported by the committee, to implement reforms recommended by the panel, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010).

The committee notes that while the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 is intended to address the full scope of the defense acquisition system, there remain numerous acquisition policy-related matters outside the scope of the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 that are within the committee's jurisdiction and are addressed in this title. The committee included a provision which would expand the Department's authority for rapid acquisition in concert with the committee's decision to provide significant additional funding for rapid acquisition in title XV of this Act. The committee builds upon legis-

lation included in the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) authorizing the Department to designate major subprograms under major defense acquisition programs by including provisions in the title that would clarify the application of multiple acquisition-related laws to major subprograms, and would require the Secretary of Defense to designate the F135 and F136 engine programs of the F–35 Lightning II aircraft program as major subprograms.

The committee included several provisions relating to strategic materials in this title to ensure that the Department of Defense retains access to these materials and is able to mitigate vulnerabilities created when items of military equipment are dependent on them. The committee continues and extends its work providing oversight on contracting in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in this title, and addresses a variety of other matters relating to the industrial base, energy-related acquisition matters, and other matters of acquisition policy. The committee emphasizes its intention to continue robust oversight of defense acquisition.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Acquisition Oversight for TRICARE Management Agency

As discussed in a related item of special interest in title VII of this Act, the committee is concerned about the acquisition expertise of the TRICARE Management Agency (TMA). The committee is aware of significant shortcomings in the recent past in the training and certification status of those undertaking acquisition functions at TMA. These shortcomings are concerning because TMA is responsible for acquisitions budgeted at levels equivalent to those of a major defense acquisition program. The committee also notes that protests on two out of three regional TRICARE contract awards were upheld in 2009 by the Government Accountability Office due to significant shortcomings in proposal evaluation.

The committee is aware that TMA has reorganized its acquisition activities and has appointed a new chief acquisition officer in recent months. The committee strongly supports the decision to enhance the extent and quality of acquisition expertise at TMA. The committee also notes that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD AT&L) acts as the service acquisition executive for TMA and ultimately provides oversight of acquisition activities at TMA. The committee urges USD AT&L to continue to provide a heightened level of oversight to TMA while the acquisition function in TMA is being enhanced and TRICARE regional contracts are finalized.

Acquisition Process for Information Technology

The committee recognizes the need for reform of the acquisition process within the Department of Defense. The committee has taken several steps to achieve comprehensive acquisition reform, including passage of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) and section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), which called for an alternative acquisition process for information

technology (IT) systems, and the establishment of the Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform which carried out a comprehensive review of the defense acquisition system.

The committee endorses the findings of the Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform, and encourages the Department of Defense to integrate its findings regarding the acquisition of IT systems as it implements section 804 of Public Law 111–84. The full findings of the Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform can be found in H.R. 5013, but include:

(1) Determine clear performance metrics for specific programs from the start;

(2) Foster an ongoing dialogue during the technology development process between the system developers and the warfighters;

(3) Promote an open architecture approach that allows for more modularization of hardware and software;

(4) Develop a plan for how to strengthen the IT acquisition workforce;

(5) Implement alternative milestone decision points that are more consistent with commercial product development for IT;

(6) Develop a process for competitive prototyping in the IT environment;

(7) Develop a new test and evaluation approach that merges developmental and operational testing in a parallel fashion;

(8) Place greater emphasis on the up-front market analysis; and

(9) Conduct a rigorous analysis of contracting mechanisms and contract incentive structures to determine which work best for IT acquisitions.

Advanced Technology Clusters

The committee is aware of recent Department of Defense (DOD) and Small Business Administration efforts through the DOD Office of Small Business Programs and its laboratory network to initiate regional Advanced Technology Clusters (ATCs) to encourage the development of innovative advanced technologies, including robotics and autonomous systems, to address national security, homeland security, and first responder challenges. The committee is encouraged that the Department has made progress in marshalling existing statutory authorities in support of ATC and defining a method to collaborate with and leverage resources from the Small Business Administration. However, the committee is concerned that greater effort and commitment must be made in order to secure the support needed for these fledgling ATCs to succeed. To date, ATCs in Hawaii, Michigan, Hampton Roads, Virginia, and the Pacific Northwest have been established, each offering expertise in advanced technology and coordinating application of the current authorities contained in the following: (1) Technology Transition—Defense Production Act, Technology Transition, and Manufacturing Technology; (2) Industrial Policy—Defense Industrial Base Capabilities, Civil-Military Integration, and Independent Research and Development/Bid and Proposal; (3) Technology Transfer, Homeland Security Tech Transfer, Anti-Terrorist Capabilities; and (4) Small Business—Mentor Protégé Program and SBIR/STTR.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to enhance regional ATCs, resource the clusters, collaborate and share resources with other federal agencies, and assist the expansion of regional clusters in encouraging the development of innovative advanced technologies, including robotics and autonomous systems, to address national security, homeland security, and first responder challenges.

Application of Berry Amendment to Tents and Related Items

The committee is aware that the Director, Defense Logistics Agency has chosen to interpret the requirement to buy certain articles from domestic sources per subsection (b) of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, in such a manner that it applies expressly to tents, tarpaulins, or covers, but not to the materials and components of tents, tarpaulins, or covers. The committee is concerned that this narrow interpretation of the statute is inconsistent with the law. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Defense Logistics Agency to review the interpretation of the current statute to ensure that it is compliant with both the law and with congressional intent and submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 1, 2011, explaining how the committees' concerns were addressed.

Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan

The committee notes that section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) created the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan. The deadline for submission of the final report of the commission was extended for one year by section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to reflect additional time needed to accommodate the delays that occurred in establishing the commission in the final year of the previous Administration. The committee notes that section 841 mandated that the commission's final report provide its findings and recommendations on a number of critical policy issues relating to contingency contracting. The committee urges the commission to use the additional year to focus on these policy issues so that the committee can benefit from the timely submission of the commission's findings and recommendations in its final report while significant reconstruction expenditures remain in execution and under consideration by Congress.

Competition Requirements for Acquisitions Involving Federal Prison Industries

The committee notes that section 827 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Department of Defense (DOD) to acquire products using competitive procedures if such a product was listed in the Federal Prison Industries (FPI) catalog, and if FPI has more than a five percent share of the DOD market for the category that includes the product. The committee notes that Congress intended this policy to limit the extent to which FPI's unique status under federal procurement law affects the Department's access to the commercial marketplace for entire categories of products while maintaining

FPI's ability to serve as a supplier to the Department. The committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense is required to identify and publish a list of the product categories for which this competition requirement applies and to modify the list as new data is received.

The committee notes that the implementation of this section relies critically on how product categories are defined. Overly broad categories can effectively nullify the requirements of the section while overly narrow categories increase the administrative burden of these requirements. The committee believes that in order for the application of section 827 to be consistent with congressional intent, product categories should be defined so that the products within a category are part of a marketplace with similar market participants. Categories that aggregate large numbers of dissimilar market participants can lead to the Department being denied access to an entire commercial market. The committee notes that in the past, combat helmets have sometimes been treated as items which required mandatory sourcing from Federal Prison Industries. The committee further notes that combat helmets fall within the broad and diverse category of personal armor, which may have contributed to a mandatory sourcing designation. Likewise, the committee is concerned that the lists may be published irregularly, which limits the planning horizon for market participants, and that non-competitive awards may be made to FPI prior to the effective date of newly published lists (after which a procurement preference for FPI may not apply).

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to: review the list of product categories used in complying with section 827 to ensure that these categories contain similar market participants and are consistent with the need to protect the Department's access to the commercial market; to establish consistent dates for the publication of an updated list; and to notify industry of such dates. Lastly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of contract awards made to FPI (including awards of contract options on existing contracts) since the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to ensure that non-competitive awards are not being made to FPI following the publication of a new list of product categories, but prior to the effective date of such a list. The Secretary should submit a report on such a review to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Denial of Award Fees to Contractors for Jeopardizing Government Personnel

The committee notes that section 823 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) authorized the Secretary of Defense to reduce or deny award fees to contractors who jeopardize the health or safety of government personnel. The committee notes that section 823 provides the Secretary with considerable discretion in the application of this authority due to the diverse nature of the incidents for which this authority may be applicable. The committee believes that this authority provides an important tool for the Secretary to correct instances where negligent contractor behavior becomes apparent only after

significant levels of contractor profit have already been awarded. However, the proper application of the authority is necessary for it to serve its intended purpose.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2011, on incidents which satisfy the criteria identified in section 823(b). The report should list covered incidents occurring in the calendar year preceding the submission of the report, whether or not the Secretary exercised the authority provided by section 823 in relation to the incident, and whether the Secretary proposed the contractor for debarment in relation to the incident.

Employment Impact of Military Construction

The committee notes that Department of Defense contracts, while properly focused first and foremost on fulfilling national security objectives, are also a significant source of employment. In particular, contracts for military construction produce significant local employment benefits. The committee notes that maximizing the local employment benefits of military construction contracts, consistent with achieving national security objectives and the effective use of defense resources, is an important national interest.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study ways of maximizing the local employment benefits of military construction contracts including: incentives for hiring locally licensed labor; the increased use of small businesses for subcontractors and local procurements; a review of existing small business subcontracting goals and the effects of an expansion of such goals; and any other measures the Secretary deems appropriate. The study should also include an evaluation of potential costs to the Department that each option considered would incur. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees containing the findings of the study by March 1, 2011.

Matters Relating to the Common Database for Tracking Contracts and Contractor Personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan

Section 861 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding matters relating to contracts in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) later clarified that the requirements of section 861 of Public Law 110–181 also apply to grants and cooperative agreements. In response, the agencies promulgated new business rules requiring all personnel working under U.S. contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements in Iraq and Afghanistan to register in the Department of Defense's Synchronized Pre-deployment Operational Tracker (SPOT) database.

The committee has become aware that many nongovernmental organizations (NGO) have expressed concern about these new requirements. The NGOs believe that providing the U.S. Government detailed personal information for their Iraqi and Afghan employees

puts the neutrality of their organizations at risk and endangers the safety and security of these local national employees. In testimony before the committee on March 23, 2010, on these concerns, representatives from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID assured the committee that they would address the concerns of the NGOs in a way that would still meet the needs of the agencies. The committee encourages the agencies to find and implement a solution quickly and stresses the importance of the work performed by these NGOs. The committee also emphasizes that the statute only requires an accounting of total numbers of personnel, unless those personnel are performing private security functions. The committee encourages the agencies not to collect detailed personal information on local national personnel working under a U.S. contract, grant, or cooperative agreement unless such personnel are performing a private security function; require access to U.S. facilities, services, or support; or desire consideration for refugee or special immigrant status under the Refugee Crisis in Iraq Act of 2007 (subtitle C of title XII of Public Law 110–181).

The committee continues to be concerned about the slow progress made by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID in fully implementing the requirements of section 861 of Public Law 110–181. The committee has tracked the implementation of the memorandum of understanding and the SPOT database with interest and is disappointed by the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) most recent assessment, which found that the agencies continue to face significant challenges tracking contractor personnel and contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and its partner agencies to fully implement the SPOT database and take appropriate steps to ensure it is accurate and complete. The committee recommends that such steps include penalties on contractors who do not comply with their SPOT database requirements. In testimony before the committee on March 23, 2010, representatives from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID indicated that part of the reason the SPOT database was incomplete and inaccurate was that many of their contractors were remiss in entering the information needed. The committee encourages the agencies to include, in any new or modified contracts, penalties for contractors who fail to enter and update their required SPOT database information and that contracting officers exercise those penalties as appropriate.

The committee emphasizes that an accurate and complete database on contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan is not only required by section 861 of Public Law 110–181, but is in the best interest of the agencies, Congress, and the public. A fully accurate and complete SPOT database would allow the agencies to better manage and coordinate their contracts, would enable more effective oversight by Congress, and would facilitate greater transparency in government spending to the public. Furthermore, both GAO and the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction have stressed to the committee that if the SPOT database were accurate and complete, it would be a valuable tool to assist them in audits and investigations.

Titanium Supply for Defense Uses

The committee notes that titanium is an increasingly important element in the supply chain of the Department of Defense as well as in the supply chains of an increasing variety of commercial firms. The market for titanium and titanium parts has changed significantly in recent years, though it remains a market heavily influenced by foreign suppliers. The committee further notes that section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense, with a few limited exceptions, to procure titanium produced in the United States.

The rapidly evolving nature of the market for titanium, coupled with recent changes in section 2533b, has created significant uncertainty about the status of the domestic titanium manufacturing and production base and about the Department's requirements for titanium. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the state of the domestic titanium manufacturing base to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011. The report should:

(1) Identify projected levels of supply, over the next five years, for titanium and titanium parts produced in the United States (as such term is defined in section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, as amendment by section 813 this Act) for Department of Defense end items, or components thereof, including a discussion of the different metal grades, for each of the following categories: aircraft; missile and space systems; ships; tank and automotive items; weapon systems; and ammunition;

(2) Provide a projection of the Department's demand for titanium and titanium parts over the same time period and categories, including the projected value of such items;

(3) Identify any grade or category of titanium or titanium parts for which the Department's demand is likely to exceed the domestic supply available to the Department;

(4) Estimate the percentage and value of titanium and titanium parts that are not produced in the United States due to exceptions to domestic sourcing requirements applicable to specialty metals in end items or components sourced from qualifying countries and specialty metals contained in commercial off the shelf components;

(5) Identify representative examples of end items or components (such as engine and airframe components) previously manufactured in the United States that are no longer obtained from the United States industrial base.

(6) Evaluate the overall impact of section 2533b on the domestic titanium manufacturing and production base;

(7) Evaluate the impact of exceptions to domestic sourcing in section 2533b on the domestic titanium manufacturing and production base; and

(8) Make such recommendations relating to measures to improve the health of the domestic titanium manufacturing and industrial base as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Undefinitized Contractual Actions

The committee notes that section 809 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance to ensure the implementation and enforcement of requirements applicable to undefinitized contractual actions (UCA). UCAs expose the Department to substantial risk in terms of cost and of contract performance, and section 809 was intended to address the length and proliferation of UCAs. The committee notes that the Department issued its guidance in August 2008 and substantially updated it in October 2009. This guidance instituted a semi-annual reporting requirement that allows the Department to track UCAs and ensure their compliance with the relevant requirements. The committee believes that the updated guidance, together with additional modifications adopted in accord with recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommendations, has worked substantially to address the concerns that led to the enactment of section 809. At the same time, the committee was troubled that GAO found several instances where UCAs that qualified for inclusion were not in the latest semi-annual report. The committee urges the Department to ensure that local commands are informed of, and properly motivated to comply with, the Department's guidance on UCAs.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Section 801—Disclosure to Litigation Support Contractors

This section would amend section 2320 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to disclose technical data to a litigation support contractor for the purpose of assisting the Department of Defense in preparing for litigation. This section would require that the litigation support contractor: use the technical data only for the purpose of fulfilling its contract with the Department; take all reasonable steps to protect the technical data; and not use the technical data to compete with the owner of the technical data on any government or non-government contract. This section would take effect 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 802—Designation of F135 and F136 Engine Development and Procurement Programs as Major Subprograms

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 30 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to designate the F135 and F136 engine development and procurement programs as major subprograms in accordance with section 2430a of title 10, United States Code, and would require the Secretary to use the milestone B decision for the F135 and F136 engine development and procurement programs as the baseline for the reporting requirements referred to in section 2430a(b) of title 10, United States Code.

This section would specify the application of section 2433a of title 10, United States Code, (commonly referred to as Nunn-McCurdy) to the engine subprograms designated under this section. If an engine subprogram designated under this section were to breach one

of the Nunn-McCurdy thresholds for critical cost growth, the Secretary of Defense may satisfy the Nunn-McCurdy requirements for reevaluating the engine subprogram if the Secretary fully reevaluated the engine subprogram (including associated reporting in a Selected Acquisition Report) as part of the fiscal year 2010 review caused by a Nunn-McCurdy breach of the F–35 program. If the Secretary does not take such actions for an engine subprogram as part of the Nunn-McCurdy review of the F–35 program in fiscal year 2010, or if future program changes result in unit cost growth that exceeds a Nunn-McCurdy critical cost growth threshold, an engine subprogram would still be subject to the requirements of section 2433a of title 10, United States Code.

Section 803—Conforming Amendments Relating to Inclusion of Major Subprograms to Major Defense Acquisition Programs Under Various Acquisition-Related Requirements

This section would amend several sections of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the application of various acquisition-related requirements to major subprograms of major defense acquisition programs. Major subprograms are designated pursuant to section 2340a of title 10, United States Code. This section would cover major subprograms under the certification requirements for milestone A of section 2366a and the certification requirements for milestone B of 2366b of title 10, United States Code. This section would also cover major subprograms under the operational test and evaluation requirements of section 2399 and the independent life-cycle cost estimate and manpower estimate requirements of section 2434 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 804—Enhancement of Department of Defense Authority To Respond to Combat and Safety Emergencies Through Rapid Acquisition and Deployment of Urgently Needed Supplies

This section would amend section 806 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), as amended by section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), to expand the Department of Defense's ability to use the rapid acquisition authority provided under section 806 of Public Law 107–314 to respond to combat and safety emergencies. This section would extend the authority by allowing the authority to be used to:

(1) Acquire supplies in addition to items of equipment;

(2) Prevent casualties in addition to addressing causes of fatalities; and

(3) Purchase up to $200.0 million in supplies, annually, an increase of $100.0 million.

Section 805—Prohibition on Contracts with Entities Engaging in Commercial Activity in the Energy Sector of Iran

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from entering into any contract with an entity that engages in commercial activity in the energy sector of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 811—Extension of Authority To Procure Certain Fibers; Limitation on Specification

This section would amend section 829 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense to procure fire-resistant rayon fiber for the production of uniforms. This section would also amend section 829 to prohibit the issuance of any solicitation which specifies the use of fire-resistant rayon fiber.

Section 812—Small Arms Production Industrial Base Matters

This section would strike subsection (c) of section 2473 of title 10, United States Code, which narrowly defines the small arms production industrial base as consisting of only three manufacturers. This section would also require full and open competition for any small arms parts procurement program.

The committee is concerned about the potential atrophy of the existing qualified military specification producers currently comprising the small arms production industrial base as well as respective vendors' industrial capacity, and believes this could create an undue risk to warfighters in the event a production surge would be needed to meet requirements. The committee recognizes the need to preserve the critical elements of the small arms production industrial base and notes the benefits full and open competition could provide, particularly in the areas of small arms technological innovation and more competitive pricing in small arms and critical small arms parts manufacturing. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to maintain stewardship of the established small arms production industrial base, which has demonstrated high quality and performance.

Section 813—Additional Definition Relating to Production of Specialty Metals Within the United States

This section would amend section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the definition of the term "produced" used in that section. This section would define "produced" to mean "melted, or processed in a manner that results in physical or chemical property changes that are the equivalent of melting." The term would not include finishing processes such as rolling, heat treatment, quenching, tempering, grinding, or shaving.

SUBTITLE C—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 821—Studies To Analyze Alternative Models for Acquisition and Funding of Technologies Supporting Network-Centric Operations

This section would require an independent federally funded research and development center and the Joint Staff to carry out concurrent studies that analyze alternative models for acquisition and funding of interconnected systems for network centric operations and recommend changes from the present service-based approach.

Section 822—Annual Joint Report and Comptroller General Review on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan

This section would amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by adding a new section 865 that would require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to annually submit to the relevant committees of Congress (as those committees are defined in section 864 of Public Law 110–181) a joint report on United States contracts in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The report would include information on any significant developments or issues with respect to contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan during the 12-month reporting period. The report would also include a description of the agencies' plans for strengthening interagency coordination of contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan and in future contingency operations.

This section would also require the Comptroller General to review the joint report and interagency coordination of contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan and submit to the relevant committees of Congress a report on such review. The Comptroller General would be required to review how the agencies are using the data contained in the common databases established pursuant to section 861(b)(4) of Public Law 110–181 and assess the agencies' plans for strengthening interagency coordination of contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan, and future contingency operations. This section would require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of USAID to provide the Comptroller General with full access to information on contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan for the purposes of this review and report.

Section 823—Extension of Comptroller General Review and Report on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan

This section would amend section 863 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to extend, for fiscal year 2011, the requirement for the Comptroller General to conduct a review and report on contracting in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 824—Interim Report on Review of Impact of Covered Subsidies on Acquisition of KC–45 Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees an interim report on any review of a covered subsidy under section 886 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) within 60 days after the initiation of the review.

Section 825—Reports on Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and a federally funded research and development center selected by the Secretary to analyze the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) to identify improvements in the JCIDS process. This section would require the Secretary to submit reports on

both analyses within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and would also require the Secretary to begin implementing a plan to address problems in JCIDS within one year after the date of enactment. This section would require that problems identified in the analyses also be addressed as part of a program to manage performance in establishing joint military requirements and would allow the consolidation of the plan into any report relating to a program to manage performance in establishing joint military requirements. The committee notes that legislation which has passed the House of Representatives, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (Improve Acquisition Act of 2010), includes a provision, section 103, that requires the establishment of a program to manage performance in establishing joint military requirements.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 831—Extension of Authority for Defense Acquisition Challenge Program

This section would extend the expiration date of the Defense Acquisition Challenge Program from 2012 to 2017.

Section 832—Energy Savings Performance Contracts

This section would clarify the application of the enhanced competition requirements for task and delivery order contracts included in section 843 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to energy savings performance contracts. Energy savings performance contracts are developed using a detailed energy audit and through the negotiation of guaranteed energy savings between the contracting agency and the contractor. The committee recognizes that this process entails significant upfront costs, which are intended to be recouped out of the contract after it is awarded. This section would clarify the requirements for the notification of potential bidders and for the review of expressions of interest from bidders prior to entering into an energy savings performance contract and would deem such requirements to satisfy the requirements of section 843, which is codified at section 2304c(d) of title 10, United States Code, and section 253j(d) of title 41, United States Code.

Section 833—Consideration of Sustainable Practices in Procurement of Products and Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and issue guidance directing the secretary of each military department and the head of each defense agency to consider sustainable practices in the procurement of products and services. This section would not apply to the acquisition of weapon systems.

Section 834—Definition of Materials Critical to National Security

This section would amend section 187 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the definition of materials critical to national security. The revised definition would ensure that strategic materials whose supply to the Department of Defense can potentially be disrupted are monitored and addressed by the Strategic Materials

Protection Board established under section 187 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 835—Determination of Strategic or Critical Rare Earth Materials for Defense Applications

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to undertake an assessment of the supply chain for rare earth materials and determine which rare earth materials, if any, are strategic materials and which are materials critical to national security. Following such an assessment, the Secretary would be required to develop a plan to ensure the long-term availability of rare earth materials identified as strategic materials or materials critical to national security, with a goal of establishing domestic sources for such materials by December 31, 2015. In developing such a plan, the Secretary would be required to: consider including such materials in the National Defense Stockpile; identify, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, any trade practices that limit the Secretary's ability to meet the goals of the plan; assess financing options, such as loan guarantees, to private entities to provide the capacity required to ensure the availability of such materials; evaluate the benefits of funding under Title III of the Defense Production Act (Public Law 81–774); consider research and development funding; assess other means of establishing domestic sources by December 31, 2015; and develop a plan to eliminate supply-chain vulnerability by the earliest date practicable for materials for which, after exhausting all prior considerations, a domestic source cannot be established by December 31, 2015. This section would require the Secretary to submit a report, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Senate Committee on Finance, the House Committee on Financial Services, and the House Committee on Ways and Means, containing the findings of the assessment and plan.

Section 836—Review of National Security Exception to Competition

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the implementation of the national security exception to full and open competition provided in section 2304(c)(6) of title 10, United States Code (commonly known as the Competition in Contracting Act). The review would include an examination of: the pattern of usage; the range of items or services being acquired; the justification and approval process; compliance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation; issues relating to follow-on procurements; and possible additional uses for the exception. The committee intends that the examination of possible additional uses in this review would include, at a minimum, a review of any legislative proposals requesting national security-related exceptions to full and open competition submitted to the Department of Defense's Office of Legislative Counsel in the five years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. This section would require the Secretary to submit a report on the review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Finally, this section would require the Secretary, upon completion of the review, to submit draft regulations

relating to the implementation of the national security exception to full and open competition to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Section 837—Inclusion of Bribery in Disclosure Requirements of the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System

This section would amend section 872(c) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to include information about a federal contractor relating to violations of any law relating to bribery of a country which is a signatory of the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions in the federal awardee performance and integrity information system.

Section 838—Requirement for Entities With Facility Clearances That Are Not Under Foreign Ownership Control or Influence Mitigation

This section would require a corporation holding a facility clearance granted by the Department of Defense that is not subject to foreign ownership control or influence to establish a government security committee to ensure that such corporation maintains policies and procedures that meet requirements under the national industrial security program. The committee notes that corporations subject to foreign ownership control or influence are already required, in most cases, to have a government security committee.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Advisory Panel on Improving Interagency National Security Coordination

Section 1054 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) authorized the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to jointly establish a standing advisory panel to "advise, review, and make recommendations on ways to improve coordination among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID on matters relating to national security, including reviewing their respective roles and responsibilities." The committee believes this panel will provide invaluable objective information and recommendations to the agencies, as well as to Congress, about how to improve coordination and collaboration. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of USAID to stand up this important panel immediately. The committee further encourages the Secretaries and Administrator to task this panel with studying and reporting recommendations on how the agencies should collaborate on creating

interagency training, education, and rotational assignment opportunities for their personnel, and how the agencies should incentivize their personnel and organizations to enable and encourage such opportunities.

Arctic Operations and the Northwest Passage

The committee continues to be concerned about the implications and potential consequences of global climate change. However, one of the possible benefits associated with climate change is the opening of a Northwest Passage and the potential expansion of trade through the Arctic Ocean. The Department of the Navy has indicated that polar ice has decreased by 67 percent since 1979 and that the Arctic Ocean is projected to be ice free for short periods of time starting in the year 2038. The committee is encouraged that the Department of the Navy, working in concert with the respective combatant commanders, has prepared an Arctic Roadmap to address future operations but believes that additional effort needs to be placed on this strategic capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by May 30, 2011, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of the strategic national security objectives and restrictions in the Arctic Region;

(2) An assessment on mission capabilities required to support the strategic national security objectives and a timeline to obtain such capabilities;

(3) An assessment of an amended unified command plan that addresses opportunities of obtaining continuity of effort in the Arctic Ocean by a single combatant commander;

(4) An assessment of the basing infrastructure required to support Arctic strategic objectives, including the need for a deep-water port in the Arctic; and

(5) An assessment of the status of and need for icebreakers to determine whether icebreakers provide important or required mission capabilities to support Arctic strategic national security objectives, and an assessment of the minimum and optimal number of icebreakers that may be needed.

Augmentation of Army Brigade Combat Teams To Advise and Assist Foreign Security Forces

In recent years, the Department of Defense has created hundreds of training teams using service members from all of the military services to mentor, advise, and partner with security forces in both the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. These teams have totaled up to 10,000 U.S. military personnel per rotation, most often from the ground forces. While these teams act as units, they are not units that exist in any of the services' doctrinal structure. Instead, they are typically sourced with personnel who were identified individually, generally company- and field-grade officers and senior non-commissioned officers who are taken from other units.

In the past, the Army faced some difficulty in sourcing these teams without affecting the readiness of its overall force. As a result of these challenges, the Army has shifted its approach and is

now replacing many of the individual training teams in Iraq with brigade combat teams that are specially augmented with leaders to carry out the advisory and assistance mission, referred to as advisory and assistance brigades. Similarly, in Afghanistan, the U.S. military is planning for the use of units similar to advisory and assistance brigades, referred to as mobility brigades-security force assistance, for this mission. While still a work in progress, the Army projects that using brigades with an augmentation for the advisory and assistance mission, instead of individual training teams, will: decrease the burden on the services of having to identify and source individuals; improve command and control for the training mission; and allow for improved mission effectiveness.

The committee is aware of the Government Accountability Office's prior evaluations of the readiness of U.S. forces and directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Army's plans for augmenting its brigade combat teams to perform the advisory and assistance mission and the use of the teams to support ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and to report the results of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This review should evaluate: the extent to which the Army has defined intended roles and missions for these brigades, including for ongoing operations or other commitments; the extent to which the Army has defined requirements for these types of brigade combat teams, including personnel, equipment, and training requirements; and the Army's ability to source these requirements, including any impacts on overall readiness.

Certification and Accreditation Process for Information Technology Programs

The committee understands the certification and accreditation (C&A) process for information technology (IT) programs is a critical component of the Department of Defense's (DOD) information assurance posture. The committee is concerned that C&A processes have neither kept pace with the rapid pace of technological changes, nor the marginal changes in DOD policy. For example, as the Department of Defense implements the alternative acquisition process for IT systems required by section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), it should also examine the C&A process to ensure that the entire acquisition and fielding process is optimized.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to evaluate the C&A process and make changes as needed to keep pace with the existing and projected technical environment. The committee supports the July 2009 DOD memorandum detailing the implementation of Information System Certification and Accreditation Reciprocity as an important step in updating the C&A process. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider certain additional actions as it reviews the C&A process, including:

(1) Requiring automated software vulnerability analysis throughout the development and deployment lifecycle of an IT system;

(2) Requiring that all category 1 software vulnerabilities are remediated;

(3) Implementing a process for shielding web applications in a runtime mode to protect them from exploitation in situations where it is not possible to remediate existing software vulnerabilities of legacy web-enabled national security systems; and

(4) Enhancing the testing and evaluation process in order to evaluate code execution as a component of the accreditation decision.

Common Alignment of World Regions in the Internal Organization of Departments and Agencies With International Responsibilities

The committee is concerned that inconsistent regional alignments in the internal organization of departments and agencies increase the difficulty of executing interagency national security policy. In February 2009, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, General James L. Jones, announced that the Administration would implement a common regional alignment. The committee notes that no action has been taken to date. The committee supports the National Security Advisor's vision and encourages the President to commission a study to assess the need for and implications of a common alignment of world regions in the internal organization of departments and agencies with international responsibilities. The committee encourages this study to assess the problems resulting from different geographic boundaries within the various agencies, potential obstacles to implementing a common alignment, and the advantages and disadvantages of a common alignment. The study should also provide a determination by the President as to what action the administration intends to take on this matter and when, and what legislative action, if any, would be required by Congress.

Intelligence Information Sharing

The committee is concerned that Department of Defense intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) program guidance does not provide sufficient overarching direction and priorities for sharing intelligence information across the defense intelligence community. As highlighted in a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report requested by the committee, the military services do not have a coordinated acquisition strategy, resulting in the current lack of ability and capacity of the military services to fully share ISR information collected by the warfighter. Each military service has proceeded at its own pace, and continues to proceed at its own pace, to conform to standards that facilitate sharing of ISR information. The committee believes that until all participants in the defense intelligence community successfully share intelligence information, inefficiencies will continue, and data collection efforts may be unnecessarily duplicative, with the result being shortfalls in the effectiveness of efforts to support the warfighter.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to implement the recommendation of GAO report, GAO–10–265NI, which recommends that the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military service secretaries, develop intelligence information sharing guidance, such as a concept of operations, and to

provide such direction and prioritization to the intelligence community. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, by September 1, 2010, on the actions planned or taken to implement this recommendation.

Finally, the committee requests the Comptroller General evaluate the Secretary's report and determine whether it is consistent with, and adequately addresses the recommendation, and to provide the committee with an update on the conclusions of this evaluation as soon as it is practicable.

Personnel Management Policy and Plans Affecting Special Operations Forces

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) has yet to finalize DOD Directive 5100.01, titled "Functions of the Department of Defense and Its Major Components", that establishes a means by which the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) could coordinate with the service secretaries for matters related to Special Operations Forces (SOF) personnel management policy and plans as they relate to accessions, assignments, compensation, promotions, professional development, readiness, retention, sustainment, and training of all SOF personnel. The committee is aware that each existing service-specific memorandum of agreement that defines service responsibilities and support to USSOCOM is being reviewed, and is encouraged that the Department of the Navy has recently completed its review including an appendix that defines responsibilities and relationships for personnel management of SOF assigned to USSOCOM.

The committee appreciates this service-specific approach, but is concerned that individual service reviews and subsequent updated or enacted agreements that defines relationships with respect to SOF personnel management may be inconsistent across the services. The committee therefore encourages the Secretary of Defense to finalize Directive 5100.01 within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and continue to review the aforementioned service-specific agreements to ensure a holistic approach with respect to personnel management policy and plans that affect SOF and USSOCOM. The committee believes that such agreements should establish a means by which the service secretaries and the Commander of USSOCOM can consult with one another to manage and mitigate concerns across the entire special operations community as they relate to accessions, assignments, compensation, promotions, professional development, readiness, retention, sustainment, and training.

Senior Workforce in the Business Transformation Agency

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed concern about the lack of permanent billets for senior executive service staff within BTA and the deleterious effect that would have on hiring and promotions within the agency. In the past two years, the committee notes that no cor-

rective actions were taken, resulting in the loss of senior staff due to the lack of promotion opportunities. Therefore, the committee directs the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to provide written notification of compliance to the House Committee on Armed Services on actions being taken to address the committee's concerns within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Strategic Management Plan

The committee is aware that the Strategic Management Plan (SMP) required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) is a document that continues to evolve since it was originally submitted in July 2008. The committee applauds the Department of Defense's efforts to develop this congressional reporting requirement into a management tool to improve the performance of the business functions of the Department. The committee encourages the Department to strengthen the management framework in the SMP and further refine the data that is collected and included in the report to make it an even more useful performance analysis tool. For example, the SMP should incorporate performance goals captured by other documents, such as the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan and the reports required by the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347). The committee also recommends that the SMP include a number of other performance measures, such as information sharing standards, facility recapitalization rates, and tracking for critical workforce specialties within the Department.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

Section 901—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

Section 902—Realignment of the Organizational Structure of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to Carry Out the Reduction Required by Law in the Number of Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense

This section would amend certain statutory provisions in United States Code related to the organizational structure of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). These changes would reduce the number of Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense and implement the realignment of the organizational structure of OSD as directed by section 906 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. These changes would provide a logical construction for the organization of the most senior officials within OSD by remov-

ing the wide variance in the status and stature of officials with the same title, and providing the same title to officials of generally equal status and stature. Additionally, this section would remove the prescription on certain specific titles of officials and organizations within OSD allowing the Department to provide a more consistent, recognizable application across the entire enterprise.

Section 903—Unified Medical Command

This section would provide legal authority to the Secretary of Defense to establish a unified medical command to provide medical services to the armed forces and other health care beneficiaries of the Department of Defense as defined in chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code. This section also would require the Secretary to develop a comprehensive plan to establish a unified medical command. Further, this section would amend title 10, United States Code, to specify that one of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense will be for Health Affairs, responsible for health care policy formulation and oversight.

SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Section 911—Integrated Space Architectures

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to maintain the capability to conduct integrated national security space architecture planning, development, coordination, and analysis.

The Department of Defense's (DOD) space architecture function was originally established in 1995 as the Department of Defense Office of the Space Architect (DODOSA). In 1998, DODOSA became the Office of the National Security Space Architect, and in 2004 was combined with the National Security Space Integration Directorate by the DOD Executive Agent for Space to become the National Security Space Office (NSSO). Its purpose was to bridge defense and intelligence space capabilities, programs, and organizations by developing integrated national security space architectures and provide recommendations to guide space decisions and investments.

The committee is aware of ongoing discussions within the Department regarding the disposition of the NSSO. However, absent a clear mandate to conduct integrated space architecture planning, development, coordination, and analysis that is independent or outside of any individual military service or intelligence community organization, the committee is concerned that space architecture work will be stove-piped and will not reflect enterprise-wide interests and priorities. The committee believes senior decision makers should have the benefit of an independent capability to oversee, assess, and coordinate, where appropriate, the national security space activities of the defense and intelligence communities. The committee recognizes that the preponderance of national security space expertise resides in the individual military services and intelligence community organizations, and believes this expertise can be effectively leveraged to support enterprise-wide architecting.

This section would not be intended to limit rapid acquisition efforts such as Operationally Responsive Space (ORS); however, the

committee does endorse efforts that expand user access to ORS capabilities and data.

Given the challenges associated with space acquisitions, the expensive nature of modern satellite development programs, and a limited cadre of space professionals, the committee believes that major decisions regarding national security space should be approached in a holistic and strategic manner to identify opportunities to: coordinate and cooperate on space capabilities, technologies, and resources; leverage expertise; promote greater information sharing; and minimize duplication wherever feasible.

SUBTITLE C—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 921—5-Year Extension of Authority for Secretary of Defense To Engage in Commercial Activities as Security for Intelligence Collection Activities

This section would amend existing statutory authority for the use by the Department of Defense of intelligence commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities by granting the Secretary of Defense a 5-year extension of authority to approve such activities.

Section 431 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 102–88) first granted the Secretary authority to approve the use of commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities. Since that time, Congress has extended this authority six times, in increments of two, three and four years, with the current authority set to expire on December 31, 2010. Regular reports to Congress enable effective congressional oversight and make possible a 5-year extension of this authority.

Section 922—Space and Counterspace Intelligence Analysis

This section would require the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency to designate a lead integrator for foreign space and counterspace defense intelligence analysis, and to authorize the lead integrator to conduct original intelligence analysis and production within the areas of responsibility of such lead integrator. This section would also require a notification to the congressional defense committees and intelligence committees of any changes in the designation of the lead integrator.

The National Air and Space Intelligence Center (NASIC) has been the designated lead integrator for space and counterspace intelligence. However, the Defense Intelligence Agency recently issued guidance prohibiting NASIC from conducting original intelligence analysis in certain counterspace mission areas despite its technical expertise and historical knowledge.

The committee believes it is important for a lead integrator to maintain technical proficiency in the areas for which it is given lead integrator responsibilities. This proficiency can be maintained by conducting original intelligence analysis, when necessary or appropriate, and also developing competitive, or alternative, analysis consistent with the objectives of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–458).

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 931—Revisions to the Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

This section would amend section 2113a of title 10, United States Code, to add four individuals appointed by the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services to the Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

Section 932—Increased Flexibility for Combatant Commander Initiative Fund

This section would amend section 166(a) of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fund up to $10.0 million of research, development, test, and evaluation initiatives from funds authorized under the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund.

Section 933—Two-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Temporary Waiver of Reimbursement of Costs of Activities for Nongovernmental Personnel at Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies

This section would amend section 941(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to extend for two fiscal years the temporary authority for the five Regional Centers for Security Studies of the Department of Defense to waive the reimbursement of costs required under section 184(f) of title 10, United States Code, for personnel of nongovernmental organizations and international organizations to participate in activities of the centers.

Section 934—Additional Requirements for Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review in 2011

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider information operations, strategic communications, and detention and interrogation activities as part of the 2011 Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review required by section 118b of title 10, United States Code.

Section 935—Codification of Congressional Notification Requirement Before Permanent Relocation of Any United States Military Unit Stationed Outside the United States

This section would amend chapter 6 of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section 162a that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress at least 30 days before the permanent relocation of a military unit stationed outside of the United States. That notification would include a description of the impact that relocation would have on United States national security policy.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

The budget request contained $1.13 billion for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $107.4 million, for operational tempo, which is contained within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2011 to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2) domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology support; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2011 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

FY11 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request	$1,131.4
International Support	$580.9
Domestic Support	$216.8
Intelligence and Technology Support	$193.6
Demand Reduction	$140.0
FY11 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request Recommendation	$1,131.4

COUNTERTERRORISM

Counterterrorism Initiatives

The committee notes that the United States has made significant gains in the effort to disrupt, defeat, and dismantle al Qa'ida and its extremist allies. According to open sources, over the course of 2009, the United States was able to successfully kill or capture hundreds of al Qa'ida fighters and members of affiliated organizations, a substantial increase over prior years. The committee further notes that the effort to enlist regional allies in the fight against al Qa'ida and its extremist allies has also led to notable successes, in particular the recent capture of the second in command of the Afghan Taliban, a former Taliban finance minister, and two Taliban "shadow governors" in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Republic of Yemen has also taken effective, though as yet incomplete, measures to eliminate the threat from al Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula. The committee believes that the Administration as a whole, and in particular the men and women of the United States military deserve our thanks and congratulations for this significant progress.

The committee believes, however, that much work remains to be done before the fight against al Qa'ida is finished and the threat to the United States is eliminated. The committee has focused its efforts in this year's National Defense Authorization Act in four main areas. First, the committee has acted to improve force protection from terrorists and their allies at home and abroad. Second, the committee has enhanced the capacity of the United States military, particularly the United States Special Operations Forces (USSOF), who have been integral in successes to date, to act directly against terrorist organizations. Third, the committee has built upon past efforts and begun new initiatives to counter extremist ideology and improve cooperation in the fight against al

Qa'ida and its allies. Fourth, the committee has enhanced or expanded several critical authorities related to counterterrorism.

To better protect our troops at home, the committee has provided $100.0 million in this title to implement the initial recommendations of the Fort Hood Follow-On Review conducted by the Department of Defense in the wake of the shooting at Fort Hood that killed 12 soldiers and one civilian and wounded 30 other people. The Follow-On Review was charged with identifying and addressing possible deficiencies in force protection and the identification of Department of Defense employees who could pose a credible threat to themselves or others as well as other related issues. In a related effort in this title, the committee has required the Secretary of Defense to begin an additional, more comprehensive review of force protection. This review will address such issues as standoff distances for building, protective standards related to weapons of mass destruction, standards for access to Department of Defense bases, and enhanced information sharing between federal agencies and intelligence agencies to better identify threats, including those that might originate from persons who have access to Department of Defense bases. Finally, to address force protection concerns in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee has included the authority in title 15 of this Act for the Secretary of Defense to obligate up to $200.0 million to address urgent force protection needs in Afghanistan and to utilize rapid acquisition authority in carrying out this function. The committee believes that these efforts, taken together, will substantially reduce potential vulnerabilities of our servicemen and women at home and on the battlefield.

The committee has also acted to enhance the ability of the USSOF to carry on the fight against al Qa'ida and its extremist allies. These forces have been on the front lines of this fight, and the efforts of USSOF have been integral in weakening that terrorist organization. To further enhance the ability of USSOF to find, fix, and eliminate terrorists who threaten the United States, the committee has provided nearly $10.0 billion for USSOF and counterterrorism capabilities throughout the bill, which represents an increase of almost $800.0 million over fiscal year 2009. Of this number, $205.0 million is provided to address unfunded requirements identified by the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). In title 12 of this Act, the committee has also provided a 25 percent increase in authority for the so-called Section 1208 program, which permits the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals facilitating military operations by USSOF to combat terrorism. Finally, the committee notes that General Stanley McChrystal, among others, has commented on the urgent need to develop language skills in the United States military to enhance the capacity to conduct counterinsurgency in Afghanistan. The committee has responded to this need and placed a renewed focus on the development of critical language and cultural skills among USSOF, urging the Department of Defense to provide Foreign Language Proficiency Pay in a uniform manner for all members of USSOF who have achieved a 1/1 and 1+ standard of proficiency and directing the Commander of USSOCOM to brief the committee on his command's cultural immersion objectives, challenges, and strategies.

The committee has also acted on a variety of fronts to counter the ideology of extremists, to curb their ability to use the internet for recruiting and fundraising, and to enhance United States and allied efforts to infiltrate and combat terrorist networks. The committee has provided additional funds in several ways to focus research on efforts to counter terrorists' ideology: providing an increase of $5.0 million for the Minerva Initiative in title 2 of this Act, an increase of $10.0 million for counter-ideology programs and to address science and technology gaps in DOD activities to counter adversarial ideologies, and a total of $9.0 million to support the social science researchers who are assisting the Department of Defense in understanding the cultural and ideological basis of our adversaries in the current fights. This year, the committee has taken additional steps to counter the use of the internet by extremists. To gain a more full understanding of those activities already conducted by the Department and to ensure that those actions are coordinated, the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to report on the activities taken by the Department in this area. The committee has also provided an additional $2.5 million in title 2 of this Act in the Combating Terrorism Technical Support program for an extensive study to determine the state of the virtual media environment occupied by today's extremist and terrorist enemies. Finally, the committee has included two new initiatives in this year's National Defense Authorization Act designed to enhance the ability of the United States and allied forces to infiltrate and combat enemy forces. Therefore, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to institutionalize the Legacy program and similar programs. The Legacy and similar programs, based on a successful European model, assisted with the development of an indigenous capacity to infiltrate and disrupt local terrorist networks. The committee has also noted that many innovative programs for mapping complex and social landscapes, understanding relationships among key actors in insurgencies, identifying the key goals of marginalized groups that could lead them to be recruited by terrorists, and integrating whole-of-government approaches in support of indigenous institutions to reduce the appeal of terrorist groups have failed in the past for lack of institutionalized support. The committee notes that it is precisely this sort of information that is vital for understanding the environment in which terrorist groups live and operate, and therefore is of great benefit in the effort to eliminate such terrorist groups. The committee has therefore directed the Secretary to provide a plan by September 1, 2010, for supporting and sustaining the variety of innovative programs in these areas.

The committee has acted to expand several critical authorities used by the Department of Defense in combating terrorism. The committee expands the authority of the Secretary of Defense to build the capacity of foreign military forces, the "1206 program," by increasing funds by $150.0 million over fiscal year 2010 levels. Out of the funds provided by the committee for the 1206 program, not less than $75.0 million would be used to enhance the capacity of the Yemeni security forces to combat al Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula, the terrorist group that attempted to down Northwest Airlines flight 253 over Detroit, Michigan on December 25, 2009. The committee has also extended and expanded the Coalition Support

Program, now allowing reimbursements to any nation who provides logistical and military assistance to support the fight against al Qa'ida, the Taliban, and other militant extremists in Pakistan, in addition to the current authority to reimburse nations for logistical and military support for United States military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee has extended the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund authority by one year to ensure that the transition of the program from the Department of Defense to the Department of State is conducted smoothly and without an interruption to the vital aid intended to assist Pakistan in combating militant extremists. Finally the committee requires that the next Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review examine critical core missions relating to counterterrorism including: strategic communications; information operations; and interrogation and detention.

The committee believes that the initiatives outlined above, combined with the host of other programs and authorizations provided in this bill, will substantially enhance the ability of the brave men and women of the United States military to protect themselves at home and abroad and will provide them with the additional tools they need to disrupt, dismantle, and eventually defeat al Qa'ida and their extremist allies.

Countering Extremist Use of the Internet

The committee is concerned that while extremist groups are becoming increasingly more sophisticated in their use of the internet, the U.S. Government has been slow to mobilize an effective counter-response to the proliferation of extremist websites that are used for recruiting, training, propaganda, and fundraising. The committee understands that there are a range of significant policy, legal, technical, and management challenges to dealing with the increasing use of the internet to promulgate extremist views.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act a report on the actions that the Department of Defense is taking to counter extremists' use of the internet. More details on this requirement can be found in the classified annex accompanying this report.

Countering Network-Based Threats

The committee applauds the Irregular Warfare Support (IWS) program achievements supporting both unconventional and irregular approaches to warfare. The committee is especially interested in the "Attack the Network" approach used in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan under the Legacy program. The doctrinal program was based on a previously successful European model and began as a research and development pilot project. Proven to be immediately effective in disrupting terrorist network activities, saving lives, and building a leave-behind indigenous capability, Legacy successes have been documented and validated in an independent Department of Defense commissioned study carried out by the RAND Corporation.

The committee notes that network-based threats come in many forms. Whether in the form of terrorism, insurgencies, narco-traf-

ficking, organized crime, piracy, or gangs, these networks are a persistent danger that will continue to grow around the world. These destructive and illegal networks find sanctuary within indigenous populations around the world and particularly flourish where governance and law enforcement is weak. The committee cannot emphasize enough that defeating these networks will require the persistent presence, local knowledge, and specialized training that a program such as Legacy employs.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to conduct the following activities:

(1) Assess the applicability of the Legacy program in other areas where network-based threats are present or where conditions are conducive to supporting these threats;

(2) Establish an appropriate management structure within the Department for Legacy and other similar programs;

(3) Coordinate with interagency partners, including but not limited to, the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of Homeland Security to synchronize Legacy with other capacity building and intelligence programs; and

(4) Develop a plan to institutionalize, within the U.S. Government, the capability necessary to institutionalize and train foreign forces to gather and exploit counterinsurgency intelligence at a local level within the U.S. Government.

Defense Threat Reduction Agency Mission and Resourcing

The committee recognizes that countering the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by our adversaries is a national priority, and that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) plays a central role in our efforts. The committee is aware that the recent Quadrennial Defense Review report calls for increased investment in preventing proliferation and countering WMD. The committee is also aware that the fiscal year 2011 budget request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency reflects these priorities and requirements. In particular, the budget request for DTRA contained increased investments to secure vulnerable fissile materials worldwide, expand global biological threat reduction initiatives, develop arms control monitoring and verification capabilities, combat WMD terrorism, develop and acquire technology and train forces to locate and identify radiological or nuclear threats, develop post-detonation nuclear forensics capabilities, and provide countering WMD reachback support to the warfighter. The committee is supportive of these priorities and expects the Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to carefully oversee execution of the additional funding.

Rotary-Wing Assets for United States Special Operations Forces

The committee is aware that rotary-wing aviation assets are critical enablers supporting the armed forces, and in particular United States Special Operations Forces (USSOF), engaged in counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations. The committee is aware that rotary-wing shortfalls exist in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and elsewhere as noted in Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and

Capabilities (TUTC) hearings and the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The committee also notes that the recent personnel growth of USSOF has far outpaced the organic rotary-wing capacity of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM).

The committee is encouraged that both the QDR and the fiscal year 2011 budget request address service-wide and USSOCOM rotary-wing shortfalls and provide modest but targeted improvements in force structure, training, acquisition timelines, and service-life-extension programs for support to USSOF. The committee is pleased that the Department has increasingly leveraged general purpose rotary-wing assets to support USSOF worldwide missions and requirements. However, the committee remains concerned that proposed solutions may not offer timely relief, and that continued shortfalls in OEF, OIF and elsewhere may impede operations where USSOF presence will continue for the foreseeable future. The committee is aware that the Joint Staff's Review of Helicopter Assets (ROHA), as cited in testimony before TUTC, recommended significant adjustments in force management of rotary-wing platforms. The committee is aware, however, that the ROHA is presently being updated, and is discouraged that the Department has yet to provide the ROHA to the committee despite several requests, and despite its citing in official testimony before TUTC.

The committee believes USSOCOM should take the appropriate steps to ensure that rotary aviation assets are appropriately managed and resourced. The committee understands that USSOCOM and U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) plan to establish a special operations aviation command to address critical needs. The committee is concerned that USSOCOM has not discussed in detail the command's plans to address its rotary aviation needs. The committee therefore encourages the Secretary of Defense, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, Low-Intensity Conflict, and Interdependent Capabilities, and the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command to continue to aggressively identify and implement solutions such as the expanded use of general purpose rotary-wing assets, improvements in USSOF rotary-wing organic force structure, accelerated acquisition timelines, and the expanded use of non-standard aviation platforms and aviation foreign internal defense activities, and to openly communicate solutions, future plans and actions with the congressional defense committees.

Strategies for Countering Irregular Warfare Challenges

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to place greater emphasis on pursuing efforts to develop innovative, non-material, and multi-disciplinary methodologies and strategies for disrupting irregular and asymmetric threats and threat enablers, such as insurgency, radicalization, improvised explosive device activity, threat financing, and associated infrastructures. The committee believes that such approaches could offer broader capabilities to the Department, interagency and international partners, as well as better leverage the collective resources of the entire federal government to:

(1) Map the complex social and cultural landscape of areas of interest;

(2) Understand the relationships between centers of power, bases of support, and key influencers that provide critical infrastructure and enable violent extremist organizations (VEO);

(3) Identify common goals among marginalized groups and institutions within areas of interest that have the potential to be recruited by terrorist groups;

(4) Integrate whole-of-government approaches in support of indigenous groups and institutions to reduce the appeal of local terrorist organizations and thus their local effectiveness; and

(5) Degrade any enabling factors within fragile societies that allow for VEOs to flourish.

The committee notes that the Department, under the auspices of the Irregular Warfare Support Program, the Rapid Reaction Technology Office, and the Asymmetric Warfare Group, has developed and implemented a few pilot projects to test concepts employing non-material, multi-disciplinary methodologies. However, while some of these concepts have shown promise, they often fail to reach full operational capability. The committee notes that these failures occur for various reasons, most notably because of unstable funding or lack of proper management, or both. The committee emphasizes the need for the Department of Defense, other U.S. Government agencies and international partners to pursue, test, and implement novel approaches that address the current threat environment.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees, by September 1, 2010, a plan for supporting and sustaining innovative approaches to address the stated goals above, including such approaches that incorporate and blend legal, law enforcement, intelligence, and military tactics, techniques and procedures.

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Center for Strategic Communications and Public Diplomacy

The committee continues to support the development of capabilities within the U.S. Government to effectively engage with global communities. In section 1055 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), the committee directed the National Security Council to conduct a comprehensive review of strategic communications (SC) and public diplomacy (PD) activities within the federal government. A component of that review called for a study of whether to establish an independent organization to serve as a critical mass within the U.S. Government that would foster intergovernmental and non-governmental innovation to support various government clients.

The committee was dissatisfied with the inadequacy of the analysis supporting the response to section 1055. The report required by section 1055 does not provide sufficient justification to support that conclusion that an independent organization for SC and PD is not needed. The committee is aware of 10 other studies since 2003 that have indicated the need for such an organization, which contradicts the section 1055 report recommendation. The committee urges the National Security Council to give due consideration to such an option.

Force Protection Policies

The January 2010 report by the Department of Defense Independent Review Related to Fort Hood made a number of critical observations related to underlying contributing factors in the shootings that occurred on November 5, 2009. These factors include the fact that no senior Department of Defense (DOD) official is assigned overall responsibility for force protection policy and that there is no integrating DOD policy regarding force protection (Finding 3.1); DOD force protection programs and policies are not focused on internal threats (Finding 3.2); there is no formal guidance standardizing how to share force protection threat information across the services or the combatant commands (Finding 3.4); DOD installation access control systems and processes do not incorporate behavioral screening strategies and capabilities, and are not configured to detect an insider threat (Finding 3.7).

These findings recognize that force protection policies have evolved over the past two decades, but have not been updated in holistic manner to deal with changing organizational responsibilities and an expansion of the threat spectrum to include those emanating from within the base perimeter as well as from without. As the scope of interested parties in ensuring force protection has also grown, it is clear to the committee that current policies and procedures have not kept pace with this evolving threat environment. The committee recognizes the need for a comprehensive review and clarification of force protection policies and guidance, and has included a provision to address these concerns elsewhere in this Act.

Funding of National Security Requirements

The committee supports the goal of building and funding a balanced United States national security strategy. The committee is concerned that current levels of national security spending across defense, homeland security, and non-defense foreign engagement programs strain to meet the national security requirements of the United States, especially in programs external to the Department of Defense.

The committee encourages the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to develop and implement measures aimed at improving coordination of security policy and budget planning in order to improve cooperation and further national security goals. The committee notes that such efforts should include the consideration of a unified set of national security priorities.

Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center

The committee is aware that the Department of Homeland Security, along with the Department of State and the Department of Justice, is chartered to operate the interagency Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center (HSTC). Its purpose is to foster greater integration of U.S. Government efforts to counter migrant smuggling, trafficking in persons, and clandestine terrorist travel. HSTC carries out this mission though the broad dissemination of all-source information, preparation of strategic assessments, identification of

issues for enhancing interagency coordination, and coordination of interagency initiatives.

The committee believes that some of the capabilities of HSTC could provide valuable support for certain global missions of the Department of Defense, and in particular the U.S. Special Operations Command. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to find additional ways to increase cooperation with HSTC in areas of common interest in which the Department of Defense has personnel with particular skills and expertise, such as in analysis of international smuggling routes, social networks, terrorist financing, and document exploitation.

Policy and Guidance for Defense Support of Civil Authorities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) approach toward meeting its defense support of civil authorities, or civil support, mission has been evolving since prior to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and continues to evolve today. The committee notes that the recent Quadrennial Defense Review report revealed a new approach to consequence management response forces. Specifically, the 2nd and 3rd Consequence Management Response Forces will be replaced with smaller units focused on providing command, control and communications capabilities for Title 10 follow-on forces, and the Department will draw on existing National Guard forces to build a Homeland Response Force in each of the ten Federal Emergency Management Agency regions. The committee recognizes the potential for this organizational construct to strengthen the links between federal, state and local authorities.

While supportive of these recent changes, the committee is concerned that civil support policy and guidance has not kept pace with the Department's evolving approaches to meeting the civil support mission. A recent Comptroller General report (GAO–10–386) noted "a lack of alignment across DOD's policies, strategy, and doctrine for its civil support mission, making it difficult to determine DOD's capability requirements." For example, at least six DOD directives relevant to civil support pre-date the establishment of the United States Northern Command, the entity currently responsible for planning, organizing, and executing homeland defense and civil support missions within the continental United States, Alaska, and territorial waters. The committee is aware that the Department concurred with related recommendations of another recent Comptroller General report (GAO–10–364). This report recommended that the Secretary of Defense update civil support policy and guidance delineating the role, responsibilities, and relationships between DOD entities, and direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, in coordination with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to establish a timeline to develop and issue a partner guide that identifies roles and responsibilities of DOD entities and agreed-upon approaches for interagency coordination for homeland defense and civil support efforts. The committee notes that, according to its response to GAO–10–364, the Department expects to have implemented these two recommendations by September 2011.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide written notification of compliance to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 15 days of the date on which the Secretary determines that the De-

partment has completed actions necessary to implement the two specified Comptroller General recommendations. In the event that the Secretary determines that these two recommendations will not be implemented by September 30, 2011, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide written notification to the aforementioned committees containing an updated timeline for completion of actions necessary to implement the two recommendations.

Report on the Potential Use of Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization Initiatives To Support Humanitarian Mine Action

Each year, landmines and explosive remnants of war cause thousands of causalities in more than 60 countries around the world. In recent years, our military has made great improvements by developing technologies and tactics to detect and neutralize explosive remnants of war and improvised explosive devices. The committee is aware that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) has made significant advances in the detection and neutralization of explosive devices and that some JIEDDO-developed initiatives may have the potential to be used by U.S. Humanitarian Mine Action programs. The committee therefore directs the Comptroller General to provide a report on the following areas:

(1) A survey of JIEDDO-developed initiatives that may have humanitarian demining applications;

(2) Recommendations to improve interagency coordination between the Departments of Defense and State with respect to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, and relevant humanitarian demining funding activities of the Department of Defense and the Department of State; and

(3) Recommendations to improve demining and disarming efforts through the use of new or existing JIEDDO-initiated technology, training, and equipment, including new joint testing strategies between the Departments of Defense and State in foreign countries including Bosnia-Herzegovina, and other identified countries with respect to emerging demining and disarming technologies.

The report shall be distributed to the congressional defense committees and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by March 1, 2011. Relevant classified information should be submitted in a classified annex.

Solid Rocket Motor Industrial Base

The committee remains concerned about the health and long-term viability of the solid rocket motor industrial base. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends additional procurement funding to maintain a warm production line for Minuteman III solid rocket motors. However, such action does not fully address the challenges associated with sustaining currently-deployed strategic and missile defense systems or maintaining an intellectual and engineering capacity to support the next-generation rocket motors. These challenges are made worse by the proposed termination of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Constellation program. Defense officials have estimated that the cost of propulsion systems could increase from 40 to 100 percent

because infrastructure costs currently shared by the Department of Defense (DOD) and NASA would be passed on to the Department of Defense.

After extensive briefings with the Department and industry, the committee believes there is an opportunity to identify a more strategic, long-term, defense-wide approach to the development, acquisition, and production of solid rocket motors that would benefit the industrial base and could be leveraged for future strategic strike (both nuclear and non-nuclear), missile defense, and space launch systems.

First, the committee believes the Department should invest in a substantive defense-wide research and development (R&D) activity specifically focused on design, development, and technology maturation associated with a 40-inch diameter class rocket motor. The committee understands that the industrial base capabilities necessary to support a 40-inch diameter class rocket motor can be applied to larger size motors that may be required for a next-generation intercontinental ballistic missile or submarine-launched ballistic missile and is also useful for missile defense and prompt global strike applications. However, the committee notes that strategic propulsion development activities have declined in recent years. The Navy terminated its R&D program in 2008; numerous technology demonstrations funded by the Air Force ended in 2009. The committee further recommends the Department foster competition and maintain at least two viable developers through this R&D effort.

Second, the committee believes the Department should align its long-term solid rocket motor production plans to maximize the use of existing production capabilities. For example, the Navy will require solid rocket motor production through 2023 to support its Trident D5 life extension program. At this point, production could transition to the Air Force to support life extension of the Minuteman III beyond 2030 or a follow-on system. Thereafter, production could transition back to the Navy in the mid-2030 timeframe to support a Trident D5 follow-on system. Solid rocket motor production for missile defense systems should also be taken into account.

Finally, the committee believes that the health and long-term viability of the solid rocket motor industrial base is a government-wide challenge. Any DOD strategic plan should include NASA, and any NASA plan should include the Department of Defense. The committee encourages the Department to give full consideration to the committee's preferences in the preparation of the solid rocket motor industrial base sustainment plan required by section 1078 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

OTHER MATTERS

Department of Defense Rapid Innovation Program

The committee notes that several major acquisition programs under the purview of the Department of Defense (DOD) have been plagued by cost growth, schedule delays, and under-performance. The Department often emphasizes transformation and reform in its acquisition policies and procedures, however, the trend to poor program performance continues. The committee recognizes that trans-

formation combined with a smart acquisition process should result in affordable and interoperable weapon systems and platforms. Open architecture systems are an example of a transformational technology that has resulted in cost savings or avoidance to the Department.

A great source for transformational technologies and ideas is the small business community which harbors many of the nation's innovative thinkers and creative minds. Not only are small businesses vital to our economy, the committee considers them a vital source for developing innovative and cost-saving technologies in areas of military need. The Department has had success leveraging this source, primarily through the Small Business and Innovative Research (SBIR) Phase I and Phase II awards. The committee remains concerned though over the dismal record of success inserting such technologies into major defense acquisition programs and into the commercial market, despite the many transition organizations, processes, and initiatives designed to do just that. The Defense Science Board stated, in their July 2009 report titled "Fulfillment of Urgent Operational Needs," that "the Department of Defense lacks the ability to rapidly field new capabilities to the warfighter in a systematic and effective way."

The committee notes that SBIR Phase III awards, funded by non-SBIR sources, are intended to help move SBIR-funded projects to the marketplace or into a program of record. The committee remains troubled that the Department has not effectively capitalized on the successes of SBIR Phase I and II innovations. Findings from the National Research Council and the Department of Defense indicate that a lack of stable funding and lack of a transition path are significant inhibitors. To address these inhibitors, the committee notes the precedent set by Navy Program Executive Office Submarine (PEO SUBS), during fiscal years 2008 through 2010, who undertook an effort to solve this problem using funding for the insertion of technologies developed by small businesses. Funding was made available to small business projects identified in program acquisition plans for high-risk/high-reward component technology development for inclusion in the procurement process. The committee notes that there are other examples of funding that has allowed for expedited small business awards that met program of record interoperability and affordability goals. The committee notes the National Research Council's 2009 report, titled "An Assessment of the SBIR Program at the Department of Defense," states that SBIR "Phase III transitions at PEO SUBS account for approximately 86 percent of all Navy Phase III contracts, and Navy in turn accounts for 70 percent of all DOD Phase III contracts." The committee applauds the efforts of the Navy and encourages the acquisition community within the Department of Defense to expand its work on improving the transition of small business research and development ideas.

The committee has included a provision, section 1054, in this title that would establish the Department of Defense Rapid Innovation Program. The committee has also included $500.0 million in title XV of this Act to fund the program. In executing this program, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense, working through the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD AT&L), to:

(1) Develop and implement a competitive program designed to stimulate innovative technologies; reduce lifecycle costs; address technical risks; improve the timeliness and thoroughness of test and evaluation outcomes; and rapidly insert such products into military systems that meet critical national security needs, such as, but not limited to: force protection, sensors, complex data handling, advanced communications, advanced materials, nano-manufacturing, chemical/biological standoff detection, language translation, and cyber security;

(2) Develop and implement clear goals and metrics for the program that would enhance the insertion or commercialization success of those technologies identified in paragraph (1);

(3) Evaluate and prioritize projects based on the following:

(a) Phase II Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) projects;

(b) Non-SBIR projects that support ACAT I–IA, II, III and IV programs;

(c) Projects executed by the defense laboratories and the test and evaluation community;

(d) Projects cost-shared with state, local, or other government funds; and

(e) Issue annual solicitations from the military departments, the defense agencies, and the U.S. Special Operations Command applications for funding;

(4) Fund projects proposed by the PEOs or Program Managers that are determined most likely to be fielded or commercialized within three years;

(5) Ensure technology transition decisions are localized as much as possible between the program manager, the acquisition manager, and the user;

(6) The amount for each project under this program would nominally not exceed $3,000,000, but projects with a cost greater than that would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis approved by the USD AT&L; and

(7) Selected projects would be funded for no more than two years, except on a case-by-case basis approved by the USD AT&L.

The committee further notes that section 1054 would explicitly provide that nothing in section 1054 shall be interpreted to require any official of the Department of Defense to provide funding to any earmark as defined pursuant to House Rule XXI, clause 9 or any congressionally directed spending item as defined pursuant to Senate Rule XLIV, paragraph 5. The committee notes that no bill or report language located anywhere else in this report or in this Act should be interpreted to require the use of funding from the Department of Defense Rapid Innovation Program for any earmark as so defined.

Feasibility Study for Transfer of Aircraft to Non-Federal Entities

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, with participation of the Defense Logistics Agency, the military departments and other relevant federal agencies (to include the General Services Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Homeland Security), to study the feasibility and advisability of developing criteria for transferring aircraft from a mili-

ability of developing criteria for transferring aircraft from a military department to non-federal entities for the purposes of restoring and flying the aircraft. The study should, at a minimum, consider the following criteria for allowing such transfers:

(1) Public safety as well as the safety record of the non-federal entities to which aircraft are proposed to be transferred;

(2) Prevention of the release of sensitive or proprietary information or technology and other security concerns;

(3) Cost, including any potential costs, both one-time and recurring, to the military departments;

(4) Requirements for demilitarization of aircraft pursuant to section 2572 of title 10, United States Code;

(5) Statutory considerations and identification of existing federal statutes prohibiting or otherwise impeding a proposed transfer;

(6) Liability concerns, and other legal matters including restrictions against the sale or transfer of the aircraft by recipient entities to any other entity;

(7) Status and availability of aircraft for transfer and of spare parts necessary to keep the transferred aircraft airworthy and whether such parts are needed to sustain any existing departmental assets;

(8) The Department of Defense's goals for the long-term preservation of available aircraft, including protection against vandalism, accidents, or complete destruction of the aircraft through a crash or other means;

(9) Public access to aircraft proposed to be transferred, including such access in museums, public displays or air shows;

(10) Criteria by which the military departments should evaluate a request for transfer of aircraft;

(11) The ability of the non-federal entity to which an aircraft is proposed to be transferred to comply with any standards set by the Secretary of Defense;

(12) Reversionary rights to the aircraft for the military department of origin should the recipient entity file for bankruptcy, cease operations or fail to comply with standards set by the Secretary of Defense; and

(13) Any other information the Secretary of Defense deems relevant to determining the feasibility and advisability of conducting such transfers.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the findings of the study along with any recommendations the Secretary of Defense may have relating to establishing criteria for transferring aircraft to non-federal entities for the purposes of restoring and flying the aircraft to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 15, 2011.

Impact Assessment of Cybersecurity Standards

The committee is aware that there have been discussions within the Department of Defense (DOD) regarding instituting voluntary standards and guidelines that follow best practices within the Department of Defense in future DOD contracts where a contractor is responsible for maintaining minimum standards for safeguarding, proper handling, and cyber intrusion reporting of unclas-

sified DOD information. The committee is interested in determining the cost and policy impacts of making these standards and guidelines that follow section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) mandatory in contract language.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2011, that assesses the cost impacts to potential contractors and the Department of Defense of including these mandatory minimum standards in future contracts. This report shall also include an examination of the policy impact on the Department of Defense of including these requirements in the Federal Acquisition Regulation system, as well as an analysis of how automated reporting might facilitate improved cyber intrusion reporting of unclassified DOD information between industry and the Department of Defense.

Knowledge Management for Information Operations Programs

In the conference report (H. Rept. 111–288) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee expressed concern with the Department of Defense's information operations (IO) and strategic communications programs, particularly with the budget transparency and financial accountability for these types of programs, as well as the enterprise-wide oversight and coordination mechanisms necessary to prevent waste, fraud and abuse.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has made significant strides in its justification of the IO budget request, but the process to collect and analyze reporting data is time intensive. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to make the necessary investments to develop a knowledge management system to collect and disseminate information related to strategic communication, information operations, and related activities from all of the services, agencies, and combatant commands in a more effective manner. To the extent that it is possible, this system should be portal-based and leverage business analytic tools.

Military Liaison Elements

The committee is aware of an ongoing review of the Military Liaison Elements (MLE) program being conducted by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). The committee understands that this review is being conducted in conjunction with the geographic combatant commanders, on a country-by-country basis, and with the relevant country teams. The committee understands that the review is intended to outline program requirements as defined by the geographic combatant commanders and sourced by USSOCOM.

The committee expects that this review will further define military liaison requirements, authorities, and responsibilities as they relate to defense activities within the MLE program purview. The committee looks forward to the results of the review and working with the Department, USSOCOM, and other germane congres-

sional committees, as required, to ensure proper resourcing and program implementation.

Rebalancing of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal Force

The committee recognizes the dedication and courageous professionalism of the Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) force, and acknowledges the bravery associated with defeating improvised explosive devices (IED), countering weapons of mass destruction, and eliminating explosive hazards from the battlefield. The committee further recognizes that EOD forces are indispensable combat enablers and contribute significantly to security, stability, counterinsurgency, and counterterrorism objectives.

The committee also recognizes that the services have made extraordinary efforts to revitalize the EOD force in support of unprecedented operational requirements in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and that this highly specialized EOD force will remain an essential combat enabler for each service in the years to come.

The committee, however, notes that recent growth in the EOD force has been funded primarily through Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) requests and therefore may constitute a potentially unsustainable force structure. The committee is also aware that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) through OCO requests has procured substantial amounts of materiel, including up-armored vehicles, robotics, and electronic warfare equipment for the EOD force. The committee is therefore concerned about the long-term sustainment and maintenance of these systems as responsibility is transferred to the base budget for the EOD force within each individual service.

The committee notes that the Department's response to the Senate Committee on Armed Services report (S. Rept. 110–77) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 stated that authorized EOD force levels were inadequate and would remain inadequate to meet future asymmetric threats, even if the operational tempo in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan decreased. The committee also notes that because of overwhelming requirements in Iraq and Afghanistan, EOD forces have been primarily focused on defeating improvised explosive devices and have had difficulty maintaining critical competencies in other advanced EOD skills, such as countering weapons of mass destruction, supporting domestic response forces, and underwater mine countermeasures. While improvements have been made, the committee remains concerned that the Services have not rebalanced the EOD force structure and maintained full-spectrum capabilities to ensure success in a wide range of contingencies as directed by the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review.

The committee encourages the Department to further define Joint Service EOD force structure requirements, correct identified inadequacies, rebalance force levels to meet future global requirements, and consider a consolidated budget justification display covering all programs and activities of the EOD force including procurement, operations and maintenance, and research, development, testing and evaluation.

Report on Acquisition Strategy for Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment

The committee is aware that organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE) programs for the military services continue to be funded primarily through overseas contingency operation requests. The committee believes there should be better accountability and transparency in long-term planning, programming, and investment by the military services for the acquisition of OCIE. Further, a long-term investment strategy could better position the domestic OCIE industrial base to rapidly respond to new threats or requirements as well as accelerate industry investments that would further advancements in survivability and weight reduction for OCIE programs.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act that would include the following:

(1) A plan to incorporate organizational clothing and individual equipment (personnel protection equipment and battle dress uniforms) into the President's annual base budget request;

(2) A survey and assessment of the capabilities, capacities, risks, and long-term sustainment requirements of the domestic industrial base of the United States, including critical subcontractor suppliers, in meeting the requirements of the military departments for organizational clothing and individual equipment requirements;

(3) An assessment of organizational clothing and individual equipment programs and related research, development, and acquisition objectives, priorities, and funding profiles for these programs;

(4) An assessment of existing initiatives used by the military departments to maintain the current level of readiness, jointness, and management of programs for the development, production, and fielding of organizational clothing and individual equipment to include the Cross-Service Warfighter Equipment Board, the Joint Clothing and Textiles Governance Board, and advance planning briefings for industry.

Report on Department of Defense Support to State Defense Forces

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Service not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that assesses Department of Defense support to State Defense Forces, as defined in section 109(c) of title 32, United States Code. This report shall include an assessment of current Department support to State Defense Forces, current limitations on provision of support, and Defense Support to Civil Authorities activities that support state-level defense forces, first responders and Department of Homeland Security agencies.

Study on the Feasibility of the Democratic Republic of Georgia as a Transportation Base

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of establishing in the democratic Republic of Georgia, at the

invitation of the government of Georgia, a transportation base for supplying U.S. and coalition forces in Afghanistan. The committee further directs that, not later than December 31, 2010, the Secretary submit to the Committee on Armed Services in the House and the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate a report containing the results of that study.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—General Transfer Authority

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to make transfers between any amounts of authorizations for fiscal year 2011 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount transferred under this authority to $3.5 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

Section 1002—Authorization of Additional Appropriations for Operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Haiti for Fiscal Year 2010

This section would increase the authorizations in title XV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to reflect fiscal year 2010 funding requests for operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Republic of Iraq, and the Republic of Haiti submitted by the Department of Defense after the passage of Public Law 111–84. This section would increase the authorizations by the total amount of the President's request for each account in title XV.

Section 1003—Budgetary Effects of this Act

This section would specify that the budgetary effects of this Act for purposes of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139) will be determined by reference to a statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1011—Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend, by one year, the unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia under section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1011 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1012—Joint Task Forces Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities

This section would extend, by one year, the support by joint task forces under section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1013—Reporting Requirement on Expenditures To Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities

This section would extend, by one year, the reporting requirement on expenditures to support foreign counter-drug activities under section 1022(a) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), as most recently amended by section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1014—Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments

This section would extend, by one year, the duration of authority for assistance under section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1014(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1021—Requirements for Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels

This section would amend section 231 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels with each submission of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The long-range plan would be required to have 3 distinct sections each spanning a period of 10 years. The first section would be a detailed construction plan for the first 10 years, the second a probable construction plan for the second 10 years, and the third a notional construction plan for the last 10 years. This section would require that during the intervening years between submissions of the QDR, the plan may not be modified unless the change is accompanied by an addendum to the QDR which explains and justifies the decrease with respect to the national security of the United States. This section would further require that the plan fully comply with section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code, to maintain a minimum of 11 operational aircraft carriers and to phase the construction of such carriers as to minimize the total cost of procurement.

Section 1022—Requirements for the Decommissioning of Naval Vessels

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to notify the congressional defense committees of the Navy's intention to decommission any battle force vessel of the active fleet of the Navy in accordance with established procedures similar to those used for prior approval reprogramming requests. This section would require the notification from the Secretary to contain reasons for the retirement of the vessel, the operational impact on other ships of the same class, a certification from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the retirement would not adversely affect the requirements of the various combatant commanders to fulfill missions critical to national security, and a detailed budgetary analysis of retaining the vessel in commission.

Section 1023—Requirements for the Size of the Navy Battle Force Fleet

This section would limit the number of battle force vessels the Secretary of the Navy may decommission, in fiscal year 2011 and subsequent fiscal years, to no more than two thirds the number of vessels scheduled for commissioning into the battle force fleet for the particular year. This limitation would apply until the total number of vessels in the battle force fleet reaches 313. Submarines would be excluded from any restriction concerning decommissioning.

Section 1024—Retention and Status of Certain Naval Vessels

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to retain the vessels USS *Nassa*u (LHA 4) and USS *Peleliu* (LHA 5) in a commissioned and operational status until delivery to the Navy of the vessels USS *America* (LHA 6) and the vessel designated LHA 7, respectively.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1031—Extension of Certain Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism

This section would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. armed forces through fiscal year 2011.

The authority to offer and make rewards by acting through government personnel of allied forces is currently in use in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 1032—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using funds available to the Department of Defense from October 1, 2010, until December 31, 2011, to release any detainee at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into the United States, its territories, or possessions. The section would also prohibit the use of funds available to the Department from October 1, 2010, until December 31, 2011, for the transfer of any such detainee into the United States, its territories, or possessions until 120 days after the President submits to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive plan for the disposition of any such detainee that includes at a minimum:

(1) A proposal for the disposition of the individual;

(2) An assessment of the risks posed to U.S. national security by the individual;

(3) The proposed measures that would be taken for mitigating those risks;

(4) The proposed location or locations at which the individual would be held;

(5) The costs associated with executing the plan, including any necessary technical or financial assistance that would be provided to state and local law enforcement agencies;

(6) A summary of the results of required consultation with the chief executive of the state, District of Columbia, territory, or possession to which the individual would be transferred; and

(7) A certification by the Attorney General that under the plan the individual poses little or no security risk to the United States, its territories, or possessions.

Section 1033—Certification Requirements Relating to the Transfer of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available to the Department of Defense for the transfer of any detainee at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or effective control of a foreign country or any other foreign entity. This prohibition would apply unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and at least 30 days prior to the transfer of any such individual, that the government of the country or the recognized leadership of the entity to which the individual would be transferred:

(1) Is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(2) Maintains effective control of any detention facility within which the individual may be held;

(3) Is not threatened in a manner that could substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(4) Has agreed to take effective steps to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(5) Has taken such steps that the Secretary of Defense determines necessary for ensuring that the individual cannot engage or re-engage in any terrorist activity; and

(6) Has agreed to share any information with the United States that is related to the individual or his or her associates that could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies.

This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds for the transfer of any such detainee to the custody or effective control of a foreign country or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the same country or entity who engaged in terrorist activity subsequent to their transfer. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to waive this additional prohibition if the Secretary of Defense certifies that such a transfer would be in the national interest of the United States.

Section 1034—Prohibition on the Use of Funds To Modify or Construct Facilities in the United States to House Detainees Transferred From United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act to modify or construct any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any detainee transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense. This prohibition would not apply to the modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. This section would also require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the merits, costs, and risks of using any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any such detainee for the purposes of detention or imprisonment. The report would include each of the following elements:

(1) A discussion of the merits associated with any proposed facility that would justify using that facility instead of the facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as well as that facility's contribution to effecting a comprehensive policy for continuing military detention operations;

(2) The rationale for selecting the specific site for any proposed facility, including the details of the selection processes and criteria used;

(3) A discussion of the potential risks to any community in the vicinity of the proposed facility, the measures that could be taken to mitigate those risks, and the likely costs of implementing those measures;

(4) A discussion of any necessary modifications to any proposed facility for ensuring that transferred detainees may not establish contact with any individual, including contact with any other person detained at the facility, that is not approved by the Department of Defense, together with the likely cost of making those modifications;

(5) A discussion of any support to the proposed facility site that would likely be provided by the Department of Defense, which identifies the types of support, the number of required support personnel for each type, and the estimated cost of support;

(6) A discussion of any off-site support that would likely be provided by the Department of Defense for operating the proposed facility, which identifies the types of possible support, the number of required support personnel for each type, and the estimated cost of support; and

(7) A discussion of the legal issues that could be raised as a result of detaining or imprisoning any individual at the proposed facility that could not be raised as a result of detaining individuals at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Section 1035—Comprehensive Review of Force Protection Policies

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of Department of Defense policies, regulations, instructions, and directives pertaining to force protection within the Department, including requirements levied from outside entities, such as the E-verify rule and Homeland Security Presidential Directive–12. This section would require that the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report on this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2011.

Section 1036—Fort Hood Follow-On Review Implementation Fund

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to deposit up to $100.0 million of fiscal year 2011 operation and maintenance funds into a fund to begin to address the recommendations of the Fort Hood Follow-on Review. Funds in the Fort Hood Follow-on Review Implementation Fund could be transferred in: military personnel; operation and maintenance; procurement; research, development, test, and evaluation; defense health program; or defense working capital funds to address the recommendations of the review. This section would provide the authority for the Secretary of Defense to transfer unused funds transferred from the Fort Hood Follow-on Review Implementation Fund back to the fund. This section also would require that the Secretary of Defense notify the congressional defense committees in advance and in writing of any proposed obligations under the fund. Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a quarterly report of commitments, obligations, and expenditures of the fund.

Section 1037—Inspector General Investigation of the Conduct and Practices of Lawyers Representing Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to investigate certain lawyers who represent individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, regarding certain conduct and practices. This section would require the Inspector General to initiate the investigation 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General: (1) determine that the Inspector General's investigation cannot be performed without interfering with, or otherwise compromising, any related criminal investigation, prosecution, or other legal proceeding; and (2) submit such determination to Congress. This section would also require the Inspector General to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report describing the results of the investigation within 90 days of its completion.

SUBTITLE E—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1041—Department of Defense Aerospace-Related Mishap Safety Investigation Reports

This section would require the secretary of a military department to provide, upon written request to the secretary concerned from

any of the congressional defense committees, a briefing on the privileged report's findings, causal factors and recommendations contained in a Department of Defense aerospace-related accident investigation report.

Section 1042—Interagency National Security Knowledge and Skills

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to commission an appropriate, independent non-profit organization to study and assess the current state of interagency national security knowledge and skills possessed by Department of Defense civilians and uniformed personnel. This section would also require the organization to make recommendations for strengthening such knowledge and skills and require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report containing the findings and recommendations of the study to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2011.

The committee believes that the ability of national security professionals to work effectively across department and agency boundaries is critical to national security. The committee encourages the Department and all agencies with national security responsibilities to pursue efforts to strengthen the interagency national security knowledge and skills of their personnel. The committee expects this report to provide the Department and Congress a thorough baseline assessment and concrete, actionable recommendations that can be pursued in the near-term future.

Section 1043—Report on Establishing a Northeast Joint Training Regional Center

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to analyze and report back to the congressional defense committees on the need for a joint regional training center capability in the northeastern United States.

Section 1044—Comptroller General Report on Previously Requested Reports

This section would require the Comptroller General to submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2011, that would evaluate the sufficiency, adequacy, and conclusions of the following three reports: the report on Air Force fighter force shortfalls required by the report of the House of Representatives which accompanied the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the report on procurement of 4.5 generation fighters as required by section 131 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2218), and the report on combat air forces restructuring as required by the report of the House of Representatives numbered 111–288) which accompanied the conference report for the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). The Comptroller General's report would examine the potential costs and benefits of the service life extension program costs to sustain the legacy fleet to meet inventory requirements, the falcon structural augmentation roadmap of F–16s, and any additional programs designed to extend the service life of legacy fighter aircraft. Additionally, this section would prohibit retirement of fighter aircraft from

the Air Force or the Air National Guard inventory in 2011 until 180 days after receipt of the Comptroller General's report.

Section 1045—Report on Nuclear Triad

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator for Nuclear Security, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the modernization and sustainment of the nuclear triad over the next 20 years no later than March 1, 2011.

Section 1046—Cybersecurity Study and Report

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the use of modeling and simulation tools to identify cybersecurity vulnerabilities and to develop strategies to deter malicious activity intended to compromise Department of Defense information systems. This section would require that the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report on this study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2012.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1051—National Defense Panel

This section would amend section 118 of title 10, United States Code by replacing the Independent Review Panel appointed by the Secretary of Defense with a National Defense Panel. The chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services will each appoint two members, and the Secretary of Defense shall appoint two panel co-chairs. This section would require the panel to submit to the Secretary of Defense a report that sets the parameters and provides guidance to the Secretary on the conduct of the review. This section would also require the panel to review the Secretary of Defense's Terms of Reference, and any other materials providing the basis for, or substantial inputs to, the work of the Department of Defense on the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and conduct an assessment of the assumptions, strategy, findings, and risks of the report of the QDR. It would also require the Panel to issue a report to Congress on the assessment of its reviews not later than three months after the publication of a report of a QDR.

Section 1052—Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would amend paragraph (4) of section 118b of title 10, United States Code to require that the recommendations of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) not be influenced, constrained or informed by the budget submitted to Congress by the President. It would also include a sense of Congress that the QDR is a strategic document that should be based upon a process unconstrained by budgetary influences.

Section 1053—Sale of Surplus Military Equipment to State and Local Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agencies

This section would amend section 2576 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding the state and local agencies to which the Secretary of Defense may sell surplus military equipment to include homeland security and emergency management agencies. This section would also expand the types of equipment that may be sold to include personal protective equipment and other appropriate equipment.

Section 1054—Department of Defense Rapid Innovation Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program for the purpose of accelerating and supporting defense technology transition to the warfighter or commercial markets and would require the Secretary, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to establish guidelines for the operation of the program. Under this section, the Secretary would be required, annually, to solicit from the military departments, the defense agencies, and the Special Operations Command applications for funding, under the program, to accelerate certain technology projects from the prototype stage to the field or marketplace. The guidance issued by the Secretary would include priorities for certain types of defense research and criteria for evaluating applications. Nothing in this section would require any official of the Department of Defense to provide funding under this section to any earmark as defined pursuant to House Rule XXI, clause 9 or any congressionally directed spending item as defined pursuant to Senate Rule XLIV, paragraph 5. Funding authorized for the program would be from amounts authorized to be appropriated within research, development, test, and evaluation defense-wide accounts and would not exceed $500.0 million for any fiscal year under the program.

This section would allow the Secretary to transfer funds available for the program to the research, development, test and evaluation accounts of a military department, defense agency, or the unified combatant command for special operations forces. The Secretary may delegate the management and operation of the program. This section would require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, not later than 60 days after the last day of a fiscal year during which the Secretary carries out the program, describing the operation of the program during such fiscal year.

The authority to carry out a program under this section would terminate on September 30, 2015.

Section 1055—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

Section 1056—Limitation on Air Force Fiscal Year 2011 Force Structure Announcement Implementation

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2011 funds for the purpose of implementing the Air Force fiscal year 2011 Force Structure Announcement until 45 days after

the Secretary of the Air Force provides the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a detailed report on the follow-on missions for bases affected by the 2010 Combat Air Forces restructure and certifies that the Air Sovereignty Alert mission will be fully resourced with required funding, personnel, and aircraft.

Section 1057—Budgeting for the Sustainment and Modernization of Nuclear Delivery Systems

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that a separate budget is included with respect to programs and platforms regarding the sustainment and modernization of nuclear delivery systems of the United States in the yearly budget submission, consistent with the plan contained in the report submitted to Congress under Section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1058—Limitation on Nuclear Force Reductions

This section contains various findings concerning reductions in the nuclear forces of the United States.

It also contains a sense of Congress provision stating that any reduction in the nuclear forces of the United States should be supported by a thorough assessment of the strategic environment, threat, and policy, and the technical and operational implications of such reductions, and that specific criteria are necessary to guide future decisions regarding further reductions in such nuclear forces.

This section would also limit implementation of a reduction in United States nuclear forces below the levels contained in the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty signed by the United States and the Russian Federation on April 8, 2010, until 180 days after the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator for Nuclear Security jointly submit a report to the congressional defense committees that includes:

(1) The justification for such reduction;

(2) An assessment of the strategic environment, threat, and policy and the technical and operational implications of such reduction;

(3) A written certification by the Secretary of Defense that: (1) either the strategic environment or the assessment of the threat has changed to allow for such reduction or technical measures to provide a commensurate or better level of safety, security, and reliability as before such reductions are implemented for the remaining nuclear forces; (2) such reduction preserves the nuclear deterrent capabilities of the "nuclear triad"; (3) such reduction does not require a change in targeting strategy from counterforce targeting to counter-value targeting; (4) the remaining nuclear forces provide a sufficient means of protection against unforeseen technical challenges and geopolitical events; and (5) such reduction is compensated by other measures that provide a commensurate or better deterrence capability and level of credibility; and

(4) A written certification by the Administrator for Nuclear Security that: (1) technical measures provide a commensurate

or better level of safety, security, and reliability as before such reductions are implemented; (2) the remaining nuclear forces provide a sufficient means of protection against unforeseen technical challenges and geopolitical events; (3) measures to modernize the nuclear weapons complex have been implemented to provide a sufficiently responsive infrastructure to support the remaining nuclear forces.

The nuclear forces covered by this section would include both active and inactive nuclear warheads in the nuclear weapons stockpile, and deployed and non-deployed delivery vehicles.

Section 1059—Sense of the Congress on the Nuclear Posture Review

This section would make it the sense of Congress that the Nuclear Posture Review, released in April 2010 by the Secretary of Defense, weakens the national security of the United States by eliminating options to defend against a catastrophic nuclear, biological, chemical, or conventional attack against the United States.

Section 1060—Strategic Assessment of Strategic Challenges Posed by Potential Competitors

The committee notes that it received testimony from the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Independent Panel that, although useful, the QDR needs to be a long-term, twenty year study that addresses the issues that are of concern to Congress. The committee also received testimony that the 2010 QDR was a budget constrained exercise, which was fiscally responsible but may have limited more ambitious questioning of assumptions and creative thinking because basic budget and end-strength assumptions were not challenged.

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of the regional combatant commands, to submit a strategic assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2011, on the current and future strategic challenges posed to the United States by potential competitors out to 2021.

Section 1061—Electronic Access to Certain Classified Information

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide to each committee of Congress an electronic communications link capable of supporting appropriate classified communications between the Department of Defense and each committee of Congress. Specifically, the committee expects that the Department will arrange for the committee to be connected to the SIPRNet through CAPNET.

Section 1062—Justice for Victims of Torture and Terrorism

This section would express the Sense of Congress that the claims of American victims of torture and hostage taking by the Government of Iraq during the regime of Saddam Hussein should be resolved by a prompt and fair settlement negotiated between the Government of Iraq and the Government of the United States.

Section 1063—Policy Regarding Appropriate Use of Department of Defense Resources

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section 113b to ensure that all resources of the Department of Defense are used only for activities that:

(1) Fulfill a legitimate government purpose;

(2) Comply with all applicable laws, regulations and policies of the Department; and

(3) Contribute to the mission of the Department.

This section would also separately establish a prohibition on the use of any Department of Defense funds for activity that does not comply with the policy established in section 113b, as added by this section, and would prohibit the payment of salary to any employee who engages in an intentional violation of such policy.

Section 1064—Executive Agent for Preventing Counterfeit Microelectronics Into the Defense Supply Chain

This section would require the Secretary of Defense designate a senior official of the Department of Defense to serve as an executive agent for preventing the introduction of counterfeit microelectronics into the defense supply chain. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a description of the roles, responsibilities and authorities for the executive agent, as well as a strategy and implementation plan to identify, mitigate, prevent and eliminate counterfeit microelectronics within the defense supply chain.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Civilian Personnel Authorizations

The committee notes that chapter 129 of title 10, United States Code, requires each Department of Defense component to manage its civilian workforce based on workload and available funding, and not on end strength, full time equivalents, or any other numerical limits unless otherwise established by law. Each Department of Defense component currently is required to provide to the congressional defense committees an annual certification in February that its civilian workforce is managed in this manner.

The committee is aware that it is the Department's policy to lock the personnel authorization levels until the next budget cycle, notwithstanding changes in workload that may occur. This has led the Department to meet the workload changes either with "overhires" or through hiring contractors. However, the committee is concerned that this emphasis on authorizations is being enforced at the expense of workload-based analysis and presents challenges for the Department to efficiently manage and grow its workforce at a time when it is attempting to reduce its reliance on contractors and to right size its workforce.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, as supported by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, to re-examine

this policy and to submit any recommended statutory revisions at the time of the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2012.

Conversion of Department of Defense Civilian Positions to General Schedule

Section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) repealed the Department of Defense (DOD) National Security Personnel System (NSPS). All DOD civilian employees covered by NSPS are to be converted back to the General Schedule (GS) system by January 1, 2012. The committee is aware that the Department has stood up a transition office and is aggressively moving forward with the conversion. While the committee applauds this action, it is concerned that many potential issues arising from a rapid conversion may not be addressed, such as personnel being placed in a retained pay status. The committee recognizes that this may be inevitable. However, the committee expects the Department's transition office to move expeditiously in reviewing all classifications and adjust the descriptions where appropriate to address those circumstances. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by November 15, 2010, on the Department's plans for a nation-wide adjustment to be paid out in January 2011, along with any other salary increases, including for individuals in a pay retention status.

The committee further notes that the Department was provided with performance management and hiring flexibilities which would apply across the DOD civilian workforce within the context of the GS system and consistent with collective bargaining principles. The committee believes that many of the problems encountered under the GS system that were related to position classifications, hiring or performance appraisals, and rewarding performance are regulatory barriers that have been imposed either by the Office of Personnel Management or internally by the Department. The committee commends the work to date of the transition office in beginning to tackle these issues. The committee expects the Department to exercise fully the authorities provided under section 1113 of Public Law 111–84 and to continue to work with its civilian workforce, the federal employee labor unions, and Congress to establish a fair and transparent personnel system within the GS system. By utilizing these authorities, the committee believes that the Department's initiatives could serve as a model for personnel reform, under GS, for the entire federal workforce.

Deployed Civilians

The committee continues to address issues related to the benefits provided to federal civilian employees who are assigned, on a voluntary basis, to work in a combat zone. In this title, provisions are included to address post-combat care coordinators to assist civilians who have been injured while serving in a combat zone as well as the extension of premium pay. However, the committee had been anticipating that the Office of Personnel Management, in coordina-

tion with the Department of Defense, Department of State, and Department of Labor, would be proposing a broader package of pay, leave, workman's compensation and health benefits and incentives for all federal agencies that send personnel to hazardous duty areas; this is particularly important for those federal agencies that have not have had as much experience, as have the Department of Defense or Department of State, in sending their personnel into combat zones. The committee is disappointed that no such proposal has yet been received, despite the fact that federal civilians increasingly are playing a key support role in the current operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and will continue to do so in future operations.

Retirement Eligibility for Department of Defense Fire Fighters

The committee is aware that changes made by the Office of Personnel Management to the classification series for federal fire fighters potentially has impacted the ability of some individuals to retire pursuant to section 8412 of title 5, United States Code. The impact has been exacerbated because many Department of Defense components updated personnel records for these individuals to reflect the changes without taking into consideration the special retirement provisions of section 8412. The committee understands that now each retirement package for the affected personnel must be reviewed and approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. This process can cause unnecessary delays in the retirement plans for the affected individuals.

The committee, therefore, directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to review and adjudicate these cases in a more expeditious manner that fully takes into consideration the desire of the affected individuals to move on to the next phase of their lives. The committee further directs the Under Secretary to provide written notice of compliance to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by November 1, 2010. The notification of compliance also should include the numbers of affected personnel, including the status of each individual's re-adjudicated annuity, and whether any future statutory changes are necessary to prevent a recurrence of the problem. If the Under Secretary determines a statutory change is required, the committee directs the Under Secretary to submit a proposal with the notification of compliance letter to the aforementioned committees.

Scholarship Program for Civilians in the Mental Health Profession

Section 1117 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to Congress on the feasibility of establishing a scholarship program for civilians in the mental health profession. The Department of Defense issued the "Report on Civilian Health Professions Scholarship Program for Mental Health Providers," in June 2009. The report notes that the supply of available personnel may not meet the increasing demand for civilian mental health care practitioners, and recommends that a pilot scholarship pro-

gram be established to determine whether the cost of such an effort is worth the number of practitioners it might generate. The committee agrees with the report's assessment that with the increasing numbers of cases of traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder, there is a need to recruit and develop individuals with the skills to handle such injuries. However, the committee is disappointed that the Department has not yet submitted a recommendation for a pilot scholarship program for civilians interested specifically in the mental health profession. The committee believes that such a program may have value and encourages the Secretary of Defense to consider developing a mental health scholarship pilot program for civilians.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Authority for the Department of Defense To Approve an Alternate Method of Processing Equal Employment Opportunity Complaints Within One or More Component Organizations Under Specified Circumstances

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish, within one or more of the component organizations of the Department of Defense, an alternate program for processing equal employment opportunity complaints. The alternate program would include procedures to reduce processing time and eliminate redundancy, reinforce local management and chain-of-command responsibility, and provide the parties involved with early opportunities for resolution of complaints. Participation in the program is voluntary on the part of the complainant. The Secretary shall consult with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in developing the alternate program. Such a program would expire five years after the date of enactment of this Act unless the Secretary submits a request to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services for an extension within 180 days of expiration of the program.

This section is based on section 1111 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) which authorized the Department to implement three pilot programs to streamline the processing of equal employment opportunity complaints. The programs were authorized for a three-year period, which expired on October 1, 2007. The law required the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to study and report to Congress on the results of the pilot program during, and at the conclusion of, the program. Recommendations made by GAO are incorporated into this section, including a requirement for an assessment of the program in meeting program objectives. In addition, this section would require GAO to provide two reports to Congress on the results of the alternate program, beginning two years after date of enactment of this Act.

Section 1102—Clarification of Authorities at Personnel Demonstration Laboratories

This section would make technical corrections to section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) related to the Department of Defense science and

technology reinvention-laboratories to conform with the legislative intent to provide direct-hire authority for such laboratories. This section also would amend the authority provided in section 1108 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to hire scientists and engineers, designated as shortage categories, by increasing the limitation on positions from 2 percent to 4 percent of the total number of positions within one laboratory. This section also would make technical and conforming amendments to section 1108 of Public Law 110–417.

Section 1103—Special Rule Relating to Certain Overtime Pay

This section would amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to allow certain executive branch employees working aboard, or in support of, the forward-deployed carrier USS *George Washington* (CVN 73) to earn overtime at the rate of one and one-half times their hourly rate while the carrier is forward-deployed in Japan.

Currently, employees serving in a foreign area, such as Japan, are not covered by the mandatory requirement of the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 213(f)) to pay not less than time-and-a-half for overtime work. The current lower overtime rate for work performed overseas has the potential to negatively impact work being done on, or in support of, the current forward deployment of the USS *George Washington* to Yokosuka, Japan. The committee notes that the USS *George Washington* is the first forward-deployed nuclear-powered aircraft carrier homeported in a foreign country. These employees will play a critical, ongoing role in maintaining the readiness and mission capabilities of the nation's forward-deployed ships.

This section also would require the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management on the use of this authority, including any associated costs, within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 1104—One-Year Extension of Authority To Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas

This section would extend, for one additional year, the authority of the head of a federal agency to waive the limitations on the amount of premium pay that may be paid to a civilian employee who performs certain work in an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Central Command, an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Africa Command, in support of a military operation, or in responding to an emergency declared by the President. The payment may not exceed the annual rate of salary payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3, United States Code.

Section 1105—Waiver of Certain Pay Limitations

This section would amend section 9903 of title 5, United States Code, which provides for the authority to hire highly qualified experts (HQE) and prescribes appropriate pay rates. This section

would clarify the intent of that statute to allow such individuals who are serving in a contingency operation area, as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code, to receive similar benefits and compensation as other federal civilian employees serving in those areas currently receive. This includes premium pay or danger pay allowances, compensatory time off, and other appropriate compensation or allowances authorized under chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code.

The committee is aware that highly qualified experts currently serving in areas of contingency operations have been denied any type of hazardous duty compensation because the Department of Defense and the Office of Personnel Management have interpreted such compensation as an incentive, which is explicitly prohibited under section 9903 of title 5, United States Code. While the committee does not agree with the interpretation that such hazardous duty compensation is an incentive, this section would remove any possible ambiguity. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Department to take immediate action to remedy the compensation inequities experienced by HQE currently working in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 1106—Services of Post-Combat Case Coordinators

This section would require that each federal agency that sends civilian employees on hazardous duty assignments in support of U.S. military operations in a contingency operation to assign post-combat case coordinators to employees who sustain a traumatic injury, or experience a serious disease or illness during performance of their duty in the contingency operation. The committee notes that federal civilian employees increasingly are providing important support in contingency operations and many are experiencing serious medical problems upon returning to their regular assignment.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense already assigns caseworkers to its civilian expeditionary workforce. The responsibility of these caseworkers is to guide and direct all deployed civilians to available resources, provide intervention in problem claims, and work with the service component's Injury Compensation Program Administrators to help injured employees navigate the Office of Worker's Compensation Program claims process. However, the committee is concerned that no similar support yet exists for civilians deployed from other federal agencies who need assistance coordinating benefits between the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and the Federal Employees Compensation Act (Public Law 89–554).

Section 1107—Authority To Waive Maximum Age Limit for Certain Appointments

This section would amend section 3307 of title 5, United States Code, to allow the Department of Defense to waive the hiring and retirement age limits for federal law enforcement and fire fighter positions in certain circumstances. While the committee supports the Department's plan to scale back significantly the use of contractors in support services, it is concerned that there may be unintended consequences when converting law enforcement and fire

fighting functions to federal government positions. Even if the contractor employees currently performing these functions would like to transition into positions with the federal government, many may not be able to compete for such positions because of existing age limits. This section would help to rectify that situation by explicitly allowing the waiver of the hiring age limits for law enforcement and fire fighter personnel in these circumstances. The committee expects that any Department of Defense established physical or medical standards for these positions still would apply.

Section 1108—Sense of Congress Regarding Waiver of Recovery of Certain Payments Made Under Civilian Employees Voluntary Separation Incentive Program

This section would express the Sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should waive repayment of the voluntary separation incentive pay (VSIP) for employees who accepted a reassignment with the Department of Defense during the period of April 1, 2004 to May 1, 2008 and had received written assurance that repayment would not be required or would be waived. The committee notes that the individuals who were rehired were assured that they would not be required to repay their separation pay based on an Office of Personnel Management (OPM) national emergency guidance issued following September 1, 2001. However, due to an oversight, the committee understands that it was subsequently determined the guidance did not apply to employees covered under section 9902, title 5, United States Code, which effectively superseded the OPM guidance. The committee understands that approximately 40 individuals were affected by this determination and that the Defense Finance and Accounting Service now is seeking VSIP repayment from these individuals. While the Department no longer waives VSIP repayment for individuals who have been rehired since May 1, 2008, the committee believes those individuals who returned to the Department immediately following the declaration of a national emergency, and who received written assurances that repayment would not be required, deserve to retain, or be repaid, their voluntary separation incentive pay. The committee further notes that paragraphs (f)(6)(A) and (f)(6)(B) already authorize a waiver of VSIP repayment and urges the Secretary to utilize this authority for the individuals covered by this section.

Section 1109—Suspension of DCIPS Pay Authority Extended for a Year

Section 1114 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) suspended implementation of the Defense Civilian Personnel System until December 31, 2010. This section would extend the suspension for an additional year, through December 31, 2011.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee focused on three broad areas in this title. First, the committee acted to ensure that both the necessary resources and the proper degree of oversight were brought to bear on the war against al Qa'ida and other militant extremists in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Second, the committee continued its oversight of the redeployment of United States military forces from, and the transition of the U.S. military role in, the Republic of Iraq. Third, the committee continued its past pattern of working to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to build the capacity of nations that have chosen to partner with the United States in combating militant extremism.

On December 1, 2009, the President announced that he was deploying an additional 30,000 United States troops to Afghanistan on top of troop increases that were announced in March of 2009. When these troops are fully deployed, sometime in the fall of 2010, there will be about 98,000 U.S. troops in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, more than a three-fold increase in the troop level of two years ago and almost four times the level from the end of 2007. The committee applauds this renewed focus on Afghanistan and has acted in this title and other titles to ensure that those troops have the resources they need. The committee has included a provision that would authorize funding for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) and additionally has included a provision that would authorize a program to fund reintegration efforts for low-level Taliban fighters who wish to end their involvement in the insurgency. Further, the committee has included a provision that would improve reporting on the war in Afghanistan to ensure that proper oversight of United States efforts there is maintained.

The committee has also worked hard to ensure that the new focus on engagement with the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is properly supported. Over the past year, the government and military of Pakistan have taken aggressive action to combat violent extremists in their country and additionally captured important leaders in the Afghan Taliban. Such actions are vital to the successful completion of the United States mission in Afghanistan and the ongoing fight to eliminate al Qa'ida. The committee has acted to enhance the cooperative relationship with Pakistan and ensure that bureaucratic issues do not interfere with the relationship. The committee has included a provision that would extend the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund by year and a provision that would further extend Coalition Support Funds authority to include operations involving al Qa'ida, the Taliban, and other military extremists in Pakistan.

The committee has acted to continue oversight of the redeployment of United States troops out of the Republic of Iraq and the transition of their mission in that country. The United States' long military involvement in that country is coming to a close, and the combat mission will be transitioning on September 1, 2010, to a mission to provide advice and assistance to Iraqi security forces until December 31, 2011, at which point all U.S. forces will be re-

moved from Iraq. The committee has acted to ensure that the reduced, but still significant, number of troops in Iraq have the resources they need. The committee has included legislative provisions that would provide $100.0 million for CERP for Iraq and $2.0 billion for the Iraq Security Forces Fund in title XV. The committee has also acted to enhance oversight of the remaining mission in Iraq, eliminating unnecessary reports and refocusing the requirements of those that remain.

Finally, the committee has again acted aggressively to enhance the capacity of nations that choose to partner with the United States to combat al Qa'ida. Such partnership was a key tenet of the recently-released Quadrennial Defense Review, and the committee believes that building the capacity of partners is vital to bring about the eventual end of al Qa'ida and their extremist allies. Such programs have already shown some promise, particularly in the Republic of Yemen, which has taken effective action to attack the extremist group al Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula. Thus, the committee has included a provision in this title that would increase the authorization for the 1206 program to $500.0 million, an increase of $150.0 million, including an authorization of $75.0 million in that program specifically for a program to train and equip security forces in Yemen. As already noted, the committee has acted to enhance the counterterrorism capabilities of Pakistan. And the committee has included a provision that would increase the authorization for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Coordination Center by $20.0 million. The committee believes that these actions will further enhance the United States' capability to combat al Qa'ida, prosecute the war in Afghanistan, bring to a close the war in Iraq, and build the capacity of those nations that share the desire to end the threat of militant extremism.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Air Force Requirements for Light Air Support Aircraft

The committee fully supports the Air Force's Light Air Support (LAS) aircraft concept to equip the Afghan National Army Air Corps (ANAAC) and other emerging partners but is concerned that the pre-solicitation notice for the LAS aircraft includes non-essential technical requirements that increase cost, inhibit competition, and impose avoidable long-term logistical and maintenance challenges on the recipient air corps. As with any procurement, the committee believes that requirements should focus on demonstrated survivability and mission performance, while reducing cost and follow-on maintenance and logistics requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to review the requirements for the LAS and ensure that any invitation for bids or request for proposals clearly articulate the ANAAC capability and performance requirements and not overly prescriptive or non-essential requirements. The Secretary shall inform the congressional defense committees of the results of his review and a justification of requirements for the LAS at least 30 days prior to issuance of a final request for proposal.

Annual Report on Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China

Section 1246 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) expanded the scope of the Annual Department of Defense Report on the Military Power of the People's Republic of China to include information on developments regarding U.S. engagement and cooperation with China on security matters, including through military-to-military contacts, and the U.S. strategy for such engagement and cooperation in the future. The report was due on March 1, 2010. The committee is disappointed that the report has not been delivered, as the information provided by the Administration in this report will inform the committee's assessments on a range of critical matters involving China. The committee requests that the Department of Defense submit the report to the committee at the earliest possible date, and in the interim, provide the committee with complete and timely information on all significant security developments involving China.

Concerns Regarding Iraqi Contractor Employees

The committee is concerned that as United States forces in the Republic of Iraq begin to redeploy out of Iraq, Iraqi citizens who were employed by United States contractors in Iraq to support U.S. efforts in that country could face potential retribution for their service. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to look into the status of these former contract employees and provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on his findings.

Countering Narcotics in Afghanistan

Although there has been a slight decrease in opium cultivation over the last two years, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan produces more opium than any other country in the world. The committee notes that the preponderance of Afghan opium cultivation remains in southern Afghanistan and that there is a strong correlation between the insurgency and narcotics cultivation and trade.

The committee is concerned that funding gained from the opium trade continues to be a significant source of funding for the insurgency as well as a basis of corruption within the government of Afghanistan. To build upon and perpetuate security gains in Afghanistan and establish conditions for stability and economic prosperity, the United States must work together with its coalition partners and the Afghan government to disrupt the link between narcotics and the insurgency. Such efforts should focus on reducing the funding the insurgency receives from the narcotics industry and assisting the Afghan government's efforts to eliminate the nexus between narcotics and corruption.

The committee commends the efforts of the Afghan Threat Finance Cell (ATFC), created in 2008 to disrupt the flow of funding from the Afghan opium trade and other illicit sources to the Taliban, al-Qa'ida, and other terrorist and insurgent groups in Afghanistan. The committee notes that the ATFC and related organizations have helped Afghan authorities investigate individuals connected to the opium trade, identify outside sympathizers who have been supplying funding to those individuals, and police a variety of

corrupt schemes that have filled the coffers of the Taliban-led insurgency and other illicit actors.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue to support U.S. interagency efforts, such as those of the AFTC, to: reduce opium cultivation; interdict narcotics and precursor materials; disrupt narcotic networks, traffickers, and facilities; and improve Afghan capacity to counter the illicit narcotics industry in Afghanistan. The committee also encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue to work with his North Atlantic Treaty Organization counterparts to enhance their efforts in reducing the narcotics cultivation, production, and trafficking in Afghanistan. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to continue to keep the committee apprised of the Department's progress with regard to these efforts.

Counterinsurgency Efforts in Pakistan

The committee welcomes recent efforts by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to address terrorist and other extremist elements located within Pakistan. The committee also recognizes the importance of building the counterinsurgency capabilities of Pakistan's security forces, and encourages effective management, execution and oversight of United States funds for these purposes, including funds transferred to the Department of Defense from the Department of State Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund (PCCF).

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees by April 10, 2011, a report on the management, execution and oversight of funds transferred to the Department of Defense from the PCCF. The report should include a description of the following:

(1) The spending plan of the United States Central Command for fiscal year 2011 for funds transferred to the Department of Defense from the PCCF.

(2) Any delays in transfers of PCCF funds to the Office of the Defense Representative for Pakistan (ODRP).

(3) A description of any goals, objectives, or emerging requirements that the ODRP was not able to meet as a result of any delays in transfers of PCCF funds to the ODRP.

(4) Any other information relevant to the management, execution, and oversight of funds transferred to the Department of Defense from the PCCF.

Cyber Attacks Involving China

The committee is concerned about recent reports of highly sophisticated and targeted cyber attacks originating from the People's Republic of China, including the widely publicized attacks against Google and other large companies. Such cyber attacks undermine the ability to operate with confidence in cyberspace, which is critical in a modern society and economy. The committee welcomes the Administration's efforts to actively address these issues with China and requests that the Administration keep the committee fully informed of significant developments.

The committee also notes that the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities has conducted close over-

sight throughout the last year on a broad range of cyber-security issues, including those involving China. The committee commends the Administration, and the Department of Defense in particular, for actively working to address the nation's cyber-security challenges. The committee notes that the establishment of a Defense Industrial Base Task Force to promote collaboration and information-sharing between government and industry, as well as the incorporation of new rules within the defense federal acquisition regulations to require enhanced incident reporting, are particularly positive actions.

Future Agreements With the Government of Iraq

The committee notes that the "Agreement Between the United States of America and the Republic of Iraq on the Withdrawal of United States Forces from Iraq and the Organization of Their Activities During Their Temporary Presence in Iraq" will expire on January 1, 2012. The committee further notes that the United States and the Republic of Iraq have signed a "Strategic Framework Agreement for a Relationship of Friendship and Cooperation Between the United States and the Republic of Iraq" that calls for continued cooperation in a number of areas between the United States and Iraq. The committee believes that such continued cooperation is in the interests of both nations and encourages the Administration and the new Government of Iraq, when it is seated, to continue to look for ways to continue and enhance such cooperation. The committee further believes that such cooperation should, with the redeployment of United States troops from Iraq by the end of 2011, assume the nature of normal nation-to-nation relations. Pursuant to that objective, the committee believes that any future agreement with the Government of Iraq that permits the stationing of any United States forces in Iraq, for any reason including training and advising Iraqi forces or for other purposes, assumes the character of typical Status of Forces Agreements such as the United States has with many other nations, including those physical and legal protections for United States forces as are typical and necessary to protect United States service members from malicious prosecution and physical danger. Furthermore, the committee believes that any such agreement, if it were to make any commitments or guarantees that either party would take military action to defend the interests of the other party, must be either enacted by an Act of Congress or ratified as a treaty by the United States Senate, consistent with the Constitution and the past practice of the United States.

Non-Standard Rotary—Wing Study

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has placed on order the full complement of Mi-17s necessary to support the current October 2011 Afghan National Army (ANA) end-strength target of 171,000. The committee notes that additional helicopters may be needed to support the ANA if that end-strength target is increased in the future and believes that should such additional helicopters be required, a helicopter manufactured in the United States should be included in the options considered. The committee further notes that the Department of Defense is con-

ducting a study concerning "non standard rotary wing" requirements, which in part consists of an examination of the future helicopter requirements for the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, including the possibility of transitioning the Afghan National Army Air Corps (ANAAC) to a helicopter manufactured in the United States. The committee understands that this part of the study is scheduled to be completed around the end of August 2010. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to complete the portion of the study regarding helicopters for the ANAAC as expeditiously as possible and to inform the House Committee on Armed Services of the recommendations and conclusions included in the report not later than October 1, 2010.

Realignment of U.S. Marines From Japan to Guam

The committee emphasizes the need to continue implementing the realignment of United States Marines from Japan to the territory of Guam, pursuant to a plan that will ensure a long-term presence of United States forces in Japan and transform Guam into a hub for security activities in the region.

The committee notes that the U.S.-Japan security relationship has been built on common interests and shared values and provided a foundation for peace, security, stability, and economic prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region since the end of World War II. However, the committee emphasizes the relationship must continue to evolve to address changes in the security environment and other areas. The committee believes the Guam realignment will help ensure that the U.S.-Japan relationship continues to be an integral part of the region's strategic landscape, with benefits for both countries and indeed countries throughout the world. Moreover, the committee emphasizes that the Guam realignment rightly acknowledges the strategic importance of Guam to regional and global security interests.

The committee supports the Administration's efforts with respect to the Guam realignment. The committee also notes that it includes a number of provisions elsewhere in this Act that are intended to facilitate the realignment. The committee requests that the Department of Defense keep the committee fully informed of significant developments with respect to the Guam realignment, including any changes to funding requirements.

Resources for Success in Afghanistan and Policy Against Arbitrary Limitations on Deployed Personnel

The committee notes that on December 1, 2009, the President announced that the United States would deploy an additional 30,000 troops to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee welcomes the long overdue deployment of additional forces to meet mission requirements and further notes that United States force levels are expected to approach 98,000 by August 2010, which is nearly three times the number of troops deployed in Afghanistan on January 1, 2009. The committee has requested testimony from several senior officials of the Department of Defense regarding the flow of United States forces authorized to deploy to Afghanistan. The committee has worked in this manner to ensure U.S. force lev-

els are not limited in an arbitrary manner that would hamper the deployment of critical combat enablers, including force protection.

The committee is disturbed to have received some reports contrary to the public testimony of senior Department of Defense officials, and continues to hear from personnel deployed to Afghanistan and in briefings that there is the perception of an arbitrary limit on the number of forces that can be deployed to Afghanistan, and that such a limit may have hampered the ability of commanders to deploy needed capabilities. The committee believes that the United States should have a policy to devote all necessary resources for success in Afghanistan and a policy against arbitrary limitations on deployed personnel. Thus, the committee is troubled by the perception that United States force levels are limited in an arbitrary manner and the committee is determined to ensure that all necessary actions are taken to ensure that this perception does not interfere with the success of the mission in Afghanistan.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to address the perception of an arbitrary limit on United States force levels in Afghanistan among personnel in Afghanistan and in the Department of Defense that has caused delays or complications in fielding needed capabilities or additional assets for force protection and other important missions. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2010, on the steps taken to ensure that the perception of an arbitrary limit on United States force levels in Afghanistan does not jeopardize mission success.

Security Concerns Involving North Korea

The committee remains concerned by the nuclear and missile activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which constitute a threat to international peace and security and are in blatant defiance of the United Nations (U.N.) Security Council.

The committee supports U.N. Security Council actions, which condemn North Korea's reckless and threatening provocations and confirm that they violate international law. The committee also supports actions by the Administration that urge North Korea to verifiably abandon its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, and refrain from further provocations in this regard. This includes efforts to work with U.S. allies and partners in the Six-Party Talks and other members of the U.N. Security Council to achieve the verifiable elimination of the North Korea's nuclear weapons program and the reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

The committee continues to carefully monitor the security situation on the Korean Peninsula and in the region and encourages the Department of Defense and the interagency to keep the committee fully informed of significant developments.

Security Developments in Pakistan and Implications for Afghanistan

The committee remains seriously concerned about instability in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, and the implications for U.S. national security and security in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan

and the region. The committee notes that it has held hearings and briefings throughout the last year on a range of security issues involving Pakistan, including:

(1) The security situation in Pakistan's border areas, and any implications for Afghanistan;

(2) Internal instability in Pakistan, including increasing militant attacks in the country's settled areas;

(3) The security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons, including the command and control structure;

(4) Counterterrorism operations by Pakistan's military;

(5) Pakistan-India tensions following the November 2008 terrorist bombings in Mumbai, Republic of India;

(6) U.S. strategy and policy involving Pakistan, including measures of progress toward achieving goals and objectives;

(7) U.S. efforts to increase the counterinsurgency capabilities of Pakistan's security forces, U.S.-Pakistan intelligence sharing, and Pakistan's counternarcotics activities;

(8) U.S. military and other security-related assistance for Pakistan, and possible limits, conditions, and performance requirements relating to such assistance;

(9) Department of Defense Coalition Support Fund reimbursements to Pakistan and possible alternatives that could achieve the same goals and objectives;

(10) The effectiveness of the Department of Defense Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF), including the management and execution of funds transferred from the Department of State Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund (PCCF) to the PCF; and

(11) Information regarding possible U.S. military involvement in Pakistan.

The committee welcomes the Administration's efforts to prioritize issues involving Pakistan, its commitment to strengthening the U.S.-Pakistan partnership, and increasing U.S.-Pakistan cooperation on shared security goals. The committee believes the Administration's new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, its appointment of a U.S. Special Representative for the two countries, and its regional approach to issues involving Pakistan are positive developments. The committee also appreciates the Administration's efforts to improve the effectiveness of U.S. funding and other assistance for Pakistan, including efforts to achieve the appropriate balance between military and non-military assistance.

However, the committee emphasizes that implementation of the Afghanistan-Pakistan strategy, measures of effectiveness, and accountability are also critical, as well as close cooperation with Pakistan in these areas.

The committee also notes that the Administration continues to request significant funding from Congress and the American people for efforts in Pakistan. The committee will continue to conduct vigorous oversight of such Department of Defense funding, to ensure that the funding achieves its intended goals and objectives and is not without limits.

The committee requests that the Department of the Defense and the inter-agency keep the committee fully informed on all significant security developments involving Pakistan.

Support for United States Special Operations Forces During the Redeployment of United States Armed Forces From Iraq

The committee is aware that the force disposition and operational tempo of United States Special Operations Forces (USSOF) in the Republic of Iraq will continue unabated during the responsible redeployment of conventional United States armed forces from Iraq. The committee is further aware that both USSOF and Iraqi Special Operations Forces (ISOF) utilize many key enabling assets currently being provided by United States conventional forces that may be withdrawn as part of the redeployment, including engineering, rotary aircraft, logisticians, communications, intelligence analysts, forensic analysts, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms. The committee is concerned that a loss of many key conventional enabling assets could adversely impact USSOF and ISOF operations and degrade ISOF capacity development in critical special operations mission areas. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the appropriate officials to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2010, on: the level of support currently provided by United States armed forces to ISOF; the requirement for ISOF and USSOF support between October 1, 2010, and December 31, 2011; measures taken to ensure that ISOF and USSOF operational and logistical requirements and equities are fully considered during redeployment of United States armed forces from Iraq; and on measures taken to ensure that current and future USSOF requirements and equities are incorporated into the political-military negotiations and frameworks established to support U.S.-Iraqi relations post-December 31, 2011.

Transition in Iraq

The committee notes that the mission of the United States military and the Department of Defense in the Republic of Iraq has entered a period of substantial transition. This transition includes the redeployment of over 40,000 U.S. servicemembers and their equipment over the next few months, leading to all uniformed personnel being redeployed from Iraq by the end of 2011. Although concerns with this redeployment remain, the committee congratulates the Department, the commanders in the field, and the uniformed personnel of the armed forces for their successful actions to date to make this redeployment run smoothly. However, well over 1,000 programs, projects, and activities must still be concluded or transferred to other agencies of the United States Government, other international organizations, or the Government of Iraq. While some of these activities are relatively minor, there are a number of activities including transferring responsibility for training and advising Iraqi police that could have a substantial impact on the future development of Iraq and U.S.-Iraqi relations. Furthermore, many if not most of these projects, programs, and activities will likely need to be transferred over a relatively short period of time before too many U.S. forces redeploy, a time frame which also includes the ongoing process to seat a new government in Iraq and the associated risk of increased violence. These concurrent events could substantially complicate such transitions and increase overall tension. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to submit

a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2010, outlining those activities, programs, and projects that must be transferred or concluded, an estimated timeline for such transfers to take place, and a description of problems in transferring or concluding program, projects, and activities that have been encountered to date and what steps have been taken to remedy those issues.

United States Africa Command Intelligence and Knowledge Development Directorate

The committee is aware that United States Africa Command (USAFRICOM) has developed an innovative approach for the analysis and integration of social science research to complement and amplify traditional intelligence products. The committee remains supportive of the use of social science research to support operational missions within the Department of Defense, as well as the development of organic social science expertise. The committee is aware that USAFRICOM's Intelligence and Knowledge Development (IKD) Directorate not only addresses those issues, but does it in a way that sets it apart from similar efforts, such as the Army's Human Terrain System (HTS). The IKD Directorate addresses certain USAFRICOM requirements by shaping the pre-crisis, pre-conflict environment in cooperation with joint, interagency, and international partners. The committee notes that the structure of the IKD Directorate indirectly addresses the perception that social scientists are supporting kinetic targeting of people or groups by maintaining a clear divide between the traditional intelligence function and the social science research function. Whereas HTS blends these functions in a tactical environment, the social science component of IKD carries out its research at a higher echelon and provides its analyses as additional input to the traditional intelligence process. The committee recognizes that each approach may be appropriate for the circumstances for which it was developed, and points to the need for flexible and tailorable approaches as the Department of Defense gains a better understanding of how social science research can support defense missions.

U.S. Forces Korea Transfer of Wartime Operational Control of Republic of Korea Forces

The committee continues to conduct oversight of progress under the "opcon transition roadmap" by which the Republic of Korea (ROK) will take over wartime operational control of ROK forces by 2012. The committee welcomes progress to date and requests U.S. Forces Korea to keep the committee fully informed of developments.

The committee also welcomes the recent U.S.-ROK "Joint Vision" statement, which addresses transformation of the alliance from one primarily focused on defending against a North Korean attack to an alliance in which the United States and the ROK cooperate on a broad range of regional and global issues.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—Expansion of Authority for Support of Special Operations To Combat Terrorism

This section would increase the amount of funds available to the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals supporting or facilitating military operations by U.S. Special Operations Forces to combat terrorism from $40.0 million to $50.0 million.

The Secretary of Defense would exercise this authority and operations would be funded through the U.S. Special Operations Command with operations and maintenance funds in accordance with the procedures established by the Secretary of Defense on March 29, 2005.

Section 1202—Addition of Allied Government Agencies to Enhanced Logistics Interoperability Authority

This section would amend section 127d of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide logistic support, supplies, and services to allied governmental logistics, security, or similar agencies, other than military forces, if the United States Armed Forces will benefit from such provision.

Section 1203—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program To Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

This section would amend section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1206 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) by increasing the amount authorized for "global train and equip" (also known as "1206") programs to $500.0 million. This section would also increase the temporary limitation on the amount available to build the capacity of foreign military forces to participate in or support military and stability operations to $100.0 million.

The committee is concerned about the rise of al Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula and recognizes that the Republic of Yemen is a strategic partner in combating that organization. The committee understands that the most capable counter-terrorism force in Yemen resides within the Ministry of the Interior (MOI) and that "1206" programs have been limited to a foreign nation's Ministry of Defense (MOD) forces. The committee wants to provide the Secretary of Defense authority to train and equip the Yemeni MOI counter-terrorism forces, but is also aware of the ongoing interagency effort within the United States Government to take a holistic look at the security assistance and security cooperation authorities that current law provides both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State in an effort to determine the proper mix and design of these authorities in the future.

Therefore, this section would require that the Secretary of Defense transfer to the Secretary of State $75.0 million for the purpose of providing assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763) to build the capacity of the counter-

terrorism forces of the Yemeni MOI, provided that, not later than July 31, 2011, the Secretary of State certifies that the Department of State is able to effectively provide that assistance. If the Secretary of State is unable to issue such a certification, then the Secretary of Defense may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and subject to the standard procedures of section "1206" authority, use that $75.0 million only for the purposes of training and equipping those Yemeni MOI forces. The committee notes that this does not preclude the Secretary of Defense from conducting additional train and equip programs with Yemeni MOD forces.

Additionally, the committee is aware of the report by the Government Accountability Office entitled "DOD and State Need to Improve Sustainment Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation for Section 1206 and 1207 Assistance Programs" and encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of State to jointly formulate mechanisms to monitor and evaluate the impact of 1206-funded assistance to a recipient country, including the impact on overall security and stability of the country. Lastly, the committee has recently become more concerned about the sustainment plans for equipment provided to foreign nations through "1206" programs once the initial sustainment packages provided at the time the equipment is delivered are depleted, and the committee will in the future require much greater detail on the long-term sustainment plans during the Congressional notification process.

Section 1204—Air Force Scholarships for Partnership for Peace Nations To Participate in the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a demonstration scholarship program to allow Partnership for Peace countries to participate in pilot and other types of training through the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program. It would require a report on the status of the program not later than February 1, 2015.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND PAKISTAN

Section 1211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Purposes Relating to Iraq

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized by this Act to establish permanent United States military installations or bases in the Republic of Iraq or to exercise United States control of the oil resources of Iraq.

Section 1212—Commanders' Emergency Response Program

This section would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 106–163), as amended most recently by section 1212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), to modify the authorized level of funding for the activities of the Commanders' Emergency Response Program. This section would authorize $900.0 million for activities in Fiscal Year 2011. This sec-

tion would also require quarterly reports by the Secretary of Defense to the congressional defense committees.

Section 1213—Modification of Authority for Reimbursement to Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would modify section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 1223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for (a) logistical, military, and other support provided by that nation to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom; or (b) logistical and military support provided by that nation to confront the threat posed by al'Qaida, the Taliban, and other militant extremists in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (Coalition Support Fund reimbursements). The total amount of reimbursements made under this authority during fiscal year 2011 would not exceed $1.6 billion. The congressional notice and reporting requirements under section 1233 of Public Law 110–181, as amended by section 1223 of Public Law 111–84, would apply to Coalition Support Fund reimbursements authorized by this section.

Section 1214—Modification of Report on Responsible Redeployment of United States Armed Forces From Iraq

This section would modify reports concerning United States involvement in the Republic of Iraq to better focus reporting requirements on the redeployment of United States forces out of Iraq, the transition of activities and programs currently conducted by the Department of Defense in Iraq to other agencies of the United States Government or the Government of Iraq, and the development of those military capabilities that the Secretary of Defense deems necessary to allow for the Government of Iraq to provide for its own defense. This section would require that the Secretary of Defense provide an opportunity for the Secretary of State to submit with the report any additional information that the Secretary of State deems important. This section would also repeal the report required by section 1227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) as amended, and the report required by section 1225 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 1215—Modification of Reports Relating to Afghanistan

This section would modify the report required by section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by requiring a discussion of those conditions and criteria that would need to exist in key districts and across the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to meet United States and coalition goals in Afghanistan and the region, permit the transition of lead security responsibility in key districts to the Government of Afghanistan, and permit the redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan. This section would further modify the report by requiring that with respect to each performance indicator

and measure of progress, it should include a description of the conditions that would lead the Secretary of Defense to conclude that the indicator or measure of progress had been achieved.

Section 1216—No Permanent Military Bases in Afghanistan

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized by this Act to establish permanent United States military installations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 1217—Authority To Use Funds for Reintegration Activities in Afghanistan

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to use up to $50.0 million to carry out a program designed to reintegrate former low-level Taliban fighters into Afghan society. Such authority would be subject to a certification made by the Secretary of State that such a reintegration program is necessary to support the goals of the United States in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and that the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development are unable to carry out a similar program of reintegration because of the security environment in certain areas, or for other reasons. This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense submit the guidance to be used to carry out the program and a quarterly report concerning the activities carried out under this section.

Section 1218—One-Year Extension of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund

This section would amend section 1224(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), by extending the Department of Defense Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) through fiscal year 2011.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense has requested this authority in order to address fiscal and legal issues associated with the transfer of responsibilities for Pakistan counterinsurgency funds to the Department of State for Fiscal Year 2011.

The committee further understands that such request is not intended to alter the agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State regarding such transfer of responsibilities.

Moreover, the committee notes that the Department of Defense has not requested additional funding for the PCF for Fiscal Year 2011, and expects that any additional funding will be transferred to the PCF from the Department of State Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund.

The committee encourages strong coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of State on costs associated with execution of the PCF; and requests that the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Department of State, keep the relevant committees fully informed of such costs and related issues.

Section 1219—Authority To Use Funds To Provide Support to Coalition Forces Supporting Military and Stability Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan

This section would authorize the Department of Defense to spend up to $400.0 million from funds made available for operations and maintenance on lift and sustainment for coalition forces supporting operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the support provided under this authority.

Section 1220—Requirement To Provide United States Brigade and Equivalent Units Deployed to Afghanistan with the Commensurate Level of Unit and Theater-Wide Combat Enablers

This section would establish a policy and would require the Secretary of Defense to provide each United States brigade and equivalent units deployed to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan with the commensurate level of unit and theater-wide combat enablers, including Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance, force protection, including force protection at U.S. Forward Operating Bases, and medical evacuation. This section would further require a report describing: The requests for forces submitted by United States Forces-Afghanistan for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010; the current troop-to-task analysis; the number of United States brigade and equivalent units deployed to Afghanistan; and information regarding the number of United States unit and theater-wide combat enablers.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1231—NATO Special Operations Coordination Center

This section would increase the amount of authorized funds available to the Secretary of Defense to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Coordination Center from $30.0 million to $50.0 million.

Section 1232—National Military Strategic Plan To Counter Iran

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense develop a National Military Strategic Plan to Counter Iran. This section would further require that the Secretary of Defense develop a plan to address any gaps in capabilities identified as part of the planning and review process. Finally, this section would require a report to Congress identifying and justifying any resources, capabilities, legislative authorities, or changes to current law the Secretary believes are necessary to address the gaps in capabilities.

Section 1233—Report on Department of Defense's Plans To Reform the Export Control System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Department of De-

fense's plans to reform the Department's export control system. The report would include a description of plans to reform the export control system and an assessment of the plans' impact on the Department.

Section 1234—Report on the United States Efforts To Defend Against Threats Posed by the Advanced Anti-Access Capability of Potentially Hostile Foreign Countries

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than April 1, 2011, to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report on the United States' efforts to defend against threats posed by the anti-access capabilities of potentially hostile foreign countries. The report should include a description of any efforts by the Department of Defense to address findings in the Department's 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review regarding advanced anti-access capabilities of foreign countries, including any efforts to:

(1) Develop a joint air-sea battle concept;

(2) Expand future long-range strike capabilities;

(3) Exploit advantages in subsurface operations;

(4) Increase the resiliency of United States forward posture and base infrastructure;

(5) Ensure access to space and the use of space assets;

(6) Enhance the robustness of key Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) capabilities;

(7) Ensure access within the cyber domain;

(8) Develop regional missile defense architecture;

(9) Defeat enemy sensors and engagement systems; and

(10) Enhance the presence and responsiveness of United States military forces abroad.

For the purposes of this section, to the extent possible, the committee encourages the Department to utilize information provided to Congress in the Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China, required by section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), as most recently amended by section 1246 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84;) and the Annual Report on the Military Power of Iran as required by Section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1235—Report on Force Structure Changes in Composition and Capabilities at Military Installations in Europe

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, not later than one year after enactment of this Act, on evaluating potential changes in the composition and capabilities of units of the United States armed forces in European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Section 1236—Sense of Congress on Missile Defense and New START Treaty With Russian Federation

This section would express a sense of the Congress that: (1) there would be no limitations on any phase of the phased, adaptive approach to missile defense in Europe resulting from ratification of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation, signed on April 8, 2010; (2) the United States should deploy the phased, adaptive approach for missile defense in Europe to protect the United States, its deployed forces, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, after appropriate testing and consistent with NATO policy; and (3) the ground-based midcourse defense system in Alaska and California should be maintained, evolved, and appropriately tested because it is the only missile defense capability as of the date of the enactment of this Act that would protect the United States from the growing threat of a long-range ballistic missile attack.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $522.5 million for fiscal year 2011, representing an increase of $98.4 million from the amount authorized in fiscal year 2010, excluding any supplemental funds. The request contained the following decreases: $5.5 million for nuclear weapons storage security in the Russian Federation; $1.4 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia; $11.1 million for weapons of mass destruction (WMD) proliferation prevention in states of the former Soviet Union (FSU); and $17.0 million for new CTR initiatives. The request also contained the following increases: $0.3 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia; $56.9 million for biological threat reduction in the FSU; $74.5 million for global nuclear lockdown; and $1.6 million for other assessments and administrative costs.

The committee supports the goals of the CTR Program and continues to believe that the Program is critical to U.S. national security and must be a top priority. In past years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have limited the progress of the CTR Program. The committee has also noted that despite the significant achievements of the CTR Program over more than 10 years, much remains to be done, and has emphasized the need for a strong national commitment to reinvigorate the CTR Program.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) addressed these concerns by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the FSU; increasing CTR funding, including funding for new CTR initiatives; requiring reports by the National Academy of Sciences and the Secretary of Defense on the development of new CTR initiatives and CTR metrics; requiring a report by the Secretary of Defense re-

garding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project at Shchuch'ye, Russia; requiring increased reporting from the Secretary of Defense on CTR defense and military contacts; providing CTR programs with authority for urgent threat reduction activities; authorizing the CTR Program to accept international contributions; and including other provisions to ensure that wherever possible, the CTR Program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

In addition, the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," included a number of provisions and authorized funding to accelerate, strengthen, and expand the CTR Program.

The committee welcomes the President's efforts to reinvigorate the CTR Program and ensure it is a top priority going forward. This includes the President's effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear materials within four years to ensure that such materials do not fall into the hands of terrorists; the Nuclear Security Summit; and other efforts to accelerate, strengthen, and expand CTR activities.

This Act specifically supports the President's goals and objectives for the CTR Program, and encourages these programs to maintain a particular focus on securing WMD and related materials and technologies at the source wherever possible.

The committee authorizes $522.5 million, the amount of the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Biological Threat Reduction

The committee continues to recognize the importance of biological threat reduction activities to U.S. national security interests and believes the United States should be actively engaged in this area. However, the committee also believes that the Biological Threat Reduction Program (BTRP) under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program should be guided by a comprehensive long-term interagency strategy for biological threat reduction and requires: robust interagency engagement and coordination; rigorous Department management and oversight; coordination and integration with other Department programs and activities; and concrete metrics for measuring progress.

The committee welcomes current efforts by the Department of Defense to restructure and strengthen BTRP activities, including in the area of metrics and interagency engagement and coordination to ensure that the Department is the appropriate agency to undertake such activities. The committee encourages the Department to keep the committee fully informed of developments with respect to this effort. The committee also encourages the Department to maintain a strong focus within the CTR Program on other threat reduction challenges, including preventing the proliferation of chemical and nuclear weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

Cooperative Threat Reduction Defense and Military Contacts Program

Section 1304 of the National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) amended the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) annual report to include additional information on the CTR Defense and Military Contacts program. It also required the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Defense and Military Contacts program is: strategically used to advance the mission of the CTR Program; focused and expanded to support specific relationship-building opportunities, which could lead to CTR Program development in new geographic areas and achieve other CTR Program benefits; directly administered as part of the CTR Program; and includes, within an overall strategic framework, cooperation and coordination with the unified combatant commands that operate in areas in which CTR activities are carried out, and with related diplomatic efforts.

The committee welcomes recent efforts by the Department in this regard, and encourages the Department to actively consult with the committee and to keep the committee fully informed of developments in this area.

Metrics for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

The committee continues to emphasize the importance of concrete metrics for measuring the impact and effectiveness of activities under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to address threats arising from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise. The committee welcomes recent efforts by the Department in this regard, and encourages the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and to keep the committee fully informed of developments in this area.

New Initiatives for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) authorized a new funding line for new Cooperative Threat Reduction Program initiatives in order to strengthen and expand the CTR Program. Such funding was accompanied by provisions in Public Law 110–181, which specified the uses for such funding and required reports from the National Academy of Sciences and the Secretary of Defense on the development of new CTR initiatives that could enable the CTR Program to be more flexible, responsive, and effective in addressing threats arising from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons, and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee welcomes the Administration's efforts to undertake new CTR initiatives, and strengthen and expand the program in additional ways. Given such efforts, the committee no longer finds the new CTR initiatives funding line necessary and does not authorize funding under this line for fiscal year 2011. Rather, the committee authorizes funding for the CTR Program, including for the President's plan to secure all loose nuclear materials within

four years, within the existing program lines in the Department of Defense budget request for fiscal year 2011.

The committee encourages the Department to actively consult with the committee and to keep the committee fully informed of significant developments as the CTR Program accelerates, strengthens, and expands its activities.

Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Project

The committee is pleased that the chemical weapons destruction facility in the Russian Federation at Shchuch'ye is currently operating at full capacity. This has been a flagship project for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and in past years the committee has conducted vigorous oversight of the project. The committee welcomes recent efforts by the Department to ensure the sustainability of the project, and encourages the Department to keep the committee fully informed of developments in this regard.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would define the programs and funds that are Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act and specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for three fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program element under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program from within the overall $522.5 million that the committee would authorize for the CTR Program. The allocation under this section reflects the amount of the budget request for fiscal year 2011. This section would also require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2011 funds for purposes other than those specifically authorized. In addition, this section would provide limited authority to obligate amounts for a program element under the CTR Program in excess of the amount specifically authorized for that purpose.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Department of Defense Inspector General Growth Plan

The budget request contained $283.4 million for the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG).

The committee is aware of the important role of the Department of Defense Inspector General. The inspector general improves the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of DOD personnel, programs and operations, and helps to eliminate fraud, waste, and abuse.

The committee is aware that a plan for increasing DOD IG audit and investigative capabilities was published March 31, 2008. This plan required increased resources for it to be fully implemented, and Congress provided these resources in fiscal years 2008–10. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense Inspector General is funded below the level required to meet the growth plan in fiscal year 2011. The committee believes the Department has had sufficient time to assimilate the requirements of the IG growth plan and is disappointed that the Department has failed to fully resource the IG requirements. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to provide the necessary resources to this critical function in future budget requests.

The committee recommends $283.4 million, the amount of the request.

Fuel Infrastructure Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization

The committee is aware that the Defense Energy Supply Center (DESC) faces mounting deficiencies in its aging fuel infrastructure. The committee is concerned that high fuel prices in recent years may have contributed to deferred investment in DESC facilities' upkeep due to resource constraints. The committee is aware that recent estimates indicate a need for $561.7 million to $774.8 million per year for sustainment, restoration and modernization for fuel infrastructure from fiscal year 2011–15. This reflects an increase of approximately $300 million to $400 million per year, based on estimates submitted with the fiscal year 2010 budget request. The committee is also aware that as infrastructure requirements mount, the costs are passed through to fuel customers through the operating cost component of the standard price of fuel. In fiscal year 2011, this component will be $16.73 per barrel, an increase of $6.55 from the amount in fiscal year 2010.

The committee encourages the Defense Energy Supply Center and the Defense Logistics Agency to plan and budget for fuel infrastructure sustainment requirements, and includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency to submit a plan for addressing fuel infrastructure sustainment, restoration, and modernization requirements.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $161.0 million for Working Capital Funds and $1.3 billion for Defense Working Capital Fund, Defense Commissary.

Section 1402—Study on Working Capital Fund Cash Balances

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to contract with a federally funded research and development center, within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to carry out an independent review of each working capital fund within the Department of Defense to ascertain the appropriate cash corpus required to maintain good financial management of the funds.

The committee notes that current Department of Defense fiscal policy for all working capital funds is to maintain a 7-day minimum and 10-day maximum cash balance. The committee believes that this three-day cash corpus is outdated and arbitrary and does not take into account increased activity due to contingency operations or fluctuations in commodity markets outside of the Department's control. The committee is concerned that maintaining this narrow cash corpus tolerance may not allow for successful long-term financial management of the funds in today's dynamic environment.

The committee is disappointed with the lack of effort the Department exhibited in generating the report that was required in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. The committee's intent was to provide an avenue for the Department to review its restrictive financial management policies regarding the required cash corpus to allow the Department to rectify chronic fiscal issues. Rather than dedicating sufficient effort to propose methods to correct this habitual error, the Department submitted a three-page report with minimal information and recommendations. The committee notes that the recommendations included maintaining the status quo and a request that Congress provide the Department with specific authorities which were previously denied due to restrictions mandated by the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344).

The committee anticipates that the independent reviews required by this section would provide recommendations to improve management of the Department's working capital funds and assist in bringing in best business practices from the private sector for the successful management of each fund.

Section 1403—Modification of Certain Working Capital Fund Requirements

This section would amend section 2208(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to allow supplies developed through continuous technology refreshment (CTR) to be purchased with working capital funds and would amend section 2208(k)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the expense or investment threshold to $250,000.

The committee notes that Army Regulation 700–127, paragraph 5–23f, states that CTR will be addressed as part of the post-production support strategy to provide a means to acquire technologically improved replacement parts and to reduce ownership costs. The committee views CTR as a necessary and vital aspect of weapon system sustainment and a primary means for technology insertion in post-production equipment where supply is affected by aging technology, obsolescence, poor reliability, excessive cost, or unavailability. The committee intends that development of the CTR solution will consist of a business case analysis, specifications, and engineering drawings achieved through either research, development, test and evaluation; sustainment systems technical support; or industry investment. The established form-fit-function CTR replacement solution can then be translated to hardware and qualified, and then procured with working capital funds to improve reliability and maintainability, extend useful life, enhance safety, reduce

maintenance costs, and enable weapon system performance requirements to be maintained.

The committee believes that by implementing these recommended changes, CTR could enable the military departments to make vital progress in resolving critical supply problems affecting military readiness.

Section 1404—Reduction of Unobligated Balances Within the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund

This section would require the return of $77.0 million of excess unobligated balances within the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund to the Miscellaneous Receipts Fund of the United States Treasury.

The committee notes that unobligated balances within the Pentagon Renovation Maintenance Revolving Fund have increased threefold since the fiscal year 2009 budget request. Budget materials submitted by the Department of Defense indicate that Pentagon renovation operations will end in fiscal year 2011, yet these unobligated balances increase from year to year. Based on fiscal year 2011 budget materials, capital purchases for the Pentagon renovation decreased from $257.2 million in fiscal year 2009 to $16.3 million in fiscal year 2011. Therefore the committee questions the need to maintain $120.0 million in unobligated balances as of the end of fiscal year 2011 for this purpose.

Section 1405—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize $934.9 million for the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Section 1406—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize $1.5 billion for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

Section 1407—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize $1.1 billion for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Section 1408—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize $283.4 million for the Department of Defense Inspector General.

Section 1409—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize $31.0 billion for the Defense Health Program (DHP) and other programs.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $41.2 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2011. This section would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

Section 1412—Revision to Required Receipt Objectives for Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize revisions on limitations in asset sales contained in section 3402(b)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) as most recently amended by section 1412(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 418) to increase the Department of Defense's stockpile commodity disposal authority from $710.0 million to $730.0 million.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1421—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $71.2 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2011.

Section 1422—Plan for Funding Fuel Infrastructure Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization Requirements

This section would require the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for addressing fuel infrastructure sustainment, restoration, and modernization requirements. The report shall be submitted not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for fiscal year 2012, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
010	PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	54,636		54,636
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**54,636**		**54,636**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
020	PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	66,861		66,861
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**66,861**		**66,861**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
040	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	39,468		39,468
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**39,468**		**39,468**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
010	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,273,571		1,273,571
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,273,571**		**1,273,571**
	NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
020	MPF MLP	380,000		380,000
030	POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	31,202		31,202
040	NATIONAL DEF SEALIFT VESSEL	1,463		1,463
050	LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	106,898		106,898
060	DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	25,902		25,902
070	TAH MAINTENANCE	24,384		24,384
080	STRATEGIC SEALIFT SUPPORT	4,875		4,875
090	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	28,012		28,012
100	READY RESERVE FORCE	332,130		332,130
	TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	**934,866**		**934,866**

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	DEFENSE COALITION SUPPORT, DEFENSE			
010	COALITION SUPPORT	10,000	-10,000	0
	Program Reduction		[-10,000]	
	TOTAL, DEFENSE COALITION SUPPORT, DEFENSE	**10,000**	**-10,000**	**0**
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
010	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM O&M	29,915,277	32,515	29,947,792
	Extension of Prohibition on TRICARE Health Fees (Sec. 701)		[12,000]	
	Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization		[430]	
	Madigan Army Medical Center Trauma Assistance Program		[2,500]	
	Military Wellness Initiative		[585]	
	Shock Trauma Center - National Simulation Training Center		[2,000]	
	TRICARE Dependent Coverage Extention		[10,000]	
	United States Olympic Committee (USOC) Paralympic Military Program		[5,000]	
020	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM R&D	499,913	24,326	524,239

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	Autism Brain Morphology Library		[2,000]	
	Bone Marrow Failure Disease Research		[3,000]	
	Gulf War Syndrome Brain Image Analysis		[146]	
	Military Photomedicine Program		[6,000]	
	Multiple Sclerosis Research (CDMRP)		[1,000]	
	Nanoparticle Delivery System for Pocket Vaccines		[1,400]	
	Old Dominion University Bioelectrics Research for Casualty Care and Management		[2,780]	
	Polycystic Kidney Disease Program		[5,000]	
	Research in Alcohol and Substance Use Disorders		[3,000]	
030	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM PROCUREMENT	519,921		519,921
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**30,935,111**	**56,841**	**30,991,952**
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
001	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	1,067,364		1,067,364
002	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E	392,811		392,811
003	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	7,132		7,132
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**1,467,307**		**1,467,307**
	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES			
001	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	1,131,351		1,131,351
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	**1,131,351**		**1,131,351**
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
010	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	282,354		282,354
030	PROCUREMENT	1,000		1,000

Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	283,354		283,354
	Total, Title XIV	36,196,525	46,841	36,243,366

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee notes that section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) requires the budget submission to Congress for each fiscal year to include:

(1) A request for the appropriation of funds for ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(2) An estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for operations; and

(3) A detailed justification of the funds requested.

The committee recommends authorization of $159.3 billion in funds to be appropriated available upon enactment of this Act to support overseas contingency operations principally associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATION

The following table summarizes contained in the bill for overseas contingency operations.

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY							
FIXED WING							
002	C-12 CARGO AIRPLANE	5	78,060			5	78,060
004	MQ-1 UAV	0	47,000			0	47,000
005	RQ-11 (RAVEN)	0	17,430			0	17,430
ROTARY							
011	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	2	40,500			2	40,500
013	CH-47 HELICOPTER	2	70,600			2	70,600
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT							
016	C-12 AIRCRAFT MODS	0	122,340			0	122,340
017	MQ-1 PAYLOAD - UAS	0	3,600			0	3,600
019	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)	0	30,200			0	30,200
020	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)	0	86,200			0	86,200
021	AH-64 MODS	0	199,200			0	199,200
023	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	0	82,900			0	82,900
027	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	0	14,530			0	14,530
028	KIOWA WARRIOR	0	187,288			0	187,288
029	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	0	24,983			0	24,983
031	RQ-7 UAV MODS	0	97,800			0	97,800
GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS							
036	ASE INFRARED CM	0	197,990			0	197,990
OTHER SUPPORT							
038	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	0	65,627			0	65,627
040	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	0	7,555			0	7,555
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**9**	**1,373,803**			**9**	**1,373,803**
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY							
AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM							

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	0	190,459			0	190,459
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,782	112,769			1,782	112,769
	MODIFICATIONS						
013	ITAS/TOW MODS	0	40,600			0	40,600
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,782**	**343,828**			**1,782**	**343,828**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
009	STRYKER (MOD)	0	445,000			0	445,000
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
026	MORTAR SYSTEMS	136	8,600			136	8,600
028	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	5,428	22,500			5,428	22,500
032	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO	425	100,000			425	100,000
034	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)	14	62,000			14	62,000
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
036	M4 CARBINE MODS	0	12,900			0	12,900
037	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS	0	15,000			0	15,000
040	M119 MODIFICATIONS	0	21,500			0	21,500
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**6,003**	**687,500**			**6,003**	**687,500**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	0	32,604			0	32,604
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	0	128,876			0	128,876
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	0	20,056			0	20,056
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	0	23,826			0	23,826
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	0	62,700			0	62,700
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	0	120,160		-50,100	0	70,060
	Program Reduction				[-50,100]		
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION							
015	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES	0	37,620			0	37,620
016	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES	0	37,620			0	37,620
018	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T	0	15,048			0	15,048
ARTILLERY FUZES							
019	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	0	12,540			0	12,540
ROCKETS							
024	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	17,556			0	17,556
025	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	0	139,285			0	139,285
OTHER AMMUNITION							
027	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	2,000			0	2,000
MISCELLANEOUS							
031	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	0	15,000			0	15,000
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT							
040	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL	0	37,700			0	37,700
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**0**	**702,591**		**-50,100**	**0**	**652,491**
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY							
TACTICAL VEHICLES							
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	1,692	516,350			1,692	516,350
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	0	188,677			0	188,677
009	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	106	52,780			106	52,780
010	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY	0	136,700			0	136,700
014	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	0	989,067			0	989,067
015	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	0	20,000			0	20,000
COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS							

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
024	WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	0	8,163			0	8,163
COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS							
027	SHF TERM	0	62,415			0	62,415
029	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	0	13,500			0	13,500
COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS							
040	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS - OPA2	0	3,946			0	3,946
047	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY	0	78,253			0	78,253
048	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	0	15,000			0	15,000
INFORMATION SECURITY							
051	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	0	0		38,172	0	38,172
	Biometrics Equipment- Transfer from RDA 171				[38,172]		
COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS							
053	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	0	70,000			0	70,000
COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS							
057	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM(	0	413,200			0	413,200
ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)							
065	PROPHET GROUND	0	18,900			0	18,900
070	DCGS-A (MIP)	0	197,092			0	197,092
074	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) (MIP	0	52,277			0	52,277
075	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)	0	5,400			0	5,400
ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)							
076	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	0	25,000			0	25,000
077	WARLOCK	0	225,682			0	225,682
079	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	0	455,639			0	455,639
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)							
081	FAAD GBS	0	167,460			0	167,460
084	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	0	5,019			0	5,019

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
089	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM)	0	291,400			0	291,400
090	BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS	0	486,050			0	486,050
095	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)	0	69,800			0	69,800
096	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)	0	135,500			0	135,500
098	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD	0	22,371			0	22,371
099	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	0	1,800			0	1,800
101	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	0	20,000			0	20,000
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS							
103	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	0	43,800			0	43,800
104	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	0	566			0	566
105	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC	0	420			0	420
108	KNIGHT FAMILY	0	49,744			0	49,744
110	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	0	2,222			0	2,222
114	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE	0	5,000			0	5,000
115	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	0	60,111			0	60,111
ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION							
121	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	0	10,500			0	10,500
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
129A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	775			0	775
CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT							
130	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	0	5,690			0	5,690
BRIDGING EQUIPMENT							
135	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	0	3,220			0	3,220
ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT							
137	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS	0	191,000			0	191,000
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
141	HEATERS AND ECU'S	0	8,708			0	8,708

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
149	FORCE PROVIDER	0	261,599			0	261,599
150	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	0	29,903			0	29,903
PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT							
154	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	0	55,105			0	55,105
WATER EQUIPMENT							
155	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	0	12,086			0	12,086
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT							
156	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	0	8,680			0	8,680
MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT							
157	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	0	41,398			0	41,398
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT							
159	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	0	3,390			0	3,390
161	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	0	3,195			0	3,195
164	LOADERS	0	1,157			0	1,157
168	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS	0	3,750			0	3,750
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	0	4,140			0	4,140
GENERATORS							
174	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	0	37,480			0	37,480
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT							
175	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)	0	4,562			0	4,562
177	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	0	56,609			0	56,609
TRAINING EQUIPMENT							
179	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	0	28,624			0	28,624
180	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	0	8,200			0	8,200
TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)							
184	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	0	622			0	622
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
186	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	58,590			0	58,590

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
187	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	0	77,000			0	77,000
192	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	0	1,987			0	1,987
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,798**	**5,827,274**		**38,172**	**1,798**	**5,865,446**
JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND							
NETWORK ATTACK							
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK	0	1,434,400			0	1,434,400
JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT							
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE	0	1,529,390			0	1,529,390
FORCE TRAINING							
003	TRAIN THE FORCE	0	286,210			0	286,210
STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE							
004	OPERATIONS	0	0		214,368	0	214,368
	Excessive Contractor Growth for Counter-IED Operations Integration Center Functions				[-1,500]		
	Transfer from Title I				[215,868]		
	TOTAL, JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND	**0**	**3,250,000**		**214,368**	**0**	**3,464,368**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY							
COMBAT AIRCRAFT							
011	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	3	88,500			3	88,500
OTHER AIRCRAFT							
028	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	0	0			0	0
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT							
029	EA-6 SERIES	0	15,000			0	15,000
031	AV-8 SERIES	0	72,100			0	72,100
032	F-18 SERIES	0	43,250			0	43,250
034	AH-1W SERIES	0	35,510			0	35,510
035	H-53 SERIES	0	36,248			0	36,248

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
036	SH-60 SERIES	0	6,430			0	6,430
039	P-3 SERIES	0	6,000			0	6,000
048	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	0	6,100			0	6,100
053	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	0	38,700			0	38,700
054	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	0	14,100			0	14,100
055	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	0	10,500			0	10,500
057	RQ-7 SERIES	0	8,000			0	8,000
058	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	0	36,420			0	36,420
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
059	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	3,500		423,000	0	426,500
	URL Aviation Spares				[423,000]		
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**3**	**420,358**		**423,000**	**3**	**843,358**
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY							
TACTICAL MISSILES							
005	SIDEWINDER	9	2,923			9	2,923
009	HELLFIRE	794	85,504			794	85,504
GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS							
026	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	0	4,998			0	4,998
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**803**	**93,425**			**803**	**93,425**
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC							
NAVY AMMUNITION							
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	6,060			0	6,060
003	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	0	76,043			0	76,043
004	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	0	69,660			0	69,660
007	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	0	33,632			0	33,632
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	0	455			0	455

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	0	7,757			0	7,757
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	0	1,209			0	1,209
MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION							
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	0	19,498			0	19,498
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	0	4,677			0	4,677
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	0	11,307			0	11,307
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	0	17,150			0	17,150
019	81MM, ALL TYPES	0	27,738			0	27,738
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	0	96,895			0	96,895
021	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	0	990			0	990
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	6,137			0	6,137
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	0	13,543			0	13,543
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	0	137,118			0	137,118
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	9,296			0	9,296
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	0	25,888			0	25,888
027	NON LETHALS	0	31			0	31
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**0**	**565,084**			**0**	**565,084**
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY							
SMALL BOATS							
025	STANDARD BOATS	0	30,706			0	30,706
AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT							
057	MATCALS	0	27,080			0	27,080
OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT							
074	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	0	1,800			0	1,800
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
099	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	0	26,024			0	26,024
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
117	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	0	132,386			0	132,386
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
122	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	0	1,234			0	1,234
123	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	0	420			0	420
124	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	0	55,474			0	55,474
126	TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	91,802			0	91,802
129	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	0	26,016			0	26,016
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
131	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	0	33,659			0	33,659
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
137	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	2,775			0	2,775
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	46,417			0	46,417
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	4,942			0	4,942
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**0**	**480,735**			**0**	**480,735**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
002	LAV PIP	0	152,333			0	152,333
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
005	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	20	103,600			20	103,600
006	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	0	145,533			0	145,533
007	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	0	7,329			0	7,329
	OTHER SUPPORT						
009	MODIFICATION KITS	0	12,000			0	12,000
010	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	0	18,571			0	18,571
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS						
016	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	0	112,424			0	112,424

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT							
017	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	0	15,962			0	15,962
OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)							
019	MODIFICATION KITS	0	18,545			0	18,545
COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)							
020	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	0	11,549			0	11,549
021	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	0	41,031			0	41,031
RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)							
022	RADAR SYSTEMS	0	5,493			0	5,493
INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)							
023	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	4,710			0	4,710
024	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	82,897			0	82,897
026	DCGS-MC	0	21,789			0	21,789
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)							
028	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	0	29,412			0	29,412
029	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	0	36,256			0	36,256
030	RADIO SYSTEMS	0	155,545			0	155,545
031	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	63,280			0	63,280
TACTICAL VEHICLES							
035	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	77	12,994			77	12,994
037	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	0	80,559			0	80,559
038	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	230	109,100			230	109,100
039	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	0	22,130			0	22,130
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT							
042	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	0	17,799			0	17,799
043	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	0	1,628			0	1,628
044	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	0	83,698			0	83,698

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
045	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	0	41,536			0	41,536
046	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	0		33,000	0	33,000
	Assault Breacher Vehicle - Unfunded Requirement				[33,000]		
047	EOD SYSTEMS	0	213,985		38,000	0	251,985
	Mine Roller Systems - Unfunded Requirement				[38,000]		
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT							
048	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	5,200			0	5,200
050	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	58,264			0	58,264
GENERAL PROPERTY							
052	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	0	0		5,000	0	5,000
	Unfunded Requirement				[5,000]		
053	TRAINING DEVICES	0	55,864			0	55,864
054	CONTAINER FAMILY	0	8,826			0	8,826
056	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)	73	28,401			73	28,401
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**400**	**1,778,243**		**76,000**	**400**	**1,854,243**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE							
TACTICAL FORCES							
001	F-35	1	204,900	-1	-204,900	0	0
	Program Reduction			[-1]	[-204,900]		
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT							
025	HH-60M OPERATIONAL LOSS REPLACEMENT	3	114,000			3	114,000
026	RQ-11	0	9,380			0	9,380
OTHER AIRCRAFT							
034	MQ-9	12	216,000			12	216,000
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT							
037	B-1B	0	8,500			0	8,500

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT							
039	A-10	0	16,500			0	16,500
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT							
044	C-5	0	73,400			0	73,400
047	C-17A	0	224,450			0	224,450
OTHER AIRCRAFT							
056	KC-10A (ATCA)	0	3,540			0	3,540
062	C-130	0	166,720			0	166,720
063	C-130 MODS INTEL	0	10,900			0	10,900
066	COMPASS CALL MODS	0	10,000			0	10,000
072	H-60	0	81,000		-61,000	0	20,000
	Program Reduction				[-61,000]		
075	OTHER AIRCRAFT	0	61,600			0	61,600
078	MQ-9 PAYLOAD - UAS	0	45,000			0	45,000
079	CV-22 MODS	0	830			0	830
AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS							
080	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	0	10,900			0	10,900
OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES							
098	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	0	57,500			0	57,500
DARP							
104	DARP	0	47,300			0	47,300
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**16**	**1,362,420**	**-1**	**-265,900**	**15**	**1,096,520**
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE							
CARTRIDGES							
002	CARTRIDGES	0	30,801			0	30,801
BOMBS							
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	53,192			0	53,192

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	5,831	147,991			5,831	147,991
FUZES							
011	FLARES	0	20,486			0	20,486
012	FUZES	0	24,982			0	24,982
SMALL ARMS							
013	SMALL ARMS	0	15,507			0	15,507
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**5,831**	**292,959**			**5,831**	**292,959**
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE							
TACTICAL							
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	431	41,621			431	41,621
CLASS IV							
010	AGM-65D MAVERICK	0	15,000			0	15,000
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**431**	**56,621**			**431**	**56,621**
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE							
CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES							
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	0	7,350			0	7,350
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES							
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	15,540			0	15,540
BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT							
011	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000(VEHICLES)	0	690			0	690
INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS							
016	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	0	1,400			0	1,400
ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS							
019	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN	0	4,354			0	4,354
020	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	0	9,825			0	9,825
SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS							
028	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	0	6,100			0	6,100

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS							
038	USCENTCOM	0	28,784			0	28,784
DISA PROGRAMS							
044	MILSATCOM SPACE	0	4,300			0	4,300
046	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	0	8,200			0	8,200
ORGANIZATION AND BASE							
047	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	0	2,552			0	2,552
MODIFICATIONS							
052	COMM ELECT MODS	0	470			0	470
PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP							
053	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	0	8,833			0	8,833
BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT							
056	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	0	9,070			0	9,070
057	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	0	131,559			0	131,559
059	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	0	16,588			0	16,588
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS							
066	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	0	9,700			0	9,700
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
066A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	2,822,166			0	2,822,166
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**0**	**3,087,481**			**0**	**3,087,481**
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE							
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA							
005	DIA SUPPORT TO CENTCOM INTELLIGENCE ACT	0	27,702			0	27,702
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA							
018	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	0	1,000			0	1,000
020	TELEPORT PROGRAM	0	6,191			0	6,191
023	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK	0	520			0	520

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD							
050	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	0	5,700			0	5,700
050A	COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	0	0		205,000	0	205,000
	Iron Dome				[205,000]		
UNDISTRIBUTED							
052	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE	0	15,000			0	15,000
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
054A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	323,486			0	323,486
AVIATION PROGRAMS							
055	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	14	5,600			14	5,600
056	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	0	4,222			0	4,222
064	MQ-1 UAS	10	8,202			10	8,202
065	MQ-9 UAV	10	4,368			10	4,368
AMMUNITION PROGRAMS							
071	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	0	75,878			0	75,878
072	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	0	49,776			0	49,776
OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS							
073	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	32	9,417			32	9,417
074	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	107	149,406		91,500	107	240,906
	Special Operations Funding for Overseas Operations - Intelligence Systems				[91,500]		
081	TACTICAL VEHICLES	263	36,262		55,000	263	91,262
	Special Operations Funding for Overseas Operations - Tactical Vehicles				[55,000]		
083	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	1	30,000			1	30,000
088	SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	21	1,291			21	1,291
090	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	1	25,000			1	25,000
092	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR	55	3,200			55	3,200
093	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	217	3,985			217	3,985

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element Title	FY 2011 Request Qty	FY 2011 Request Cost	House Change Qty	House Change Cost	House Authorized Qty	House Authorized Cost
096	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	11	5,530			11	5,530
097	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	198	79,869		150,000	198	229,869
	Special Operations Funding for Overseas Operations - Operational Enhancements				[150,000]		
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS							
098A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	2,941			0	2,941
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**940**	**874,546**		**501,500**	**940**	**1,376,046**
MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND							
002	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND - UNDD	0	3,415,000			0	3,415,000
	TOTAL, MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND	**0**	**3,415,000**			**0**	**3,415,000**
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT							
005	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT	0	0		700,000	0	700,000
	Program Increase				[700,000]		
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT	**0**	**0**		**700,000**	**0**	**700,000**
	Total, OCO Procurement	**18,016**	**24,611,868**	**-1**	**1,637,040**	**18,015**	**26,248,908**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations- RDT and E Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY					
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	57,900		57,900
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**57,900**		**57,900**
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
075	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	5,400		5,400
077	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	8,100		8,100
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**13,500**		**13,500**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
171	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	63,306	-38,172	25,134
		Transfer to OPA 051		[-38,172]	
178	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	16,200		16,200
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**79,506**	**-38,172**	**41,334**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**150,906**	**-38,172**	**112,734**
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY					
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
019	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	14,100		14,100
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**14,100**		**14,100**
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
053	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	1,000		1,000
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,000**		**1,000**
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
124	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	300		300

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations- RDT and E Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**300**		**300**
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
153	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	5,200		5,200
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**5,200**		**5,200**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
213	0305233N	RQ-7 UAV	6,900		6,900
223	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	32,901		32,901
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**39,801**		**39,801**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**60,401**		**60,401**
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF					
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
036	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	16,000		16,000
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**16,000**		**16,000**
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
066	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	30,000		30,000
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**30,000**		**30,000**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
164	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	4,443		4,443
211	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	6,100		6,100
230	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	10,325		10,325
245	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	199,373		199,373
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**220,241**		**220,241**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**266,241**		**266,241**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations- RDT and E Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Element	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW					
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)					
061A	0603XXXD8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM	0	500,000	500,000
		Department of Defense Rapid Innovation Program		[500,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)	**0**	**500,000**	**500,000**
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
197	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS	23,125		23,125
202	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	750		750
254	1160405BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	9,440		9,440
274	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	123,925		123,925
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**157,240**		**157,240**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**157,240**	**500,000**	**657,240**
		Total, OCO Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**634,788**	**461,828**	**1,096,616**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	47,638,208		47,638,208
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	1,300,000	-400,000	900,000
	Program Decrease		[-400,000]	
160	RESET	7,840,211		7,840,211
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**56,778,419**	**-400,000**	**56,378,419**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	3,465,334		3,465,334
	SECURITY PROGRAMS			
340	SECURITY PROGRAMS	2,358,865		2,358,865
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,824,199**		**5,824,199**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**62,602,618**	**-400,000**	**62,202,618**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	1,839,918		1,839,918
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	3,453		3,453
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	1,400		1,400
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	26,837		26,837
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	44,567		44,567

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	233,114		233,114
BASE SUPPORT				
270	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	10,350		10,350
280	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	28,250		28,250
290	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	381,749		381,749
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT				
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	38,468		38,468
150	WARFARE TACTICS	82,801		82,801
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	24,855		24,855
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	2,737,727		2,737,727
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	3,677		3,677
200	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	7,000		7,000
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	7,455		7,455
SHIP OPERATIONS				
080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,151,465		1,151,465
090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	27,472		27,472
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,266,556		1,266,556
WEAPONS SUPPORT				
240	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	99,118		99,118
250	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	82,519		82,519
260	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	16,938		16,938
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**8,115,689**		**8,115,689**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILIZATION PREPARATION				
330	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	4,400		4,400
350	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	254,461		254,461

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCE				
300	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	27,300		27,300
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**286,161**		**286,161**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
390	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	81,454		81,454
420	TRAINING SUPPORT	5,400		5,400
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**86,854**		**86,854**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
700	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	22,581		22,581
INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS				
610	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	78,464		78,464
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
540	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	300,868		300,868
570	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	6,091		6,091
600	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	2,153		2,153
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
470	ADMINISTRATION	4,265		4,265
480	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	467		467
490	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	450		450
500	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	11,214		11,214
510	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	2,706		2,706
520	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	28,671		28,671

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**457,930**		**457,930**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**8,946,634**		**8,946,634**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	BASE SUPPORT			
080	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	55,301		55,301
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	2,448,572		2,448,572
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	514,748		514,748
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	523,250		523,250
	USMC PREPOSITIONING			
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	7,808		7,808
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**3,549,679**		**3,549,679**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
140	TRAINING SUPPORT	223,071		223,071
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**223,071**		**223,071**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
210	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	360,000		360,000
220	ADMINISTRATION	3,772		3,772
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**363,772**		**363,772**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**4,136,522**		**4,136,522**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,896,647		1,896,647
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,954,759		1,954,759
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	113,948		113,948
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	297,623		297,623
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	704,463		704,463
060	BASE SUPPORT	1,780,052		1,780,052
	COCOM			
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	127,861		127,861
	COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	128,632		128,632
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	397,894		397,894
	SPACE OPERATIONS			
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	28,975		28,975
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	34,091		34,091
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**7,464,945**		**7,464,945**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	4,403,800		4,403,800
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	240,394		240,394
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	217,023		217,023
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	20,360		20,360

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
190	BASE SUPPORT	57,362		57,362
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**4,938,939**		**4,938,939**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING				
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,948		1,948
240	BASE SUPPORT	6,088		6,088
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	45,893		45,893
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	20,277		20,277
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	1,500		1,500
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	1,820		1,820
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**77,526**		**77,526**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	292,030		292,030
380	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	10,500		10,500
390	BASE SUPPORT	31,985		31,985
SECURITY PROGRAMS				
440	SECURITY PROGRAMS	305,689		305,689
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
400	ADMINISTRATION	5,438		5,438
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	247,149		247,149
420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	113,082		113,082
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**1,005,873**		**1,005,873**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**13,487,283**		**13,487,283**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	20,500		20,500
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,012,026		3,012,026
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**3,032,526**		**3,032,526**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
	DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	27,000		27,000
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	74,862		74,862
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	136,316		136,316
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	120,469		120,469
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	14,799		14,799
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	2,000,000		2,000,000
210	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	1,218		1,218
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	485,769		485,769
250	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	188,099		188,099
270	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,345,300		3,345,300
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**6,393,832**		**6,393,832**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**9,426,358**		**9,426,358**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	286,950		286,950
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**286,950**		**286,950**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	**286,950**		**286,950**
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	49,089		49,089
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	400		400
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	17,760		17,760
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT				
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	3,185		3,185
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	12,169		12,169
SHIP OPERATIONS				
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	9,395		9,395
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	497		497
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**92,495**		**92,495**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,064		1,064
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**1,064**		**1,064**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	**93,559**		**93,559**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	BASE SUPPORT			
050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	6,114		6,114
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	23,571		23,571
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**29,685**		**29,685**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	**29,685**		**29,685**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	116,924		116,924
050	BASE SUPPORT	12,683		12,683
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**129,607**		**129,607**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**129,607**		**129,607**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	544,349		544,349
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**544,349**		**544,349**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	**544,349**		**544,349**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	152,896		152,896
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	57,800		57,800
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	140,127		140,127
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**350,823**		**350,823**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	**350,823**		**350,823**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
	DEFENSE FORCES			
010	INFRASTRUCTURE	1,790,933	-350,900	1,440,033
	Unexecutable Program		[-350,900]	
020	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	1,846,623		1,846,623
030	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	836,842		836,842
040	SUSTAINMENT	2,992,616		2,992,616
	TOTAL, BA 01: MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**7,467,014**	**-350,900**	**7,116,114**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
	INTERIOR FORCES			
060	INFRASTRUCTURE	1,078,413	-303,400	775,013
	Unexecutable Program		[-303,400]	

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
070	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	917,966		917,966
080	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	990,213		990,213
090	SUSTAINMENT	1,098,845		1,098,845
	TOTAL, BA 02: MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**4,085,437**	**-303,400**	**3,782,037**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES			
	RELATED ACTIVITIES			
110	SUSTAINMENT	6,037		6,037
120	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	1,530		1,530
130	INFRASTRUCTURE	58,265		58,265
140	COIN ACTIVITIES	1,000		1,000
	TOTAL, BA 03: ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES	**66,832**		**66,832**
	TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**11,619,283**	**-654,300**	**10,964,983**
	IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
	DEFENSE FORCES			
010	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	1,067,706		1,067,706
020	TRAINING	248,075		248,075
030	SUSTAINMENT	341,125		341,125
	TOTAL, BA 01: MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**1,656,906**		**1,656,906**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
	INTERIOR FORCES			
040	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	220,469		220,469
060	SUSTAINMENT	47,625		47,625

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	TOTAL, BA 02: MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**268,094**		**268,094**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES			
	RELATED ACTIVITIES			
070	QUICK RESPONSE FORCE	75,000		75,000
	TOTAL, BA 03: ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES	**75,000**		**75,000**
	TOTAL, IRAQ SECURITY FORCES FUND	**2,000,000**		**2,000,000**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
100	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	1,551,781	-1,045,000	506,781
	Unexecutable Program		[-245,000]	
	Unjustified Request		[-800,000]	
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,551,781**	**-1,045,000**	**506,781**
	Total, OCO Operation and Maintenance	**115,205,452**	**-2,099,300**	**113,106,152**

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Military Personnel Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
MILITARY PERSONNEL	15,275,502		15,275,502

Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Total
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
010	TRANSPORTATION FALLEN HEROES	17,000		17,000
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**17,000**		**17,000**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
070	SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT - DEF	84,484		84,484
080	ENERGY MANAGEMENT - DEF	383,900		383,900
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**468,384**		**468,384**
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
010	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM O&M	1,398,092		1,398,092
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**1,398,092**		**1,398,092**
	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES			
001	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	457,110		457,110
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	**457,110**		**457,110**
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
010	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	10,529		10,529
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**10,529**		**10,529**
	Total, OCO Other Authotizations	**2,351,115**		**2,351,115**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

F–35A Aircraft

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained $204.9 million for one F–35A aircraft.

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force justified the $204.9 million request for one F–35A aircraft, which would be delivered in June 2013, as a replacement for the combat loss of one legacy aircraft. However, the committee further notes that the Department of the Air Force does not plan to declare F–35A initial operational capability until 2016 and that for fiscal year 2010, the Department plans the early retirement of 250 fighter aircraft.

The committee believes that the Department of the Air Force could choose to delay the retirement of one or more of the 250 fighter aircraft planned for retirement in fiscal year 2010.

The committee therefore recommends no funds, a decrease of $204.9 million, for one F–35A aircraft. In title I of this Act, the budget request for $3.7 billion and 22 F–35A aircraft is authorized.

Force Protection Measures on United States Forward Operating Bases in Afghanistan

The committee notes that there continues to be a serious indirect fire threat to United States and Coalition forces on Forward Operation Bases (FOB) in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). The committee understands that certain force protection systems to protect FOBs are currently deployed in OIF, but not in OEF. The committee has been briefed that the force protection systems in OIF have saved hundreds of lives. The committee understands that United States Central Command has a validated Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statement (JUONS) for a capability to sense, warn, and intercept enemy rocket, artillery, and mortar fires for OEF similar to the capability that is already in OIF. The committee fully supported a reprogramming in support of this JUONS in September 2009, and has provided an additional $200.0 million elsewhere in this title to address urgent force protection requirements in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on force protection measures implemented by the United States Forces for Afghanistan on United States Forward Operating Bases in Afghanistan. The report should include the following information:

(1) An assessment of the indirect fire threat to FOBs in OEF. This assessment should include at a minimum, total rocket and mortar attacks for all FOBs, by month, for the last 24 months, and U.S. and Coalition Killed in Action, and U.S. Wounded in Action as a result of such attacks.

(2) A description of the types and levels of sense, warn, and intercept capabilities located at each FOB to protect against indirect fires in OIF for calendar year 2010.

(3) A description of the types and levels of sense, warn, and intercept capabilities located at each FOB to protect against indirect fires in OEF in calendar year 2010, and any pending plans to increase such capabilities.

(4) A description of manning requirements, to include a breakdown of military personnel and contractors to support OIF sense, warn, and intercept requirements during calendar year 2010.

(5) A description of current or planned manning requirements, to include a breakdown of military personnel and contractors in OEF during calendar year 2010 or beyond to support sense, warn, and intercept capabilities.

(6) A cost and schedule analysis that compares and contrasts the benefits of how sense, warn, and intercept capabilities were implemented versus the current plan to implement such capabilities in OEF. Such an analysis should include a description of all significant differences in the planned force protection capabilities for OEF and OIF, the impact these differences might have on the level of protection provided to U.S. and coalition forces/equipment, and the reason for the difference in planned force protection implementation between OIF and OEF.

H–60 Modifications

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained $81.0 million for H–60 modifications to procure forward looking infra-red radars (FLIR) for the HH–60G fleet.

The committee is informed by program officials that, by using fiscal year 2010 funds to leverage an existing Navy contract, only $20.0 million is required to complete the FLIR procurement for the HH–60G fleet, including spares.

The committee therefore recommends $20.0 million, a decrease of $61.0 million, for H–60 modifications. The $20.0 million authorized is in addition to the $11.6 million authorized in title I of this Act.

Iraq Security Forces Fund

The committee recognizes that the Iraq Security Forces Fund (ISFF) is an important tool for building a long-term security relationship with the Government of the Republic of Iraq. However, the committee has a number of concerns about the budget request for the Iraq Security Forces Fund. First, the request appears to be largely intended to procure systems and support contracts that the Government of Iraq apparently does not consider as priorities and has not provided for out of its own funds. In a time of significant fiscal constraint in the United States, requests by the Government of Iraq for funds for kitchen equipment, office supplies, basic first-aid kits, and other easily obtainable items for Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) are less than compelling. Second, the committee is concerned that the Government of Iraq may not be fully committed to maintaining those capabilities being provided by the United States, in particular those associated with logistics and sustainment. This concern is heightened when the Government of Iraq has not contributed financially to the acquisition of such capabilities. Third, the committee agrees with the Administration that the United States should help Iraq in building a set of "minimum essential capabilities" to provide for internal defense, and a limited capability for external defense, prior to the redeployment of all United States troops. However, the committee notes that much of the equipment that would be purchased with funds in the budget request would

not directly contribute to this goal and would likely not be delivered prior to the redeployment of U.S. forces.

The committee agrees that the support capabilities described in the budget justification materials for the ISFF are necessary to increase the effectiveness of the ISF in the long run, but is concerned that building consensus in the Government of Iraq that such capabilities are important may take more time than is available prior to the redeployment of all United States troops by January 1, 2012. Instead, the committee believes the Iraq Security Forces Fund should be used to purchase significant military equipment, particularly U.S.-standard equipment, which both governments view as vital, to enhance Iraqi capabilities as well as to provide a foundation for a close security relationship in the future. This approach would allow the Government of Iraq to contribute some of its own funding to build the necessary logistics and sustainment capabilities that it will need in the future. This approach, in turn, would increase the likelihood that the Government of Iraq would commit to maintaining and supporting such capabilities.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to closely examine the budget request for the ISFF program and determine if the current plans are the most appropriate way to build an Iraqi capability to provide for its internal and, to a limited extent, external defense prior to the withdrawal of U.S. forces, and to provide the basis for a long-term U.S.-Iraq security relationship.

Marine Corps Radio Systems

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) contained $155.6 million for Marine Corps radio systems.

The committee notes that $45.2 million was for Enterprise-Land Mobile Radio (E-LMR) infrastructure upgrades at training facilities in the United States. The committee does not believe these funds should be requested in the OCO budget request, and urges the Marine Corps to pursue these funds in the fiscal year 2012 base budget.

The committee recommends $110.4 million, a decrease of $45.2 million, for Marine Corps radio systems. The $110.4 million authorized is in addition to the $26.5 million for Marine Corps radio systems authorized in title II of this Act.

Special Operations Funding for Overseas Operations

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained $3.5 billion for U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) in support of current and future U.S. Special Operations Forces (USSOF) operations in the Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and other locations.

The committee notes that USSOF operational tempo will remain high for the foreseeable future, and strained by ongoing requirements and challenges in the Horn of Africa, the Trans-Saharan region, the Republic of Columbia, and the Republic of the Philippines.

The committee notes that the list of unfunded requirements it received for USSOCOM procurement is in excess of $410.0 million to support USSOF current and future operations indicating significant gaps in these critical areas. The committee understands that these unfunded requirements would provide immediate operational

and survivability enhancements and improvements, as well as procure additional SOF-peculiar items for USSOF engaged in combat operations and indirect missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other areas.

The committee recommends $3.8 billion, an increase of $296.5 million, to support overseas contingency operations for USSOCOM and to provide for urgently needed unfunded requirements to include additional tactical vehicles, communications and electronics equipment, nonstandard aviation platforms, intelligence systems, and classified program areas.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in additional to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

Section 1502—Army Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $8.9 billion for Army procurement.

Section 1503—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would authorize the President's request of $3.5 billion for requirements to defeat improvised explosive devices.

The committee concurs with the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization's decision to increase its support to disrupt and discourage human networks that use improvised explosive devices to attack United States and coalition military forces in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 1504—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $3.8 billion for Navy and Marine Corps procurement.

Section 1505—Air Force Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $4.5 billion for Air Force procurement.

Section 1506—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $1.4 billion for Defense-wide activities procurement.

Section 1507—Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense Program

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $205.0 million from the funds authorized in section 1506 of this title for Defense-Wide Activities Procurement to the Government of the State of Israel for procurement of the Iron Dome defense system to counter short-range rocket threats.

Section 1508—National Guard and Reserve Equipment

This section would authorize $700.0 million for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, non-system training devices, logistic automation systems, and other critical dual-use procurement items for the national guard and reserves as part of a specific National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account (NGREA). The committee expects national guard and reserve forces to use this NGREA funding to procure high-priority equipment that would be used by these units in their critical dual-mission role of full-spectrum combat operations and domestic civil support missions.

Section 1509—Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund

This section would authorize the President's request of $3.4 billion for the mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicle fund. The committee is aware these vehicles are high priority assets in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom and continue to save lives in combat.

The committee notes the MRAP family of vehicles consists of legacy MRAP vehicles produced in three different variants based on weight, size, and personnel capacity; as well as a new, lighter MRAP All Terrain variant (MATV) to be used exclusively in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee notes the extraordinary effort it took to produce over 26,000 MRAP vehicles to include MATVs in just over 3 years and commends the Secretary of Defense for acknowledging the importance of this program by making it a top priority.

The committee expects funding for sustainment of these vehicles to begin to transition from overseas contingency operation requests to the individual military services base budget requests as part of future year budget requests.

Section 1510—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize an additional $1.1 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation.

Section 1511—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize an additional $113.1 billion for operation and maintenance programs.

Section 1512—Limitations on Availability of Funds in Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would subject funds authorized in this title for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund or any other funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund to the terms and conditions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 1513—Limitations on Iraq Security Forces Fund

This section would subject funds authorized in this title for the Iraq Security Forces Fund or otherwise made available to the De-

partment of Defense for the Iraq Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2011 to the terms and conditions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The section would further require that the Government of the Republic of Iraq support at least 20 percent of the cost of any item or service that is procured for the Iraqi Security Forces with funds from the Iraq Security Forces Fund. The provision would provide an exception to the cost-sharing requirement for items and services that are either significant military equipment as defined by the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794(9)) or are included on the United States Munitions List, as defined in section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778 (a)(1)).

Section 1514—Military Personnel

This section would authorize an additional $15.3 billion for military personnel.

Section 1515—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize an additional $485.4 million for Defense Working Capital Funds.

Section 1516—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize an additional $1.4 billion for the Defense Health Program.

Section 1517—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize an additional $457.1 million for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Section 1518—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize an additional $10.5 million for the Office of the Inspector General.

Section 1519—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq

This section would apply section 1508(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) and prohibit the use of funds contained in this title for the acquisition, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of facilities for the use of the Government of the Republic of Iraq, political subdivisions of Iraq, or agencies, departments, or forces of the Government of Iraq or its subdivisions.

Section 1520—Availability of Funds for Rapid Force Protection in Afghanistan

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to obligate up to $200.0 million in fiscal year 2011 Defense-wide Operation and Maintenance funds to address urgent force protection requirements facing United States military forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The section would clarify that in carrying out this sec-

tion, the Secretary of Defense should utilize those rapid acquisition authorities available to the Secretary.

Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations

This section would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to an additional $3.5 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

TITLE XVI—IMPROVED SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE IN THE ARMED FORCES

OVERVIEW

The committee continues its ongoing efforts to prevent and resolve sexual assault offenses by or against military members. Congress required the creation of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services (DTFSAMS) as an extension of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies in section 576 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). The committee notes that DTFSAMS was not constituted by the Department of Defense, and therefore did not begin its work, until August 2008.

The committee notes the depth, breadth, thoughtfulness, and quality of the DTFSAMS final report. The final report of the task force made 30 recommendations to improve sexual assault prevention and response by the Department of Defense in the following areas: strategic direction; prevention and training; response to victims; and accountability.

The committee holds sexual assault in the armed forces to be an abhorrent violation of the military culture of trust, respect, and selfless service. The committee will continue to be vigilant in its oversight of the sexual assault prevention and response programs of the Department of Defense.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Improved Coordination Between Military and Civilian Law Enforcement in Response to Sexual Assaults Involving a Service Member

The committee notes the importance of coordination between military and civilian law enforcement in response to sexual assaults involving a member of the armed forces. The committee encourages the secretaries of the military departments to ensure that military law enforcement agencies under their jurisdiction enter into written agreements with local law enforcement authorities to provide for: the notification of a military law enforcement agency when there is a report of a sexual assault involving a member of

the armed forces, whether a member of the armed forces is the victim, alleged assailant, or both; and a clear delineation of how each agency will respond to reports of such sexual assaults. The committee also encourages the Secretary of Defense to examine the feasibility of having a military law enforcement agency prepare a report and conduct an investigation concurrently with any local law enforcement authority investigating a sexual assault involving a service member.

Inclusion of Community Organizations

The committee notes that local communities should play an important role in the sexual assault prevention and response programs of the Department of Defense. The committee encourages commanders of military installations, and Sexual Assault Response Coordinators assigned to installations, to collaborate with supporting community organizations in the implementation of the sexual assault prevention and response programs.

Reduced Delays for Convening Courts-Martial Involving Charges of Sexual Assault

The committee encourages the secretaries of the military departments and the Judge Advocate Generals to consider increasing the use of military judges from a different armed service to expedite the disposition of courts-martial cases involving offenses under section 920 of title 10, United States Code (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1601—Definition of Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program and Other Definitions

This section would define the term "sexual assault prevention and response program" as referring to Department of Defense policies and programs, including policies and programs of a specific military department or armed force, that are intended to effectively prevent and respond to sexual assaults involving members of the armed forces, whether members of the armed forces are the victim, alleged assailant, or both.

SUBTITLE A—IMMEDIATE ACTIONS TO IMPROVE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE PROGRAM

Section 1611—Specific Budgeting for Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense allocate a separate line of funding to the Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program, effective with the Program Objective Memorandum to be issued for fiscal year 2012.

Section 1612—Consistency in Terminology, Position Descriptions, Program Standards, and Organizational Structures

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to use consistent termi-

nology, position descriptions, minimum program standards, and organizational structures throughout the armed forces in implementing the Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program. This section would also require the Secretary to take into account operational differences between the military departments when fulfilling the requirements of this section.

Section 1613—Guidance for Commanders

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments to issue guidance, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to all military unit commanders that implementation of the Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program requires their leadership and is their responsibility.

Section 1614—Commander Consultation With Victims of Sexual Assault

This section would require the commanding officer of a victim to offer to meet with the victim of the offense to determine the opinion of the victim regarding case disposition and provide that information to the convening authority before making a decision regarding how to proceed under the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the case of an alleged sexual assault or other offense covered by section 920 of title 10, United States Code (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

Section 1615—Oversight and Evaluation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to issue standards to be used to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the sexual assault prevention and response program of each military department in preventing and responding to sexual assaults involving members of the armed forces, and to develop measures to ensure that the armed forces comply with those standards.

Section 1616—Sexual Assault Reporting Hotline

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to establish a universal hotline to facilitate the reporting of a sexual assault by a member of the armed forces, whether serving in the United States or overseas, who is a victim of a sexual assault. This hotline would also be available for use by any other person who is a victim of a sexual assault involving a member of the armed forces. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator serving in the locality of the victim promptly responds to the reporting of a sexual assault using the hotline.

Section 1617—Review of Application of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program to Reserve Components

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the application of the sexual

assault prevention and response program for the reserve components.

Section 1618—Review of Effectiveness of Revised Uniform Code of Military Justice Offenses Regarding Rape, Sexual Assault, and Other Sexual Misconduct

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the effectiveness of section 920 of title 10, United States Code (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 552 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). This section would also require the Secretary to use a panel of military justice experts to conduct the review.

Section 1619—Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to develop curricula to provide sexual assault prevention and response training and education for members of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the secretary and civilian employees of the military department to strengthen individual knowledge, skills, and capacity to prevent and respond to sexual assault. The scope of the training would encompass initial entry and accession programs, annual refresher training, professional military education, peer education, and specialized leadership training, and would be tailored for specific leadership levels and local area requirements. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that sexual assault prevention and response training provided to members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees is consistent throughout the military departments, and be included in professional military education and first responder training.

Section 1620—Use of Sexual Assault Forensic Medical Examiners

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within two years of the date of enactment of this Act, to provide for the use of forensic medical examiners within the Department of Defense who are specially trained regarding the collection and preservation of evidence in cases involving sexual assault.

Section 1621—Sexual Assault Advisory Board

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to establish a Sexual Assault Advisory Board, to be modeled after other Department of Defense advisory boards, such as the Defense Business Board, the Defense Policy Board, or the Defense Science Board.

Section 1622—Department of Defense Sexual Assault Advisory Council

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to reorganize the Sexual Assault Advisory Council and limit membership on the Sexual Assault Advisory Council to Department of Defense personnel.

Section 1623—Service-Level Sexual Assault Review Boards

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to establish for each military installation or operational command under the jurisdiction of the secretary, a multi-disciplinary group to serve as a sexual assault review board. A sexual assault review board would be, at minimum, responsible for addressing safety issues, developing prevention strategies, analyzing response processes, community impact and overall trends, and identifying training issues. These functions would be flexible to accommodate the resources available at different installations and operational commands.

Section 1624—Renewed Emphasis on Acquisition of Centralized Department of Defense Sexual Assault Database

This section would set a new deadline of September 30, 2011, for the Secretary of Defense to complete the implementation of the centralized sexual assault database required by section 563 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

SUBTITLE B—SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION STRATEGY AND ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT

Section 1631—Comprehensive Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive strategy to effectively prevent sexual assaults involving members of the armed forces, whether they are the victim, alleged assailant, or both. In developing the comprehensive strategy, the Secretary of Defense would incorporate and build upon the new requirements of this subtitle. This section would also require the Secretary, within six months of the submission of the comprehensive strategy, to complete its implementation throughout the Department of Defense. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement an evaluation plan for assessing the effectiveness of the comprehensive strategy and its intended outcomes at the Department of Defense and individual armed force levels.

Section 1632—Annual Report on Sexual Assaults Involving Members of the Armed Forces and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments by January 15, of each year, to submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on the sexual assaults involving members of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of that secretary during the preceding year. The Office of the Judge Advocate General of an armed force, or in the case of the Marine Corps the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, would verify the accuracy of the information, including courts-martial data. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to establish

a consistent definition of "founded" for purposes of the report and require that military criminal investigative organizations only provide synopses for those cases for the preparation of reports under this section.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report on sexual assaults involving members of the armed forces and the sexual assault prevention and response program prepared by the military departments, together with the comments of the Secretary of Defense on the report.

SUBTITLE C—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10

Section 1641—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office

This section would require that the director of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office be a general or flag officer or an employee of the Department of Defense in a comparable Senior Executive Service position. This section would also specify that the director of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office would serve as the single point of authority, accountability, and oversight for the Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program and provide oversight to ensure that the military departments comply with the program.

Section 1642—Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to standardize the allocation, staffing, training, and certification of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish a professional and uniform training and certification program for Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates. This section would require the program to be structured and administered in a manner similar to the professional training available for Equal Opportunity Advisors through the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute. This section would also require that the secretaries of the military departments ensure that a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, including a deployable Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, has direct access to senior commanders and any other commander within the unit or geographical area of responsibility of the Sexual Assault Response Coordinator. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a protocol for the establishment and use of sexual assault response teams throughout the Department of Defense. Further, this section would prohibit personnel of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Inspector General of the Army, the Naval Inspector General, and the Inspector General of the Air Force from performing Sexual Assault Response Coordinator duties.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to work with the Office for Crime Victims of the Department of Justice when developing the training and certification of the program for Sexual

Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates. The committee also encourages the military departments to work towards certifying individuals as Sexual Assault Victim Advocates before they assume duties as a Sexual Assault Victim Advocate, and to keep Congress informed on progress made towards this goal.

Section 1643—Sexual Assault Victims Access to Legal Counsel and Victim Advocate Services

This section would entitle a member of the armed forces who is the victim of a sexual assault to legal assistance provided by a military legal assistance counsel certified as competent to provide such duties and assistance provided by a qualified Sexual Assault Victim Advocate. This section would also entitle a dependent of a member of the armed forces who is the victim of a sexual assault and resides on or in the vicinity of a military installation, to the extent practicable, legal assistance provided by a military legal assistance counsel certified as competent to provide such duties and assistance provided by a qualified Sexual Assault Victim Advocate. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to implement a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator-led process by which a member or dependent who is the victim of a sexual assault may decline to participate in the investigation of the sexual assault.

Section 1644—Notification of Command of Outcome of Court-Martial Involving Charges of Sexual Assault

This section would require the trial counsel, in the case of an alleged sexual assault or other offense covered by section 920 of title 10, United States Code (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to notify the servicing staff judge advocate at the military installation, who shall notify the convening authority and commanders, as appropriate. This section would also require the commanding officer, in consultation with the servicing staff judge advocate, to notify members of the command of the outcome of the case.

Section 1645—Copy of Record of Court-Martial to Victim of Sexual Assault Involving a Member of the Armed Forces

This section would require that in the case of a general or special court-martial involving a sexual assault or other offense covered by section 920 of title 10, United States Code (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), a copy of the prepared record of the proceedings of the court-martial be given to the victim of the offence if the victim testified during the proceedings. This section would also require that the record of the proceedings be provided without charge and as soon as the record is authenticated, and that the victim be notified of the opportunity to receive the record of the proceedings.

Section 1646—Medical Care for Victims of Sexual Assault

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish protocols for providing medical care to a member of the armed forces who is a victim of a sexual assault, including protocols with respect to the appropriate screening, prevention, and mitigation of

diseases, taking into account the gender of the victim. This section would also require the Secretary to ensure that an accurate and complete medical record is made for each member of the armed forces who is a victim of a sexual assault with respect to the physical and mental condition of the member resulting from the assault, and that such record complies with the requirement for confidentiality in making a restricted report under section 1044e(b) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 1647—Privilege Against Disclosure of Certain Communications With Sexual Assault Victim Advocates

This section would establish that a confidential communication between a victim of a sexual assault and a qualified Sexual Assault Victim Advocate be treated in the same manner as a confidential communication between a patient and a psychiatrist for proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1661—Recruiter Selection and Oversight

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments to ensure effective recruiter selection and oversight with regard to sexual assault prevention and response. This section would also require commanders of recruiting organizations and Military Entrance Processing Stations to ensure that sexual assault prevention and response awareness campaign materials are available and posted in locations visible to potential and actual recruits for the armed forces.

Section 1662—Availability of Services Under Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program for Dependents of Members, Military Retirees, Department of Defense Civilian Employees, and Defense Contractor Employees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to revise materials made available under the sexual assault prevention and response program to include information on the extent to which dependents of members of the armed forces, retired members, Department of Defense civilian employees, and employees of defense contractors are eligible for sexual assault prevention and response services under the sexual assault prevention and response program. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility of extending all sexual assault prevention and response services available for a member of the armed forces who is the victim of a sexual assault to dependents of members of the armed forces, retired members, Department of Defense civilian employees, and employees of defense contractors who are the victim of a sexual assault.

Section 1663—Application of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program in Training Environments

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments to ensure that a member of the armed forces who is a victim

of a sexual assault in a training environment is provided, to the maximum extent possible, with confidential access to victim support services and afforded time for recovery. The member should not be required to repeat training unless the time needed for support services and recovery significantly interferes with the progress of the member's training.

Section 1664—Application of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program in Remote Environments and Joint Basing Situations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the combatant commanders to ensure that the sexual assault prevention and response program continues to operate even in remote environments in which members of the armed forces are deployed, including coalition operations. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to monitor the implementation of the sexual assault prevention and response program and military justice and jurisdiction issues at joint basing locations. Elements of the armed forces sharing a joint base location would be required to closely collaborate on sexual assault prevention and response issues to ensure consistency in approach and messages at the joint base location.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction, family housing, and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2011. As recommended by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $20,002,370,000 for construction in support of the active forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2011.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $14,209,418,000 for military construction, $2,714,759,000 for Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities, and $1,823,191,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends authorization of $14,648,514,000 for military construction, $2,714,759,000 for BRAC activities, and $1,823,191,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2011.

Division B - Summary of FY 2011 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Construction			
Army	4,078,798	119,376	4,198,174
Navy	3,879,104	62,535	3,941,639
Air Force	1,311,385	4,388	1,315,773
Defense Agencies	3,118,062	-118,482	2,999,580
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	124,971		124,971
NATO Security Investment Program	258,884		258,884
Army National Guard	873,664	146,238	1,019,902
Army Reserve	318,175	40,156	358,331
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	61,557	30,000	91,557
Air National Guard	176,986	115,385	292,371
Air Force Reserve	7,832	39,500	47,332
Subtotal, Military Construction	**14,209,418**	**439,096**	**14,648,514**
Family Housing			
Army Family Housing Construction	92,369		92,369
Army Family Housing Operations	518,140		518,140
Air Force Family Housing Construction	78,025		78,025
Navy Family Housing Construction	186,444		186,444
Navy Family Housing Operations	366,346		366,346

Division B - Summary of FY 2011 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Air Force Family Housing Operations	513,792		513,792
Defense Agencies Family Housing Operations	50,464		50,464
Homeowners Assistance	16,515		16,515
Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,096		1,096
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,823,191**		**1,823,191**
Base Closure (Title XXVII)			
Base Realignment and Closure 2005	2,354,285		2,354,285
Base Realignment and Closure IV	360,474		360,474
Subtotal, Base Closure (Title XXVII)	**2,714,759**		**2,714,759**
Overseas Contingency Operations			
Army Military Construction	929,996	0	929,996
Air Force Military Construction	280,506	0	280,506
Defense Agencies Military Construction	46,500		46,500
Subtotal, Overseas Contingency Operations	**1,257,002**	**0**	**1,257,002**
Undistributed Adjustments			
Prior Year Savings			
General Reductions	0	-441,096	-441,096

Division B - Summary of FY 2011 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments	0	-441,096	-441,096
Total, Division B	20,004,370	-2,000	20,002,370

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	AK	Eielson AFB	Repair Central Heat Plant & Power Plant Boilers	28,000		28,000
AF	AK	Elmendorf AFB	Add/Alter Air Support Operations Squadron Training	4,749		4,749
AF	AK	Elmendorf AFB	Construct Railhead Operations Facility	15,000		15,000
AF	AK	Elmendorf AFB	F-22 Add/Alter Weapons Release Systems Shop	10,525		10,525
Army	AK	Fort Greely	Fire Station	26,000		26,000
Army	AK	Fort Richardson	Brigade Complex, Ph 1	67,038		67,038
Army	AK	Fort Richardson	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	12,200		12,200
Army	AK	Fort Richardson	Simulations Center	34,000		34,000
Army	AK	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Task Force Complex, Ph 1 Incr 2	30,000	-30,000	0
Army	AK	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Task Force Complex, Ph 2A (Hangar)	142,650		142,650
Army	AK	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Task Force Complex, Ph 2B (Company Ops Facility)	27,000		27,000
FH Con Army	AK	Fort Wainwright	Family Housing Replacement Constrution (110 units)	21,000		21,000
Army	AK	Fort Wainwright	Urban Assault Course	3,350		3,350
Army	AL	Fort Rucker	Aviation Component Maintenance Shop	29,000		29,000
Army	AL	Fort Rucker	Aviation Maintenance Facility	36,000		36,000
Army	AL	Fort Rucker	Training Aids Center	4,650		4,650
AF	AL	Maxwell AFB	ADAL Air University Library	13,400		13,400
Navy	AL	Mobile	T-6 Outlying Landing Field	29,082		29,082
Air NG	AL	Montgomery Regional Airport (ANG) Base	Fuel Cell And Corrosion Control Hangar	7,472		7,472
Army NG	AR	Camp Robinson	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	30,000		30,000
Army NG	AR	Fort Chaffee	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	19,000		19,000
Army NG	AR	Fort Chaffee	Live Fire Shoot House	2,500		2,500
Air NG	AZ	Davis Monthan AFB	Predator Foc-Active Duty Associate	4,650		4,650
AF	AZ	Davis-Monthan AFB	Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group Hangar	25,000		25,000

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	AZ	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC-130 Aerospace Ground Equipment Maintenance Facility	4,600		4,600
AF	AZ	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC-130J Aerial Cargo Facility	10,700		10,700
AF	AZ	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC-130J Parts Store	8,200		8,200
Army NG	AZ	Florence	Readiness Center	16,500		16,500
AF	AZ	Fort Huachuca	Total Force Integration-Predator Launch and Recovery Element Beddown	11,000		11,000
Def-Wide	AZ	Marana	Special Operations Forces Parachute Training Facility	0	6,250	6,250
Navy	AZ	Yuma	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	63,280		63,280
Navy	AZ	Yuma	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	40,600		40,600
Navy	AZ	Yuma	Communications Infrastructure Upgrade	63,730		63,730
Navy	AZ	Yuma	Intermediate Maintenance Activity Facility	21,480		21,480
Navy	AZ	Yuma	Simulator Facility	36,060		36,060
Def-Wide	AZ	Yuma	Special Operations Forces Military Free Fall Simulator	8,977		8,977
Navy	AZ	Yuma	Utilities Infrastructure Upgrades	44,320		44,320
Navy	AZ	Yuma	Van Pad Complex Relocation	15,590		15,590
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - 13 Area	42,864		42,864
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Las Flores	37,020		37,020
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Center for Naval Aviation Technical Training/Fleet Replacement Squadron - Aviation Training and Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	66,110		66,110
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Conveyance/Water Treatment	100,700		100,700
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Marine Aviation Logistics Squadron-39 Maintenance Hangar Expansion	48,230		48,230
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Marine Corps Energy Initiative	9,950		9,950
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	North Region Tert Treat Plant (Incremented)	30,000		30,000

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Small Arms Magazine - Edson Range	3,760		3,760
Navy	CA	Camp Pendleton	Truck Company Operations Complex	53,490		53,490
Army NG	CA	Camp Roberts	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	19,000		19,000
Navy	CA	Coronado	Rotary Hangar	67,160		67,160
Navy	CA	Coronado NB	Maritime Expeditionary Security Group- One (MESG-1) Consolidated Boat Maintenance Facility	0	6,890	6,890
Army Res	CA	Fairfield	Army Reserve Center	26,000		26,000
Army Res	CA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Equipment Concentration Site Tactical Equipment Maint Facility	22,000		22,000
Army Res	CA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Equipment Concentration Site Warehouse	15,000		15,000
Army Res	CA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Grenade Launcher Range	1,400		1,400
Army Res	CA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Hand Grenade Familiarization Range (Live)	1,400		1,400
Army Res	CA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Light Demolition Range	2,700		2,700
Army Res	CA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Tactical Vehicle Wash Rack	9,500		9,500
AF	CA	Los Angeles AFB	Parking Garage, Ph 2	0	4,500	4,500
Navy	CA	Miramar	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	90,490		90,490
Navy	CA	Miramar	Hangar 4	33,620		33,620
Navy	CA	Miramar	Parking Apron/ Taxiway Expansion	66,500		66,500
Navy	CA	Monterey NSA	International Academic Instruction Building	0	11,960	11,960
Def-Wide	CA	Point Loma Annex	Replce Storage Facility, Incr 3	20,000		20,000
Def-Wide	CA	Point Mugu	Aircraft Direct Fueling Station	3,100		3,100
Army	CA	Presidio Monterey	Advanced Individual Training Barracks	63,000		63,000
Army	CA	Presidio Monterey	General Instruction Building	39,000		39,000
Army	CA	Presidio Monterey	Satellite Communications Facility	38,000		38,000
Navy	CA	San Diego	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Homeport Ashore	75,342		75,342

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Navy	CA	San Diego	Berthing Pier 12 Replace & Dredging, Ph 1	108,414		108,414
Navy	CA	San Diego	Marine Corps Energy Initiative	9,950		9,950
Navy	CA	Twentynine Palms	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters & Parking Structure	53,158		53,158
N/MC Res	CA	Twentynine Palms	Tank Vehicle Maintenance Facility	5,991		5,991
Air NG	CO	Buckely AFB	Taxiway Juliet and Lima	0	4,000	4,000
AF	CO	Buckley AFB	Security Forces Operations Facility	12,160		12,160
Army NG	CO	Colorado Springs	Readiness Center	20,000		20,000
Army	CO	Fort Carson	Automated Sniper Field Fire Range	3,650		3,650
Army	CO	Fort Carson	Battalion Headquarters	6,700		6,700
Army	CO	Fort Carson	Brigade Complex	56,000		56,000
Army NG	CO	Fort Carson	Regional Training Institute	40,000		40,000
Army	CO	Fort Carson	Simulations Center	40,000		40,000
Def-Wide	CO	Fort Carson	Special Operations Forces Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	3,717		3,717
Army NG	CO	Gypsum	High Altitude Army Aviation Training Site/ Army Aviation Support Facility	39,000		39,000
AF	CO	Peterson AFB	Rapid Attack Identification Detection Repair System Space Control Facility	24,800		24,800
Chem Demil	CO	Pueblo Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph 12	65,569		65,569
AF	CO	U.S. Air Force Academy	Const Center for Character & Leadership Development	27,600		27,600
Army NG	CO	Watkins	Parachute Maintenance Facility	0	3,569	3,569
Army NG	CO	Windsor	Readiness Center	7,500		7,500
Army NG	CT	Windsor Locks	Readiness Center (Aviation)	41,000		41,000
AF	DC	Bolling AFB	Joint Air Defense Operations Center	13,200		13,200

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Def-Wide	DC	Bolling AFB	Replace Parking Structure, Ph 1	3,000		3,000
AF	DE	Dover AFB	C-5M/C-17 Maintenance Training Facility, Ph 2	3,200		3,200
Army NG	DE	New Castle	Armed Forces Reserve Center(JFHQ)	27,000		27,000
Air NG	DE	New Castle County Airport	Joint Forces Operations Center-Ang Share	1,500		1,500
Navy	FL	Blount Island	Consolidated Warehouse Facility	17,260		17,260
Navy	FL	Blount Island	Container Staging and Loading Lot	5,990		5,990
Navy	FL	Blount Island	Container Storage Lot	4,910		4,910
Navy	FL	Blount Island	Hardstand Extension	17,930		17,930
Navy	FL	Blount Island	Paint and Blast Facility	18,840		18,840
Navy	FL	Blount Island	Washrack Expansion	9,690		9,690
Army	FL	Eglin AB	Chapel	6,900		6,900
AF	FL	Eglin AFB	F-35 Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar	11,400		11,400
Def-Wide	FL	Eglin AFB	Special Operations Forces Ground Support Battalion Detachment	6,030		6,030
AF	FL	Hurlburt Field	ADAL Special Operations School Facility	6,170		6,170
AF	FL	Hurlburt Field	Add to Visiting Quarters (24 Rm)	4,500		4,500
AF	FL	Hurlburt Field	Base Logistics Facility	24,000		24,000
Air NG	FL	Jacksonville IAP	Security Forces Training Facility	6,700		6,700
Army Res	FL	Miami	Army Reserve Center/Land	13,800		13,800
Army	FL	Miami-Dade County	Command & Control Facility	41,000		41,000
Army Res	FL	Orlando	Army Reserve Center/Land	10,200		10,200
Navy	FL	Panama City NSA	Purchase 9 Acres	0	5,960	5,960
AF	FL	Patrick AFB	Air Force Technical Application Center	158,009	-79,000	79,009
AF Res	FL	Patrick AFB	Weapons Maintenance Facility	3,420		3,420
Navy	FL	Tampa	Joint Comms Support Element Vehicle Paint Facility	2,300		2,300

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	FL	US Army Garrison Miami	Commissary	19,000		19,000
Army Res	FL	West Palm Beach	Army Reserve Center/Land	10,400		10,400
Navy	GA	Albany MCLB	Maintenance Center Test Firing Range	0	5,180	5,180
Def-Wide	GA	Augusta	National Security Agency/Central Security Service Georgia Training Facility	12,855		12,855
Army NG	GA	Cumming	Readiness Center	17,000		17,000
Army NG	GA	Dobbins ARB	Readiness Center Add/Alt	10,400		10,400
Def-Wide	GA	Fort Benning	Dexter Elementary School Construct Gym	2,800		2,800
Army	GA	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	12,200		12,200
Army	GA	Fort Benning	Museum Operations Support Building	32,000		32,000
Def-Wide	GA	Fort Benning	Special Operations Forces Company Support Facility	20,441		20,441
Def-Wide	GA	Fort Benning	Special Operations Forces Military Working Dog Kennel Complex	3,624		3,624
Army	GA	Fort Benning	Trainee Barracks, Ph 2	51,000		51,000
Army	GA	Fort Benning	Training Battalion Complex, Ph 2	14,600		14,600
Army	GA	Fort Benning	Training Battalion Complex, Ph 2	14,600		14,600
Army	GA	Fort Benning	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	53,000		53,000
Army	GA	Fort Gordon	Training Aids Center	4,150		4,150
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	Automated Infantry Platoon Battle Course	6,200		6,200
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	9,100		9,100
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	Aviation Unit Operations Complex	47,000		47,000
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	Battalion Complex	18,000		18,000
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	General Instruction Building	8,200		8,200
Def-Wide	GA	Fort Stewart	Health Clinic Addtion/Alteration	35,100		35,100
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	Modified Record Fire Range	3,750		3,750

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	Simulations Center	26,000		26,000
Army	GA	Fort Stewart	Training Aids Center	7,000		7,000
Def-Wide	GA	Hunter ANGS	Fuel Unload Facility	2,400		2,400
Def-Wide	GA	Hunter Army Airfield	Special Operations Forces Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility Expansion	3,318		3,318
Navy	GA	Kings Bay	Security Enclave & Vehicle Barriers	45,004		45,004
Navy	GA	Kings Bay	Waterfront Emergency Power	15,660		15,660
Army Res	GA	Macon	Army Reserve Center/Land	11,400		11,400
AF	GA	Robins AFB	Warehouse	0	5,500	5,500
Air NG	GA	Savannah/Hilton Head IAP	Relocate Air Supt Opers Sqdn (Asos) Fac	7,450		7,450
Navy	HI	Camp Smith	Physical Fitness Center	29,960		29,960
Army	HI	Fort Shafter	Command & Control Facility, Ph 1	58,000		58,000
Army	HI	Fort Shafter	Flood Mitigation	23,000		23,000
Def-Wide	HI	Hickam AFB	Alter Fuel Storage Tanks	8,500		8,500
Air NG	HI	Hickam AFB	F-22 Beddown Intrastructure Support	5,950		5,950
Air NG	HI	Hickam AFB	F-22 Hangar, Squadron Operations And Amu	48,250		48,250
Air NG	HI	Hickam AFB	F-22 Upgrade Munitions Complex	17,250		17,250
Army NG	HI	Kalaeloa	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	38,000		38,000
Navy	HI	Kaneohe Bay	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	90,530		90,530
Navy	HI	Kaneohe Bay	Waterfront Operations Facility	19,130		19,130
Navy	HI	Pearl Harbor	Center for Disaster Mgt/Humanitarian Assistance	9,140		9,140
Navy	HI	Pearl Harbor	Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command	99,328		99,328
Def-Wide	HI	Pearl Harbor	Naval Special Warfare Group 3 Command and Operations Facility	28,804		28,804

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	HI	Schofield Barracks	Barracks	98,000		98,000
Army	HI	Schofield Barracks	Barracks	90,000		90,000
Army	HI	Schofield Barracks	Training Aids Center	24,000		24,000
Army	HI	Tripler Army Medical Center	Barracks	28,000		28,000
Army Res	IA	Des Moines	Army Reserve Center	8,175		8,175
Air NG	IA	Des Moines IAP	Corrosion Control Hangar	0	4,750	4,750
Army NG	ID	Gowen Field	Barracks (Operational Readiness Training Complex) Ph1	17,500		17,500
Army NG	ID	Mountain Home	Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility	6,300		6,300
Def-Wide	ID	Mountain Home AFB	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	27,500		27,500
Air NG	IL	Capital Map	CNAF Beddown-Upgrade Facilities	16,700		16,700
Army NG	IL	Marseilles TA	Simulation Center	0	2,500	2,500
Army Res	IL	Quincy	Army Reserve Center/Land	12,200		12,200
Def-Wide	IL	Scott Air Force Base	Field Command Facility Upgrade	1,388		1,388
Army NG	IL	Springfield	Combined Support Maintenance Shop Add/Alt	15,000		15,000
Air NG	IN	Hulman Regional Airport	ASOS Beddown-Upgrade Facilities	4,100		4,100
Army Res	IN	Michigan City	Army Reserve Center/Land	15,500		15,500
Army	KS	Fort Leavenworth	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	7,100		7,100
Army	KS	Fort Riley	Automated Infantry Squad Battle Course	4,100		4,100
Army	KS	Fort Riley	Automated Qualification/Training Range	14,800		14,800
Army	KS	Fort Riley	Battalion Complex, Ph 1	31,000		31,000
Army	KS	Fort Riley	Known Distance Range	7,200		7,200
Army NG	KS	Wichita	Field Maintenance Shop	24,000		24,000
Army NG	KS	Wichita	Readiness Center	43,000		43,000
Chem Demil	KY	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Ph 11	59,402		59,402

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army NG	KY	Burlington	Readiness Center	19,500		19,500
Army	KY	Fort Campbell	Automated Sniper Field Fire Range	1,500		1,500
Army	KY	Fort Campbell	Brigade Complex	67,000		67,000
Army	KY	Fort Campbell	Company Operations Facilities	25,000		25,000
Army	KY	Fort Campbell	Rappelling Training Area	5,600		5,600
Def-Wide	KY	Fort Campbell	Special Operations Forces Battalion Ops Complex	38,095		38,095
Army	KY	Fort Campbell	Unit Operations Facilities	26,000		26,000
Army	KY	Fort Campbell	Urban Assault Course	3,300		3,300
Army	KY	Fort Campbell	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	15,500		15,500
Army	KY	Fort Knox	Access Corridor Improvements	6,000		6,000
Army	KY	Fort Knox	Military Operation Urban Terrain Collective Training Facility	12,800		12,800
AF	LA	Barksdale AFB	Weapons Load Crew Training Facility	18,140		18,140
Army	LA	Fort Polk	Barracks	29,000		29,000
Army	LA	Fort Polk	Heavy Sniper Range	4,250		4,250
Army	LA	Fort Polk	Land Acquisition	6,000		6,000
Army	LA	Fort Polk	Land Acquisition	24,000		24,000
Army NG	LA	Fort Polk	Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility	5,500		5,500
Army NG	LA	Minden	Readiness Center	28,000		28,000
N/MC Res	LA	New Orleans	Joint Air Traffic Control Facility	16,281		16,281
Air NG	MA	Barnes ANGB	Add to Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	0	6,000	6,000
Army Res	MA	Devens Reserve Forces Training Area	Automated Record Fire Range	4,700		4,700
Army NG	MA	Hanscom AFB	Armed Forces Reserve Center(JFHQ)Ph2	23,000		23,000
Def-Wide	MA	Hanscom AFB	Mental Health Clinic Addition	2,900		2,900
Army	MD	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Auto Tech Evaluate Facility, Ph 2	14,600		14,600

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Def-Wide	MD	Aberdeen Proving Ground	US Army Medical Research Institue of Infectious Diseases Replacement, Inc 3	105,000		105,000
Def-Wide	MD	Andrews AFB	Replace Fuel Storage & Distribution Facility	14,000		14,000
Def-Wide	MD	Bethesda Naval Hospital	National Naval Medical Center Parking Expansion	17,100		17,100
Def-Wide	MD	Bethesda Naval Hospital	Transient Wounded Warrior Lodging	62,900		62,900
Def-Wide	MD	Fort Detrick	Consolidated Logistics Facility	23,100		23,100
Def-Wide	MD	Fort Detrick	Information Services Facility Expansion	4,300		4,300
Def-Wide	MD	Fort Detrick	National Interagency Biodefense Campus Security Fencing And Equipment	2,700		2,700
Def-Wide	MD	Fort Detrick	Supplemental Water Storage	3,700		3,700
Def-Wide	MD	Fort Detrick	US Army Medical Research Institue of Infectious Diseases-Stage I, Inc 5	17,400		17,400
Def-Wide	MD	Fort Detrick	Water Treatment Plant Repair & Supplement	11,900		11,900
Army	MD	Fort Meade	Indoor Firing Range	7,600		7,600
Def-Wide	MD	Fort Meade	North Campus Utility Plant	219,360		219,360
Army	MD	Fort Meade	Wideband SATCOM Operations Center	25,000		25,000
Navy	MD	Indian Head	Agile Chemical Facility, Ph 2	34,238		34,238
Air NG	MD	Martin State Airport	Replace Ops and Medical Training Facility	11,400		11,400
Navy	MD	Patuxent River	Broad Area Maritime Surveillance & E Facility	42,211		42,211
Navy	MD	Patuxent River NAS	Atlantic Test Range Addition	0	10,160	10,160
Army NG	MD	St. Inigoes	Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility	5,500		5,500
Navy	ME	Portsmouth NSY	Structural Shops Addition, Ph 1	0	11,910	11,910
Army NG	MI	Camp Grayling Range	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	19,000		19,000
Army NG	MN	Arden Hills	Field Maintenance Shop	29,000		29,000

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army NG	MN	Camp Ripley	Infantry Squad Battle Course	4,300		4,300
Army NG	MN	Camp Ripley	Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility	4,450		4,450
Air NG	MN	Duluth	Load Crew Training and Weapon Release Shops	0	8,000	8,000
Army	MO	Fort Leonard Wood	Barracks	29,000		29,000
Army	MO	Fort Leonard Wood	Brigade Headquarters	12,200		12,200
Army	MO	Fort Leonard Wood	General Instruction Building	7,000		7,000
Army	MO	Fort Leonard Wood	Information Systems Facility	15,500		15,500
Army	MO	Fort Leonard Wood	Training Barracks	19,000		19,000
Army	MO	Fort Leonard Wood	Transient Advanced Trainee Barracks, Ph 2	29,000		29,000
Army Res	MO	Kansas City	Army Reserve Center	11,800		11,800
AF	MO	Whiteman AFB	Consolidated Air Ops Facility	0	23,500	23,500
Def-Wide	MS	Stennis Space Center	Special Operations Forces Land Acquisition, Ph 3	0	8,000	8,000
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	2nd Intel Battalion Maintenance/Ops Complex	90,270		90,270
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Armory- II MEF - Wallace Creek	12,280		12,280
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Courthouse Bay	40,780		40,780
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Courthouse Bay	42,330		42,330
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - French Creek	43,640		43,640
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Rifle Range	55,350		55,350
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Wallace Creek	51,660		51,660
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Wallace Creek North	46,290		46,290
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters- Camp Johnson	46,550		46,550
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Explosive Ordnanance Disposal Unit Addition - 2nd Marine Logistics Group	7,420		7,420
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Hangar	73,010		73,010

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Maintenance Hangar	74,260		74,260
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Maintenance/Ops Complex - 2ND Air Naval Gunfire Liaison Company	36,100		36,100
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Marine Corps Energy Initiative	9,950		9,950
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Mess Hall - French Creek	25,960		25,960
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Mess Hall Addition - Courthouse Bay	2,553		2,553
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Motor Transportation/Communications Maintenance Facility	18,470		18,470
Def-Wide	NC	Camp Lejeune	Tarawa Terrace I Elementry School Replace School	16,646		16,646
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Utility Expansion - Hadnot Point	56,470		56,470
Navy	NC	Camp Lejeune	Utility Expansion-French Creek	56,050		56,050
Navy	NC	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	42,500		42,500
Navy	NC	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Mariners Bay Land Acquisition - Bogue	3,790		3,790
Navy	NC	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Missile Magazine	13,420		13,420
Navy	NC	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Station Infrastructure Upgrades	5,800		5,800
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Battalion Complex	33,000		33,000
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Brigade Complex	41,000		41,000
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Brigade Complex	25,000		25,000
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Brigade Complex	50,000		50,000
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Command and Control Facility	53,000		53,000
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Company Operations Facilities	12,600		12,600
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Dining Facility	11,200		11,200
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	McNair Elementry School- Replace School	23,086		23,086
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Murchison Road Right of Way Acquisition	17,000		17,000
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	Murray Elementry School - Replace School	22,000		22,000

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	Special Operations Forces Admin/Company Operations	10,347		10,347
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	Special Operations Forces C4 Facility	41,000		41,000
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	Special Operations Forces Joint Intelligence Brigade Facility	32,000		32,000
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	Special Operations Forces Operational Communications Facility	11,000		11,000
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	Special Operations Forces Operations Additions	15,795		15,795
Def-Wide	NC	Fort Bragg	Special Operations Forces Operations Support Facility	13,465		13,465
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Staging Area Complex	14,600		14,600
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Student Barracks	18,000		18,000
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	28,000		28,000
Army	NC	Fort Bragg	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	7,500		7,500
Army NG	NC	High Point	Readiness Center Add/Alt	1,551		1,551
Army NG	NC	Morrisville	AASF 1 Fixed Wing Aircraft Hangar Annex	0	8,815	8,815
AF	NC	Pope AFB	Crash/Fire/Rescue Station	0	13,500	13,500
Air NG	NC	Stanly County Airport	Upgrade Asos Facilities	2,000		2,000
Army NG	ND	Camp Grafton	Readiness Center Add/Alt	11,200		11,200
AF	ND	Minot AFB	Control Tower/Base Operations Facility	18,770		18,770
Army NG	NE	Lincoln	Readiness Center Add/Alt	3,300		3,300
Army NG	NE	Mead	Readiness Center	11,400		11,400
Army NG	NH	Pembroke	Barracks Facility (Regional Training Institute)	15,000		15,000
Army NG	NH	Pembroke	Classroom Facility (Regional Training Institute)	21,000		21,000
Air NG	NJ	Atlantic City IAP	Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Hangar	0	8,500	8,500
Army Res	NJ	Fort Dix	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	0	9,800	9,800
AF	NJ	McGuire AFB	Base Ops/Command Post Facility (TFI)	8,000		8,000
AF	NJ	McGuire AFB	Dormitory (120 RM)	18,440		18,440

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	NM	Cannon AFB	Dormitory (96 rm)	14,000		14,000
Def-Wide	NM	Cannon AFB	Special Operations Forces ADD/ALT Simulator Facility For MC-130	13,287		13,287
Def-Wide	NM	Cannon AFB	Special Operations Forces Aircraft Parking Apron (MC-130j)	12,636		12,636
Def-Wide	NM	Cannon AFB	Special Operations Forces C-130 Parking Apron Phase I	26,006		26,006
Def-Wide	NM	Cannon AFB	Special Operations Forces Hangar/AMU (MC-130j)	24,622		24,622
Def-Wide	NM	Cannon AFB	Special Operations Forces Operations And Training Complex	39,674		39,674
AF	NM	Cannon AFB	UAS Squadron Ops Facility	20,000		20,000
Army NG	NM	Farmington	Readiness Center Add/Alt	8,500		8,500
AF	NM	Holloman AFB	Parallel Taxiway, Runway 07/25	0	8,000	8,000
AF	NM	Holloman AFB	UAS Add/Alter Maintenance Hangar	15,470		15,470
AF	NM	Holloman AFB	UAS Maintenance Hangar	22,500		22,500
AF	NM	Kirtland AFB	Aerial Delivery Facility Addition	3,800		3,800
AF	NM	Kirtland AFB	Armament Shop	6,460		6,460
AF	NM	Kirtland AFB	H/MC-130 Fuel System Maintenance Facility	14,142		14,142
AF	NM	Kirtland AFB	Replace Fire Station	0	6,800	6,800
Army Res	NM	Las Cruces	Army Reserve Center/Land	11,400		11,400
Army	NM	White Sands	Barracks	29,000		29,000
Def-Wide	NM	White Sands	Health And Dental Clinics	22,900		22,900
AF	NV	Creech AFB	UAS Airfield Fire/Crash Rescue Station	11,710		11,710
Army NG	NV	Las Vegas	CST Ready Building	0	8,771	8,771
AF	NV	Nellis AFB	F-35 Add/Alter 422 Test Evaluation Squadron Facility	7,870		7,870
AF	NV	Nellis AFB	F-35 Add/Alter Flight Test Instrumentation Facility	1,900		1,900
AF	NV	Nellis AFB	F-35 Flight Simulator Facility	13,110		13,110

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	NV	Nellis AFB	F-35 Maintenance Hangar	28,760		28,760
Army Res	NY	Binghamton	Army Reserve Center/Land	13,400		13,400
AF	NY	Fort Drum	20th Air Support Operations Squadron Complex	20,440		20,440
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Aircraft Fuel Storage Complex	14,600		14,600
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	16,500		16,500
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Alert Holding Area Facility	0	6,700	6,700
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Battalion Complex	61,000		61,000
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Brigade Complex, Ph 1	55,000		55,000
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Infantry Squad Battle Course	8,200		8,200
Air NG	NY	Fort Drum	Reaper Infrastructure Support	2,500		2,500
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Training Aids Center	18,500		18,500
Army	NY	Fort Drum	Transient Training Barracks	55,000		55,000
AF Res	NY	Niagara ARS	C-130 Flightline Operations Facility, Ph 1	0	9,500	9,500
Army NG	NY	Ronkonkoma	Flightline Rehabilitation	0	2,780	2,780
Air NG	NY	Stewart ANGB	Aircraft Conversion Facility	0	3,750	3,750
Air NG	NY	Stewart IAP	Base Defense Group Beddown	14,250		14,250
Army	NY	U.S. Military Academy	Science Facility, Ph 2	130,624		130,624
Army	NY	U.S. Military Academy	Urban Assault Course	1,700		1,700
Def-Wide	NY	U.S. Military Academy	West Point MS Add/Alt	27,960		27,960
Army NG	OH	Camp Sherman	Maintenance Building Add/Alt	0	3,100	3,100
Def-Wide	OH	Columbus	Replace Public Safety Facility	7,400		7,400
Air NG	OH	Toledo Express Airport	Replace Security Forces Complex	0	7,300	7,300
Army	OK	Fort Sill	General Purpose Storage Building	13,800		13,800
Army	OK	Fort Sill	Museum Operations Support Building	12,800		12,800

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	OK	McAlester	Igloo Storage, Depot Level	3,000		3,000
AF	OK	Tinker AFB	Upgrade Building 3001 Infrastructure, Ph 3	14,000		14,000
Def-Wide	PA	Def Distribution Depot New Cumberland	Replace Headquarters Facility	96,000		96,000
Air NG	PA	State College ANGS	Add to and Alter AOS Facility	4,100		4,100
Army NG	RI	East Greenwich	United States Property & Fiscal Office	27,000		27,000
Army NG	RI	Middletown	Readiness Center Add/Alt	0	3,646	3,646
Navy	RI	Newport	Electromagnetic Facility	27,007		27,007
Navy	SC	Beaufort	Air Installation Compatable Use Zone Land Acquisition	21,190		21,190
Navy	SC	Beaufort	Aircraft Hangar	46,550		46,550
Navy	SC	Beaufort	Physical Fitness Center	15,430		15,430
Navy	SC	Beaufort	Training and Simulator Facility	46,240		46,240
AF	SC	Charleston AFB	Civil Engineer Complex (TFI) - Ph 1	15,000		15,000
Army	SC	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks	28,000		28,000
Army	SC	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks Complex, Ph 1	46,000		46,000
Army	SC	Fort Jackson	Training Aids Center	17,000		17,000
Air NG	SC	McEntire Joint National Guard Base	Replace Operations and Training	0	9,100	9,100
Army NG	SD	Watertown	Readiness Center	25,000		25,000
Air NG	TN	Nashville IAP	Renovate Intel Squadron Facilities	5,500		5,500
Army NG	TX	Camp Maxey	Combat Pistol/Military Pistol Qualification Course	2,500		2,500
Army NG	TX	Camp Swift	Urban Assault Course	2,600		2,600
Army	TX	Corpus Christi NAS	Rotor Blade Processing Facility, Ph 2	0	13,400	13,400
Army Res	TX	Dallas	Army Reserve Center/Land	12,600		12,600
AF	TX	Dyess AFB	C-130J Add/Alter Flight Simulator Facility	4,080		4,080
AF	TX	Ellington Field	Upgrade Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar	7,000		7,000

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	6,700		6,700
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Company Operations Facilities	18,500		18,500
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	22,000		22,000
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Heavy Sniper Range	3,500		3,500
Def-Wide	TX	Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement, Incr 2	147,100		147,100
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Indoor Swimming Pool	15,500		15,500
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Light Demolition Range	2,100		2,100
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Live Fire Exercise Shoothouse	3,150		3,150
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Scout/Reconnaissance Crew Engagement Gunnery Complex	15,500		15,500
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Squad Defense Range	3,000		3,000
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Theater High Altitude Area Defense Battery Complex	17,500		17,500
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Transient Training Complex	31,000		31,000
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Urban Assault Course	2,800		2,800
Army	TX	Fort Bliss	Vehicle Bridge Overpass	8,700		8,700
Army	TX	Fort Hood	Battalion Complex	40,000		40,000
Army	TX	Fort Hood	Brigade Complex	38,000		38,000
Army	TX	Fort Hood	Company Operations Facilities	4,300		4,300
Army	TX	Fort Hood	Convoy Live Fire	3,200		3,200
Army	TX	Fort Hood	Live Fire Exercise Shoothouse	2,100		2,100
Army	TX	Fort Hood	Unmanned Aerial System Hangar	55,000		55,000
Army	TX	Fort Hood	Urban Assault Course	2,450		2,450
Army	TX	Fort Sam Houston	Simulations Center	16,000		16,000
Army	TX	Fort Sam Houston	Training Aids Center	6,200		6,200
Navy	TX	Kingsville NAS	Youth Center	0	2,610	2,610

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Def-Wide	TX	Lackland AFB	Ambulatory Care Center, Ph 2	162,500		162,500
AF	TX	Lackland AFB	Basic Military Training Satellite Classroom/Dining Facility No 2	32,000		32,000
AF	TX	Lackland AFB	One-Company Fire Station	5,500		5,500
AF	TX	Lackland AFB	Recruit Dormitory, Ph 3	67,980		67,980
AF	TX	Lackland AFB	Recruit/Family Inprocessing & Info Center	21,800		21,800
AF	TX	Laughlin AFB	Community Event Complex	0	10,500	10,500
Army Res	TX	Rio Grande	Army Reserve Center/Land	6,100		6,100
Army Res	TX	San Marcos	Army Reserve Center/Land	8,500		8,500
Def-Wide	UT	Camp Williams	Comprehensive National Cybersecurity Initiative Data Center Increment 2	398,358		398,358
AF	UT	Hill AFB	F-22 T-10 Engine Test Cell	2,800		2,800
Def-Wide	VA	Craney Island	Replace Fuel Pier	58,000		58,000
Army	VA	Fort A.P. Hill	1200 Meter Range	14,500		14,500
Army Res	VA	Fort A.P. Hill	Army Reserve Center	15,500		15,500
Army	VA	Fort A.P. Hill	Indoor Firing Range	6,200		6,200
Army	VA	Fort A.P. Hill	Known Distance Range	3,800		3,800
Army	VA	Fort A.P. Hill	Light Demolition Range	4,100		4,100
Army	VA	Fort A.P. Hill	Military Operation Urban Terrain Collective Training Facility	65,000		65,000
Def-Wide	VA	Fort Belvoir	Dental Clinic Replacement	6,300		6,300
Army	VA	Fort Eustis	Warrior in Transition Complex	18,000		18,000
Army	VA	Fort Lee	Automated Qualification Training Range	7,700		7,700
Army	VA	Fort Lee	Company Operations Facility	4,900		4,900
Army	VA	Fort Lee	Museum Operations Support Building	30,000		30,000
Army	VA	Fort Lee	Training Aids Center	5,800		5,800

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	VA	Langley AFB	F-22 Add/Alter Hangar Bay LO/CR Facility	8,800		8,800
Navy	VA	Norfolk	Pier 9 & 10 Upgrades for DDG 1000	2,400		2,400
Navy	VA	Norfolk	Pier 1 Upgrades to Berth USNS Comfort	10,035		10,035
Def-Wide	VA	Pentagon	Pentagon Metro & Corridor 8 Screening Facility	6,473		6,473
Def-Wide	VA	Pentagon	Power Plant Modernization, Ph 3	51,928		51,928
Def-Wide	VA	Pentagon	Secure Access Lane-Remote Vehicle Screening	4,923		4,923
Navy	VA	Portsmouth	Ship Repair Pier Replacement	100,000		100,000
Navy	VA	Quantico	Academic Facility Addition - Staff Non Comissioned Officer Academy	12,080		12,080
Navy	VA	Quantico	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	37,810		37,810
Def-Wide	VA	Quantico	New Consolidated Elemetary School	47,355		47,355
Navy	VA	Quantico	Research Center Addition- MCU	37,920		37,920
Navy	VA	Quantico	Student Officer Quarters - The Basic School	55,822		55,822
Army Res	VA	Roanoke	Army Reserve Center/Land	14,800		14,800
Army Res	VA	Virginia Beach	Army Reserve Center	11,000		11,000
N/MC Res	VA	Williamsburg	Navy Ordnance Cargo Logistics Training Camp	21,346		21,346
Navy	WA	Bangor	Commander Submarine Development Squadron 5 Laboratory Expansion Ph1	16,170		16,170
Navy	WA	Bangor	Limited Area Emergency Power	15,810		15,810
Navy	WA	Bangor	Waterfront Restricted Area Emergency Power	24,913		24,913
Navy	WA	Bremerton	Limited Area Product/STRG Complex (incremented)	19,116		19,116
Army	WA	Fort Lewis	Barracks	47,000		47,000
Army	WA	Fort Lewis	Barracks Complex	40,000		40,000
Def-Wide	WA	Fort Lewis	Preventive Medicine Facility	8,400		8,400

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	WA	Fort Lewis	Rappelling Training Area	5,300		5,300
Army	WA	Fort Lewis	Regional Logistic Support Complex	63,000		63,000
Army	WA	Fort Lewis	Regional Logistic Support Complex Warehouse	16,500		16,500
Def-Wide	WA	Fort Lewis	Special Operations Forces Military Working Dogs Kennel	0	4,700	4,700
Navy	WA	Kitsap NB	Charleston Gate ECP Improvements	0	6,150	6,150
Army NG	WA	Tacoma	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	25,000		25,000
N/MC Res	WA	Yakima	Marine Corps Reserve Center	13,844		13,844
Army	WA	Yakima	Sniper Field Fire Range	3,750		3,750
Army Res	WI	Fort McCoy	AT/MOB Billeting Complex, Ph 1	9,800		9,800
Army Res	WI	Fort McCoy	NCO Academy, Ph 2	10,000		10,000
Army NG	WI	Madison	Aircraft Parking	5,700		5,700
Army NG	WI	Wausau	Field Maintenance Shop	0	12,008	12,008
Army NG	WV	Moorefield	Readiness Center	14,200		14,200
Army NG	WV	Morgantown	Readiness Center	21,000		21,000
AF	WY	Camp Guernsey	Nuclear/Space Security Tactics Training Center	4,650		4,650
Army NG	WY	Laramie	Field Maintenance Shop	14,400		14,400
Army	AF	Bagram AB	Army Aviation HQ Facilities	19,000		19,000
Army	AF	Bagram AB	Barracks	18,000		18,000
Army	AF	Bagram AB	Consolidated Community Support Area	14,800		14,800
Army	AF	Bagram AB	Eastside Electrical Distribution	10,400		10,400
Army	AF	Bagram AB	Eastside Utilities Infrastructure	29,000		29,000
Army	AF	Bagram AB	Entry Control Point	7,500		7,500
Army	AF	Bagram AB	Joint Defense Operations Center	2,800		2,800
AF	AF	Bagram AFB	Consolidated Rigging Facility	9,900		9,900

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	AF	Bagram AFB	Fighter Hangar	16,480		16,480
AF	AF	Bagram AFB	MEDEVAC Ramp Expansion/Fire Station	16,580		16,580
Def-Wide	BE	Brussels	NATO Headquarters Facility	31,863		31,863
Def-Wide	BE	Brussels	Replace Shape Middle School/High School	67,311		67,311
Navy	BI	SW Asia	Navy Central Command Ammunition Magazines	89,280		89,280
AF	BI	SW Asia	North Apron Expansion	45,000		45,000
Navy	BI	SW Asia	Operations and Support Facilities	60,002		60,002
Navy	BI	SW Asia	Waterfront Development, Ph 3	63,871		63,871
FH Con Navy	GB	Guantanamo Bay	Replace GTMO Housing	37,169		37,169
Def-Wide	GU	Agana NAS	Hospital Replacement, Incr 2	70,000		70,000
AF	GU	Andersen AFB	Combat Communications Operations Facility	9,200		9,200
AF	GU	Andersen AFB	Commando Warrior Open Bay Student Barracks	11,800		11,800
AF	GU	Andersen AFB	Guam Strike Ops Group & Tanker Task Force	9,100		9,100
AF	GU	Andersen AFB	Guam Strike South Ramp Utilities, Ph 1	12,200		12,200
AF	GU	Andersen AFB	Red Horse Headquarters/Engineering Facility	8,000		8,000
Army NG	GU	Barrigada	Combined Support Maint Shop Ph1	19,000		19,000
Army	GY	Ansbach	Physical Fitness Center	13,800		13,800
Army	GY	Ansbach	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	18,000		18,000
FH Con Army	GY	Baumholder	Family Housing Replacement Construction (64 units)	34,329		34,329
Army	GY	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	20,000		20,000
Army	GY	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	19,000		19,000
Army	GY	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	19,000		19,000
Army	GY	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	17,500		17,500
AF	GY	Kapaun	Dormitory (128 RM)	19,600		19,600

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Def-Wide	GY	Katterbach	Health/Dental Clinic Replacement	37,100		37,100
Def-Wide	GY	Panzer Kaserne	Replace Boeblingen High School	48,968		48,968
AF	GY	Ramstein AB	Unmanned Aerial System Satellite Communication Relay Pads & Facility	10,800		10,800
AF	GY	Ramstein AFB	Construct C-130J Flight Simulator Facility	8,800		8,800
AF	GY	Ramstein AFB	Deicing Fluid Storage & Dispensing Facility	2,754		2,754
Army	GY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Barracks Complex	35,000		35,000
Army	GY	Sembach AB	Confinement Facility	9,100		9,100
AF	GY	Vilseck	Air Support Operations Squadron Complex	12,900		12,900
Def-Wide	GY	Vilseck	Health Clinic Add/Alt	34,800		34,800
Army	GY	Wiesbaden AB	Command and Battle Center, Incr 2	59,500		59,500
Army	GY	Wiesbaden AB	Construct New Access Control Point	5,100		5,100
Army	GY	Wiesbaden AB	Information Processing Center	30,400		30,400
Army	GY	Wiesbaden AB	Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility	91,000	-45,000	46,000
Army	HO	Soto Cano AB	Barracks	20,400		20,400
AF	IT	Aviano AFB	Air Support Operations Squadron Facility	10,200		10,200
AF	IT	Aviano AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	19,000		19,000
Army	IT	Vicenza	Brigade Complex - Barracks/Community, Incr 4	26,000	-13,000	13,000
Army	IT	Vicenza	Brigade Complex - Operations Support Facility, Incr 4	25,000	-12,000	13,000
Navy	JA	Atsugi	MH-60R/S Trainer Facility	6,908		6,908
Def-Wide	JA	Kadena AB	Install Fuel Filters-Separators	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	JA	Misawa AB	Hydrant Fuel System	31,000		31,000
Def-Wide	KR	Camp Carroll	Health/Dental Clinic Replacement	19,500		19,500
Army	KR	Camp Walker	Electrical System Upgrade & Natural Gas System	19,500		19,500

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	KR	Kunsan AFB	Construct Distributed Mission Training Flight Simulator Facility	7,500		7,500
Navy	ML	Guam	Anderson AFB North Ramp Parking, Ph 1, Inc 2	93,588		93,588
Navy	ML	Guam	Anderson AFB North Ramp Utilities, Ph 1, Inc 2	79,350		79,350
Navy	ML	Guam	Apra Harbor Wharves Improvements, Ph 1	40,000		40,000
Navy	ML	Guam	Defense Access Roads Improvements	66,730		66,730
Navy	ML	Guam	Finegayan Site Prep and Utilities	147,210		147,210
AF	QA	Al Udeid	Blatchford-Preston Complex Ph 2	62,300		62,300
Def-Wide	QA	Al Udeid	Qatar Warehouse	1,961		1,961
Army NG	PR	Camp Santiago	Live Fire Shoot House	3,100		3,100
Army NG	PR	Camp Santiago	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	9,200		9,200
Def-Wide	PR	Fort Buchanan	Antilles Elementry School/Intermediate School - Replace School	58,708		58,708
Navy	SP	Rota	Air Traffic Control Tower	23,190		23,190
Def-Wide	UK	Menwith Hill Station	Menwith Hill Station PSC Construction - Generators 10 & 11	2,000		2,000
Def-Wide	UK	Royal Air Force Alconbury	Alconbury Elementry School Replacement	30,308		30,308
AF	UK	Royal Air Force Mildenhall	Extend Taxiway Alpha	15,000		15,000
Def-Wide	UK	Royal Air Force Mildenhall	Replace Hydrant Fuel Distribution System	15,900		15,900
Army NG	VI	St. Croix	Readiness Center (JFHQ)	25,000		25,000
Navy	DJ	Camp Lemonier	Camp Lemonier HQ Facility	12,407		12,407
Navy	DJ	Camp Lemonier	General Warehouse	7,324		7,324
Navy	DJ	Camp Lemonier	Horn of Africa Joint Operations Center	28,076		28,076
Navy	DJ	Camp Lemonier	Pave External Roads	3,824		3,824
BRAC 05	MD	Bethesda (WRNMMC)	Defense Access Roads - Medical Center Entrance	20,000		20,000
BRAC 05	MD	Bethesda (WRNMMC)	Traffic Mitigation, Incr 2	7,600		7,600
BRAC 05	TX	Fort Sam Houston	San Antonio Military Medical Center (North), Incr 4	93,941		93,941

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
BRAC 05	VA	Fort Belvoir	Hospital Replacement, Incr 5	63,637		63,637
BRAC 05	VA	Fort Belvoir	NGA Headquarters Facility	83,328		83,328
BRAC 05	VA	Fort Belvoir	Office Complex, Incr 4	5,610		5,610
BRAC IV	ZU	Base Realignment & Closure, Air Force	Base Realignment & Closure	124,874		124,874
BRAC IV	ZU	Base Realignment & Closure, Army	Base Realignment & Closure	73,600		73,600
BRAC IV	ZU	Base Realignment & Closure, Navy	Base Realignment & Closure	162,000		162,000
NATO	ZU	NATO Security Investment Program	NATO Security Investment Program	258,884		258,884
FH Con AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Classified Project	50		50
FH Con Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements (235 units)	35,000		35,000
FH Con AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvments	73,750		73,750
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
FH Con Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Design	3,255		3,255
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Energy Conservation Investment Program	120,000	10,000	130,000
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Exercise Related Construction	8,210		8,210
AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	F-35 Academic Training Center	54,150		54,150
AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	F-35 Flight Simulator Facility	12,190		12,190
FHIF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,096		1,096
FH Con Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Family Housing Planning & Design	2,040		2,040
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	14,478		14,478
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	4,501		4,501
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	18		18
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	35,399		35,399
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	General Reduction	0	-150,000	-150,000
HOAP	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Homeowers Assistance Program	16,515		16,515

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Host Nation Support FY 11	28,000		28,000
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Privatization	53,903		53,903
FH Con Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	146,020		146,020
FH Ops Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	203,184		203,184
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	95,143		95,143
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	10,293		10,293
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	97,484		97,484
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	34,124		34,124
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing Account	528		528
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance	159,725		159,725
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance Account	1,971		1,971
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	87,134		87,134
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	707		707
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	70		70
FH Ops Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	120,899		120,899
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	63,551		63,551
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	1,561		1,561
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	365		365
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	54,633		54,633
N/MC Res	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction	2,238		2,238
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction	4,884		4,884
Air NG	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction	8,000	2,000	10,000
Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction FY 11	23,000	3,450	26,450
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	1,710		1,710

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	464		464
FH Ops Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	1,201		1,201
FH Ops Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operations	96,142		96,142
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operations	50		50
AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	66,336	8,088	74,424
Army NG	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	25,663	31,193	56,856
Air NG	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	9,214	11,985	21,199
FH Con AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	4,225		4,225
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	6,270		6,270
AF Res	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	1,653		1,653
Army Res	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	25,900	356	26,256
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	28,239		28,239
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	1,988		1,988
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	54,221	2,568	56,789
N/MC Res	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	1,857		1,857
Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	120,050	1,715	121,765
Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design FY11	221,636	5,826	227,462
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Privatization Support Costs	26,526		26,526
FH Ops Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Privatization Support Costs	27,059		27,059
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	19,974		19,974
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	29		29
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	16,790		16,790
Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Constr	20,877		20,877
Army NG	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	11,400	9,856	21,256

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	13,841		13,841
Army Res	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - FY11	18,000	3,000	21,000
FH Ops Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	69,655		69,655
FH Ops AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	89,245		89,245
FH Ops Navy	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	59,919		59,919
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	297		297
FH Ops DW	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	10		10
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Environmental	73,511		73,511
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Environmental	15,201		15,201
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Environmental	19,555		19,555
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Military Personnel Permanent Change of Station	1,456		1,456
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Military Personnel Permanent Change of Station	1,277		1,277
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Operation and Maintenance	99,570		99,570
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Operation and Maintenance	887,231		887,231
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Operation and Maintenance	321,888		321,888
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Operation and Maintenance	476,764		476,764
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Other	121,584		121,584
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Other	6,853		6,853
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Other	51,678		51,678
BRAC 05	ZU	Various	Other	3,601		3,601
Army	ZU	Various	Training Barracks	0	190,000	190,000
AF	ZU	Various Worldwide Locations	F-35 Squadron Operations Facility	10,260		10,260

FY 2011 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Def-Wide	ZU	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	230,300		230,300
Def-Wide	ZU	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	79,763		79,763
Def-Wide	ZU	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	30,836		30,836
Def-Wide	ZU	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Const	7,663		7,663
AF Res	ZU	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,759		2,759
Def-Wide	ZU	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,258		5,258
Air NG	ZU	Varlocs	Varlocs	0	50,000	50,000
N/MC Res	ZU	Varlocs	Varlocs	0	15,000	15,000
N/MC Res	ZU	Varlocs	Varlocs	0	15,000	15,000
Army Res	ZU	Varlocs	Varlocs	0	30,000	30,000
Army NG	ZU	Varlocs	Varlocs	0	60,000	60,000
AF Res	ZU	Varlocs	Varlocs	0	30,000	30,000
GR	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	General Reductions	0	-441,096	-441,096
			Total, FY 2011 AUTHORIZATIONS	**18,747,368**	**-2,000**	**18,745,368**

Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite Division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011."

Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVI and title XXIX shall expire on October 1, 2013, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

Section 2003—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII and XXIX of this Act take effect on October 1, 2010, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

Section 2004—General Reduction Across Division

This section would reduce the overall authorization of appropriations in this Division. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of enactment of this Act describing how the Secretary determines to implement the reduction.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $4,078,798,000 for Army military construction and $610,469,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends authorization of $4,198,174,000 for military construction and $610,469,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, Land Disposal

The committee is aware of an unresolved land disposal issue at the former Defense Depot Ogden (DDOU), Utah, which was closed in the 1993 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. Under the original disposal agreement, the Army assigned administrative jurisdiction of a small parcel of the DDOU to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) in order for HHS to convey the property through a Public Benefit Conveyance (PBC) to a private transportation company to assist disabled citizens in the community. The company has since disbanded, and the property has been abandoned for more than two years. The City of Ogden, the recognized Local Reuse Authority, has requested that the title of the abandoned property be transferred to the City for further economic and reutilization activities since the original plan can no longer be executed. However, neither the Army nor HHS believes it has the authority to transfer the land, with each claiming the other agency must take the first action. The committee believes that the Army and HHS have requisite authority under BRAC law to resolve the

issue and return the property to the beneficial use of the Ogden community. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review this matter, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 31, 2010, concerning the resolution of the issue and any legislative assistance the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of HHS believe may be required.

Fort Bragg Parking Concerns Due to BRAC Force Structure

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, is the recipient of several Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 activities including the movement of Army's Forces Command headquarters (FORSCOM) and the Army's Reserve Command headquarters (USARC) by September 2011. This realignment is expected to increase base loading by more than 16,000 personnel, straining the existing transportation grid. The committee is concerned that the installation does not have adequate transportation and parking to fully support the realignment. The increase in personnel will cause a parking burden on facilities such as the FORSCOM/USARC headquarters, Fort Bragg's Soldier Support Center, and Womack Army Medical Center.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report to the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2011, on an assessment of the parking requirements that are required to support the personnel increase caused by the BRAC realignments. At a minimum, this report will include:

(1) The projected number of military and civilian personnel that require parking to support the realigning BRAC activities;

(2) The current parking available;

(3) The parking plan to accommodate the increased number of personnel caused by the BRAC realignment; and

(4) Options to address the parking deficiencies that could include parking garages or other public transportation mitigation measures.

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to consider including the most practical solution into the Future Years Defense Program.

Quarters #1, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois

The committee is aware of the Department of the Army's initiative to enter into a lease, pursuant to section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, that would reuse this historic structure. The committee believes that this 1871 historic structure is integral to the integrity of the local community and a key element in the history of Rock Island Arsenal. The committee encourages the Department of the Army to take all prudent steps to ensure Quarters #1, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, is restored and renovated to a state that will retain its proud and historic character.

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $30,000,000 for the Aviation Task Force Complex Phase 1, Increment 2, at Fort Wainwright, Alaska.

The budget request included $30,000,000 for this project and would provide a second increment of phase one to construct a standard design Aviation Task Force complex.

The committee notes that the Department recently reported that favorable local bidding in Alaska resulted in the complete award of Increment 1 and 2 within the authorization of appropriations provided in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), rendering this project moot.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $30,000,000, to support this project.

(2) $45,000,000 for the Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility at Wiesbaden, Germany.

The budget request included $91,000,000 to construct a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility for consolidated tactical, theater, and national intelligence functions.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute the project in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2011.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $46,000,000, a reduction of $45,000,000, to support this project.

(3) $12,000,000 for the Operations Support Facility, Increment 4, at Vicenza, Italy.

The budget request included $25,000,000 to construct the fourth increment of an operational support facility required to support a brigade complex

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute the project in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2011.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $13,000,000, a reduction of $12,000,000, to support this project.

(4) $12,000,000 for Barracks and Community Support, Increment 4, at Vicenza, Italy.

The budget request included $26,000,000 to construct the fourth increment of an operational support facility required to support a brigade complex

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute the project in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2011.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $13,000,000, a reduction of $13,000,000, to support this project.

Planning and Design, Army

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $347,000—Easton Readiness Center Addition/Alteration, BG Louis G. Smith Readiness Center, Maryland;

(2) $3,060,000—Growth Support Infrastructure, Fort Belvoir, Virginia;

(3) $2,070,000—Rail Yard Improvements, Fort Bliss, Texas; and

(4) $1,166,000—Alternative Energy Projects, Fort Bliss, Texas.

Unspecified Minor Construction, Army

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army complete unspecified minor construction activities for the following projects:

(1) $1,700,000—Emergency Medical Services Facility, Fort Rucker, Alabama; and

(2) $1,750,000—Mapes Road and Cooper Avenue Improvements, Fort Meade, Maryland.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Army construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2011. This section would further provide the authorization of appropriations to support Army family housing.

Section 2103—Use of Unobligated Army Military Construction Funds in Conjunction With Funds Provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Project

This section would provide the Secretary of the Army authority to use unobligated funds, in conjunction with funds provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia, to construct a two-company fire station at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

Section 2104—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would change the location of a construction project for an Aircraft/Vehicle Maintenance Shop from Katterbach, Federal Republic of Germany, to Grafenwoehr, Germany.

Section 2105—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project

This section would expand the scope of a construction project for a Brigade Complex at Fort Riley, Kansas.

Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2011, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2012, whichever is later.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,879,104,000 for Navy military construction and $552,790,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends authorization of $3,941,639,000 for military construction and $552,790,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Access Road Assessment To Support Naval Support Activity, Northwest Annex, Virginia

The committee is concerned that the main access road to Naval Support Activity Northwest Annex, Chesapeake, Virginia, is insufficient to support the current mission requirements of the installation. Even though the installation has sufficient space to support future additional command tenants, the inadequate load and volume capacity of the main access road may preclude the Naval Support Activity Northwest Annex, Virginia, from supporting future missions. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy, in conjunction with the Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command, to consider actions necessary to designate Ballahack Road from United States Route 17 to Route 168 as a Defense Access Road in the most condensed timeframe possible.

Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range

The committee notes that the San Diego Shotgun Sports Association (SDSSA) has operated a trap and skeet range on Marine Corps Air Station Miramar since 1957, providing free recreational shooting for active-duty military personnel and their families for more than 50 years and strengthening the bond between the residents of the community and the United States Marine Corps. The committee understands that the Preliminary Assessment and Site Investigation (PA/SI) conducted to assess possible lead contamination

beyond the range boundaries is now complete and recommends a Remedial Investigation (RI) be conducted to better evaluate the full range of possible contamination. While the committee expects the Secretary of the Navy to plan and budget for necessary mitigation and environment cleanup measures as required by law, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to seek creative solutions to continue even limited range operations during the conduct of the RI and any further required activities and directs the Secretary to brief the results of the review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2010. Further, the committee urges the Secretary to explore fiscally prudent measures by which the SDSSA and the Marine Corps may partner in an effective range management plan that prevents any future off-range contamination and permits full operations in the future.

Planning and Design, Navy

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Navy complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $550,000—Submarine Group Two Headquarters, Navy Submarine Base New London, Connecticut; and

(2) $760,000—Platform Protection Engineering Complex, Navy Surface Warfare Center Crane, Indiana.

Silver Strand Training Complex, California

The committee is aware of the Navy's proposal for increased training activities within the Navy's Silver Strand Training Complex (SSTC) and southern areas of the Naval Air Station North Island. While the committee understands the importance of SSTC to west coast naval amphibious, special warfare, and mine countermeasure activities, the committee is concerned about the impact additional training will have on the quality of life for residents of the City of Imperial Beach and the City of Coronado. The committee strongly urges the Navy to actively work with the City of Imperial Beach and the City of Coronado to mitigate increases in noise, including helicopter noise at Naval Outlying Field Imperial Beach, and environmental disturbances resulting from the proposed increase in training. The committee also urges the Navy to communicate in advance whenever practicable the potential impact of these activities to nearby communities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Navy construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Navy may obligate on military construction projects. Finally, this section would restrict the expenditures of planning and design appropriations to support the

establishment of a homeport for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier at Naval Station Mayport, Florida.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2011. This section would further provide the authorization of appropriations to support Navy family housing.

Section 2203—Technical Amendment To Reflect Multi-Increment Fiscal Year 2010 Project

This section would add an explicit authorization for the incremented construction project listed.

Section 2204—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2011, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2012, whichever is later.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,311,385,000 for Air Force military construction and $591,817,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends authorization of $1,315,773,000 for military construction and $591,817,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $79,000,000 for the Air Force Technical Applications Center at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida.

The budget request included $158,009,000 to construct a multiple story facility for unique equipment needed to support critical missions.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute the project in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2011.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $79,009,000, a reduction of $79,000,000, to support this project.

F–22 Raptor Basing

The committee understands that the Secretary of the Air Force is contemplating basing options to support the F–22 Raptor mission. Since the Air Force is procuring fewer aircraft than initially programmed, the committee supports the basing consolidation under way and encourages the Secretary to promptly replace aviation assets that have already been reduced at affected installations with aviation assets of a similar mission. In the determination of consolidation options, the Secretary should consider completing a cost benefit analysis that appropriately maximizes full use of available capacity at existing F–22 installations. The Secretary is urged to complete this assessment expeditiously and brief the assessment to the congressional defense committees.

Ogden Air Logistics Center, Hill Air Force Base, Utah

The committee understands that the Secretary of the Air Force initially decided to separate the Single Program Manager and the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Prime Integration Function and locate a significant effort associated with these entities in leased space in the local community. This schism in operations has endured for over ten years and is the cause for heightened costs, lost productivity, and an increase vulnerability associated with the leasing location. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has not performed a sufficient review of the life cycle costs associated with this enduring, critical effort. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to evaluate the life cycle costs with the current effort and program sufficient funds to implement the least cost solution that could include traditional military construction or an Enhanced Use Lease option.

Planning and Design, Air Force

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $378,000—AEDC Power Distribution Modernization, Arnold Air Force Base, Tennessee;

(2) $495,000—Central Deployment Center, Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota;

(3) $900,000—Consolidated Security Forces Operations Center, Phase 1, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas;

(4) $249,000—Infrastructure Improvements, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida;

(5) $396,000—New Fitness Facility, Phase 1, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois;

(6) $387,000—BCE Maintenance Shops and Supply Warehouse, Travis Air Force Base, California; and

(7) $810,000—Air Traffic Control Tower, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

Unspecified Minor Construction, Air Force

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Air Force

complete unspecified minor construction activities for the following project:

(1) $3,000,000—Land Acquisition Clear Zone, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Air Force construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2011. This section would further provide the authorization of appropriations to support Air Force family housing.

Section 2303—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2011, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2012, whichever is later.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,118,062,000 for defense agency military construction and $68,075,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends authorization of $2,999,580,000 for military construction and $68,075,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2011.

The budget request also contained $124,971,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of $124,971,000 for chemical demilitarization construction for fiscal year 2011.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $150,000,000 for a general reduction in the Defense-Wide military construction account to correctly increment construction projects.

The committee supports the full authorizations of these projects. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the defense agencies to execute the projects in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For these projects, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2011.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $150,000,000, across the defense-wide military construction account, to increment projects properly.

Planning and Design, Defense-Wide

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of Defense complete planning and design activities for the following project:

(1) $1,036,000—Fuel Storage Complex, Tulsa International Airport, Oklahoma.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the defense agencies construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the defense agencies may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2402—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction, planning and design, and credits to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund for defense agencies family housing for fiscal year 2011. This section would further provide the authorization of appropriations to support defense agencies family housing.

Section 2403—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects and require that the Secretary of Defense reserve a portion of the amount for energy conservation projects for reserve components.

SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2011 for chemical demilitarization construction. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the chemical demilitarization office may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2412—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2000 Project

This section would expand the scope of the authorization listed to continue chemical demilitarization construction at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $258,884,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends authorization of $258,884,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2011.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this Act and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize $258,884,000 as the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,438,214,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2011 of $1,809,493,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	$1,019,902,000
Air National Guard	292,371,000
Army Reserve	358,331,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	91,557,000
Air Force Reserve	47,332,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station

The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 decisions directed the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve wings at Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, in completing an association of the two wings, to jointly operate C–130 tactical airlift assets assigned

to the air reserve station. However, the air reserve station needs to expand existing C–130 capabilities to support this integration. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force Reserve to include the second phase of the C–130 flightline operations facility in the next Future Years Defense Plan.

Planning and Design, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $675,000—Multipurpose ANG Training Facility, Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania;

(2) $3,600,000—Aircraft Maintenance Shops, Joe Foss Field, South Dakota;

(3) $2,000,000—ASA Replace Alert Complex, Naval Air Station JRB New Orleans, Louisiana; and

(4) $534,000—Contingency Response Group Facility, Standiford Field, Kentucky.

Planning and Design, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $223,000—Fire Fighting Team Support Facility, Murphy, North Carolina;

(2) $281,000—Joint Forces Headquarters, Phase 1, Boone, Kentucky;

(3) $446,000—Troops Service Support Center, Fort Custer, Michigan;

(4) $671,000—Readiness Center, Hermitage, Pennsylvania;

(5) $778,000—Readiness Center, Barrigada, Guam;

(6) $800,000—Regional Training Institute Phase 1, Camp Dodge, Iowa;

(7) $947,000—Field Maintenance Shop, Mankato, Minnesota;

(8) $1,243,000—Armed Forces Reserve Center Addition/Alteration, Salem, Oregon;

(9) $1,484,000—Barracks (AT) Phase 1, Camp Butner, North Carolina;

(10) $1,508,000—Field Maintenance Shop, Williamsport, Pennsylvania;

(11) $1,513,000—Armed Forces Reserve Center, Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania;

(12) $2,000,000—FWAATS Expansion, Bridgeport, West Virginia;

(13) $2,334,000—Regional Training Institute Phase 2, Camp Robinson, Arkansas;

(14) $3,729,000—Readiness Center, Quonset Point, Rhode Island;

(15) $5,000,000—Operational Reserve Headquarters, McLennan County, Texas; and

(16) $5,000,000—Cantonment and Support Infrastructure, South Texas Training Center, Texas.

Stratton Air National Guard Base

The 109th Airlift Wing, located at the Stratton Air National Guard Base, New York, provides direct support to the Air Expeditionary Forces and provides aviation support to the National Science Foundation to execute a Presidential Directive mandating a U.S. National Polar mission presence. New York State's Civil Support Team is also located at the Stratton Air National Guard Base.

Given the unique missions of these units, the construction of a new Joint Warehousing facility at Stratton is essential to future operations at the base to ensure these units can store and catalogue their unique mission equipment. The committee encourages the Air Force Reserve to include the Stratton Air National Guard Base Warehouse and Logistics Center in the next Future Years Defense Program.

Unspecified Minor Construction, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Air Force complete unspecified minor construction activities for the following project:

(1) $2,000,000—Relocate Main Gate, Moffett Field, California.

Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army complete unspecified minor construction activities for the following projects:

(1) $891,000—Paving, Sacramento Depot, California;

(2) $1,466,000—Renewable Photovoltaic Solar Power, Ventura, California;

(3) $1,500,000—Emergency Power Generator, Glen Jean, West Virginia;

(4) $1,999,000—Simulation Center, Iowa City Melrose, Iowa;

(5) $2,000,000—FWAATS Apron Expansion, Bridgeport, Connecticut; and

(6) $2,000,000—Unit Training Equipment Site Addition/Alteration, Ravenna TS, Ohio.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Army National Guard construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Army National Guard may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Army Reserve construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Army Reserve may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Air National Guard construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Air National Guard may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section lists the Air Force Reserve construction projects authorized for fiscal year 2011 on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force Reserve may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2606—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2011, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2012, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $360,474,000 for activities related to prior Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities and $2,354,285,000 for activities related to BRAC 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $360,474,000 for prior BRAC round activities and $2,354,285,000 for BRAC 2005 activities.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Access Roads Assessment

The committee remains concerned that the Defense Access Roads (DAR) Program criteria place a disproportionate burden on local communities to manage the impact of military installation-generated traffic volume. While this problem has been exacerbated in a number of locations as a result of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 activities, BRAC is by no means the only defense-related cause of rising traffic congestion around military installations.

Even so, the committee remains particularly concerned that the Secretary of Defense has aggravated traffic congestions at multiple transportation nodes as a result of implementing the BRAC requirements. The traffic criteria promulgated by the DAR program do not appear to appropriately address pre-existing urban traffic congestion. To address these concerns, the committee is pleased to note that the Secretary of Defense has commissioned the National Academy of Sciences to review "Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases."

While the committee applauds this effort, it also believes that current DAR program criteria often fail to consider existing and escalating traffic congestion at installations unaffected by BRAC. The committee believes that the impact of Department of Defense activities on local traffic infrastructure is too often ignored, causing unnecessary friction with cash-strapped state and local governments. In addition, unmitigated traffic congestion degrades the mission capability of an installation if the workforce cannot readily access the base.

To better assess this program, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide copies of the National Academy of Sciences assessment of this program to the congressional defense committees within 15 days of its final publication by the National Academy of Sciences. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the Department's assessment of the National Academy of Sciences report within 45 days of final publication that identifies corrective actions to implement the proposed changes for BRAC-impacted installations and other enduring locations.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990

This section would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of prior Base Realignment and Closure activities.

Section 2702—Authorized Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2011 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions to support Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 activities.

Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2011 that are required to implement the decisions of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 activities. This provision would also provide an overall limit of the amount authorized for BRAC military construction projects.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2711—Transportation Plan for BRAC 133 Project Under Fort Belvoir, Virginia, BRAC Initiative

This section would limit the acceptance of not more than 1,000 parking spaces at a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Project at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, also known as the "Mark Center," until the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees a viable transportation management plan and certifies that construction has been completed to provide adequate ingress and egress from the business park at which the BRAC project is located. This section would also require the Department of Defense Inspector General to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by September 30, 2011, assessing the sufficiency of the Secretary of the Army's transportation management plan.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assessment of Improvements in Construction Techniques To Achieve Life-Cycle Cost Effective Facilities

The committee remains concerned that the varying construction methods, authorized by the Department of Defense, may not obtain

the most life cycle cost effective facilities as defined by section 2801 of title 10, United States Code. This issue was highlighted by a recent Government Accountability Office study entitled "DoD Needs to Determine and Use the Most Economical Building Materials and Methods When Acquiring New Permanent Facilities" dated April 2010. Therefore, the committee directs the Defense Science Board to conduct an independent assessment of construction techniques that provide life cycle cost effective facilities used by the Department of Defense to include the following:

(1) An evaluation of the current construction techniques used by the Department of Defense to achieve life cycle cost effective facilities;

(2) A comparison of Department of Defense and industry construction methods;

(3) An assessment of the effectiveness of contract provisions to obtain life cycle cost effective facilities;

(4) An assessment of the effectiveness of the Department of Defense to obtain the life cycle cost effective assessment established pursuant to section 2801 of title 10, United States Code;

(5) A recommendation of the most effective life cycle period, by facility type, that the Department of Defense should use to obtain the most cost effective facilities; and

(6) Such other related matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2011, a report on the results of the assessment, including such comments and recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

Carbon Fiber Grid Precast Concrete

The committee supports, where practical, the use of innovative building systems to accomplish the Department of Defense's construction objectives. The committee, for example, is aware of the widespread commercial use of carbon fiber grid reinforced precast concrete, a relatively recent but proven innovation in concrete. This technology uses steel for primary reinforcing and a carbon fiber grid for secondary reinforcing and shear transfer, thereby resulting in thinner, lighter, more durable, thermally efficient, and cost effective concrete. The committee notes that this building application has been inserted in several military construction projects and has yielded positive results. The committee also notes that the Tri Service Engineering Executive Board is considering a change to the concrete guide specification to incorporate this innovation.

If the Secretary of Defense determines that this construction methodology is in the best interest of national defense, the committee encourages the rapid promulgation of this technology into future construction contract solicitations.

Collaborative Efforts To Address Installation Encroachment

The committee remains concerned about the negative impacts on military training and operations resulting from encroachment around the nation's military installations. The 2009 National Academy of Public Administration report, "Strengthening National Defense: Countering Encroachment through Military-Community Col-

laboration" noted that ". . . despite efforts by the DOD, the challenges to military readiness created by nearby civilian communities are significant and growing. Among [the panel's recommendations] is the recommendation for increased collaboration among key stakeholders—local and state governments, non-profit organizations, the Military Services and installations, and other federal agencies, in order to creatively and effectively address these complex and critical issues."

The committee supports this recommendation, and notes that such a collaborative effort continues to address encroachment around Naval Air Station (NAS) Oceana, Virginia, a base that was once considered the "poster child" for military base encroachment. In recognition of the dangers to military readiness posed by encroachment, the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake, Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Virginia have taken a number of steps to reduce encroachment around NAS Oceana. For example, the communities have implemented modifications to land zoning ordinances to comply with compatible use guidelines, including rezoning approximately one-third of City of Virginia Beach property, purchased parcels of property to prevent future incompatible development, and the Commonwealth of Virginia and communities continue to annually commit $15.0 million for land acquisitions to reduce encroachment.

In a collaborative effort, the Department of the Navy has partnered with these communities by utilizing Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative funds to purchase conservation easements on properties acquired by the communities, allowing for additional community efforts to reduce encroachment or prevent encroachment in areas of concern to NAS Oceana. The committee applauds such collaborative efforts, and encourages the secretaries of the military departments to explore similar partnering initiatives at installations around the nation.

Department of Defense Policy Regarding Installation Energy Management

The committee is concerned that a Department of Defense instruction regarding installation energy management, issued December 11, 2009, suggests that it is departmental policy to satisfy some, but not all, goals established by law. Specifically, pursuant to this instruction, it is departmental policy to comply with the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58) but not the goal set forth by section 2852 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to issue implementing guidance and ensure that departmental policy is consistent with this law. The committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan and implementation guidelines for achieving this goal.

Disposal Plans for Excess and Obsolete Facilities

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's goal is to maintain only those facilities that are essential to its needs and to eliminate unneeded facility inventories in order to minimize

sustainment, restoration, modernization, and operating costs. To help achieve this goal, the committee also notes that the Department conducted a survey in 2004 to identify unneeded facilities and developed plans to dispose of these facilities by fiscal year 2013.

The committee recognizes that eliminating excess and obsolete facility inventories can reduce costs. The committee also recognizes, however, that funding and implementing facility disposal plans can be a challenge, in view of competing facility funding needs. Nonetheless, the committee encourages the Department to continue to identify and dispose of excess and obsolete facilities. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 30, 2011, that reviews the Department's plans for eliminating excess and obsolete facilities. At a minimum, the review should assess the following: what amount of excess and obsolete facility inventory currently exists and what is the related impact on annual operation and maintenance and other costs; what is the status of the Department's plans for disposing of excess and obsolete facilities, including the amounts of past and planned disposal funding; what impediments exist, if any, to fully implement the Department's plans; and any other issues the Comptroller General finds relevant to this review.

East Coast Homeport Cost Assessment

The committee is concerned that the full costs associated with the planned second East coast homeport for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier has been underestimated, introducing a measure of budgetary risk and potential shortfalls in future year's defense budget submissions. The committee directs that, not later than February 15, 2011, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an independent estimate of the total direct and indirect costs to be incurred by the Federal Government in homeporting a nuclear carrier at Mayport, Florida.

Enhanced Use Leases

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has begun to address challenges associated with a large inventory of deteriorating facilities and excess and underutilized property by pursuing a multi-part strategy that includes Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), housing privatization, and demolition of facilities that are no longer needed. The committee is also aware that the Department has used authority provided under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to pursue a program of leasing real property not currently needed for mission requirements to gain additional resources for the maintenance and repair of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities.

The committee believes that leasing of underutilized real property, particularly the use of longer-term leases that are referred to as "enhanced use leases," offers opportunities to reduce infrastructure and base operating costs. However, the committee has concerns about the program, including potential impediments that exist which could adversely affect the Department's implementation of enhanced use leases, such as the complexities of some lease

transactions. The committee is also concerned about whether the Department has received fair market value in its enhanced use leases and how potential future BRAC rounds might affect lease agreements and potential liability due to lease termination prior to lease expiration.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 30, 2011, to review the Department of Defense's implementation of enhanced use leases, as provided for under the authority of section 2667 of title 10, United States Code. At a minimum, the review should assess the following:

(1) To what extent the Department has used the authorities in section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to implement enhanced use leases;

(2) How the Department has dealt with the impediments to the use of enhanced use leases, including potential liability due to lease termination prior to lease expiration;

(3) How the Department determines the fair market value of the enhanced use lease interest;

(4) To what extent the Department has realized the expected benefits from implemented leases;

(5) The Department's determination to enter into a lease rather than making a surplus determination; and

(6) The Department's determination that the proposed leases are compatible with the mission of the installations.

Ensuring Realistic Air-to-Air Training for Fifth-Generation Aircraft Units

The committee is aware that fifth-generation fighter aircraft squadrons face unique challenges in developing, scheduling, and engaging in realistic air-to-air combat training activities. Such challenges are particularly acute when low-observable aircraft with exceptional avionics systems are only able to conduct air-to-air training with identical aircraft. In order to conduct realistic training in such cases, some of the aircraft must artificially limit their capabilities in order to simulate third- or fourth-generation aircraft, employ inter-flight data link systems to simulate use of aircraft sensors, or leave pilots in unrealistic "stealth-on-stealth" engagements. This results in inefficient training for fifth-generation aircraft pilots, erosion of skills in effective operational use of aircraft sensors, radars, and other equipment, and unnecessary "wear and tear" on the nation's premier fighter aircraft fleet in training scenarios in which older aircraft would perform more effectively. Although these issues are primarily experienced today by F–22 Raptor units, the committee expects units equipped with the F–35 Lightning II aircraft in the future to face similar challenges. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to review air-to-air training practices of existing fifth-generation aircraft units and to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2011, on options for basing aggressor aircraft at fifth-generation aircraft bases.

Future Unmanned Aerial Systems Training, Operations, and Sustainability

The Department of Defense continues to rapidly increase its investment in unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) to meet battlefield commanders' demand for the capabilities provided by UAS. For example, the Department's recent budget requests have sought funds to continue to increase the Air Force Predator and Reaper UAS programs to 50 combat air patrols by fiscal year 2011, an increase of nearly 300 percent from fiscal year 2007. Moreover, the Department's February 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review report states that the Air Force will continue to increase the number of combat air patrols to 65 by fiscal year 2015.

The rapid growth of UAS inventories to meet operational demands raises a number of questions concerning the military services' ability to support these inventories in the near- and long-term. In particular, to support their UAS inventories, the military services must train sufficient numbers of personnel to operate and maintain the aircraft, provide adequate facilities and other infrastructure to sustain them, and provide sufficient access to airspace and training ranges to train military personnel within the United States and at military bases overseas.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees with its fiscal year 2012 budget request that describes the military services' plans to support their current and planned UAS inventories. The report should, at a minimum, discuss:

(1) Current UAS inventory levels and planned UAS inventory levels for each fiscal year through 2017;

(2) Plans to supply the number of personnel needed to operate the aircraft and sensor payloads and to perform UAS maintenance;

(3) Current and planned UAS basing and other operating locations;

(4) Progress made in providing the number of facilities needed for UAS inventories to support operations and training and the funding required for any additional facilities; and

(5) The availability of airspace, ranges, and other infrastructure at each planned UAS location, and a description of the steps that the services plan to take to overcome any limitations that adversely impact UAS training.

Guam Civilian Infrastructure Requirements To Support and Sustain Realignment of Military Installations and the Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam

The committee notes the lack of a comprehensive report on the local civilian infrastructure funding needs from Guam. The committee, further notes that in a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report on civilian infrastructure needs on Guam, GAO–09–653, they highlighted the following, "Although DOD has taken a number of actions to identify its requirements and potential solutions for meeting this significant demand, it has not begun development of a comprehensive utilities plan to use as an important planning tool in managing and informing stakeholders, including Congress, on the several challenges that pose considerable risk to the

success of building up the infrastructure to meet the demand and ensure utilities are available when needed. Without sufficient utility services, major construction projects, movement of Marines and other forces, and other buildup activities may fall behind schedule and increase implementation costs due to further compression of the timeline near the end of the implementation period." In particular, the call for a comprehensive plan and report from the Department of Defense has not been completed.

Furthermore, the committee notes that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in their formal comments and submission on the draft environmental impact statement gave the Department of Defense the lowest scoring possible for an environmental impact statement. In part, the lowest score from the EPA was a result of the lack of comprehensive planning by the Department of Defense on how it would fix critical infrastructure gaps on Guam. The committee remains concerned that without a comprehensive civilian infrastructure plan that the military build-up on Guam will be greatly inhibited and cause significant cost overruns. As such, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to work with the U.S. Department of Interior's Office of Insular Affairs and with the Government of Guam on the preparation of a comprehensive effort to coordinate local civilian infrastructure requirements associated with the military expansion on Guam.

Naval Air Station North Island Transportation Improvements

The committee is aware of the Secretary of the Navy's efforts to collaborate with the City of Coronado, California, and other state and regional partners including the California Department of Transportation on addressing congestion in the city related to Naval Air Station North Island, California. The committee strongly encourages the Navy to continue working with the city and regional partners to expeditiously find and implement short-and long-term solutions to the current traffic problem, as well as likely increased congestion with the loading of an additional aircraft carrier.

Naval Station Mayport, Florida, Homeporting Alternatives

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees, not later than December 15, 2010, on the implementation and recurring costs of homeporting alternatives including the following homeporting options at Naval Station Mayport:

(1) Nuclear-powered aircraft carrier;

(2) Littoral Combat Ships;

(3) Non-nuclear options considered in the "Environmental Impact Statement for Homeporting of Additional Surface Ships at Naval Station Mayport" signed January 14, 2009; and

(4) Other options that the Secretary considers appropriate.

Such a review shall include an assessment of one-time and recurring operation and maintenance requirements and military construction requirements associated with the various alternatives. This report shall review the benefits to the northeast Florida ship maintenance industrial base that could result from the homeporting of non-nuclear vessels at the installation.

The committee notes that the estimates for the costs of homeporting a nuclear aircraft carrier at Naval Station Mayport continue to rise, and may cost as much as $1 billion in military construction and recurring operation and maintenance costs.

The committee believes that a better assessment of these cost estimates of the various alternatives is warranted. The committee also believes that a complement of non-nuclear-powered surface combatants could be more compatible with the existing support structure at Naval Station Mayport and less expensive than duplicating a nuclear maintenance capability that already exists on the East Coast. The committee also notes that the northeast Florida ship maintenance industrial base could be enhanced if the Department of the Navy were to base non-nuclear-powered ships at Naval Station Mayport. Naval Station Mayport already has the pier infrastructure necessary to homeport non-nuclear-powered surface combatant ships, and the maintenance requirements of these alternative homeporting solutions appear to be more closely matched to the expertise of the existing local ship repair industrial base.

Finally, the committee understands that a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier homeported at Naval Station Mayport could undergo at the installation only two of the four types of scheduled carrier maintenance availabilities: the Carrier Incremental Availability and the Planned Incremental Availability. These activities would likely provide the local private shipyards with combined yearly revenues of only approximately $20 million. Furthermore, the Navy has indicated that the remaining two types of scheduled nuclear maintenance availabilities can be conducted only in the Norfolk area, requiring a temporary shift in homeport to Norfolk to complete these availabilities. The committee believes that such a temporary shift in homeport could present an additional requirement on carrier crews and their families that could be avoided if Naval Station Mayport were resourced with non-nuclear-powered ships.

Report on Workforce Housing and Medical Needs of Guest Workers on Guam

The committee remains concerned about the lack of a detailed plan by the Department of Defense regarding the requirements and planning for the housing of a transient and guest worker labor force on the Territory of Guam during the planned military buildup. Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) has determined that the primary acquisition strategy for major construction will be done via Multiple Award Construction Contracts (MACC). To date, NAVFAC has requested that potential construction contract bidders provide a strategy for the housing of a transient and guest worker population, as well as for how the contractor would provide medical care to this population. The committee is concerned that this approach could lead to poor workforce housing conditions and sub-optimized medical care. The committee believes that a more comprehensive strategy from the Department of Defense is necessary to direct contractors as to appropriate workforce housing and medical care on Guam during the major construction phases.

The committee notes the development of workforce housing options for the transient and guest workforce but encourages the Department to meet certain benchmarks and requirements, such as

reducing the impact on the surrounding community, as well as reducing potential traffic congestion by locating worker housing near major construction sites. The committee would also note that preferences should be given to firms that meet these requirements.

Additionally, the committee notes that individual construction firms are required to provide details on how they will provide medical care and insurance to the transient and guest worker population on Guam during the major construction phases. Further, the Joint Guam Program Office has indicated that most medical care would have to be provided by the individual contractor, but severe injuries would be handled at the Guam Naval Hospital and the Department of Defense would encourage contractors to purchase health insurance from local firms on Guam. The committee recognizes that the purchase of healthcare insurance relies on the available healthcare infrastructure. Unfortunately, the health infrastructure on Guam is deficient. The committee believes the Navy plan has serious flaws and could potentially overburden the local medical system and reduce access to care at the Guam Naval Hospital for veterans and military retirees.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2010, on methods the Secretary will use to ensure common standards for workforce housing and medical care. The report, at a minimum, must:

(1) Outline the standards and requirements that the Secretary will require all providers of workforce housing to meet;

(2) Outline selection criteria being used that will ensure contractors locate workforce housing in areas near major construction sites and that are consistent with the Guam 2030 Transportation Plan;

(3) Discuss how the Secretary will incorporate the minimum requirements for workforce housing into the MACC for construction firms;

(4) Detail the strategy and responsible parties for ensuring compliance with workforce housing standards;

(5) Detail the requirements for medical care and insurance for the transient and guest worker population on Guam;

(6) Outline the organic, attached healthcare assets and capabilities the Secretary requires industry to provide;

(7) Detail how industry will coordinate those assets with resident Guam healthcare to minimize the impact on Guam's citizens and business environment;

(8) Detail how the Secretary will incorporate the minimum requirements for medical care of the transient and guest worker population into the MACC for construction firms; and

(9) Detail the strategy and responsible parties for ensuring compliance with medical care and insurance standards.

Sensors Center of Excellence—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

The committee supports the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 decision that established a Sensors Center of Excellence at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base through the consolidation of various radars and sensor development. The committee understands that the Department of Defense is reviewing the develop-

ment and detection of unmanned aircraft systems and integration of these systems into the national airspace system. In order to advance the functionality of unmanned aircraft systems, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, on efforts to examine opportunities to utilize the Sensors Center of Excellence at Wright-Patterson AFB, particularly in regard to supporting the development of detect, sense and avoid capability for unmanned aircraft systems. In conducting the study, the Secretary is encouraged to consult with other federal entities that may also be able to benefit from enhancing the capabilities and resources at the Sensors Center of Excellence.

Technologies To Achieve Progressive Collapse Resistance

The committee is concerned about a total building failure that originates when a local failure of a primary structural component(s) leads to the collapse of adjoining members, which in turn leads to additional collapse. Hence, the extent of total building damage is disproportionate to the original source. In order to address this type of building failure, the committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense established anti-terrorism standards regarding progressive collapse resistance, Unified Facilities Criteria 4–023–03, to better control this action. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the anti-terrorism criteria, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011, that includes the following information:

(1) An assessment of technologies available to meet requirements for construction compliant with progressive collapse resistance requirements;

(2) An assessment of the cost to incorporate such requirements in new construction; and

(3) A discussion of incorporation of affordable progressive collapse protection into planning for new construction.

Vulnerability of Defense Critical Infrastructure to Electromagnetic Pulse Attack

The committee is concerned about the vulnerability of Department of Defense critical infrastructure to electromagnetic pulse (EMP) and cyber attack. The committee is aware that the Department is undertaking energy-generation projects on some military installations, and is concerned that some of these initiatives may not include requirements related to energy security such as EMP and cyber attack hardening. The committee directs the Comptroller General to review assessments of the threat of EMP and cyber attack on DOD infrastructure, identify DOD programs or activities to mitigate the threat, and assess the extent to which the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program has incorporated this threat into its risk assessment methodology. The review shall consider the progress, findings, and recommendations of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack. Initial findings shall be submitted no later than June 1, 2011.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Availability of Military Construction Information on Internet

This section would amend section 2851 of title 10, United States Code, and provide unrestricted access to military construction data to the general public.

Section 2802—Authority To Transfer Proceeds From Sale of Military Family Housing to Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to transfer proceeds of the handling and the disposal of family housing, received pursuant to section 2831 of title 10, United States Code, to the Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established under section 2883(c) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2803—Enhanced Authority for Provision of Excess Contributions for NATO Security Investment Program

This section would amend section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to initiate construction services and certain construction projects, not otherwise authorized by law, as an element of excess North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program contribution.

Section 2804—Duration of Authority To Use Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund for Construction and Repairs at Pentagon Reservation

This section would rescind the authority of the Sectary of Defense to use the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund for construction and repairs on September 30, 2012. The Secretary of Defense has reported that the overall Pentagon renovation is scheduled to be complete in fiscal year 2011.

Section 2805—Authority To Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Inside the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility

This section would extend the Contingency Construction Authority first enacted by section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) until September 30, 2011. This section would also provide the Secretary of Defense the ability to waive the pre-notification requirements associated with section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, with regard to a construction project carried out under the authority of this section. Finally, the authority of this section would be limited to $200,000,000. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to increase this authority by $100,000,000, to a total of $300,000,000, for projects within the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 2806—Veterans to Work Pilot Program for Military Construction Projects

This section would establish a Veterans to Work Pilot program that requires veterans apprenticeship programs on 20 military construction projects annually through fiscal year 2015. This section would require that not later than 150 days after the end of each fiscal year during which the pilot program is active, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report as to the implementation of the pilot program; by March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense should submit to Congress a report assessing the pilot program, including whether the program should be continued, modified, or expanded.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Notice-and-Wait Requirements Applicable to Real Property Transactions

This section would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, and require additional reporting requirements associated with leases of real property owned by the United States that were previously included in section 2667 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2812—Treatment of Proceeds Generated From Leases of Non-Excess Property Involving Military Museums

This section would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, and authorize the secretary concerned to retain all the proceeds derived at a museum as a result of lease of non-excess property for the exclusive use by the museum developing such proceeds.

Section 2813—Repeal of Expired Authority To Lease Land for Special Operations Activities

This section would repeal section 2680 of title 10, United States Code, whose authority expired on September 30, 2005.

Section 2814—Former Naval Bombardment Area, Culebra Island, Puerto Rico

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to remediate a portion of the bombardment area referred to as Flamenco Beach on the Island of Culebra, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to permit the land to be used for public park or public recreational purposes. This section would also require the Secretary to assess the extent of military munitions safety hazards and environmental contamination existing on the balance of the bombardment area.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATED TO GUAM REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Sense of Congress Regarding Importance of Providing Community Adjustment Assistance to Government of Guam

This section would express the sense of Congress that the United States is required to construct major, new installations despite the adverse impact to the local communities. However, this section would also express the sense of Congress that it is incumbent on

the federal government to offset the impact of these significant construction efforts.

Section 2822—Department of Defense Assistance for Community Adjustments Related to Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense temporary authority to assist the Government of Guam in mitigating the costs associated with the realignment of military forces to Guam, if the Secretary determines an unfair and excessive financial burden would be incurred by the Government of Guam, and the services and facilities would directly support the Guam realignment. This authority would be provided through existing federal programs. Finally, the transfer authority would be limited to $500,000,000 and, pending the receipt of semiannual reports on the execution of this authority, would expire on September 30, 2017.

Section 2823—Extension of Term of Deputy Secretary of Defense's Leadership of Guam Oversight Council

This section would extend the Deputy Secretary of Defense's leadership of the Guam Oversight Council until September 30, 2020.

Section 2824—Utility Conveyances to Support Integrated Water and Wastewater Treatment System on Guam

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to convey water and wastewater treatment utility systems to the Guam Waterworks Authority. As consideration for conveying these utilities, the Guam Waterworks Authority shall pay the fair market value of the conveyed infrastructure. If the Secretary of Defense and the Guam Waterworks Authority decide to convey these utilities, the Secretary of Defense shall be apportioned a 33 percent voting representation on the Guam Consolidated Commission on Utilities. If the Secretary conveys the water and wastewater treatment utility systems to the Guam Waterworks Authority, this section would require new water and wastewater systems to also be managed and operated by the Guam Waterworks Authority. Furthermore, in the determination of fair market value, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall consider the value of in kind services provided by the Government of Guam pursuant to the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Government of the Republic of Palau. Finally, this section would authorize the Secretary of Interior to provide technical assistance to the Secretary of Defense to support the integrated water and wastewater treatment utility systems on Guam.

Section 2825—Report on Types of Facilities Required To Support Guam Realignment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, within 180 days

after the date of enactment of this Act, on the structural requirements of facilities necessary to support the realigned forces on Guam.

Section 2826—Report on Civilian Infrastructure Needs for Guam

This section would require the Secretary of Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Government of the Territory of Guam, and the Interagency Group on Insular Affairs, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Natural Resources, and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary of Interior would be required to include in the report an assessment of the civilian infrastructure improvements needed on Guam to support the military relocation on Guam and identify potential funding sources to support the implementation of this effort.

Section 2827—Comptroller General Report on Planned Replacement Naval Hospital on Guam

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the size and scope of a naval hospital necessary to support the current and future military mission requirements and Department of Defense beneficiary population on the territory of Guam.

SUBTITLE D—ENERGY SECURITY

Section 2831—Consideration of Environmentally Sustainable Practices in Department Energy Performance Plan

This section would amend section 2911(c) of title 10, United States Code, by modifying the required elements of the Department of Defense energy performance plan to include consideration of hybrid-electric drive and high efficiency vehicles and opportunities for high-performance construction, lease, maintenance, and operation of buildings.

Section 2832—Plan and Implementation Guidelines for Achieving Department of Defense Goal regarding Use of Renewable Energy To Meet Facility Energy Needs

This section would amend section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to develop a plan and implementation guidelines for achieving the goal to produce or procure renewable energy equivalent to 25 percent of facility electrical use during fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter.

Section 2833—Insulation Retrofitting Assessment for Department of Defense Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services an assessment of Department of Defense

facilities that, if retrofitted with improved insulation, would result in cost and energy savings.

SUBTITLE E—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2841—Conveyance of Personal Property Related to Waste-to-Energy Power Plant Serving Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey personal property for use in a waste-to-energy power plant in the Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska. As consideration, the Borough would offset the waste disposal fees by the fair market value of the conveyed property.

Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Whittier Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricant Tank Farm, Whittier, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the City of Whittier, Alaska, a parcel of land for the purposes of local public activities.

Section 2843—Land Conveyance, Fort Knox, Kentucky

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, approximately 194 acres at Fort Knox, Kentucky, to the Department of Veterans Affairs of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the purpose of establishing and operating a state veterans home and future expansion of the adjacent veterans cemetery.

Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Naval Support Activity (West Bank), New Orleans, Louisiana

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey real property interests at the former Naval Support Activity (West Bank), New Orleans, Louisiana to the Algiers Development District.

Section 2845—Land Conveyance, Former Navy Extremely Low Frequency Communications Project Site, Republic, Michigan

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, approximately seven acres comprising the former Navy Extremely Low Frequency communications project site to Humboldt Township in Marquette County, Michigan, for the purpose of assisting the local public activities.

Section 2846—Land Conveyance, Marine Forces Reserve Center, Wilmington, North Carolina

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, the Marine Forces Reserve Center in Wilmington, North Carolina, to the North Carolina State Port Authority for development of a port facility and for other public purposes.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2851—Requirements Related to Providing World Class Military Medical Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a unified construction and repair standard for military medical facilities. The section would further require that the Secretary establish an advisory committee to assess the proposed design and organizational structure for military medical facilities in the national capital region to achieve a world-class medical facility.

Section 2852—Naming of Armed Forces Reserve Center, Middletown, Connecticut

This section would name the newly constructed Armed Forces Reserve Center in Middletown, Connecticut, as the "Major General Maurice Rose Armed Forces Reserve Center."

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,257,002,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) military construction. The committee recommends authorization of $1,257,002,000 for OCO military construction.

TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	AF	Airborne	Rotary Wing Parking	1,200	-1,200	0
Army	AF	Bagram	Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Task Force Compound	24,000	-24,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Command & Control Facility	13,600	-13,600	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Detention Facility in Parwan Detainee Housing	23,000	-23,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Dining Facility	2,650	-2,650	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Military Police HQ	2,800	-2,800	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Replace Temporary Guard Towers	5,500	-5,500	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Role III Hospital	35,000	-35,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Tanker Truck Off-Load Facility	5,700	-5,700	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Task Force Freedom Compound	18,000	-18,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Troop Housing, Ph 4	23,000	-23,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Troop Housing, Ph 5	29,000	-29,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Troop Housing, Ph 6	29,000	-29,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Troop Housing, Ph 7	29,000	-29,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Troop Housing, Ph 8	29,000	-29,000	0
Army	AF	Bagram Air Base	Vet Clinic & Kennel	2,600	-2,600	0
Army	AF	Dwyer	Command & Control Facility	5,200	-5,200	0
Army	AF	Dwyer	Dining Facility	6,000	-6,000	0
Army	AF	Dwyer	Rotary Wing Apron	44,000	-44,000	0
Army	AF	Dwyer	Wastewater Treatment Facility	16,000	-16,000	0
Army	AF	Frontenac	Waste Management Complex	4,200	-4,200	0
Army	AF	Frontenac	Wastewater Treatment Facility	4,200	-4,200	0
Army	AF	Jalalabad	Rotary Wing Parking	1,100	-1,100	0
AF	AF	Kandahar	Expand Cargo Handling Area	7,100	-7,100	0

TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
AF	AF	Kandahar	Expeditionary Airlift Shelter	7,400	-7,400	0
Army	AF	Kandahar	North Area Utilities, Ph 2	21,000	-21,000	0
Army	AF	Kandahar	Special Operation Forces Joint Operations Center	6,000	-6,000	0
Army	AF	Kandahar	Troop Housing, Ph 4	20,000	-20,000	0
Army	AF	Kandahar	Troop Housing, Ph 5	20,000	-20,000	0
Army	AF	Kandahar	Troop Housing, Ph 6	20,000	-20,000	0
Army	AF	Kandahar	Troop Housing, Ph 7	20,000	-20,000	0
Army	AF	Maywand	Wastewater Treatment Facility	7,000	-7,000	0
Army	AF	Shank	Ammunition Supply Point	25,000	-25,000	0
Army	AF	Shank	Expand Extended Cooperation Programme 1 and Extended Cooperation Programme 2	16,000	-16,000	0
Army	AF	Shank	Guard Towers	2,400	-2,400	0
Army	AF	Shank	Roads and Utilities, Ph 1	8,000	-8,000	0
AF	AF	Sharana	Runway	35,000	-35,000	0
Army	AF	Sharana	Bulk Materials Transfer Station	12,400	-12,400	0
AF	AF	Shindand	Passenger & Cargo Terminal	15,800	-15,800	0
Army	AF	Shindand	Medical Facility	7,700	-7,700	0
Army	AF	Tarin Kowt	Medical Facility	5,500	-5,500	0
Army	AF	Tarin Kowt	Rotary Wing Parking and Taxiway, Ph 2	24,000	-24,000	0
Army	AF	Tarin Kowt	Wastewater Treatment Facility	4,200	-4,200	0
AF	AF	Tombstone/Bastion	Expand Fuels Operations and Storage	2,500	-2,500	0
AF	AF	Tombstone/Bastion	Parallel Taxiway	86,000	-86,000	0
AF	AF	Tombstone/Bastion	Refueler Apron	55,000	-55,000	0
Army	AF	Tombstone/Bastion	Contingency Housing	41,000	-41,000	0

TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	AF	Tombstone/Bastion	Dining Facility	12,800	-12,800	0
Army	AF	Tombstone/Bastion	Rotary Wing Parking	35,000	-35,000	0
Army	AF	Tombstone/Bastion	Wastewater Treatment Facility	13,000	-13,000	0
AF	AF	Various Locations	Maintenance and Production Facilities		7,400	7,400
AF	AF	Various Locations	Operational Facilities		203,000	203,000
AF	AF	Various Locations	Supply Facilities		7,100	7,100
Army	AF	Various Locations	Air Pollution Abatement		16,000	16,000
Army	AF	Various Locations	Community Facilities		21,450	21,450
Army	AF	Various Locations	Hospital and Medical Facilities		50,800	50,800
Army	AF	Various Locations	Operational Facilities		69,600	69,600
Army	AF	Various Locations	Route Gypsum, Ph 1	40,000	-40,000	0
Army	AF	Various Locations	Supply Facilities		30,700	30,700
Army	AF	Various Locations	Supporting Activities		199,800	199,800
Army	AF	Various Locations	Troop Housing Facilities		283,000	283,000
Army	AF	Various Locations	Utility Facilities		90,600	90,600
AF	AF	Warrior	Runway	8,700	-8,700	0
Army	AF	Wolverine	Entry Control Point	5,100	-5,100	0
Army	AF	Wolverine	Perimeter Fence	5,100	-5,100	0
Army	AF	Wolverine	Rotary Wing Apron	24,000	-24,000	0
Army	AF	Wolverine	Wastewater Treatment Facility	13,000	-13,000	0
Def-Wide	XC	Classified Location	Classified Project	41,900		41,900
Def-Wide	XC	Classified Location	Planning and Design	4,600		4,600
AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	13,422		13,422
AF	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - FY11 OCO	49,584		49,584

TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	State/ Country	Installation/Location	Project Title	FY 2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction	78,330		78,330
Army	ZU	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	89,716		89,716
			Total, FY 2011 AUTHORIZATIONS	**1,257,002**	**0**	**1,257,002**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FISCAL YEAR 2010 PROJECTS

Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize overseas contingency operations military construction projects for the Army. The authorized amounts are listed on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2902—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize overseas contingency operations military construction projects for the Air Force. The authorized amounts are listed on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may obligate on military construction projects.

SUBTITLE B—FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECTS

Section 2911—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize overseas contingency operations military construction projects for the Army. The authorized amounts are listed on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2912—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize overseas contingency operations military construction projects for the Air Force. The authorized amounts are listed on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project

and provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may obligate on military construction projects.

Section 2913—Authorized Defense-Wide Construction and Land Acquisition Projects and Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize overseas contingency operations military construction project for the defense agencies. The authorized amount is listed on a project-by-project basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific project authorized at each location. Furthermore, this section would provide the authorization of appropriations for each project and provide an overall limit on the amount the defense agencies may obligate on the military construction project.

Section 2914—Construction Authorization for National Security Agency Facilities in a Foreign Country

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to construct a facility in a foreign country for the National Security Agency.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2921—Notification of Obligation of Funds and Quarterly Reports

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, within the notification period prescribed, as to the necessity and cost estimate of the proposed projects required under this title. This section would further require the Secretary to submit quarterly reports as to the obligations and expenditures of proposed projects.

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $17.8 billion for atomic energy defense activities, an increase of 7.4 percent from the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2010. Of this amount, $11.3 billion is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and $6.5 billion is for environmental and other defense activities.

Last year, the committee expressed concern that the request for NNSA did not adequately address the recognized need for increased investment in the Stockpile Stewardship Program and in Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs. The committee also noted that the fiscal year 2010 budget request reflected more risk within the NNSA programs than it did within Defense Environmental Cleanup activities.

This year, the budget request for the programs of the NNSA contained an increase of $1.2 billion above the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level. Of that amount, the budget request for the Weapons Activities account that supports the Stockpile Stewardship Program increased by $624.4 million and the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account increased by $550.5 million. The budget request for Defense Environmental Cleanup contained an increase of $30.7 million above the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level.

The committee supports these requests for increased funding and believes that the budget request for Department of Energy National Security Programs for fiscal year 2011 reflects a more balanced approach to meeting the diverse missions encompassed within the atomic energy defense activities account.

The committee recommends $17.8 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability:			
ENERGY SECURITY AND ASSURANCE	6,188	0	6,188
Total, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	**6,188**	**0**	**6,188**
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	7,008,835	0	7,008,835
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	2,687,167	0	2,687,167
NAVAL REACTORS	1,070,486	0	1,070,486
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	448,267	0	448,267
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	**11,214,755**	**0**	**11,214,755**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	5,588,039	0	5,588,039
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	878,209	0	878,209
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	0	0	0
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,466,248**	**0**	**6,466,248**
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,687,191**	**0**	**17,687,191**
Total, Discretionary Funding	**17,687,191**	**0**	**17,687,191**
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability			
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability			
Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration	6,188	0	6,188
Weapons Activities			

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
W76 Life extension program	249,463		249,463
Total, Life extension programs	**249,463**	**0**	**249,463**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	317,136		317,136
W76 Stockpile systems	64,521		64,521
W78 Stockpile systems	85,898		85,898
W80 Stockpile systems	34,193		34,193*
B83 Stockpile systems	39,349		39,349
W87 Stockpile systems	62,603		62,603
W88 Stockpile systems	45,666		45,666
Total, Stockpile systems	**649,366**	**0**	**649,366**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	58,025		58,025
Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition	**58,025**	**0**	**58,025**
Stockpile services			
Production support	309,761		309,761
Research and development support	38,582		38,582
R&D certification and safety	209,053		209,053
Management, technology, and production	193,811		193,811
Plutonium infrastructure sustainment	190,318		190,318
Total, Stockpile services	**941,525**	**0**	**941,525**
Adjustments			
Production and Dismantlement Activities	0	11,000	11,000

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, Adjustments	**0**	**11,000**	**11,000**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**1,898,379**	**11,000**	**1,909,379**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	76,972		76,972
Primary assessment technologies	85,723		85,723
Dynamic materials properties	96,984		96,984
Advanced radiography	23,594		23,594
Secondary assessment technologies	81,949		81,949
Total, Science campaign	**365,222**	**0**	**365,222**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	42,429		42,429
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	13,530		13,530
Nuclear survivability	19,786		19,786
Enhanced surveillance	66,175		66,175
Total, Engineering campaign	**141,920**	**0**	**141,920**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	109,506		109,506
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	102,649		102,649
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,000		5,000
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	4,000		4,000
Facility operations and target production	260,393		260,393
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**481,548**	**0**	**481,548**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	**615,748**		**615,748**

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Readiness Campaign			
Stockpile readiness	18,941		18,941
High explosives and weapon operations	3,000		3,000
Nonnuclear readiness	21,864		21,864
Tritium readiness	50,187	-50,187	0
Program Decrease		[-50,187]	
Advanced design and production technologies	18,100		18,100
Total, Readiness campaign	**112,092**	**-50,187**	**61,905**
Total, Campaigns	**1,716,530**	**-50,187**	**1,666,343**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Operations of facilities	1,257,991	70,000	1,327,991
Pantex Plant and Y-12 Plant		[70,000]	
Total, Operations of facilities	**1,257,991**	**0**	**1,327,991**
Program readiness	69,309		69,309
Material recycle and recovery	70,429	15,000	85,429
Y-12 Plant		[15,000]	
Containers	27,992		27,992
Storage	24,233		24,233
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)	**1,449,954**	**85,000**	**1,534,954**
Construction:			
11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project, LANL	20,000		20,000
08-D-802 High explosive pressing facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	30,000		30,000
07-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	5,000		5,000
06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED), various locations	4,000		4,000
06-D-141 Project engineering & design (PED), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	115,016		115,016

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	225,000		225,000
Total, Construction	**399,016**	**0**	**399,016**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,848,970**	**85,000**	**1,933,970**
Secure transportation asset			
Operation and equipment	149,018		149,018
Program direction	99,027		99,027
Total, Secure transportation asset	**248,045**	**0**	**248,045**
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	**233,134**		**233,134**
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program			
Operations and maintenance:			
Operations and maintenance	94,000		94,000
Total, Operations and maintenance	**94,000**	**0**	**94,000**
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	**94,000**	**0**	**94,000**
Site stewardship			
Operations of facilities			
Operations and maintenance	90,478		90,478
Total, Operations of facilities	**90,478**	**0**	**90,478**
Construction			
11-D-601 Sanitary effluent reclamation facility, LANL	15,000		15,000
Total, Construction	**15,000**	**0**	**15,000**
Total, Site stewardship	**105,478**	**0**	**105,478**
Safeguards and security			

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance:			
Operations and maintenance	667,954		667,954
Total, Operations and maintenance	**667,954**	**0**	**667,954**
Construction:			
08-D-701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory	52,000		52,000
Total, Construction	**52,000**	**0**	**52,000**
Total, Defense nuclear security	**719,954**	**0**	**719,954**
Cyber security	124,345		124,345
Total, Safeguards and security	**844,299**	**0**	**844,299**
Science, technology and engineering capability	**20,000**		**20,000**
Congressionally directed projects	**0**		**0**
Subtotal, Weapons activities	**7,008,835**	**45,813**	**7,054,648**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	0	-45,813	(45,813)
Total, Adjustments	**0**	**-45,813**	**(45,813)**
Total, Weapons Activities	**7,008,835**	**0**	**7,008,835**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance:			
Operations and maintenance	351,568		351,568
Total, Operations and maintenance	**351,568**	**0**	**351,568**
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	**351,568**	**0**	**351,568**
Nonproliferation and international security	**155,930**		**155,930**
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	**590,118**		**590,118**

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition			
Operations and maintenance:			
U.S. plutonium disposition	278,940		278,940
U.S. uranium disposition	25,985		25,985
Total, Operations and maintenance	**304,925**	**0**	**304,925**
Construction:			
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	475,788		475,788
99-D-141-01 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	80,000		80,000
99-D-141-02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC	57,000		57,000
Total, Construction	**612,788**	**0**	**612,788**
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	**917,713**	**0**	**917,713**
Russian surplus materials disposition	113,000		113,000
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**1,030,713**	**0**	**1,030,713**
Global threat reduction initiative	558,838		558,838
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,687,167**	**0**	**2,687,167**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance			
Operation and maintenance	997,886		997,886
Total, Operation and maintenance	**997,886**	**0**	**997,886**
Construction:			
10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL	400		400
10-D-904, NRF infrastructure upgrades, Idaho	500		500
09-D-902, NRF Office Building #2 ECC Upgrade; Idaho	4,000		4,000

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
08-D-190 Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	25,000		25,000
07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC)	2,700		2,700
Total, Construction	**32,600**	**0**	**32,600**
Total, Naval reactors development	**1,030,486**	**0**	**1,030,486**
Program direction	40,000		40,000
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,070,486**	**0**	**1,070,486**
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	448,267		448,267
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**448,267**	**0**	**448,267**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	6,375		6,375
Total, Closure sites	**6,375**	**0**	**6,375**
Hanford site:			
Central plateau remediation			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition PFP	64,969		64,969
SNF stabilization and disposition	94,016		94,016
Solid waste stabilization and disposition 2035	135,026		135,026
Soil and water remediation - groundwater vadose zone 2035	129,629		129,629
Total, Central plateau remediation	**423,640**	**0**	**423,640**
River corridor and other cleanup operations			
Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford 2035	139,641		139,641
Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project	386,028		386,028

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Richland community and regulatory support	19,620		19,620
Total, River corridor & other cleanup operations	**545,289**	**0**	**545,289**
Total, Hanford site	**968,929**	**0**	**968,929**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012	43,337		43,337
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	172,631		172,631
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	111,773		111,773
Construction:			
06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho	6,500		6,500
Total, Construction	**6,500**	**0**	**6,500**
Soil and water remediation - 2012	68,959		68,959
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,900		3,900
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**407,100**	**0**	**407,100**
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	635		635
NNSA Service Center/SPRU	15,547		15,547
Nevada	66,000		66,000
California site support	238		238
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,953		196,953
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**279,373**	**0**	**279,373**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Building 3019	50,001		50,001
Nuclear facility D & D ORNL	58,101		58,101
Nuclear facility D & D Y-12	63,775		63,775
Nuclear facility D & D, E. Tennessee technology park	87		87
OR reservation community and regulatory support	6,409		6,409

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012	23,925		23,925
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**202,298**	**0**	**202,298**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
Construction:			
01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01-D-16 A-D facilities	370,178		370,178
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility	370,000		370,000
Total, Construction	**740,178**	**0**	**740,178**
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**740,178**	**0**	**740,178**
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	418,000		418,000
Total, Tank farm activities	**418,000**	**0**	**418,000**
Total, Office of River protection	**1,158,178**	**0**	**1,158,178**
Savannah River sites:			
Cleanup and waste disposition			
Savannah River Community and regulatory support	18,330		18,330
Total, Cleanup and waste disposition	**18,330**	**0**	**18,330**
Site risk management operations			
Radioactive liquid tank waste			
NM stabilization and disposition	370,042		370,042
SNF stabilization and disposition	23,194		23,194
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**393,236**	**0**	**393,236**
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization			

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	549,282		549,282
Construction:			
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	256,951		256,951
Total, Construction	**256,951**	**0**	**256,951**
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**806,233**	**0**	**806,233**
Total, Site risk management operations	**1,199,469**	**0**	**1,199,469**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,217,799**	**0**	**1,217,799**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	134,999		134,999
Central characterization project	25,797		25,797
Transportation	30,678		30,678
Community and regulatory support	28,771		28,771
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**220,245**	**0**	**220,245**
Program direction	323,825		323,825
Program support	25,143		25,143
Safeguards and Security:			
Oak Ridge Reservation	17,300		17,300
Paducah	8,496		8,496
Portsmouth	15,979		15,979
Richland/Hanford Site	69,234		69,234
Savannah River Site	132,064		132,064
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,755		4,755
West Valley	1,926		1,926
Total, Safeguards and Security	**249,754**	**0**	**249,754**
Technology development	32,320		32,320

Title XXXI - Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY2011 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	496,700		496,700
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,588,039**	**0**	**5,588,039**
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security			
Health, safety and security	356,471		356,471
Program direction	107,740		107,740
Total, Health, safety and security	**464,211**	**0**	**464,211**
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	176,122		176,122
Program direction	12,504		12,504
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**188,626**	**0**	**188,626**
Defense-related activities			
Infrastructure			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	88,200		88,200
Total, Infrastructure	**88,200**	**0**	**88,200**
Total, Defense-related activities	**88,200**	**0**	**88,200**
Defense related administrative support	**118,836**		118,836
Acquisitions workforce improvement	**11,892**		11,892
Office of hearings and appeals	**6,444**		6,444
Total, Other Defense Activities	**878,209**	**0**	**878,209**
Total, Department of Energy	**17,687,191**	**0**	**17,687,191**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request contained $11.3 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends $11.3 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Weapons Activities

The budget request contained $7.0 billion for the Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for fiscal year 2011.

Over the past few years, increasing concern has been voiced regarding the NNSA's ability to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile into the indefinite future. For example, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic forces during a July 17, 2008 hearing on the modernization of the nuclear weapons complex, each of the nation's three nuclear weapons laboratory directors expressed concerns about the reductions in highly skilled scientists and engineers at the labs required to make room for consolidation and improvements in the complex's infrastructure.

In May 2009, the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States reported that the "Stockpile Stewardship Program and the Life Extension Program (LEP) have been remarkably successful in refurbishing and modernizing the stockpile." But at the same time, the commission concluded that these strategies "cannot be counted on for the indefinite future." The commission noted that the NNSA's "physical infrastructure is in serious need of transformation" and that the "intellectual infrastructure is also in trouble."

The JASON scientific advisory panel report from September 2009 on the Life Extension Program noted: "All options for extending the life of the nuclear weapons stockpile rely on the continuing maintenance and renewal of expertise and capabilities in science, technology, engineering, and production unique to the nuclear weapons program." The JASON panel concluded that "this expertise is threatened by lack of program stability, perceived lack of mission importance, and degradation of the work environment."

The committee therefore welcomes the increased funds in the budget request for Weapons Activities, which should begin the process of resolving the physical and intellectual infrastructure challenges facing the NNSA. However, the committee notes that these challenges can only be overcome through long-term program and budget stability.

The committee recommends $7.0 billion for Weapons Activities, the amount of the budget request.

Stockpile Stewardship

The committee views execution of the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP) as the core national security mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The SSP

utilizes data from previous nuclear tests, unique experimental tools, unmatched advanced simulation and computing capabilities, and the world's foremost nuclear weapons scientists, engineers, and technicians to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of our weapons without nuclear tests.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee expressed concern about the ability of NNSA to exercise the new experimental capabilities that have been developed, and to ensure that the scientists, engineers, and technicians employed in the nuclear security enterprise are actively engaged in challenging, meaningful work. Such activity is critical to the long-term management of the stockpile because specific areas of remaining uncertainty about the performance of our nuclear weapons can only be illuminated through scientific experiments using these capabilities.

In contrast to last year, the committee believes that the budget request should be sufficient to properly exercise those experimental capabilities and to continue improving the nation's ability to certify the nuclear weapons stockpile without additional nuclear weapons testing.

Stockpile Management

Section 3113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to provide for the effective management of the weapons in the nuclear weapons stockpile. The provision created objectives for, and limitations on, the management of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

The budget request included the following specific objectives as part of the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) proposed stockpile management program:

(1) Produce sufficient quantities of W76–1 warheads to meet Navy requirements;

(2) Complete a life extension of the B61 that meets all safety, security, use control, and reliability objectives;

(3) Initiate a life extension study to explore the path forward for the W78, consistent with the principles of the stockpile management program;

(4) Modernize plutonium capabilities including the design and construction of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Facility Replacement-Nuclear Facility;

(5) Modernize uranium capabilities with emphasis on the Uranium Processing Facility; and

(6) Sustain and strengthen the science, technology and engineering, and surveillance base essential to supporting the stockpile.

The committee supports these proposed objectives and is pleased that the Administration has adopted the framework of the stockpile management program as a significant element of the recently-released Nuclear Posture Review.

However, the committee is concerned that artificial limitations might be applied to the options for managing the stockpile and observes that nothing within the statute would limit management of the nuclear weapons stockpile using the spectrum of options identified by the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of

the United States in May 2009. The committee agrees with the JASON panel that: "Assessment and certification challenges depend on design details and associated margins and uncertainties, not simply on whether the LEP is primarily based on refurbishment, reuse, or replacement."

The committee believes that the NNSA should task its design and production agencies to thoroughly evaluate the spectrum of options for managing any particular stockpile system before deciding on a case-by-case basis on the specific mix of actions required to ensure that a given stockpile system can continue to achieve its current military capabilities in a safe, secure, and reliable manner.

Directed Stockpile Work

The budget request contained $1.9 billion for Directed Stockpile Work (DSW), an increase of $392.5 million above the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level.

DSW includes activities to ensure the present and future operational readiness of nuclear weapons. While the committee welcomes the requested increase in DSW funding, it is concerned that the budget request does not contain sufficient resources to support production and dismantlement activities at the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas.

The committee recommends $1.9 billion for Directed Stockpile Work, including an increase of $11.0 million for DSW at Pantex to ensure that the W76–1 and B–61 life extension programs, stockpile surveillance and critical weapons dismantlement programs remain on schedule.

Stockpile Surveillance

Surveillance of stockpile weapons is essential to stockpile stewardship. Inadequate surveillance would place the stockpile at risk. In September 2009, the JASON scientific advisory panel found: "The surveillance program is becoming inadequate. Continued success of stockpile stewardship requires implementation of a revised surveillance program." The committee directs the National Nuclear Security Administration Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on its plans for implementing a revised surveillance plan by October 1, 2010.

B61 Phase 6.2/6.2A Life Extension Study

The budget request contained $251.6 million for Directed Stockpile Work for the B61 Phase 6.2/6.2A Life Extension Study.

The request would fund a study of the nuclear and non-nuclear components scope of the B61 life extension, including implementation of enhanced surety, extended service life, and modification consolidation. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) expects to complete the study by the end of fiscal year 2011 and is planning to deliver the first production unit (FPU) in 2017.

The committee understands the importance of meeting a 2017 delivery date and supports the full scope B–61 life extension study. However, the committee is concerned that the schedule for completion of the Life Extension Study has been delayed by a year, and is therefore concerned that the schedule for delivering the FPU by 2017 is at risk. While the committee recognizes that a thorough project baseline cannot be delivered until the Life Extension Study

is complete, it expects the NNSA Administrator for Nuclear Security to keep the committee fully informed of the progress toward establishing that baseline and of any significant changes to the schedule during the course of the year.

Science Campaign

The budget request contained $365.2 million for the Science Campaign for fiscal year 2011.

The request included $85.7 million for Primary Assessment Technologies, which is the program responsible for development and implementation of the Quantification of Margins and Uncertainty methodology used to certify weapons without testing. The request also included $77.0 million for Advanced Certification, a substantial increase above the $19.4 million provided in fiscal year 2010, to support the development of advanced certification capabilities.

The committee recommends $365.2 million, the amount of the budget request.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign

The budget request contained $481.5 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign, an increase of $23.6 million from the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level.

This campaign, often referred to as the National Ignition Campaign, includes funding for performing experiments at the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The increase supports fabrication and installation of diagnostics necessary to utilize NIF for experiments under ignition conditions, a major requirement for applying NIF to weapons problems.

The committee recommends $481.5 million, the amount of the budget request.

Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign

The budget request contained $615.7 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) Campaign.

The committee notes that the ASC Campaign funds the principal means of validating the performance of nuclear weapons absent nuclear explosive tests. As the major experimental tools of the Stockpile Stewardship Program are brought on line, more data will be available to inform these advanced simulations. Such simulations will be more robust than past efforts, and should yield greater confidence in the nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. Therefore, the committee supports the $48.1 million increase in the ASC request from the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level.

The committee recommends $615.7 million, the amount of the budget request.

Readiness Campaign

The budget request contained $112.1 million for the Readiness Campaign, an increase of $12.1 million above the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level. Of that total, $50.2 million was requested for Tritium Readiness to operate the tritium production capability required to sustain the nuclear weapons stockpile.

The committee is aware that uncosted balances have accumulated in this account as a result of delays in tritium production and

extraction due to significant technical issues related to the irradiation of tritium producing burnable absorber rods.

The committee understands that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is currently able to meet its stockpile requirements despite the lower than planned production rate by supplementing tritium production with recycled tritium from dismantled warheads. However, the committee is concerned that NNSA has identified neither effective technical solutions for increased tritium production nor viable alternative supplies. The committee does not support the additional funds in the budget request for Tritium Readiness and directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011, a plan for ensuring a sufficient supply of tritium into the future.

The committee recommends $61.9 million, a decrease of $50.2 million for the Readiness Campaign.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities

The budget request contained $1.8 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF).

RTBF supports the physical infrastructure and operational readiness of the nuclear security laboratories and plants. RTBF funds are divided between Operations and Maintenance, and Construction sub-programs.

The committee is concerned that the request for Operations of Facilities, within the Operations and Maintenance account, is insufficient to support the facilities at the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, and the Y–12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The committee recommends an additional $70.0 million to support the critical weapons program activities at these facilities. For the Y–12 facility, the committee recommends an additional $15.0 million for Material Recycle and Recovery activities within the Operations and Maintenance account to sustain enriched uranium recycle and recovery operations.

The budget request also included funds for two of the most significant National Nuclear Security Administration infrastructure projects: $225.0 million for final design and initial construction of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement-Nuclear Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, and $115.0 million in Project Engineering and Design work for the proposed Uranium Processing Facility at the Y–12 Plant. The committee supports both of these infrastructure modernization projects.

The committee recommends $1.9 billion, an increase of $85.0 million, for RTBF.

Use of prior year balances

The committee is aware of significant prior year balances within the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) accounts which are beyond recommended levels, and directs the NNSA Administrator for Nuclear Security to use these funds to finance fiscal year 2011 budget requirements and offset the recommended funding increases for Directed Stockpile Work and Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities mentioned above.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

The budget request contained $2.7 billion for Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs.

The committee fully supports the goals of the NNSA's nonproliferation programs and continues to believe that such programs are critical to U.S. national security and must be a top national security priority. In past years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have limited the progress of NNSA and other nonproliferation programs. The committee has also noted that despite the significant achievements of NNSA nonproliferation programs over more than 15 years, much remains to be done, and has emphasized the need for a strong national commitment to reinvigorate these programs.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the Duncan Hunter National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) addressed these concerns by increasing funding for NNSA nonproliferation programs, including the International Nuclear Materials and Cooperation (MPC&A) Program and the Global Threat Reduction Initiative. Public Law 110–181, Public Law 110–417 and Public Law 111–84 also: required a report by the President on nuclear terrorism prevention; required reports by the Secretary of Energy on strengthening and expanding the NNSA International Radiological Threat Reduction, MPC&A, and Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention programs; authorized a nonproliferation and national security scholarship and fellowship program; provided the Secretary of Energy with authority to accept international contributions for the NNSA Russian Plutonium Disposition and MPC&A programs; provided NNSA nonproliferation programs with authority for urgent nonproliferation activities; and included other provisions to ensure that wherever possible, NNSA nonproliferation programs address threats involving nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

In addition, the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), passed in the 110th Congress by both the House and Senate as H.R. 1 and commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," included a number of provisions and authorized funding to accelerate, strengthen, and expand NNSA nonproliferation programs. Provisions include the establishment of both a presidential coordinator and a congressional-executive commission on the prevention of weapons of mass destruction proliferation and terrorism.

The committee welcomes the President's accomplishments with respect to nonproliferation programs, as well as the President's ongoing efforts to accelerate, strengthen, and expand such programs and ensure that they are a top priority going forward. This includes the President's effort to secure vulnerable nuclear materials around the world within four years, in order to ensure that such materials do not fall into the hands of terrorists. It also includes the successor agreement to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the United States and the Russian Federation,

and the Nuclear Security Summit. This Act specifically supports the President's goals and objectives for NNSA nonproliferation programs, and encourages these programs to maintain a particular focus on securing nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials and technologies at the source wherever possible.

Moreover, the committee continues to welcome actions by the NNSA to eliminate impediments to timely obligation and execution of authorized and appropriated funds for NNSA nonproliferation programs. In recent years, such actions have enabled the NNSA to achieve a level of uncommitted uncosted balances for most NNSA nonproliferation programs that is below the acceptable levels established by the NNSA in close coordination with the Government Accountability Office. The committee encourages NNSA to continue its efforts to eliminate any remaining impediments to timely obligation and execution of funds for NNSA nonproliferation programs.

The committee authorizes $2.7 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development

The budget request contained $351.6 million for Nonproliferation Research and Development (R&D). The committee fully supports the goals of the R&D program, and continues to note that the program is the sole remaining U.S. Government capability for long-term nuclear nonproliferation research and development. The committee also continues to emphasize the importance of expanding U.S. scientific skills and resources and improving U.S. Government capabilities relating to both short- and long-term innovative nonproliferation research and development that will maintain U.S. technological advantage in this area.

The committee recommends $351.6 million, the amount of the budget request.

Radiation detection technology

The committee continues to encourage the National Nuclear Security Administration to work closely with the Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office on the research and development of radiation detection technology to ensure there is no duplication of research efforts, but rather a collaborative complementary approach to research in areas of common interest.

Nonproliferation and International Security

The budget request contained $155.9 million for Nonproliferation and International Security (NIS). The committee fully supports the goals of the NIS program, and emphasizes the importance of developing innovative policy approaches to nonproliferation challenges and undertaking activities to increase nonproliferation cooperation with international partners and organizations.

The committee also emphasizes the importance of strengthening export control and security systems and undertaking other safeguards activities relating to civil nuclear energy cooperation between the United States and other countries, including the Republic of India, in order to prevent theft or other illicit transfer of nuclear materials and technologies. The committee requests the Na-

tional Nuclear Security Administration to keep the committee fully informed of significant developments in this area.

The committee recommends $155.9 million, the amount of the budget request.

Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention

In recent years, the committee has been conducting vigorous oversight of the Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) program. In section 3116 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), the committee required a comprehensive review of the GIPP program and reports on the goals of the program, criteria for partnership projects under the program, the plans for existing and new projects, and project funding. The committee appreciates the information provided by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) on the GIPP program in response to this reporting requirement, and in response to additional committee requests. The committee particularly welcomes the completion of an interagency risk assessment of project institutes and facilities in the former Soviet Union (FSU) and the decision to focus on high-priority institutes for engagement in this region. The committee also welcomes the cost-sharing goal for GIPP projects in the FSU.

The committee recognizes that the GIPP program engagement activities with former weapons of mass destruction (WMD) scientists continue to serve important U.S. nonproliferation interests, in part by helping to impede transfers of WMD expertise and know-how to states of concern or terrorist entities.

The committee encourages the NNSA to continue strengthening the management, implementation and oversight of the GIPP program as necessary to ensure the program achieves its intended nonproliferation objectives and in no way undermines U.S. national security interests. The committee also encourages the NNSA to consult with the committee regarding continued program improvements, and to keep the committee fully informed of significant program developments.

Global Nuclear Energy Partnership

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed its concerns regarding the proliferation risks associated with the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP). The committee addressed these concerns in section 3117 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The committee notes the fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011 budget requests did not include any funding for GNEP from within any National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program line, and welcomes this positive development.

The committee encourages NNSA to ensure that any activities relating to the promotion of civil nuclear energy do not create unintended proliferation risks. The committee also encourages NNSA Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs to increase their focus on developing alternatives to nuclear energy.

International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation

The budget request contained $590.1 million for International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation (MPC&A). The committee fully supports the goals of the MPC&A program, and emphasizes the importance of securing vulnerable nuclear weapons and weapons-usable material located outside the United States; and utilizing radiation detection equipment and related capabilities at high-threat border crossings and ports of transit to deter, detect, and interdict illicit transfers of materials that could be used in weapons of mass destruction or a radiological dispersion device, known as a "dirty bomb."

The committee recommends $590.1 million, the amount of the budget request.

Second Line of Defense

The committee continues to encourage the National Nuclear Security Administration to closely coordinate its Second Line of Defense efforts to deter, detect, and interdict illicit transfers of nuclear and radioactive materials at border crossings and ports with the efforts of any other relevant U.S. agency or department, including the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security.

Fissile Materials Disposition

United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition

The budget request contained $917.7 million for United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition.

The committee supports the goals of the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program. The committee also welcomes execution of program activities and functions relating to disposition of U.S. surplus weapons-grade plutonium and the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MOX project), including management and direction of the MOX project, from within the National Nuclear Security Administration Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program, given the important nonproliferation objectives, benefits, and national security goals associated with these activities.

The committee recommends $917.7 million, the amount of the budget request.

Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition

The budget request contained $113.0 million for Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition.

The committee supports the goals of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program, which include disposition of the Russian Federation's surplus weapons-grade plutonium. The committee continues to emphasize the importance of nonproliferation cooperation with Russia to United States nonproliferation objectives and national security goals, and supports the President's efforts to strengthen and expand such cooperation.

The committee also welcomes efforts by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to resolve outstanding issues with Russia relating to the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program and to move the program forward in a manner that is consistent with the program's nonproliferation objectives. This

includes the signing of a Protocol by the United States and Russia to amend the 2000 Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement. At the same time, the committee continues to emphasize its concern with the use of fast reactors under the program for disposition of Russia's surplus weapons-grade plutonium, and expects NNSA to ensure that any reactors used under the program do not produce plutonium and include necessary monitoring and inspection controls. The committee encourages the NNSA to keep the committee fully informed of significant program developments.

The committee recommends $113.0 million, the amount of the budget request.

Global Threat Reduction Initiative

The budget request contained $558.8 million for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI). The committee fully supports the goals of the GTRI program, and emphasizes the importance of the President's four-year plan to secure and remove all known, vulnerable, weapons-usable nuclear material around the world by 2012. The committee also emphasizes the importance of converting domestic and international research reactors from the use of weapons-usable highly-enriched uranium to low-enriched uranium; removing vulnerable high-priority radiological sources located outside the United States; removing excess and unwanted radiological sources within U.S. borders; securing sites with vulnerable high-priority nuclear and radiological sources located outside the United States; and securing U.S. research and test reactors and sites with high-priority radiological sources.

The committee recommends $558.8 million, the amount of the budget request.

Report on Securing Vulnerable Nuclear Materials

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to submit to the congressional defense committees, by April 1, 2011, a joint report on the contributions of the Department of Defense's Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program and the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs to the international effort to secure vulnerable nuclear materials around the world within four years. The report should update the committees on any changes to the existing interagency strategy and work plans of the CTR Program and NNSA Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs for the four-year effort. This includes any updates to metrics for measuring progress, funds required to carry out activities, and contributions from partner nations. The committee also encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to keep the committee fully informed of significant developments relating to the four-year effort.

Naval Reactors

The budget request contained $1.1 billion for Naval Reactors, an increase of $125.4 million above the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level.

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion, from technology development through reactor operation, to reactor retirement. The Navy currently operates

104 reactor plants in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers, which make up 40 percent of the Navy's total combatants. Naval Reactors is developing a new reactor for the CVN 21 class aircraft carrier, and a life-of-the-ship core for the Virginia-class attack submarine. The requested increases would support three key deliverables: the design of the Ohio-class submarine replacement reactor plant, the refueling of the land-based prototype located in New York State, and the recapitalization of the Expended Core Facility at the Naval Reactors Facility located on the Idaho National Laboratory.

The committee recommends $1.1 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Office of the Administrator

The budget request contained $448.3 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Office of the Administrator. In recent years, the committee has encouraged the Office of the Administrator to address any issues of limited staff capacity, capabilities, and resources related to implementation of critical NNSA nonproliferation programs. The committee welcomes NNSA's recent efforts to address such issues.

The committee recommends $448.3 million, the amount of the budget request.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $6.5 billion for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $6.5 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Defense Environmental Cleanup

Execution of Funding Provided for Defense Environmental Cleanup by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

The committee notes that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) provided an additional $5.1 billion in funding for Defense Environmental Cleanup, of which approximately 99 percent was allocated to sites, 95 percent was obligated and 25 percent executed within the first year of execution.

The committee is supportive of the progress made by the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management to achieve the aggressive cleanup goals set for its Public Law 111–5 efforts. These goals include: a reduction of the active cleanup footprint by 40 percent by September 2011, acceleration by seven years of the disposition of legacy transuranic waste inventories at 11 sites, removal of 2 million tons of mill tailings at the Moab site, the acceleration of legacy cleanup, and the creation or retention of thousands of jobs at cleanup sites nationwide. The committee is pleased that approximately 10,000 jobs, including prime contractor and subcontractor positions, have been created or retained in the states of Idaho, Nevada, Ohio, New Mexico, New York, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington as a result of Public Law 111–5 funding.

The committee commends the Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management for making significant progress executing the funding and increased near-term work load provided for and required by Public Law 111–5. The committee encourages the Assistant Secretary to continue increased oversight over Public Law 111–5 projects, ensure that earned value management systems provide timely and reliable cost and schedule performance data, and consider workforce management and transition options beyond Public Law 111–5.

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant

The budget request contained $740.2 million for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) at the Hanford site.

The committee is encouraged that the Office of Environmental Management (EM) and the contractor team kept WTP cost and schedule performance on track in 2009 and reached a milestone by completing 50 percent of the project construction in October 2009.

While the committee recognizes this progress, the committee is aware that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board continues to work with the Office of Environmental Management to resolve certain technical and safety issues associated with the design of the WTP. The committee is concerned that a technical issue identified in 2006, relating to the adequacy of pulse jet mixing in process vessels, remains unresolved and that new technical and safety issues have since emerged.

The committee is aware that the budget request reflects an increase of $50.2 million over the amount authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2010. According to the budget request, this increase will accelerate completion of design, engineering, and procurements to reduce risk and improve project confidence. The committee understands that this increase does not reflect an increase in total project cost but a realignment of funding consistent with the heightened level of activity and investment required in the middle stages of construction projects.

The committee is concerned that the Office of Environmental Management may be proceeding with procurement and installation of equipment for which specifications may change pending the resolution of the technical and safety issues described above. The committee expects the Office of Environmental Management to consider the potential impact of outstanding technical issues when making decisions related to procurement and installation of equipment and to carefully manage project risk.

The committee authorizes $740.2 million for the WTP at the Hanford site, the amount of the budget request.

Other Defense Activities

The budget request contained $878.2 million for Other Defense Activities, including: $464.2 million for Health, Safety, and Security; $188.6 million for the Office of Legacy Management; and $88.2 million for Nuclear Energy.

The committee recommends $878.2 million for Other Defense Activities, the amount of the request.

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Energy recently announced the formation of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future to provide recommendations for developing a safe, long-term solution to managing used nuclear fuel and nuclear waste. The commission will consider alternatives to the Yucca Mountain site, which remains designated as the sole repository site by law as set forth in section 10134 of title 42, United States Code. The committee is concerned that defense waste, which accounts for approximately 10 percent of the total material previously destined for disposition at the Yucca Mountain site, might be overlooked considering the breadth of civilian nuclear fuel cycle issues the panel will address. The committee expects the Secretary's panel to focus on challenges and solutions that may be unique to defense waste.

Report on Defense Repository at Yucca Mountain

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit to the congressional defense committees, within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the steps and actions required to preserve and restart the nuclear waste repository located at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, as an option for disposing of defense nuclear waste, as well as a plan to complete a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, that is able to accommodate the disposal of defense nuclear waste.

Closing of the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Repository

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days of enactment of this Act that provides a detailed analysis of how closing the Yucca Mountain waste repository will impact the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and national defense activities. This report shall include a description of the following:

(1) An analysis of how the Department of Defense and Department of Energy can handle, transport, and store indefinitely its entire stockpile of high-level radioactive defense waste without a national repository.

(2) The impact on the operations of the National Nuclear Security Administration to transform itself and the entire nuclear weapons complex to be smaller, safer, more secure, and more efficient.

(3) The security risks associated with nuclear waste materials stored throughout the country in multiple locations.

(4) A full assessment of the compliance of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy with any agreements with States for the disposal of highly enriched defense nuclear fuel and radioactive wastes at Yucca Mountain.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2011, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize funds for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2011.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities for fiscal year 2011, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy.

Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance

This section would authorize funds for energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2011.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Extension of Authority Relating to the International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting Program of the Department of Energy

This section would extend the date from January 1, 2013 to January 1, 2018, for the International Nuclear Materials Protection, Control and Accounting program (currently known as the International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation program) to develop a sustainable nuclear materials protection, control, and accounting system for the Russian Federation's nuclear materials that is supported solely by Russia.

Section 3112—Energy Parks Initiative

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to facilitate the development of one or more energy parks on defense nuclear facility reuse property through the use of collaborative partnerships with state and local governments, the private sector, and community reuse organizations approved by the Secretary.

Section 3113—Establishment of Technology Transfer Centers

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish a technology transfer center at each national security laboratory, subject to the availability of appropriations provided for this purpose. The purpose of the centers would be to foster collaborative scientific research, technology development, and the appropriate transfer of research and technology to users in addition to the national security laboratories.

Section 3114—Aircraft Procurement

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to procure not more than two aircraft with funds available from the weapons activities account in fiscal year 2011. The National Nuclear Security Administration intends to procure two B–737-like aircraft to replace forty-year-old aircraft for use by the Secure Transportation Asset organization for transporting agents, limited life weapons components, and emergency response teams.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS

Section 3121—Comptroller General Report on NNSA Biennial Complex Modernization Strategy

This section would require the Comptroller General to review the adequacy of funding contained in the budget request to achieve the goals contained in each Biennial Plan and Budget Assessment on the Modernization and Refurbishment of the Nuclear Security Complex required by Section 3116 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). The Comptroller would be required to submit a review to Congress 90 days after the submission of the budget request to Congress during even-numbered years, consistent with the timing of the submission of the Biennial Plan and Budget Assessment.

Section 3122—Report on Graded Security Protection Policy

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to submit to a report to the congressional defense committees on the implementation of the graded security protection policy of the Department of Energy no later than February 1, 2011.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $28.6 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends $28.6 million, the amount of the request.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2011.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $23.6 million for fiscal year 2011 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2011

This section would authorize a total of $359.0 million for the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2011. Of the funds authorized, $100.0 million would be available for expenses necessary for operations of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; of which $30.9 million are authorized for capital improvements of the Academy, $15.0 million would be available for support of the various state maritime academies, $10.0 million for the program to dispose of obsolete vessels of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, $174.0 million for the Maritime Security Program, and $60.0 million for the loan guarantee program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Title XI Loan Program.

Section 3502—Extension of Maritime Security Fleet Program

This section would extend the authorization of the Maritime Security Fleet through fiscal year 2025.

Section 3503—United States Merchant Marine Academy Nominations of Residents of the Northern Mariana Islands

This section would amend section 51302(b) of title 46, United States Code, to change the nominating authority for appointment to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy from the Governor to the Delegate of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. This change standardizes appointment authority of the Northern Mariana Islands to conform to all other territories and possessions of the United States.

Section 3504—Administrative Expenses for Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program

This section would modify section 3512(c)(4) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (48 U.S.C. 1421r(c)(4)) to clarify that the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation has the authority to use up to three percent of any funding made available to the Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program for administration of the program.

Section 3505—Vessel Loan Guarantees: Procedures for Traditional and Nontraditional Applications

This section would amend section 53701 of title 46, United States Code, by defining a traditional application for a guaranteed loan under the section as an application which has a market, technology, or financial structure of a type that has proven successful in previous applications and does not present an unreasonable risk to the United States. A nontraditional application is an application which does not meet the requirements of a traditional application. The section would further amend section 53703 of title 46, United

States Code, to modify the length of time in which the Secretary of Transportation or the Maritime Administrator has to either approve or reject applications for loan guarantees.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2010.

Hon. JOSEPH BIDEN,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for inclusion in the same Bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for inclusion in the same Bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration

and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2010.

Hon. JOSEPH BIDEN,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration

and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, April 23, 2010.

Hon. JOSEPH BIDEN,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

Included in this transmittal is a proposal to expand eligibility for concurrent receipt of military retirement pay and veterans' disability compensation to medically retired service members, which has estimated mandatory costs as outlined in the table below. The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 requires that the cumulative effects of revenue and direct spending legislation meet a pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirement. In total, such legislation should not increase the on-budget deficit; if it does, it would produce a sequestration if it is not fully offset by the end of the Congressional session. This proposal would increase direct spending; therefore, it is subject to the PAYGO requirement. Offsets are included in the President's FY 2011 Budget.

[In millions of dollars]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
DOD/VA Concurrent Receipts Proposal:													
Cost:													
Effects on Veterans disability programs	0	47	49	51	53	54	54	54	53	53	52	254	520
Effect on military retirement	0	217	346	435	511	531	541	550	560	570	581	2,040	4,842
Total cost	0	264	395	486	564	585	595	604	613	623	633	2,294	5,362

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. TAYLOR,
Principal Deputy General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, April 23, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

Included in this transmittal is a proposal to expand eligibility for concurrent receipt of military retirement pay and veterans' disability compensation to medically retired service members, which has estimated mandatory costs as outlined in the table below. The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 requires that the cumulative effects of revenue and direct spending legislation meet a pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirement. In total, such legislation should not increase the on-budget deficit; if it does, it would produce a sequestration if it is not fully offset by the end of the Congressional session. This proposal would increase direct spending; therefore, it is subject to the PAYGO requirement. Offsets are included in the President's FY 2011 Budget.

[In millions of dollars]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
DOD/VA Concurrent Receipts Proposal:													
Cost:													
Effects on Veterans disability programs	0	47	49	51	53	54	54	54	53	53	52	254	520
Effect on military retirement	0	217	346	435	511	531	541	550	560	570	581	2,040	4,842
Total cost	0	264	395	486	564	585	595	604	613	623	633	2,294	5,362

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. TAYLOR,
Principal Deputy General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2010.

Hon. JOSEPH BIDEN,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2010.

Hon. JOSEPH BIDEN,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the enclosed legislative proposals be enacted in this session of Congress. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose additional legislative initiatives for consideration by Congress.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration

and the consideration of Congress, and that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
General Counsel.

Enclosure: As stated.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 19, 2010, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 5136, as amended, by a vote of 59–0.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science and Technology in H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 5136 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Science and Technology also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Science and Technology has valid

jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Science and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Science and Technology.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 5136, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011," introduced on April 26, 2010.

H.R. 5136 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as the Committee on Homeland Security waiving, altering, or otherwise affecting its jurisdiction over subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Homeland Security conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this or similar legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response be placed in the Committee Report accompanying the legislation and the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you on this legislation and other matters of great importance to this nation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

I agree that the Committee on Homeland Security has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Homeland Security.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Ways and Means in matters being considered in H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 5136 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have valid claims to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

I also wish to commend you for including in H.R. 5136, a requirement that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the U.S. Trade Representative, consider the effect that other countries' trade policies have on the ability of the United States to obtain rare earth minerals. Not only are those minerals critically important for many defense applications, they are also critical for many other high-tech applications such as wind turbine and hybrid gasoline-electric automobiles—and, as a result, to U.S. manufacturing competitiveness.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

SANDER M. LEVIN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. SANDER M. LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Ways and Means.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs agrees not to request a sequential referral. By waiving consideration of H.R. 5136, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over any subject matter contained in the bill which falls within its jurisdiction. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in a House-Senate conference, and requests your support if such a request is made.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 5136 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

BOB FILNER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. BOB FILNER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review the text of H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, for provisions which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources. Among these provisions are those dealing with compensation and benefits for the NOAA Corps, as well as a report on civilian infrastructure needs for Guam in light of the upcoming military realignment in the Pacific.

Because of the continued cooperation and consideration that you have afforded me and my staff in developing these provisions, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 5136 based on their inclusion in the bill. Of course, this waiver is not intended to prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over these provisions or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Natural Resources on these provisions, and request your support if such a request is made.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 5136 and the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

With warm regards, I am
Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. While this legislation as reported contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of Committee on Financial Services, the committee waives consideration of the bill in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the committee report or in the Congres-

sional Record during consideration of H.R. 5136 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Financial Services is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Financial Services.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 5136, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011".

H.R. 5136 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, I agree to waive consideration of this bill with the mutual understanding that my decision to forgo a sequential referral of the bill does not waive, reduce, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over H.R. 5136.

Further, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the appointment of conferees on H.R. 5136 or similar legislation.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in the Committee Report on H.R. 5136 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure in the House.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing about H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I appreciate your efforts to consult with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform regarding those provisions of H.R. 5136 that fall within the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction. These provisions involve the federal civil service and federal acquisition policies, among other things.

In the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 5136, the Oversight Committee will not request a sequential referral of this bill. I would, however, request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Oversight Committee should H.R. 5136 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate.

Moreover, this letter should not be construed as a waiver of the Oversight Committee's legislative jurisdiction over subjects addressed in H.R. 5136 that fall within the jurisdiction of the Oversight Committee.

Finally, I request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 5136 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor. Again, I appreciate your willingness to consult the Committee on these matters.

Sincerely,

EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in matters being considered in H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

The Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 5136 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. My decision to waive further consideration of H.R. 5136 is conditional on our mutual understanding that no part of this legis-

lation waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I respectfully request that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging this Committee's jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence also asks that you support my request to include conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any conference between the House and the Senate.

I thank you for your continued leadership.

Sincerely,

SILVESTRE REYES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. SILVESTRE REYES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

This bill contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to mark up this bill. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not

waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Foreign Affairs Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Please include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. As you know, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has jurisdictional interest in a number of provisions of this bill.

In light of the interest in moving this bill forward promptly, I do not intend to exercise the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce by seeking sequential referral of H.R. 5136. I do this, however, only with the understanding that forgoing consideration of H.R. 5136 at this time will not be construed as prejudicing this Committee's jurisdictional interests and prerogatives on the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, we reserve the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number

of conferees to any House-Senate conference named to consider such provisions.

I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for your cooperation on this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Education and Labor in matters being considered in H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 5136 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report

and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Education and Labor also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on Education and Labor has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Education and Labor is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that, as a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are able to agree to waive seeking a formal referral of the bill, in order that it may proceed without delay to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 5136 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward, so that we may address any remaining

issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to this request, and for the cooperative relationship between our two committees.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2010.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2011 and each of the following five fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

Congressional Budget Office Preliminary Cost Estimate

MAY 21, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed a preliminary estimate of the direct spending and revenue effects of H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 19, 2010. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 5136, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

Based on legislative language for H.R. 5136 that was provided to CBO on May 18 and May 19, CBO estimates that on net, enacting this bill would increase direct spending by about $4 billion in 2011, and decrease such spending by $15 million over the 2011–2015 period and by $2 million over the 2011–2020 period. The largest budgetary effects over that 10-year period would result from changes in retirement programs and the requirement that certain funds in a Department of Defense revolving fund be transferred to the Treasury and deposited in a miscellaneous receipts account, where they could not be spent without an appropriation.

In addition, a shift in the payment dates for military annuitants would increase direct spending in fiscal years 2011 and 2016 by about $4 billion each year and would decrease direct spending in subsequent years by identical amounts. (As a result, those changes would have no net impact over both the 2011–2015 period and the 2011–2020 period.)

Enacting the bill would decrease revenues by $2 million over the 2011–2020 period by allowing certain military retirees to receive a portion of their retirement pay tax-free. In total, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 5136 would have no net effect on the deficit over the 2011–2020 period. For the purposes of this estimate, we assume that H.R. 5136 will be enacted near the beginning of fiscal year 2011.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Schmit, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

cc: Honorable Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Ranking Member.

Committee Cost Estimate

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(2)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Budget Office Estimate included in this report satisfies the requirement for the committee to include an estimate by the committee of the costs incurred in carrying out this bill.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee is required to include a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits,

as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, which are in the bill or the report. The following table provides the list of such provisions which are included in the bill and the report:

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
I	APA		021	Vibration Management Enhancement Program (VMEP)	$2,000	Spratt(SC)	South Carolina National Guard	Columbia, SC
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Boren(OK)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Boswell(IA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Bright(AL)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Cao(LA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Courtney(CT)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Davis(CA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Frank(MA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Himes(CT)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Holden(PA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Kennedy(RI)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Kissell(NC)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Langevin(RI)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Loebsack(IA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Lynch(MA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	McCarthy(NY)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Melancon(LA)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Ortiz(TX)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Peterson(MN)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Pomeroy(ND)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Schauer(MI)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Shea-Porter(NH)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Walz(MN)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	APA		027	UH-60 Black Hawk Utility Helicopter Mods A to L ARNG	$17,000	Welch(VT)	US Army Utility Helicopter Project Office	Redstone Arsenal, AL
I	WTCV		047	Additional Small Arms- Nevada National Guard	$1,332	Berkley(NV)	Nevada National Guard	Carson City, NV
I	WTCV		047	Additional Small Arms- Nevada National Guard	$1,332	Titus(NV)	Nevada National Guard	Carson City, NV
I	PAA		016	Additional M1066 155MM Illuminating Cartridges	$4,000	Ross(AR)	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Pine Bluff, AR
I	PAA		037	Iowa Army Ammunition Plant Energy and Utility Monitoring Project	$2,380	Loebsack(IA)	Iowa Army Ammunition Plant	Middletown, IA
I	OPA		179	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Virtual Trainers (MRAP-VVT) Alabama National Guard	$5,000	Bright(AL)	Alabama Army National Guard	Montgomery, AL
I	OPA		179	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Virtual Trainers (MRAP-VVT) California National Guard	$6,000	Capps(CA)	California National Guard	Sacramento, CA
I	OPA		179	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Virtual Trainers (MRAP-VVT) California National Guard	$6,000	Sanchez(CA)	California National Guard	Sacramento, CA
I	OPA		179	Tabletop Trainers, Individual Gunnery Trainer (IGT)- California National Guard	$750	Davis(CA)	California Army National Guard	Camp Roberts, CA
I	PMC		044	Nitrile Rubber Collapsible Fuel Bladders	$4,100	Taylor(MS)	Marine Corps Systems Command	Quantico, VA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
I	APAF		041	F-16CM Center Pedestal Display	$2,500	Spratt(SC)	South Carolina National Guard	Columbia, SC
I	APAF		062	NP-2000 Eight-Bladed Propeller System	$8,500	Murphy(NY)	109th Airlift Wing, NY Air National Guard	Scotia, NY
I	APAF		062	NP-2000 Eight-Bladed Propeller System	$8,500	Tonko(NY)	109th Airlift Wing, Stratton Air National Guard Base	Schenectady, NY
I	PAAF		004	Bomb Line Modernization	$5,000	Boren(OK)	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	McAlester, OK
I	OPAF		035	Application Software Assurance Center	$6,950	Bright(AL)	Maxwell-Gunter AFB	Montgomery, AL
I	OPAF		060	F-22 Raptor Weather Shelters	$3,000	Nye(VA)	Langley Air Force Base	Hampton, VA
I	PDW		097	High Speed Assault Craft MKII	$4,400	Taylor(MS)	Special Operations Command	Tampa, FL
II	RDA	0601102A	002	Global Military Operating Environments	$2,000	Titus(NV)	Desert Research Institute	Reno, NV
II	RDA	0602105A	005	Nanomanufacturing of Integrated Smart Materials Systems	$4,000	Tsongas(MA)	University of Massachusetts Lowell	Lowell, MA
II	RDA	0602601A	013	Enhanced Visual Fidelity Simulation	$2,500	Levin(MI)	U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC)	Warren, MI
II	RDA	0602624A	017	Self-Inerting Munitions Technology Development	$3,000	Langevin(RI)	University of Rhode Island	Kingstown, RI
II	RDA	0602624A	017	Unmanned Hybrid Projectile Project	$4,000	Courtney(CT)	University of Hartford	West Hartford, CT
II	RDA	0602624A	017	Unmanned Hybrid Projectile Project	$4,000	Larson(CT)	University of Hartford	West Hartford, CT
II	RDA	0602784A	025	Cellulose Nanocomposites for Army Infrastructure and Troop Protection	$5,000	Michaud(ME)	University of Maine, Orono	Orono, ME
II	RDA	0602784A	025	Cellulose Nanocomposites for Army Infrastructure and Troop Protection	$5,000	Pingree(ME)	The University of Maine	Orono, ME
II	RDA	0602784A	025	Geosciences/Atmospheric Research	$1,000	Markey(CO)	Colorado State University	Fort Collins, CO
II	RDA	0602784A	025	Geosciences/Atmospheric Research	$1,000	Salazar(CO)	Colorado State University	Fort Collins, CO
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Bone-Integrated Prosthetics for Combat-Injured Soldiers	$2,000	Etheridge(NC)	North Carolina State University	Raleigh, NC
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Bone-Integrated Prosthetics for Combat-Injured Soldiers	$2,000	Kissell(NC)	North Carolina State University	Raleigh, NC
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Epigenetic Disease Research	$2,500	Smith(WA)	Washington State University	Pullman, WA
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Improving Soldier Recovery from Catastrophic Bone Injuries	$6,500	Murphy(CT)	University of Connecticut Health Center	Farmington, CT
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Maine Natural Biopolymer Research and Development Partnership	$1,320	Michaud(ME)	Gulf of Maine Research Institute	Portland, ME
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Maine Natural Biopolymer Research and Development Partnership	$1,320	Pingree(ME)	Gulf of Maine Research Institute	Portland, ME
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Scleral Healing and Bone Repair with Sphere-Templated Polymers	$1,687	Smith(WA)	University of Washington	Seattle, WA
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Tracking the Health of Soldiers with Advanced Implantable Nano-Sensors	$2,500	Courtney(CT)	University of Connecticut	Storrs, CT
II	RDA	0602787A	028	Traumatic Brain Injury Research Initiative	$3,000	Giffords(AZ)	Arizona Alzheimer's Consortium	Phoenix, AZ
II	RDA	0603001A	029	Heat illness research at West Chester University's HEAT Institute to ensure the safety of Warfighters	$375	Sestak(PA)	West Chester University's HEAT Institute	West Chester, PA
II	RDA	0603001A	029	Manufacturing Research and Development of Parachutes	$5,702	Taylor(MS)	U.S. Army Soldier System Center	Natick, MA
II	RDA	0603001A	029	Precision Airdrop Accuracy Enhancement	$2,000	Markey(MA)	The Charles Stark Draper Laboratory	Cambridge, MA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Advanced Medical Training and Technology Platform	$3,000	Smith(WA)	Seattle Science Foundation	Seattle, WA
II	RDA	0603002A	030	ALS Therapy Development Institute Gulf War Research Program	$4,830	Spratt(SC)	ALS Therapy Development Institute	Cambridge, MA
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Bethesda Hospitals' Emergency Preparedness Partnership Collaboration Toolbox	$2,500	Van Hollen(MD)	Suburban Hospital	Bethesda, MD
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Exoskeleton Development for Wounded Service Members	$3,000	Giffords(AZ)	Carondelet Health Network	Tucson, AZ
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Exoskeleton Development for Wounded Service Members	$3,000	Grijalva(AZ)	Carondelet Health Network	Tucson, AZ
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Hadron Particle Therapy	$5,000	Foster(IL)	Northern Illinois University	DeKalb, IL
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Next Generation Leishmaniasis Drug Development	$2,300	Smith(WA)	Seattle Biomedical Research Institute	Seattle, WA
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Ophthalmic Robotic Surgery	$5,000	Brady(PA)	Wills Eye Health System	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Personal Status Monitor	$1,000	Maffei(NY)	Syracuse University	Syracuse, NY
II	RDA	0603002A	030	Software-Based Treatment for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder	$1,500	Davis(CA)	San Diego State University Research Foundation	San Diego, CA
II	RDA	0603005A	033	Advanced Battery Manufacturing Research and Development	$5,000	Yarmuth(KY)	Commonwealth of Kentucky	Frankfort, KY
II	RDA	0603005A	033	Smart Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle Program	$4,730	Dingell(MI)	NextEnergy Center	Detroit, MI
II	RDA	0603008A	036	Applied Communications and Information Networking	$7,000	Andrews(NJ)	Drexel University	Camden, NJ
II	RDA	0603270A	043	Advanced Ground Electronic Warfare System (AGES)	$3,000	Maffei(NY)	SRC - formerly Syracuse Research Corp.	Syracuse, NY
II	RDA	0603734A	050	Fort Bliss Renewable and Alternative Energy Initiative	$2,500	Reyes(TX)	Fort Bliss Directorate of Public Works	Fort Bliss, TX
II	RDA	0604601A	079	Helicopter Portable Oxygen Delivery System Generation III	$3,000	Brady(PA)	Drexel University College of Medicine	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDN	0601103N	001	Gulf of Mexico/ Texas Border Geoid Model	$2,000	Ortiz(TX)	Texas A&M- Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi, TX
II	RDN	0601103N	001	Modernization of Marine Research Facility Pier, San Diego	$7,500	Davis(CA)	University of California, San Diego	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0601153N	003	ONAMI Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology and Nanobiotechnology (N3I)	$5,000	Blumenauer(OR)	Portland State University	Portland, OR
II	RDN	0601153N	003	ONAMI Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology and Nanobiotechnology (N3I)	$5,000	DeFazio(OR)	Portland State University with Subcontracting to Oregon State University and University of Oregon	Portland, OR
II	RDN	0601153N	003	High-Precision Nanoparticle Formation Control	$1,000	Sestak(PA)	Temple University	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDN	0602123N	005	Harbor Shield Homeland Defense Port Security Initiative	$5,500	Langevin(RI)	Battelle	Westerly, RI
II	RDN	0602123N	005	Applied Research in Intelligent Autonomous Systems (ARIAS)	$1,500	Sestak(PA)	Villanova University	Villanova, PA
II	RDN	0602235N	008	Cognitive Radio Institute	$1,650	Gordon(TN)	Tennessee Technical University	Cookeville, TN
II	RDN	0602235N	008	High Bandwidth, Mobile Medical Communications Platform to Revolutionize Rural Health Care	$3,500	Space(OH)	The Ohio State University	Columbus, OH
II	RDN	0602271N	010	Photonic Digital-Beamforming System	$5,500	Ellsworth(IN)	Rose-Hulman Institute for Technology and NSWC Crane	Terre Haute, IN
II	RDN	0602747N	013	Alternative Power System Testing for Innovative Sensor Delivery and Deployment Concepts	$5,000	Courtney(CT)	Promare	Chester, CT
II	RDN	0603114N	015	High Resolution Anti-Mine UAV-based System	$2,500	Taylor(MS)	Office of Naval Research	Washington, DC
II	RDN	0603123N	016	Future Logistics Immersive Training Environment (FLITE)	$3,000	Sanchez(CA)	California State University Long Beach Foundation	Long Beach, CA
II	RDN	0603123N	016	Mobile Laser Deposition Work Cell	$3,000	Dingell(MI)	Focus: HOPE	Detroit, MI

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
II	RDN	0603123N	016	Over the Horizon Vessel Tracking	$1,000	Nye(VA)	Center for Innovative Technology	Herdon, VA
II	RDN	0603123N	016	Mobile Laser Deposition Work Cell	$3,000	Levin(MI)	Focus: HOPE	Detroit, MI
II	RDN	0603123N	016	Over the Horizon Vessel Tracking	$1,000	Scott(VA)	Center for Innovative Technology	Herndon, VA
II	RDN	0603729N	022	Navy Special Warfare Performance and Injury Prevention Program for SBT 22 at Stennis Space Center	$2,400	Taylor(MS)	University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sports Medicine and Nutrition, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences	Pittsburgh, PA
II	RDN	0603561N	041	Development of Hybrid Multi-Functional Composites for Submarine Structures	$4,000	Taylor(MS)	Navy Program Executive Office Subs	Washington, DC
II	RDN	0603563N	043	Composite Deckhouse Design for DDG 51 Class Ships	$10,000	Taylor(MS)	Navy Program Executive Office Ships	Washington, DC
II	RDN	0603564N	044	Hydrodynamic Test Facilities	$5,000	Van Hollen(MD)	Carderock Division of the Naval Surface Warfare Center	West Bethesda, MD
II	RDN	0603581N	048	Axial Flow High Power Density Waterjets	$4,250	Taylor(MS)	U.S Navy Program Executive Office Ships	Washington, DC
II	RDN	0603635M	052	USMC Military Fleet Simulation Computer Co-simulation	$800	Markey(CO)	Colorado State University	Fort Collins, CO
II	RDN	0603725N	058	Critical Power Securitization for Naval Installations	$3,700	Courtney(CT)	Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative (CMEEC)	Norwich, CT
II	RDN	0603725N	058	Undersea Perimeter Security Integrated Defense Environment	$5,000	Langevin(RI)	Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation	Providence, RI
II	RDN	0603739N	060	Navy In Transit Visibility System- GTMO	$2,000	Brady(PA)	Strengthening the Mid-Atlantic Region for Tomorrow (SMART)	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDN	0603739N	060	Development of Flame Retardant Textile Fabric for Military Clothing and Other Applications	$1,500	Dingell(MI)	Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti, MI
II	RDN	0603925N	073	High Power Laser Technologies Initiative (UCF)	$4,650	Brown(FL)	University of Central Florida	Orlando, FL
II	RDN	0604311N	101	Land Based Test Facility	$5,000	Taylor(MS)	Navy Program Executive Office Ships	Washington, DC
II	RDN	0604512N	109	Aviation Data Management and Control System for Amphibious Ships	$3,500	Adler(NJ)	Ocean County College	Toms River, NJ
II	RDN	0604771N	124	Chronic Lyme Medical Social Research Network	$1,000	Connolly(VA)	COPE International	Alexandria, VA
II	RDN	0604771N	124	U.S. Navy Pandemic Influenza Vaccine Program	$4,000	Murphy(NY)	Trudeau Institute	Saranac Lake, NY
II	RDN	0604771N	124	U.S. Navy Pandemic Influenza Vaccine Program	$4,000	Owens(NY)	Trudeau Institute	Saranac Lake, NY
II	RDN	0605804N	146	Center for Commercialization of Advanced Technology	$5,000	Davis(CA)	San Diego State University Research Foundation	San Diego, CA
II	RDN	0205633N	180	Unmanned Aerial Systems Maintenance, Repair and Overhaul Advanced Technologies Initiative	$2,000	Davis(CA)	Batteile Memorial Institute	Columbus, OH
II	RDAF	0601103F	002	Integrated Industrial Microalgae Biofuel Program	$10,000	Ortiz(TX)	Texas AgriLife Research	Corpus Christi, TX
II	RDAF	0602204F	008	Information Tools for Persistent Surveillance Data Sets	$2,000	Snyder(AR)	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Little Rock, AR
II	RDAF	0602601F	009	Technology Research and Innovation Outreach for Space (TRIOS)	$3,000	Heinrich(NM)	Technology Ventures Corporation	Albuquerque, NM
II	RDAF	0603112F	015	Additive Manufacturing Consortium	$3,000	Kilroy(OH)	EWI (Edison Welding Institute)	Columbus, OH
II	RDAF	0603112F	015	Advanced Solar Photovoltaics and Power Conversion Modules	$1,700	Spratt(SC)	University of South Carolina	Columbia, SC
II	RDAF	0603112F	015	Metals Affordability Initiative	$10,000	DeFazio(OR)	department of defense	Washington, DC

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
II	RDAF	0603112F	015	Metals Affordability Initiative	$10,000	Kaptur(OH)	department of defense	Washington, DC
II	RDAF	0603112F	015	Metals Affordability Initiative	$10,000	Moore(WI)	Department of Defense	N/A, DC
II	RDAF	0603112F	015	Metals Affordability Initiative	$10,000	Ryan(OH)	department of defense	Washington, DC
II	RDAF	0603680F	027	Aerial MultiAxis Platform Enhanced for C-130 Center Wing Box Removal and Replacement	$2,000	Marshall(GA)	Robins AFB	Warner Robins, GA
II	RDAF	0604270F	064	Joint Analysis Countermeasures Knowledge Assessment & Life-Cycle (JACKAL) Electronic Warfare (EW) Improvement Program	$3,900	Marshall(GA)	Robins AFB (WR-ALC)	Warner Robins, GA
II	RDAF	0303150F	178	Defense Energy and Awareness Program (DEAP)	$8,000	Murphy(PA)	Drexel University	Bristol, PA
II	RDAF	0307141F	218	Cyber Transition Program	$2,800	Rodriguez(TX)	Southwest Research Institute	San Antonio, TX
II	RDAF	0708611F	235	Micro-Grid Energy Storage Utilizing a Deployable Zinc-Bromide Flow Battery	$3,000	Marshall(GA)	USAF Advanced Power Technology Office, Robins AFB	Warner Robins, GA
II	RDDW	0601000BR	001	University Strategic Partnerships	$5,000	Heinrich(NM)	University of New Mexico	Albuquerque, NM
II	RDDW	0601101E	002	Ant-Based Cyber Defense	$1,080	Kissell(NC)	Wake Forest University, Reynolds Campus	Winston-Salem, NC
II	RDDW	0601101E	002	Ant-Based Cyber Defense	$1,080	Watt(NC)	Wake Forest University	Winston-Salem, NC
II	RDDW	0601101E	002	Vaccine Stabilization Initiative	$3,200	Smith(WA)	PATH	Seattle, WA
II	RDDW	0601120D8Z	005	Energy and Power Career Development STEM Initiative	$4,000	Andrews(NJ)	Delaware Valley Industrial Resource Center	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDDW	0601120D8Z	005	Energy and Power Career Development STEM Initiative	$4,000	Brady(PA)	The Delaware Valley Industrial Resource Center	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDDW	0601120D8Z	005	Energy and Power Career Development STEM Initiative	$4,000	Schwartz(PA)	Delaware Valley Industrial Resource Center	Philadlephia, PA
II	RDDW	0601120D8Z	005	Energy and Power Career Development STEM Initiative	$4,000	Sestak(PA)	Delaware Valley Inustrial Resource Center (DVIRC)	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDDW	0601120D8Z	005	STEM Outreach Education	$1,233	Ellsworth(IN)	University of Southern Indiana and NSWC Crane	Evansville, IN
II	RDDW	0601384BP	006	Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station	$5,500	Bishop(NY)	New York Structural Biology Center	New York, NY
II	RDDW	0602228D8Z	008	Morehouse College, John H. Hopps Defense Research Scholars Program	$3,000	Johnson(GA)	Morehouse College	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	0602228D8Z	008	Nanoscience and Biotechnology Laboratories and Research Program	$2,000	Johnson(GA)	Clark Atlanta University	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	0602228D8Z	008	Thurgood Marshall College Fund	$2,500	Brady(PA)	Thurgood Marshall College Fund	New York, NY
II	RDDW	0602228D8Z	008	Thurgood Marshall College Fund	$2,500	Butterfield(NC)	Thurgood Marshall College Fund	New York, NY
II	RDDW	0602228D8Z	008	Thurgood Marshall College Fund	$2,500	Sestak(PA)	Thurgood Marshall College Fund	New York, NY
II	RDDW	0602384BP	014	Therapeutic Drug Against Multiple Bio-Threat Agents	$2,500	Murphy(PA)	Institute for Hepatitis and Virus Research	Doylestown, PA
II	RDDW	0602384BP	014	Viral WMD: Protection and Treatment for the Warfighter	$6,200	Higgins(NY)	Hauptman-Woodward Medical Research Institute	Buffalo, NY
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	026	Early Responders Distance Learning Center (ERDLC)	$1,255	Brady(PA)	St. Joseph's University	Philadelphia, PA
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	026	Explosive Loading Laboratory Testing Program for Forward Force Protection	$3,000	Davis(CA)	University of California, San Diego	San Diego, CA
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	026	Multi-State Combined Injury Consortium	$5,000	Snyder(AR)	University of Arkansas for Medical Science	Little Rock, AR
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	026	Risk Assessment and Resource Allocation in Combating Terrorism	$3,500	Brady(PA)	Foreign Policy Research Institute	Philadelphia, PA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
II	RDDW	0603384BP	034	Integrated Chemical and Biological Detection System Technology Demonstration	$3,000	Kilroy(OH)	Battelle Memorial Institute	Columbus, OH
II	RDDW	0603712S	044	Next Generation Manufacturing Technologies Initiative	$4,000	Loebsack(IA)	University of Iowa	Iowa City, IA
II	RDDW	0603712S	044	Woody Biomass Conversion to Jet Fuel	$3,000	Michaud(ME)	University of Maine, Orono	Orono, ME
II	RDDW	0603712S	044	Woody Biomass Conversion to Jet Fuel	$3,000	Pingree(ME)	The University of Maine	Orono, ME
II	RDDW	0603720S	047	Feature Size Yield Enhancement	$2,000	Matsui(CA)	Defense Microelectronics Activity	McClellan, CA
II	RDDW	0603720S	047	Feature Size Yield Enhancement	$2,000	Sanchez(CA)	OSD, DDR&E, DMEA	n/a, DC
II	RDDW	0603941D8Z	065	Center for Defense Systems Research (CDSR)	$2,000	Reyes(TX)	University of Texas at El Paso	El Paso, TX
II	RDDW	1160402BB	067	Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center	$4,600	Etheridge(NC)	Partnership for Defense Innovation	Fayetteville, NC
II	RDDW	1160402BB	067	Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center	$4,600	Kissell(NC)	Partnership for Defense Innovation	Fayetteville, NC
II	RDDW	1160402BB	067	Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center	$4,600	McIntyre(NC)	Partnership for Defense Innovation	Fayetteville, NC
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	134	Over the Horizon Broadcast Extension Capability	$6,830	Taylor(MS)	46th Test Squadron	Fort Walton Beach, FL
II	RDDW	0804767D8Z	174	Modeling and Simulation Development in Support of National Security Training and Decision Analysis	$3,500	Nye(VA)	Old Dominion University	Norfolk, VA
II	RDDW	0804767D8Z	174	Modeling And Simulation Development In Support Of National Security Training And Decision Analysis	$3,500	Scott(VA)	Old Dominon University	Norfolk, VA
II	RDDW	0304210BB	211	Technology Development for Quiet Tactical UAV	$4,000	Johnson(GA)	Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA
II	RDDW	1160404BB	253	Naval Special Warfare Tactical Athlete Program	$2,798	Davis(CA)	Naval Special Warfare Command	Coronado, CA
II	RDDW	1160404BB	253	Naval Special Warfare Tactical Athlete Program	$2,798	Nye(VA)	Naval Special Warfare Command	Little Creek, VA
II	RDDW	1160426BB	258	Battery Research Initiative: A Partnership of Purdue University and NSWC Crane	$5,000	Ellsworth(IN)	Purdue University and NSWC Crane	West Lafayette, IN
II	RDDW	1160428BB	260	SIGINT Payload for Expeditionary Unmanned Aircraft System (EUAS)	$4,000	Andrews(NJ)	N/A	N/A, DC
III	OMA		060	UAS Branch Concept Development	$3,200	Bright(AL)	Army Aviation School Fort Rucker	Fort Rucker, AL
III	OMA		100	Fort Bliss Data Center	$2,500	Reyes(TX)	Fort Bliss Technology Directorate	Fort Bliss, TX
III	OMA		290	Diversity Outreach for Recruiting and Retention at West Point	$1,500	Hall(NY)	United States Military Academy, Directorate of Admissions	West Point, NY
III	OMA		420	Social Work Center for Soldiers and Military Families	$956	Etheridge(NC)	Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville, NC
III	OMA		420	The National Organization on Disability Pilot Program for Wounded Warriors	$4,800	Kissell(NC)	National Organization on Disability	New York, NY
III	OMA		420	The National Organization on Disability Pilot Program for Wounded Warriors	$4,800	Langevin(RI)	National Organization on Disability	New York, NY
III	OMA		420	The National Organization on Disability Pilot Program for Wounded Warriors	$4,800	McIntyre(NC)	National Organization on Disability	Fayetteville, NC
III	OMN		320	Navy Ship Disposal Program	$4,000	Ortiz(TX)	US Navy	n/a, TX

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
III	OMN		430	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	$635	Bishop(NY)	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN		430	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	$635	Bordallo(GU)	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN		430	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	$635	Ortiz(TX)	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN		430	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	$635	Sanchez(CA)	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMN		430	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	$635	Stupak(MI)	Naval Sea Cadet Corps	Arlington, VA
III	OMAF		030	Barry M. Goldwater Range Sensor Training Area	$3,500	Giffords(AZ)	Luke AFB	Luke Air Force Base, AZ
III	OMAF		290	Diversity Outreach for Recruiting and Retention at the Air Force Academy	$2,064	Sanchez(CA)	US Air Force Academy	USAF Academy, CO
III	OMDW		050	I-CAN! E-File Program	$200	Sanchez(CA)	Legal Aid Society of Orange County	Santa Ana, CA
III	OMDW		250	Critical Language Training; San Diego State University	$3,500	Davis(CA)	San Diego State University Research Foundation	San Diego, CA
III	OMDW		250	ROTC and Reserve Component Strategic Language Hub Pilot	$1,200	Marshall(GA)	North Georgia College & State University, The Military College of Georgia	Dahlonega, GA
III	ERFUS		090	Environmental Restoration at Culebra Island, Puerto Rico	$5,000	Pierluisi(PR)	Department of Defense	Culebra, PR
III	OMNG		010	Mobile C3 & Asset Tracking Equipment	$1,821	Ortiz(TX)	Texas Army National Guard	Austin, TX
III	OMNG		070	100 Meter Indoor Small Arms Range	$1,900	Sanchez(CA)	California National Guard	Los Alamitos, CA
III	OMNG		130	North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers	$1,600	Butterfield(NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Raleigh, NC
III	OMNG		130	North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers	$1,600	Etheridge(NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Raleigh, NC
III	OMNG		130	North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers	$1,600	Kissell(NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Raleigh, NC
III	OMNG		130	North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers	$1,600	McIntyre(NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Raleigh, NC
III	OMNG		130	North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers	$1,600	Miller(NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Raleigh, NC
III	OMNG		130	North Carolina Army National Guard Family Assistance Centers	$1,600	Watt(NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Raleigh, NC
III	OMNG		130	Our Military Kids	$1,000	Connolly(VA)	Our Military Kids	McLean, VA
III	OMNG		130	Washington National Guard Employment Enhancement Project	$1,500	Larsen(WA)	Washington Army and Air National Guard	Camp Murray, WA
III	OMNG		130	Washington National Guard Employment Enhancement Project	$1,500	Smith(WA)	Washington State National Guard	Tacoma, WA
III	OMANG		020	F-16CM and AH-64D Digital Communications Bridge	$1,100	Spratt(SC)	South Carolina National Guard	Columbia, SC
IV	MILPERS			Heroes and Healthy Families - Mental Health Support for Active Duty Military Personnel	$1,500	Sanchez(CA)	The Family Violence Project	Santa Ana, CA
XIV	DHP		010	Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization	$430	Owens(NY)	Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization	Watertown, NY
XIV	DHP		010	Madigan Army Medical Center Trauma Assistance Program	$2,500	Smith(WA)	Madigan Army Medical Center, MultiCare Health System, and Franciscan Health System	Tacoma, WA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
XIV	DHP		010	Military Wellness Initiative	$585	McCarthy(NY)	Ohel Childrens Home and Family Services	Brooklyn, NY
XIV	DHP		010	Military Wellness Initiative	$585	McMahon(NY)	Ohel Children's Home and Family Services	Brooklyn, NY
XIV	DHP		010	Shock Trauma Center - National Simulation Training Center	$2,000	Cummings(MD)	University of Maryland Shock Trauma Center	Baltimore, MD
XIV	DHP		010	Shock Trauma Center - National Simulation Training Center	$2,000	Ruppersberger(MD)	University of Maryland Shock Trauma Center	Baltimore, MD
XIV	DHP		010	United States Olympic Committee (USOC) Paralympic Military Program	$5,000	Langevin(RI)	The United States Olympic Committee	Colorado Springs, RI
XIV	DHP		020	Autism Brain Morphology Library	$2,000	Edwards(TX)	Texas A&M Health Science Center	College Station, TX
XIV	DHP		020	Bone Marrow Failure Disease Research	$3,000	Matsui(CA)	U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command	Fort Detrick, MD
XIV	DHP		020	Gulf War Syndrome Brain Image Analysis	$146	Snyder(AR)	University of Central Arkansas	Conway, AR
XIV	DHP		020	Military Photomedicine Program	$6,000	Sanchez(CA)	Beckman Laser Institute and Medical Clinic University of California, Irvine	Irvine, CA
XIV	DHP		020	Multiple Sclerosis Research (CDMRP)	$1,000	Carnahan(MO)	Department of Defense	N/A, MO
XIV	DHP		020	Nanoparticle Delivery System for Pocket Vaccines	$1,400	Edwards(TX)	Texas A&M Health Science Center	College Station, TX
XIV	DHP		020	Old Dominion University Bioelectrics Research for Casualty Care and Management	$2,780	Nye(VA)	Old Dominion University	Norfolk, VA
XIV	DHP		020	Polycystic Kidney Disease Program	$5,000	DeLauro(CT)	PKD Foundation	Kansas City, MO
XIV	DHP		020	Research in Alcohol and Substance Use Disorders	$3,000	Lee(CA)	U.S. Army Telemedicine & Advanced Technology Research Center at Ft. Detrick, MD	Frederick, MD
XXI	MCA			Alternative Energy Planning and Design at Fort Bliss	$1,166	Reyes(TX)	Fort Bliss	El Paso , TX
XXI	MCA			Infrastructure (Mapes Road & Cooper Avenue)	$1,829	Kratovil(MD)	Fort George G. Meade	Fort Meade, MD
XXI	MCA			Aircraft Component Maintenance Shop, Ph 2	$14,498	Ortiz(TX)	Corpus Christi Army Depot	Corpus Christi, TX
XXI	MCA			Alert Holding Area	$6,700	Owens(NY)	Fort Drum, New York	Fort Drum, NY
XXI	MCA			BRAC Infrastructure	$3,060	Connolly(VA)	Fort Belvoir	Fairfax County, VA
XXI	MCA			BRAC Infrastructure	$3,060	Moran(VA)	Fort Belvoir	Fairfax County, VA
XXI	MCA			Emergency Medical Services Facility	$1,776	Bright(AL)	Fort Rucker	Fort Rucker, AL
XXI	MCA			Flexible Munitions & Weapons Component Production Facility	$281	Chandler(KY)	Blue Grass Army Depot	Richmond, KY
XXI	MCA			Infrastructure (Mapes Road & Cooper Avenue)	$1,829	Ruppersberger(MD)	Fort George G. Meade	Fort Meade, MD
XXI	MCA			Infrastructure (Mapes Road & Cooper Avenue)	$1,829	Sarbanes(MD)	Fort George G. Meade	Fort Meade, MD
XXI	MCA			Rail Yard Improvements	$2,070	Reyes(TX)	Fort Bliss	El Paso, TX
XXII	MCN			Test Firing Range	$5,310	Bishop(GA)	MCLB Albany, GA	Albany, GA
XXII	MCN			Atlantic Test Range Addition	$11,160	Hoyer(MD)	Patuxent River Naval Air Station	Patuxent River, MD
XXII	MCN			Charleston Gate ECP Improvements	$6,330	Dicks(WA)	Naval Base Kitsap Bremerton WA	Bremerton, WA
XXII	MCN			Consolidation of Structural Shops	$11,910	Pingree(ME)	Portsmouth Navy Shipyard	Kittery, ME
XXII	MCN			Consolidation of Structural Shops	$11,910	Shea-Porter(NH)	Portsmouth Navy Shipyard	Kittery, ME
XXII	MCN			International Academic Instruction Building	$12,510	Farr(CA)	Naval Postgraduate School	Monterey, CA
XXII	MCN			Maritime Expeditionary Security Group- One (MESG-1) Consolidated Boat Maintenance	$7,215	Davis(CA)	Coronado Naval Base	IMPERIAL BEACH, CA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
XXII	MCN			Naval Air Station Kingsville Youth Center	$2,680	Ortiz(TX)	Naval Air Station Kingsville	Kingsville, TX
XXII	MCN			Platform Protection Engineering Complex	$760	Ellsworth(IN)	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division	Crane, IN
XXII	MCN			Purchase of 9 Acres & Construct New Clinic	$6,110	Boyd(FL)	NAVAL SUPPORT ACTY PANAMA CITY PANAMA CITY, FLORIDA	Panama City, FL
XXII	MCN			Submarine Group Two Headquarters	$550	Courtney(CT)	New London	Groton, CT
XXII	MCN			Submarine Group Two Headquarters	$550	DeLauro(CT)	New London	Groton, CT
XXII	MCN			Submarine Group Two Headquarters	$550	Himes(CT)	New London	Groton, CT
XXII	MCN			Submarine Group Two Headquarters	$550	Larson(CT)	New London	Groton, CT
XXII	MCN			Submarine Group Two Headquarters	$550	Murphy(CT)	New London	Groton, CT
XXIII	MCAF			54th Combat Communications Squadron Warehouse Facility	$5,665	Marshall(GA)	Robins AFB	Warner Robins, GA
XXIII	MCAF			Air Traffic Control Tower	$810	Bright(AL)	Maxwell AFB	Montgomery, AL
XXIII	MCAF			Arnold Engineering Development Center Power Distribution Modernization	$378	Davis(TN)	Tullahoma	Tullahoma, TN
XXIII	MCAF			Central Deployment Center	$495	Pomeroy(ND)	Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota	Grand Forks, ND
XXIII	MCAF			COMMUNITY EVENT COMPLEX	$10,815	Rodriguez(TX)	LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS	Del Rio, TX
XXIII	MCAF			Consolidated Security Forces Ops Ctr, Phase 1	$900	Gonzalez(TX)	Lackland Air Force Base	San Antonio, TX
XXIII	MCAF			Consolidated Security Forces Ops Ctr, Phase 1	$900	Rodriguez(TX)	Lackland Air Force Base	San Antonio, TX
XXIII	MCAF			Construct a new health center facility, phase 1	$396	Costello(IL)	Scott Air Force Base, Illinois	Belleville, IL
XXIII	MCAF			Construct BCE Maintenance Shops & Supply Warehouse	$387	Garamendi(CA)	Travis Air Force Base	Fairfield, CA
XXIII	MCAF			Construct BCE Maintenance Shops & Supply Warehouse	$387	Miller(CA)	Travis Air Force Base	Fairfield, CA
XXIII	MCAF			Construct BCE Maintenance Shops & Supply Warehouse	$387	Thompson(CA)	Travis Air Force Base	Fairfield, CA
XXIII	MCAF			Construct New Crash/Fire/Rescue Station	$13,905	McIntyre(NC)	Pope AFB	Fayetteville, NC
XXIII	MCAF			Land Purchase, West Clear Zone	$3,384	Nye(VA)	Langley AFB	Hampton, VA
XXIII	MCAF			Land Purchase, West Clear Zone	$3,384	Scott(VA)	Langley AFB	Hampton, VA
XXIII	MCAF			Los Angeles AFB Parking Structure, Ph 2	$5,220	Sanchez(CA)	Los Angeles AFB	El Segundo, CA
XXIII	MCAF			MacDill AFB Infrastructure Improvements	$249	Castor(FL)	MacDill AFB	Tampa, FL
XXIII	MCAF			PARALLEL TAXIWAY, RWY 07/25	$8,720	Teague(NM)	HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE,
XXIII	MCAF			REPLACE FIRE STATION 3	$7,004	Heinrich(NM)	KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO	KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE,
XXIII	MCAF			Consolidated Air Operations Facility	$24,205	Skelton(MO)	Whiteman AFB	Knob Noster, MO
XXIII	MCAF			Construct New Crash/Fire/Rescue Station	$13,905	Kissell(NC)	Pope AFB	Fort Bragg, NC
XXIV	MCDW			Construct Fuels Storage Complex	$1,036	Boren(OK)	Tulsa IAP	Tulsa, OK
XXIV	MCDW			SOF Military Working Dogs Kennel	$4,982	Smith(WA)	Fort Lewis	Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA
XXIV	MCDW			SOF Parachute Training Facility	$6,850	Giffords(AZ)	Special Operations Forces Parachute Training Facility	Marana, AZ
XXIV	MCDW			SOF WESTERN MANEUVER AREA (PHASE 3)	$8,650	Taylor(MS)	STENNIS SPACE CENTER	BAY ST. LOUIS, MS
XXVI	MCANG			Add to Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	$6,540	Olver(MA)	Barnes Municipal Airport	Westfield, MA
XXVI	MCANG			Aircraft Maintenance Shops	$3,600	Herseth Sandlin(SD)	Joe Foss Field, South Dakota	Sioux Falls, SD
XXVI	MCANG			ASA Replace Alert Complex	$2,000	Melancon(LA)	NAS JRB New Orleans	New Orleans, LA

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
XXVI	MCANG			CONTINGENCY RESPONSE GROUP (CRG) FACILITY	$534	Yarmuth(KY)	LOUISVILLE INTL AIRPORT-STANDIFORD FLD, KENTUCKY	Louisville, KY
XXVI	MCANG			Corrosion Control Hanger	$5,178	Boswell(IA)	Des Moines International Airport, Iowa (Iowa Air National Guard)	Des Moines, IA
XXVI	MCANG			Directed Design Authority/Funding for Readiness Center	$3,729	Langevin(RI)	Quonset Point	North Kingstown, RI
XXVI	MCANG			FORCE PROTECTION MEASURES - RELOCATE MAIN GATE	$2,180	Eshoo(CA)	MOFFETT FIELD (NASA), SAN JOSE, (ANG), CALIFORNIA	Mountain View, CA
XXVI	MCANG			Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Hangar	$9,265	Andrews(NJ)	New Jersey Department of Military and Veterans Affairs	Lawrenceville, NJ
XXVI	MCANG			Joint Deployment Processing Center & Readiness Center, Ph 1	$9,919	Clyburn(SC)	McEntire Joint National Guard Base	Columbia, SC
XXVI	MCANG			Load Crew Training and Weapon Release Shops	$8,720	Oberstar(MN)	Duluth International Aiport	4680 Viper Street, MN
XXVI	MCANG			Repair Taxiway Juliet and Lima	$4,360	Perlmutter(CO)	Buckley AFB	Aurora, CO
XXVI	MCANG			Replace Operations and Training and Dining Hall Facilities	$675	Holden(PA)	Fort Indiantown Gap ANG Station, Pennsylvania	Annville, PA
XXVI	MCANG			Replace Security Forces and Small Arms Range Complex	$8,326	Kaptur(OH)	Toledo Express Airport, Ohio	Toledo, OH
XXVI	MCANG			Stewart Air National Guard Base Aircraft Conversion Facility	$4,088	Hall(NY)	STEWART AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE (STEWART INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, NEW YORK)	Newburgh, NY
XXVI	MCANG			Stewart Air National Guard Base Aircraft Conversion Facility	$4,088	Hinchey(NY)	STEWART AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE (STEWART INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, NEW YORK)	Newburgh, NY
XXVI	MCAR			Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	$10,156	Adler(NJ)	Fort Dix	Fort Dix, NJ
XXVI	MCAR			Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	$10,156	Andrews(NJ)	Fort Dix	Fort Dix, NJ
XXVI	MCAR			Operational Reserve Headquarters	$5,000	Edwards(TX)	Texas Army National Guard McGregor	McGregor, TX
XXVI	MCARNG			185th Regional Training Institute (RTI)	$800	Boswell(IA)	Camp Dodge, Johnston, Iowa INSNO=19901	Johnston, IA
XXVI	MCARNG			Add/Alt Unit Training Equipment Site (UTES), Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training Center	$2,172	Ryan(OH)	ohio national guard	columbus, OH
XXVI	MCARNG			AFRC Add/Alt (JFHQ)	$1,243	Schrader(OR)	JFHQ OWEN SUMMERS BLDG	Salem, OR
XXVI	MCARNG			Army Aviation Support Facility Fixed Wing Aircraft Annex	$9,546	Price(NC)	AASF #1, MORRISVILLE, NC	Morrisville, NC
XXVI	MCARNG			Construct Troop Service Support Center	$446	Schauer(MI)	CTC Fort Custer Trng Center	Battle Creek, MI
XXVI	MCARNG			CST Ready BLG	$8,771	Berkley(NV)	Las Vegas Readiness Center	Las Vegas, NV
XXVI	MCARNG			CST Ready BLG	$8,771	Titus(NV)	Las Vegas Readiness Center	Las Vegas, NV
XXVI	MCARNG			Easton Readiness Center Add/Alt	$347	Kratovil(MD)	Louis G. Smith	Easton, MD
XXVI	MCARNG			Emergency Power Generator	$1,626	Rahall(WV)	GLEN JEAN	Glen Jean, WV
XXVI	MCARNG			Field Maintenance Shop	$13,003	Obey(WI)	Wausau	Wausau, WI
XXVI	MCARNG			Firefighting Team Support facility	$223	Shuler(NC)	North Carolina National Guard	Raliegh, NC
XXVI	MCARNG			FMS Mankato	$947	Walz(MN)	Mankato, NG Armory	Mankato, MN
XXVI	MCARNG			FWAATS Expansion	$2,000	Mollohan(WV)	FWAATS-Bridgeport	Bridgeport, WV
XXVI	MCARNG			FWAATS Parking Apron Expansion	$2,168	Mollohan(WV)	FWAATS-Bridgeport	Bridgeport, WV
XXVI	MCARNG			Hermitage Readiness Center	$671	Dahlkemper(PA)	Sharon/Hermitage RC	Hermitage, PA
XXVI	MCARNG			Maintenance Building Add/Alt	$3,307	Space(OH)	Camp Sherman TNG Site	Chillicothe, OH

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title	Account	PE	Line	Description	Amount	Member	Intended Recipient	Intended Location
XXVI	MCARNG			New Sim Center/MVSB/Helipad/Mil Parking	$2,179	Loebsack(IA)	Iowa City Melrose	Iowa City, IA
XXVI	MCARNG			Phase 1 - Training Site AT Complex-Phased Construction	$1,484	Butterfield(NC)	Camp Butner Training Site	Raleigh, NC
XXVI	MCARNG			Phase 1 - Training Site AT Complex-Phased Construction	$1,484	Miller(NC)	Camp Butner Training Site	Butner, NC
XXVI	MCARNG			Readiness Center (Assembly Hall/SRP)	$778	Bordallo(GU)	Guam National Guard	Barrigada, GU
XXVI	MCARNG			Readiness Center Add/Alt	$3,948	Kennedy(RI)	Rhode Island Army National Guard	Middletown, RI
XXVI	MCARNG			Regional Training Institute (RTI), Phase II	$2,334	Snyder(AR)	Camp Joseph T. Robinson	North Little Rock, AR
XXVI	MCARNG			Renewable Photovoltaic Solar Power, Ventura AFRC	$1,505	Capps(CA)	Ventura	Ventura, CA
XXVI	MCARNG			Ronkonkoma Flight Line Rehab	$2,780	Israel(NY)	Ronkonkoma Armory	Ronkonkoma, NY
XXVI	MCARNG			Sacramento Army Depot Field Maintenance Shop Paving	$916	Matsui(CA)	National Guard Sacramento Depot Activity	Sacramento, CA
XXVI	MCARNG			Simulation Center, Marseilles Training Area	$2,573	Halvorson(IL)	Marseilles Training Area	Marseilles, IL
XXVI	MCARNG			South Texas Training Center	$5,000	Cuellar(TX)	Texas Army National Guard	Tilden, TX
XXVI	MCARNG			South Texas Training Center	$5,000	Ortiz(TX)	Texas Army National Guard	Tilden, TX
XXVI	MCARNG			Tobyhanna Armed Forces Reserve Center	$1,513	Kanjorski(PA)	Tobyhanna	Tobyhanna, PA
XXVI	MCARNG			Watkins, CO Parachute Facility	$3,787	Salazar(CO)	Watkins	Watkins, CO
XXVI	MCARNG			Williamsport Field Maintenance Shop	$1,508	Carney(PA)	Williamsport, PA	Unknown, PA
XXVI	MCAFR			C-130 Flightline Operations Facility, Ph 1	$10,355	Slaughter(NY)	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station	Niagara Falls, NY

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

With respect to clause 3(c) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the committee under clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the general goal and objective of H.R. 5136 is to strengthen our national security through a sound and balanced strategy to provide the resources we need to sustain two wars today and to be prepared for the threats of tomorrow, whatever and wherever they may be. The bill achieves this goal through the following four objectives: strengthening our counterterrorism efforts; strengthening our missile defense; strengthening our nonproliferation efforts; and strengthening support for our service members and their families.

To strengthen our counterterrorism efforts, the bill fully supports the President's new counterinsurgency strategy in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, authorizing $159.3 billion for fiscal year 2011 overseas contingency operations to provide military commanders with the resources they need. It supports the President's strategy on both sides of the border, helping to strengthen our relationship with the Islamic Republic of Pakistan by expanding Coalition Support Funds, and it supports the President's efforts to strengthen strategic partnerships with other key nations, such as the Republic of Yemen. The bill also takes important steps to create a more comprehensive approach to counterterrorism, placing a greater emphasis on understanding the recruitment methods used by violent extremists and taking the necessary action to help prevent them. Additionally, the bill takes steps to improve force protection both domestically and abroad.

The bill takes unprecedented steps to strengthen missile defense, better aligning our missile defense policy to meet the threats of the 21st century. The bill provides support to the Phased, Adaptive Approach to missile defense. It authorizes $10.3 billion for ballistic missile defense, including $190.8 million for modifications to the PAC–3 Patriot missile program and $7.0 billion for the NNSA Weapons Activities account to support stockpile stewardship and management.

The bill strengthens our nonproliferation policy, fully supporting the President's efforts to secure vulnerable nuclear material around the world in four years. It authorizes $2.7 billion for the Department of Energy's nonproliferation programs, including $558.8 mil-

lion for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and $590.1 million for International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation.

To strengthen our military families, the bill provides an array of measures to provide better care and benefits to service members and their families. It includes a 1.9 percent pay raise to the troops, increases family separation allowance for service members who are deployed away from their families, increases hostile fire and imminent danger pay, and expands college loan repayment benefits. It also allows military families to extend TRICARE coverage to their dependent adult children until age twenty-six. It includes the most comprehensive legislative package, twenty eight provisions, to implement into law many of the recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault. It establishes two new pilot programs, one to offer an alternative career path to military officers, and the other to help military spouses identify and obtain desirable and portable careers.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to rule XIII, clause 3(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

Pursuant to clause (3)(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344):

(1) This legislation does not provide budget authority subject to an allocation made pursuant to section 302(b) of Public Law 93–344;

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Estimate included in this report pursuant to clause (3)(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives contains CBO's projection of how this legislation will affect the levels of budget authority, budget outlays, revenues, and tax expenditures for fiscal year 2011 and for the ensuring four fiscal years; and

(3) The CBO Estimate does not identify any new budget authority for assistance to state and local governments by this measure at the time that this report was filed.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

The committee finds that this legislation establishes the National Defense Panel in section 1051 of this Act, and the Sexual Assault Advisory Board in section 1621 of this Act, which may qualify as advisory committees within the definition of 5 U.S.C. App., section 5(b).

APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee finds that this legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104–1).

RECORD VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 5136. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 5136 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 59–0, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 10 **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: **Comptroller General review of conversion of DOD functions to performance by DOD civilian employees** **Offered by: Mr. Miller**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. McKeon	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Jones	x		
Mr. Reyes		x		Mr. Akin	x		
Dr. Snyder		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Miller	x		
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Wilson	x		
Mr. McIntyre		x		Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Brady		x		Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Andrews		x		Mr. Turner	x		
Mrs. Davis		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Langevin		x		Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Shuster	x		
Mr. Marshall		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Ms. Fallin	x		
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Sestak		x		Dr. Fleming	x		
Ms. Giffords		x		Mr. Coffman	x		
Ms. Tsongas		x		Mr. Rooney	x		
Mr. Nye		x		Mr. Platts	x		
Ms. Pingree		x					
Mr. Kissell		x					
Mr. Heinrich		x					
Mr. Kratovil		x					
Mr. Bright		x					
Mr. Murphy		x					
Mr. Owens		x					
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell		x					
Mr. Boren		x					
Mr. Johnson		x					

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	23	37	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 145 **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: **perfecting amendment to Coffman #78 - public release of restricted annex of DOD report of independent review of Ft. Hood, TX attack** **Offered by: Mr. Andrews**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Jones		x	
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. Akin		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Miller		x	
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Wilson		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Brady	x			Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Turner		x	
Mrs. Davis	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Langevin	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Marshall	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Ms. Fallin		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Sestak	x			Dr. Fleming		x	
Ms. Giffords	x			Mr. Coffman		x	
Ms. Tsongas	x			Mr. Rooney		x	
Mr. Nye				Mr. Platts		x	
Ms. Pingree	x						
Mr. Kissell	x						
Mr. Heinrich	x						
Mr. Kratovil	x						
Mr. Bright	x						
Mr. Murphy	x						
Mr. Owens	x						
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell	x						
Mr. Boren	x						
Mr. Johnson	x						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	34	25	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 149 **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: **substitute to Turner #102r** **Offered by: Mr. Larsen**

Sense of Congress relating to declaratory policy

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Taylor		x		Mr. Jones		x	
Mr. Reyes				Mr. Akin		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Miller		x	
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Wilson		x	
Mr. McIntyre		x		Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Brady				Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Turner		x	
Mrs. Davis	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Langevin	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Marshall	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Ms. Fallin		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Sestak	x			Dr. Fleming		x	
Ms. Giffords	x			Mr. Coffman		x	
Ms. Tsongas	x			Mr. Rooney		x	
Mr. Nye	x			Mr. Platts		x	
Ms. Pingree	x						
Mr. Kissell	x						
Mr. Heinrich	x						
Mr. Kratovil		x					
Mr. Bright		x					
Mr. Murphy	x						
Mr. Owens	x						
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell	x						
Mr. Boren		x					
Mr. Johnson	x						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	28	30	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 102r **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: **Sense of Congress on Nuclear Posture Review** **Offered by: Mr. Turner**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton		x		Mr. McKeon	x		
Mr. Spratt		x		Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Ortiz		x		Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Jones	x		
Mr. Reyes				Mr. Akin	x		
Dr. Snyder		x		Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Smith		x		Mr. Miller	x		
Ms. Sanchez		x		Mr. Wilson	x		
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Brady				Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Andrews		x		Mr. Turner	x		
Mrs. Davis		x		Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Langevin		x		Mr. Rogers	x		
Mr. Larsen		x		Mr. Franks	x		
Mr. Cooper		x		Mr. Shuster	x		
Mr. Marshall		x		Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	x		
Ms. Bordallo		x		Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Ellsworth		x		Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Courtney		x		Ms. Fallin	x		
Mr. Loebsack		x		Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Sestak		x		Dr. Fleming	x		
Ms. Giffords		x		Mr. Coffman	x		
Ms. Tsongas		x		Mr. Rooney	x		
Mr. Nye		x		Mr. Platts	x		
Ms. Pingree		x					
Mr. Kissell		x					
Mr. Heinrich		x					
Mr. Kratovil	x						
Mr. Bright	x						
Mr. Murphy		x					
Mr. Owens		x					
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell		x					
Mr. Boren	x						
Mr. Johnson		x					

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	30	28	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 169 **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: **substitute to Turner #100r homeland defense hedging policy** **Offered by: Mr. Langevin**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Jones		x	
Mr. Reyes				Mr. Akin		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Miller		x	
Ms. Sanchez				Mr. Wilson		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Brady				Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Turner		x	
Mrs. Davis	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Langevin	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Marshall	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Ms. Fallin		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Sestak	x			Dr. Fleming		x	
Ms. Giffords	x			Mr. Coffman		x	
Ms. Tsongas	x			Mr. Rooney		x	
Mr. Nye	x			Mr. Platts		x	
Ms. Pingree	x						
Mr. Kissell	x						
Mr. Heinrich	x						
Mr. Kratovil	x						
Mr. Bright	x						
Mr. Murphy	x						
Mr. Owens	x						
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell	x						
Mr. Boren	x						
Mr. Johnson	x						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	32	25	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 161 **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: **2nd degree to Skelton #162 substitute to Forbes #21** **Offered by: Mr. Andrews**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Jones		x	
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. Akin		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Miller		x	
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Wilson		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Brady				Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Turner		x	
Mrs. Davis	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Langevin	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Marshall	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Ms. Fallin		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Sestak	x			Dr. Fleming		x	
Ms. Giffords	x			Mr. Coffman		x	
Ms. Tsongas	x			Mr. Rooney		x	
Mr. Nye	x			Mr. Platts		x	
Ms. Pingree	x						
Mr. Kissell	x						
Mr. Heinrich	x						
Mr. Kratovil	x						
Mr. Bright		x					
Mr. Murphy		x					
Mr. Owens	x						
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell	x						
Mr. Boren	x						
Mr. Johnson	x						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	31	28	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 162 **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: substitute to Forbes #21 **Offered by: Mr. Skelton**

prohibition on use of funds to transfer detainees from Guantanamo Bay Cuba, to United States

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. McKeon		x	
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Bartlett		x	
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. Thornberry		x	
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Jones		x	
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. Akin		x	
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Forbes		x	
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Miller		x	
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Wilson		x	
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. LoBiondo		x	
Mr. Brady				Mr. Bishop		x	
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Turner		x	
Mrs. Davis	x			Mr. Kline		x	
Mr. Langevin	x			Mr. Rogers		x	
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Franks		x	
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Shuster		x	
Mr. Marshall	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers		x	
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Conaway		x	
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Lamborn		x	
Ms. Shea-Porter		x		Mr. Wittman		x	
Mr. Courtney	x			Ms. Fallin		x	
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Hunter		x	
Mr. Sestak	x			Dr. Fleming		x	
Ms. Giffords	x			Mr. Coffman		x	
Ms. Tsongas	x			Mr. Rooney		x	
Mr. Nye	x			Mr. Platts		x	
Ms. Pingree	x						
Mr. Kissell	x						
Mr. Heinrich	x						
Mr. Kratovil	x						
Mr. Bright		x					
Mr. Murphy	x						
Mr. Owens	x						
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell	x						
Mr. Boren		x					
Mr. Johnson	x						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	31	28	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
111TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # **Date: May 19, 2010**

Description: **Final passage of H.R. 5136 and order to be reported, as amended** **Offered by:**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Skelton	x			Mr. McKeon	x		
Mr. Spratt	x			Mr. Bartlett	x		
Mr. Ortiz	x			Mr. Thornberry	x		
Mr. Taylor	x			Mr. Jones	x		
Mr. Reyes	x			Mr. Akin	x		
Dr. Snyder	x			Mr. Forbes	x		
Mr. Smith	x			Mr. Miller	x		
Ms. Sanchez	x			Mr. Wilson	x		
Mr. McIntyre	x			Mr. LoBiondo	x		
Mr. Brady				Mr. Bishop	x		
Mr. Andrews	x			Mr. Turner	x		
Mrs. Davis	x			Mr. Kline	x		
Mr. Langevin	x			Mr. Rogers	x		
Mr. Larsen	x			Mr. Franks	x		
Mr. Cooper	x			Mr. Shuster	x		
Mr. Marshall	x			Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	x		
Ms. Bordallo	x			Mr. Conaway	x		
Mr. Ellsworth	x			Mr. Lamborn	x		
Ms. Shea-Porter	x			Mr. Wittman	x		
Mr. Courtney	x			Ms. Fallin	x		
Mr. Loebsack	x			Mr. Hunter	x		
Mr. Sestak	x			Dr. Fleming	x		
Ms. Giffords	x			Mr. Coffman	x		
Ms. Tsongas	x			Mr. Rooney	x		
Mr. Nye	x			Mr. Platts	x		
Ms. Pingree	x						
Mr. Kissell	x						
Mr. Heinrich	x						
Mr. Kratovil	x						
Mr. Bright	x						
Mr. Murphy	x						
Mr. Owens	x						
Mr. Garamendi							
Mr. Boswell	x						
Mr. Boren	x						
Mr. Johnson	x						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	59	0	

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee has taken steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and will make the analysis available as soon as possible.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JIM MARSHALL

On February 24, 2010, Members of the Readiness Subcommittee received testimony on energy management and initiatives on military installations. As the Department continues to embark on independent energy initiatives, I remain concerned that it is not adequately taking into account the possibility of installing small nuclear reactors on military installations that are hardened against electromagnetic pulse (EMP) and cyber attacks.

In the FY10 NDAA, I inserted Directive Report Language (Sec. 2845 in the Conference Report) requiring the Secretary of Defense to study the development of nuclear power plants on military installations. That report is still pending.

I believe the DOD should slow down its non-nuclear independent energy initiatives, which remain vulnerable to EMP and cyber attack, while giving closer look to developing small, hardened nuclear power plants on military installations so that we have completely self-sufficient energy in the event of a catastrophic disruption to our power supply. Should such an event occur, the DOD must, beyond continuing to carry out its mission, be ready to provide power, not just services, to affected communities. At this point, wind turbines, solar, et cetera, cannot be hardened against EMP, and it's frankly the EMP attack that we're most vulnerable to here in the United States, the results of which would be disastrous should we not be prepared.

Therefore, I included language in the FY11 NDAA requiring the Comptroller General to review assessments of the threat of EMP and cyber attack on DOD infrastructure, identify DOD programs or activities to mitigate the threat, and assess the extent to which the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program has incorporated this threat into its risk assessment methodology. The review shall consider the progress, findings, and recommendations of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, including the degree to which the commission is evaluating the utility of hardened small nuclear reactors. The review shall also consider the degree to which DOD's decision making process for energy generation projects considers energy security requirements.

Additionally, I remain concerned about the DOD's plan for the defense of our homeland against ballistic missile threats, including EMP attacks, particularly from missiles launched by rogue, non-state actors. These rogue actors will likely not launch from land, which would be easily traceable and result in our rapid, devastating response against its host country. Instead, it's more likely that terrorists would launch a ballistic missile from the sea. The missile and launch platform need not be particularly sophisticated for an EMP attack. And if the launch platform is a ship, it could be immediately scuttled, making it difficult or impossible to deter-

mine the origin of the weapon and greatly limiting the effectiveness of retaliatory deterrence. This concern prompted my bill language requiring an independent assessment of the plan to defend the homeland against the mobile and fixed threats of ballistic missiles from rogue, non-state actors and accidental or unauthorized launches.

JIM MARSHALL.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We support H.R. 5136 and believe that it reflects our committee's strong and continued support for the brave men and women of the United States armed services. In many ways, this bill is a good bill that does an admirable job dealing with some of our greatest national security challenges.

H.R. 5136 authorizes the President's request for $567 billion for the Fiscal Year 2011 base budget of the Department of Defense and national security programs of the Department of Energy. Additionally, it includes $159 billion to fund Fiscal Year 2011 war costs in Iraq and Afghanistan, and $34 billion for Fiscal Year 2010 emergency supplemental funding to cover additional costs related to the increased effort in Afghanistan and the DOD response to the earthquake in Haiti.

While there are many excellent initiatives in this bill, this remains imperfect legislation.

Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Yemen

With respect to Afghanistan, this bill updates reporting requirements, including asking for the conditions and criteria that will be used to measure progress, instead of allowing the ticking Washington political clock to determine our end state. We are very pleased that the Chairman and our colleagues on the committee joined us in ensuring that life-saving combat enablers—such as force protection, Medical Evacuation, and Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities—are deployed in time to fully support the 30,000 additional troops scheduled to arrive in Afghanistan by this summer.

This provision, along with a reporting requirement on how the Department of Defense is addressing the indirect fire threat on U.S. Forward Operating Bases (FOBs) in Afghanistan, are only first steps to supporting General McChrystal and our deployed troops. But they are important first steps in getting the resources to theater so our troops can accomplish their mission with the least possible risk.

With respect to Pakistan, the bill includes and we support the Administration's request to extend the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) for another year. We continue to question the rationale behind moving the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCCF) to the State Department, especially when DOD has proven its ability to execute similar programs in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are happy to see that this committee will continue to monitor the management of PCCF so we can ensure the Commander of the United States Central Command (CENTCOM) has the flexibility and speed he needs to train and equip Pakistani security forces.

As in previous bills, the committee continues to address the Department's global train and equip authorities. We have worked to-

gether to ensure these authorities allow the Department to get ahead of our most important national security challenges. We commend the Chairman for working to ensure that 1206 funds will be used to assist the Yemen counter-terrorism unit fight al Qaeda in the Arabia Peninsula. This reinforces our view that building partnership capacity programs is an essential tool for Combatant Commanders.

Detainees and the Detention Facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

With respect to detainee policy, this legislation could have taken a stronger stand on preventing the transfer of terrorists detained at Guantanamo Bay into the United States—either for confinement or trial. Too many former Guantanamo detainees have returned to the battlefield and are actively trying to harm Americans. We need to keep terrorists off of our soil, not fight to get them here. We are disappointed the committee did not support our amendment that would have prevented the transfer of any Guantanamo Bay detainee to U.S. soil.

We were pleased that the committee adopted a modified version of our amendment that would require the DOD Inspector General to investigate possible misconduct of detainee attorneys, but are disappointed that the Attorney General would retain veto authority over the commencement of such investigations. In our view, these investigations need to commence immediately.

Nuclear Posture

Similarly, this bill could have taken prudent steps to ensure we defend America from a position of strength, rather than a position of weakness. With respect to Iran, we continue to see Tehran flout its international obligation not to pursue nuclear weapons, while the Administration continues to rely on possible U.N. sanctions and an engagement strategy that has not yielded results. Requiring the Department of Defense to engage in robust strategic planning will only serve to strengthen our Iran policy.

In the nuclear policy arena, we need to adopt policies that strengthen our security, not disarm it. Time and time again our nuclear forces have protected our shores by acting as a clear deterrent to our adversaries. The administration's recent Nuclear Posture Review changes our nation's long-standing policy of calculated ambiguity to a policy that takes options off the table in protecting the United States and our allies from potential aggressors.

In that regard, we are gratified that the committee adopted our amendment that our national policy should be to keep all our strategic response options open, and not foreclose use of our nuclear deterrent without regard to the potential actions of our foes. Similarly, we are pleased that the committee adopted language restricting future reductions in our nuclear forces until certain reviews and certifications are made. The committee is sending a strong message to the administration that we have grave concerns about the changes it is making to America's nuclear policies. We hope nuclear weapons are never employed again; nonetheless, we firmly believe a credible and reliable nuclear deterrent, combined with our past determination to keep all options open, has provided the citi-

zens of the United States protection for decades and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

Missile Defense

Likewise, our missile defense policies must support the design and deployment of a comprehensive missile defense system capable of protecting the U.S. homeland, our deployed military forces, and our allies. We are pleased the committee supported a $361.6 million increase to missile defense. We argued that such a topline increase was necessary to implement the administration's myriad missile defense commitments which include: sustainment of our homeland defense capabilities, implementation of the new phased adaptive approach for missile defense in Europe, expanded missile defense inventories, increasing testing, strengthening international efforts, and continuing promising research and development such as directed energy technology.

The committee endorsed our effort to clarify that the Congress expects there to be no limitations on missile defense in Europe resulting from ratification of the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, despite Russian statements to the contrary.

We are prepared to support the administration's new phased adaptive approach (PAA) for missile defense in Europe. However, we must have confidence that the plans are credible. We remain concerned about the lack of information and analysis on the PAA, and were pleased the committee supported our demand for a detailed report on the PAA. Furthermore, we remain concerned that the Administration's hedging strategy may not go far enough to provide protection of the U.S. homeland. The PAA is not planned to cover the United States until 2020, yet the ICBM threat from Iran could materialize as early as 2015 according to the latest intelligence assessments. We need to ensure continued investments in and enhancements to our homeland defense capabilities, and were therefore disappointed that the committee rejected our amendment to maintain and refurbish a ground-based missile defense field in Alaska to increase near-term protection of the United States.

Quadrennial Defense Review

While the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) has taken many forms over the years, it has become the most important periodic national security community review of our defense strategy. We all agree that our defense strategy should be driven by our defense needs—not solely by the budget. Yet, the Administration sent to Congress a QDR that provided the force structure of 2009 instead of a projected force structure to defeat the threats of 2029, as required by the statute. We need to take additional steps to reshape the Department of Defense's Quadrennial Defense Review, which was designed to forecast future threats and shape the Pentagon's investment decisions to meet those challenges.

We are pleased the committee adopted several amendments that address our concerns with the most recent QDR. These include amendments that would require the Department of Defense to: provide a comprehensive review of national defense requirements without regard to budget considerations in future QDRs; provide a

strategic assessment on the current and future strategic challenges posed to the United States by potential competitors out to 2021; as well as deliver a report on the military's capability to defend against advanced anti access capabilities of potential hostile countries.

Major Weapons Programs

We are troubled that the legislation largely supports the administration's continued limited approach to procurement of proven major weapons systems such as the F–22 and the C–17. Even so, we are pleased that the committee adopted our amendment for the procurement of eight additional F–18 Super Hornets for the Navy to help close the long acknowledged strike fighter shortfall.

We are very pleased that the bill includes a provision that holds the Department of Defense accountable for performance of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program as they implement plans to restructure the program and increase production rates. We also strongly support the inclusion of funding to complete development of the F136 alternative engine for the Joint Strike Fighter. We are concerned that the Department of Defense would elect to procure several thousand F–35 engines over the next 25 years at a life cycle cost of well over $100 billion through a sole source contract. This bill continues to support long-standing Congressional belief that a competitive engine development program would better ensure an affordable, reliable engine, and protect against the operational risk of having 95 percent of the entire U.S. fighter fleet dependent on one engine.

Other commendable initiatives in this bill include provisions that make significant contributions to the National Guard and Reserve Equipment account and takes steps to address many of the unfunded requests of the Services Chiefs.

Military Personnel

Finally, we need to take additional steps to ensure our military personnel and their families receive the support they have earned. Foremost, the bill addresses many of this committee's priorities in supporting the men and women of the Armed Forces, their spouses and families. Among the important measures contained in that report are a 1.9% basic pay raise. We are pleased that the chairman and the committee supported making it clear that the Secretary of Defense has sole authority over military health care and the TRICARE program. A major disappointment is that once again the committee and House leadership were unable to find the mandatory spending offsets needed to eliminate the Widow's Tax—a tax that occurs because survivors must forfeit most or all of their Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity to receive Dependency Indemnity Compensation. Nor were we able to provide for concurrent receipt of military disability retired pay and VA disability pay, as proposed by the President.

We know that the chairman has attempted to find the offsets, but so far, despite the House approval of trillions in spending that is not offset, this body has been unable or unwilling to find the means to support widows and disabled veterans.

Fort Hood

We are pleased the committee adopted our amendment that would provide combat zone benefits to the military and DOD civilian employee victims of the Fort Hood shootings. In the event of the unfortunate real possibility of future heinous attacks occurring outside designated combat zones, the amendment also provides the Secretary of Defense authority to make similar payments without need of future legislation. We are, however, deeply disappointed that the committee refused to require the public release of the restricted annex to the review of the Fort Hood shootings. American citizens need to know why a U.S. Army officer chose to murder and wound defenseless soldiers and civilians. So far, despite widespread reporting of the incident, this committee unfortunately has chosen to side with the Administration to keep the full facts from the American public.

While this bill does much to fulfill our Constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, particularly with respect to providing for the current needs of our deserving men and women in uniform, we have some ways to go in preparing for dire threats maturing in the very near future. We have accomplished much, and have much left to do. We join all members of this proud committee to continue to work for the betterment of our Armed Forces to secure America's future.

Those who serve—and will serve in years to come—deserve our commitment to keep America strong and preserve America's preeminent leadership role in the world.

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON.
BILL SHUSTER.
MIKE ROGERS.
DOUG LAMBORN.
MICHAEL R. TURNER.
MIKE COFFMAN.
MARY FALLIN.
CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.
JOHN FLEMING.
ROSCOE BARTLETT.
FRANK LOBIONDO.
J. RANDY FORBES.
W. TODD AKIN.
ROB BISHOP.
JOE WILSON.
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY.
THOMAS ROONEY.
DUNCAN D. HUNTER.
ROBERT J. WITTMAN.
JOHN KLINE.
TODD R. PLATTS.
MAC THORNBERRY.
TRENT FRANKS.
JEFF MILLER.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL R. TURNER

Thank you Chairman Skelton and Chairman Ortiz for including my directive report language within the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

The language directs the Secretary of Defense to report on how to best leverage the Sensors Center of Excellence (CoE) at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base established by the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure. The Center, its associated radars, and the Air Force Research Laboratory's ongoing research in detect, sense and avoid technologies creates a unique capability and opportunity for the Air Force and our Nation. The Center, as initially discussed with the Air Force, could be utilized to leverage untapped assets in Southwest Ohio, such as the Wilmington Air Park, and the Brush Creek and Buckeye Military Operating Areas.

Furthermore, its proximity to the National Air and Space Intelligence Center uniquely qualifies the Sensors Center of Excellence to make a significant contribution in development of capabilities essential for our Nation. The U.S. military already relies on these capabilities in conflicts we are addressing today and the civilian world could use them in the near future to facilitate their tasks, including law enforcement or border patrol. Therefore, I believe that the Pentagon as well as other entities will greatly benefit from the study my language mandates.

Once again, I'd like to thank the Chairman and the committee for including this provision in the report language.

MICHAEL R. TURNER.