AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

113TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
113–102

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1960

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

JUNE 7, 2013.—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 2014

113TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
113–102

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1960

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

JUNE 7, 2013.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81–321 WASHINGTON : 2013

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California, *Chairman*

MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
E. SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
MO BROOKS, Alabama
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota
PAUL COOK, California
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana

ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
JOHN GARAMENDI, California
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
COLLEEN W. HANABUSA, Hawaii
JACKIE SPEIER, California
RON BARBER, Arizona
ANDRÉ CARSON, Indiana
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
DANIEL B. MAFFEI, New York
DEREK KILMER, Washington
JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
SCOTT H. PETERS, California
WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas
MARC A. VEASEY, Texas

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Legislation	1
Rationale for the Committee Bill	2
Hearings	10
Committee Position	10
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	10
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	10
Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill	10
Budget Authority Implication	11
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	13
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	13
OVERVIEW	13
Aircraft Procurement, Army	13
Overview	13
Items of Special Interest	13
Apache helicopter transmission	13
Lightweight combat medical evacuation systems	14
UH–72 Light Utility Helicopter	14
Missile Procurement, Army	15
Overview	15
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	15
Overview	15
Items of Special Interest	15
Armor Brigade Combat Team force structure and industrial base	15
Abrams tank upgrades	16
Bradley fighting vehicle and transmission upgrades	17
Improved recovery vehicle	18
Carbine program	18
M9 product improvement strategy	19
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	19
Overview	19
Items of Special Interest	19
Acquisition strategy for 40mm ammunition	19
Other Procurement, Army	20
Overview	20
Items of Special Interest	20
Army unmanned ground vehicle upgrades	20
Civil Support Team information management needs	20
Criteria on the Recertification and Quantity of GEM-Ts	21
Gunshot detection systems	21
Joint Tactical Radio System Manpack radio production strategy	21
Patriot Modernization Costs	22
Personal protection equipment acquisition strategy	24
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	25
F/A–18E/F advance procurement	25
MQ–8 Fire Scout	25
Weapons Procurement, Navy	26
Overview	26
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	26
Overview	26
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	26
Overview	26
Items of Special Interest	26

Page

Air and Missile Defense Radar deployment on naval vessels 26
Joint High Speed Vessel report 27
Littoral Combat Ship radar capabilities 28
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) oversight 28
Long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels 29
Navy Close-in Weapon System (CIWS) modernization 30
Navy fleet oilers 30
Use of fixed-price incentive fee contracts for ship construction contracts 30
Other Procurement, Navy 31
Overview 31
Procurement, Marine Corps 31
Overview 31
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 31
Overview 31
Items of Special Interest 32
A–10 oxygen delivery systems modernization 32
B–52 Bomber modernization programs 32
Battlefield airborne communications node 33
C–130H Avionics and Propulsion System Modernization and Upgrade Programs 33
Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft 34
MQ–9 Reaper remotely piloted aircraft 35
Upgraded ejection seats 36
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 36
Overview 36
Missile Procurement, Air Force 36
Overview 36
Other Procurement, Air Force 37
Overview 37
Items of Special Interest 37
Remotely Piloted Aircraft Squadron Operations Centers for the Air National Guard 37
Procurement, Defense-Wide 37
Overview 37
Items of Special Interest 37
Concurrent fielding of equipment for the Army National Guard and Air National Guard 37
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund 39
Multiyear procurement authority for ground-based interceptors 39
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 40
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 40
Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations 40
Subtitle B—Army Programs 40
Section 111—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Stryker Vehicle Program 40
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 40
Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for E–2D Aircraft Program 40
Section 122—Cost Limitation for CVN–78 Aircraft Carriers 40
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 41
Section 131—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Multiple Variants of the C–130J Aircraft Program 41
Section 132—Prohibition on Cancellation or Modification of Avionics Modernization Program for C–130 Aircraft 41
Section 133—Retirement of KC–135R Aircraft 41
Section 134—Competition for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Providers 41
Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters 42
Section 141—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Ground-based Interceptors 42
Section 142—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Tactical Wheeled Vehicles 42
Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of RQ–4 Global Hawk Unmanned Aircraft Systems 42
Section 144—Personal Protection Equipment Procurement 42
Section 145—Repeal of Certain F–35 Reporting Requirements 43

Page

Section 146—Study on Procurement of Personal Protection Equipment . 43
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 43
OVERVIEW 43
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army 43
Overview 43
Items of Special Interest 43
Active protection system research and development 43
Army advanced multi-purpose tank round program 44
Army air and missile defense 44
Army cargo unmanned aerial system 44
Army directed energy testing 45
Army modernization strategy for tactical communications waveforms 45
Combat vehicle fuel efficiency engine development 46
Continued development of vehicle underbody protection systems 46
Fabric-based respiratory protective equipment 46
Improved turbine engine program 47
Innovative approaches in wound care research 47
Joint Air-to-Ground Missile program 48
Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System 48
M4 Carbine powered rail system 49
Man-portable electronic warfare 49
Modeling and simulation for advanced materials 50
Modular protective systems for wheeled vehicles 50
Multi-mission electronic warfare 51
Nano-scale electronics and materials 51
Night vision systems engineering development 51
Regenerative and rehabilitative engineering 52
Stryker survivability systems integration program 52
Tactical vehicle armor development program 53
Thermal injury protection in combat and tactical vehicles 53
Third generation forward-looking infrared sensors 54
Ultra Lightweight Reconnaissance Robotic capability 54
Use of simulation technology in medical training 54
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy 55
Overview 55
Items of Special Interest 55
Acoustic intelligence collection capability 55
Augmentation of ultra high frequency communications satellite systems using near space technologies 55
Carrier-based unmanned air vehicle system testing and development 56
Cognitive wireless networks for naval applications 56
Marine Corps unmanned airborne electronic attack systems 57
Maritime Laser Weapon System 57
Multi-Stage Supersonic Target development program 58
Offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development 58
Precision Extended Range Munition Program 59
Prepositioned expeditionary assistance kits 60
Service Life Extension of Navy Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research vessels 60
Unmanned Underwater Vehicle 61
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force 61
Overview 61
Items of Special Interest 61
Adaptive engine technology development 61
Aircraft engine component laser peening 62
F–35 aircraft program 62
Global Positioning System Next Generation Operational Control System 63
Hypersonic test facilities 63
In-space solar electric propulsion 64
Joint Space Operations Center Mission System 64
Joint surveillance target attack radar system 65
Liquid rocket engine technology 65
Metals Affordability Initiative 66
Operationally Responsive Space 66
Overhead persistent infrared processing and exploitation 67

Page

Secure wireless networking applications 68
Sense and avoid research for MQ–1 and MQ–9 remotely piloted aircraft 68
Space Fence 68
Trusted autonomy for unmanned aerial systems 69
Unmanned aerial systems development 69
Wide area surveillance strategy 70
Wideband Global Satellite communications 70
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 71
Overview 71
Items of Special Interest 71
Advanced sensor application program 71
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System 72
Request for multi-year procurement authority for Standard Missile–3 Block IB beginning in FY15 72
Service Life Extension Program for Standard Missile-3 Block IA missile interceptor 72
Standard Missile 3 Block IB ballistic missile interceptor 73
Airborne weapons layer 73
Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance Model 2 Radars 74
Ballistic Missile Defense Technology 74
Missile defense directed energy application development 74
Solid Divert and Attitude Control System 75
Ballistic missile threat analysis 75
Common Kill Vehicle for missile defense 75
Conventional Prompt Global Strike 76
Defense Science Board recommendations on Deterrent Response Capabilities 77
Defense research in remote sensing 78
Detection and threat identification technologies 78
Distributed Common Ground System enterprise 79
Electro Magnetic Rail Gun for Missile Defense 79
Enhancing participation at minority-serving universities and institutions 80
Foreign directed energy threats to U.S. military systems 81
Future missile defense sensor architectures 82
Ground-based midcourse defense system 82
East Coast missile defense site 83
Fort Greely Missile Field 1 84
Two-stage Interceptor for Ground-based Midcourse Defense 84
High-powered microwave applications 84
Highly integrated photonics 85
Human-computer interaction 85
Improving military medical innovation 86
Individual equipment for female service members 86
Inner-aural communications hearing protection capability development 87
Iron Dome short-range rocket defense 87
Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Systems 88
Medical research information sharing 88
Microscale liquid plasmas 88
Missile defense cooperation with Japan 89
Mitochondrial research 90
Modeling and simulation concurrency 90
Modeling and simulation grand challenges 90
National Defense Education Program 91
Next generation Aegis missile—Standard Missile 3 block IIB 92
Non-Lethal directed energy applications 92
Non-profit research institutions 93
Open architecture systems 93
Potential missile defense cooperation with the Republic of Korea 94
Precision Tracking Space System 95
Quantum information science 95
Report on boost phase missile defense options 96
Report on HALT/HASS Testing of Ballistic Missile Defense Systems and Components 96
Ribonucleic acid technology research 97

Page
Soft biometrics for non-cooperative identification of personnel 97
Special operations technology development 98
Standardization of directed energy weapon systems characterization . 98
Synthetic protein development 99
Technology harvesting of the Medium Extended Air Defense System . 99
Tele-medicine applications for ophthalmic injury 100
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense System 100
Three dimensional integrated circuits 101
U.S. Special Operations Command undersea systems strategy 101
Vertical Lift Consortium 101
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense 102
Overview 102
Items of Special Interest 102
Assessment of the Army Distributed Common Ground System 102
Test and evaluation capabilities for electromagnetic pulse vulnerabilities 103
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 103
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 103
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 103
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 104
Section 211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Ground Combat Vehicle Engineering and Manufacturing Phase 104
Section 212—Limitation on Milestone A Activities for Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike System Program 104
Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Air Force Logistics Transformation 104
Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defensive Cyberspace Operations of the Air Force 105
Section 215—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Precision Extended Range Munition Program 105
Section 216—Limitation on the Availability of Funds for the Program Manager for Biometrics of the Department of Defense 105
Section 217—Unmanned Combat Air System Demonstration Testing Requirement 105
Section 218—Long-Range Standoff Weapon Requirement 105
Section 219—Review of Software Development for F–35 Aircraft 105
Section 220—Evaluation and Assessment of the Distributed Common Ground Station 106
Section 221—Requirement to Complete Individual Carbine Testing 106
Section 222—Establishment of Funding Line and Fielding Plan for Navy Laser Weapon System 106
Section 223—Sense of Congress on Importance of Aligning Common Missile Compartment of Ohio-Class Replacement Program with the United Kingdom's Vanguard Successor Program 106
Section 224—Sense of Congress on Counter-electronics High Power Microwave Missile Project 107
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs 107
Section 231—Prohibition on Use of Funds For MEADS Program 107
Section 232—Additional Missile Defense Site in the United States for Optimized Protection of the Homeland 107
Section 233—Limitation on Removal of Missile Defense Equipment from East Asia 108
Section 234—Improvements to Acquisition Accountability Reports on Ballistic Missile Defense System 108
Section 235—Analysis of Alternatives for Successor to Precision Tracking Space System 108
Section 236—Plan To Improve Organic Kill Assessment Capability of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System 108
Section 237—Availability of Funds for Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense Program 109
Section 238—NATO and the Phased, Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense in Europe 109
Section 239—Sense of Congress on Procurement of Capability Enhancement II Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle 109
Section 240—Sense of Congress on 30th Anniversary of the Strategic Defense Initiative 109
Subtitle D—Reports 110

Page

Section 251—Annual Comptroller General Report on the Amphibious Combat Vehicle Acquisition Program 110
Section 252—Report on Strategy To Improve Body Armor 110
Section 253—Report on Main Battle Tank Fuel Efficiency Initiative 110
Section 254—Report on Powered Rail System 110
Subtitle E—Other Matters 111
Section 261—Establishment of Cryptographic Modernization Review and Advisory Board 111
Section 262—Clarification of Eligibility of a State to Participate in Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research 111
Section 263—Extension and Expansion of Mechanisms to Provide Funds for Defense Laboratories for Research and Development of Technologies for Military Missions 111
Section 264—Extension of Authority to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements 111
Section 265—Five-Year Extension of Pilot Program to Include Technology Protection Features During Research and Development of Certain Defense Systems 111
Section 266—Briefing on Power and Energy Research Conducted at University Affiliated Research Centers 111
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 112
OVERVIEW 112
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 113
Budget Request Adjustments 113
Office of Economic Adjustment 113
Logistics and Sustainment Issues 114
Air Force Fuel Leak Maintenance Efficiencies 114
Anti-corrosion Protective Covers for Military Hardware 114
Army Logisticians 115
Comptroller General Littoral Combat System Sustainment Review 115
Continuous Technology Refreshment 116
Defense Logistics Agency Roles and Missions Assessment 116
Disposition of Retrograded Equipment from Afghanistan 117
F–35 Sustainment Plan 118
Item Unique Identification and Automated Information and Data Capture 119
Laser Peening Technology 119
Logistical Support to the Department of Defense 120
Long-term Investment Plan for Land, Facilities, and Equipment of Former Guam Ship Repair Facility 120
Navy Fleet Readiness 121
Submarine Propeller Repair and Overhaul 121
Readiness Issues 122
Advanced Situational Awareness Training 122
Combat Training Centers 122
Comptroller General Encroachment Study 122
GAO Review of DOD Readiness and Risks 124
Identification of Foreign-Language Competency 125
Missile Defense Capabilities for Guam 125
Navy Expeditionary Combat Command 126
Military Ocean Terminal Concord 126
Report on Career Progression of U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps Advisory Personnel 127
Sustainable Range Planning 128
Water Egress Training 128
Other Matters 129
Concerns Related to Fuel Rate Determinations 129
Department of Defense Travel Restrictions 130
Navy Arctic Roadmap 130
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters 131
Operations and Maintenance of the Ballistic Missile Defense System 131
Weather Data and Modeling 131
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 132
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 132
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 132
Subtitle B—Energy and Environment 132

Page

Section 311—Deadline for Submission of Reports on Proposed Budgets for Activities Relating to Operational Energy Strategy 132
Section 312—Facilitation of Interagency Cooperation in Conservation Programs of the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and Interior to Avoid or Reduce Adverse Impacts on Military Readiness Activities 132
Section 313—Reauthorization of Sikes Act 132
Section 314—Cooperative Agreements Under Sikes Act for Land Management Related to Department of Defense Readiness Activities 133
Section 315—Exclusions from Definition of "Chemical Substance" under Toxic Substances Control Act 133
Section 316—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement 133
Section 317—Clarification of Prohibition on Disposing of Waste in Open-Air Burn Pits 133
Section 318—Limitation on Plan, Design, Refurbishing, or Construction of Biofuels Refineries 133
Section 319—Limitation on Procurement of Biofuels 133
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment 134
Section 321—Littoral Combat Ship Strategic Sustainment Plan 134
Section 322—Review of Critical Manufacturing Capabilities within Army Arsenals 134
Section 323—Inclusion of Army Arsenals Capabilities in Solicitations ... 134
Subtitle D—Reports 134
Section 331—Additional Reporting Requirements Relating to Personnel and Unit Readiness 134
Section 332—Repeal of Annual Comptroller General Report on Army Progress 135
Section 333—Revision to Requirement for Annual Submission of Information Regarding Information Technology Capital Assets 135
Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority 135
Section 341—Limitation on Reduction of Force Structure at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores 135
Section 342—Prohibition on Performance of Department of Defense Flight Demonstration Teams Outside the United States 136
Subtitle F—Other Matters 136
Section 351—Requirement to Establish Policy on Joint Combat Uniforms 136
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 136
OVERVIEW 136
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 137
Operational Reserves 137
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 137
Subtitle A—Active Forces 137
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 137
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels 138
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 138
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 138
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 138
Section 413— End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 139
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2014 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians 139
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support 140
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 140
Section 421—Military Personnel 140
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 140
OVERVIEW 140
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 141
Air Force Education Programs 141
Assessing the Trend in Costs of General and Flag Officers on Active Duty 142
Clarification of Conferees Statement on the Assignments of Military Officers as Academic Instructors at Military Service Academies as Joint Duty Assignments 142
Community-Based Youth Organizations 143

Page

Comptroller General Review of Recommendations to Prevent Sexual Misconduct at Lackland Air Force Base and Other Basic and Technical Training Facilities 143
Consistency Among Exceptional Family Member Programs 144
Disposition of Remains by Host Nations 144
Domestic Violence and Child Abuse 145
Department of Defense Efforts to Ensure Operation of Current Prohibition on Accrual of Interest on Direct Student Loans of Members of the Armed Forces Receiving Imminent Danger Pay 145
Foreign Exchange Program for Reserve Officer Training Corps Cadets and Critical Military Language Training 145
Fully Burdened Life Cycle Cost of Military Personnel 146
Mental Health Professional on a Physical Evaluation Board 147
National Support for Service Members, Veterans, Retirees and their Families 147
Navy Sea Cadet Corps Sustainment 148
Relocation Assistance Program Resource Access Review 148
Reserve Component Temporary Duty Assignments 148
Review of Programs for Male Victims of Sexual Assault in the U.S. Military 149
Suicides and Military Families 149
Support for the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children 150
Transition Assistance Program 150
Tuition Assistance 150
U.S. Special Operations Command Educational Initiatives 151
Use of Radio in Department of Defense Advertising 151
Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program 152
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 152
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally 152
Section 501—Limitations on Number of General and Flag Officers on Active Duty 152
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 153
Section 511—Minimum Notification Requirements for Members of Reserve Components Before Deployment or Cancellation of Deployment Related to a Contingency Operation 153
Section 512—Information to be Provided to Boards Considering Officers for Selective Early Removal from Reserve Active-Status List 153
Section 513—Temporary Authority to Maintain Active Status and Inactive Status Lists of Members in the Inactive National Guard 153
Section 514—Review of Requirements and Authorizations for Reserve Component General and Flag Officers in an Active Status 154
Section 515—Feasibility Study on Establishing a Unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 154
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities 154
Section 521—Review of Integrated Disability Evaluation System 154
Section 522—Compliance Requirements for Organizational Climate Assessments 154
Section 523—Command Responsibility and Accountability for Remains of Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps Who Die Outside the United States 155
Section 524—Contents of Transition Assistance Program 155
Section 525—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel Decisions Relating to Correction of Military Records 155
Section 526—Establishment And Use of Consistent Definition of Gender-Neutral Occupational Standard For Military Career Designators . 155
Section 527—Expansion and Enhancement of Authorities Relating to Protected Communications of Members of The Armed Forces and Prohibited Retaliatory Actions 156
Section 528—Applicability of Medical Examination Requirement Regarding Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Traumatic Brain Injury to Proceedings Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice 156
Section 529—Protection of the Religious Freedom of Military Chaplains to Close a Prayer Outside of a Religious Service According to the Traditions, Expressions, and Religious Exercises of the Endorsing Faith Group 156

Page

Section 530—Expansion and Implementation of Protections of Rights of Conscience of Members of the Armed Forces and Chaplains of Such Members 156
Section 530A—Service Members' Accountability, Rights, and Responsibilities Training 157
Section 530B—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Review of Separation of Members of the Armed Forces who Made Unrestricted Reports of Sexual Assault. 157
Section 530C—Report on Data and Information Collected in Connection with Department of Defense Review of Laws, Policies, and Regulations Restricting Service of Female Members of the Armed Forces 157
Section 530D—Sense of Congress Regarding the Women in Service Implementation Plan 157
Subtitle D—Military Justice and Legal Matters, Including Sexual Assault Prevention and Response 158
Section 531—Limitations on Convening Authority Discretion Regarding Court-Martial Findings and Sentence 158
Section 532—Elimination of Five-Year Statute of Limitations on Trial By Court-Martial for Additional Offenses Involving Sex-Related Crimes 158
Section 533—Discharge or Dismissal for Certain Sex-Related Offenses and Trial of Offenses by General Courts-Martial 159
Section 534—Regulations Regarding Consideration of Application for Permanent Change of Station or Unit Transfer by Victims of Sexual Assault 159
Section 535—Consideration of Need for, and Authority to Provide for, Temporary Administrative Reassignment or Removal of a Member on Active Duty Who is Accused of Committing a Sexual Assault or Related Offense 159
Section 536—Victims' Counsel for Victims of Sex-Related Offenses and Related Provisions 160
Section 537—Inspector General Investigation of Allegations of Retaliatory Personnel Actions Taken in Response to Making Protected Communications Regarding Sexual Assault 160
Section 538—Secretary Defense Report on Role of Commanders in Military Justice Process 160
Section 539—Review and Policy Regarding Department of Defense Investigative Practices in Response to Allegations of Sex-Related Offenses 161
Section 540—Uniform Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program 161
Section 541—Development of Selection Criteria for Assignment as Sexual Assault Response and Prevention Program Managers, Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates 161
Section 542—Extension of Crime Victims' Rights to Victims of Offenses Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice 161
Section 543—Defense Counsel Interview of Complaining Witnesses in Presence of Counsel for the Complaining Witnesses or a Sexual Assault Victim Advocate 162
Section 544—Participation by Complaining Witness in Clemency Phase of Courts-Martial Process 162
Section 545—Eight-Day Incident Reporting Requirement in Response to Unrestricted Report of Sexual Assault in Which the Victim is a Member of the Armed Forces 162
Section 546—Amendment to Manual for Courts-Martial to Eliminate Considerations Relating to Character and Military Service of Accused in Initial Disposition of Sex-Related Offenses 163
Section 547—Inclusion of Letters of Reprimand, Nonpunitive Letters of Reprimand and Counseling Statements 163
Section 548—Enhanced Protections for Prospective Members and New Members of the Armed Forces During Entry-Level Processing and Training 163
Section 549—Independent Reviews and Assessments of Uniform Code of Military Justice and Judicial Proceedings of Sexual Assault Cases . 163
Section 550—Review of the Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity Role in Sexual Harassment Cases 164

Page
Subtitle E—Military Family Readiness 164
Section 551—Department of Defense Recognition of Spouses of Members of the Armed Forces Who Serve in Combat Zones 164
Section 552—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements For Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces 164
Section 553—Treatment of Relocation of Members of the Armed Forces for Active Duty for Purposes of Mortgage Refinancing 164
Section 554—Family Support Programs for Immediate Family Members of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Special Operations Forces 164
Subtitle F—Education and Training Opportunities and Administration 165
Section 561—Inclusion of Freely Associated States within Scope of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Program 165
Section 562—Improved Climate Assessments and Dissemination and Tracking of Results 165
Section 563—Service-wide 360 Assessments 165
Section 564—Health Welfare Inspections 165
Section 565—Review of Security of Military Installations, Including Barracks and multi-family residences. 166
Section 566—Enhancement of Mechanisms to Correlate Skills and Training for Military Occupational Specialties with Skills and Training Required for Civilian Certification and Licenses 166
Section 567—Use of Educational Assistance for Courses in Pursuit of Civilian Certifications or Licenses 166
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education 166
Section 571—Continuation of Authority To Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 166
Section 572—Support for Efforts to Improve Academic Achievement and Transition of Military Dependent Students 167
Section 573—Treatment of Tuition Payments Received for Virtual Elementary and Secondary Education Component of Department of Defense Education Program 167
Subtitle H—Decorations and Awards 167
Section 581—Fraudulent Representations about Receipt of Military Decorations or Medals 167
Section 582—Repeal of Limitation on Number of Medals of Honor That May Be Awarded to the same Member of the Armed Forces 167
Section 583—Standardization of Time-Limits for Recommending and Awarding Medal of Honor, Distinguished-Service Cross, Navy Cross, Air Force Cross, and Distinguished-Service Medal 167
Section 584—Recodification and Revision of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard Medal of Honor Roll Requirements 167
Section 585—Treatment of Victims of the Attacks at Recruiting Station in Little Rock, Arkansas, and at Fort Hood, Texas 168
Section 586—Retroactive Award of Army Combat Action Badge 168
Section 587—Report on Navy Review, Findings, and Actions Pertaining to Medal of Honor Nomination of Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta 168
Section 588—Authorization For Award Of The Distinguished-Service Cross To Sergeant First Class Robert F. Keiser For Acts Of Valor During The Korean War 168
Subtitle I—Other Matters 169
Section 591—Revision of Specified Senior Military Colleges to Reflect Consolidation of North Georgia College and State University and Gainesville State College 169
Section 592—Authority to Enter into Concessions Contracts at Army National Military Cemeteries 169
Section 593—Commission on Military Behavioral Health and Disciplinary Issues 169
Section 594—Commission on Service to the Nation 169
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 170
OVERVIEW 170
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 170
Military Exchanges, Commissaries, and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Activities 170
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 170

Page

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 170
Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances 170
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 171
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 171
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals 171
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers 171
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities 171
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays 172
Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authority to Provide Incentive Pay for Members of Precommissioning Programs Pursuing Foreign Language Proficiency 172
Section 617—Authority to Provide Bonus to Certain Cadets and Midshipmen Enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps 172
Subtitle C—Disability, Retired Pay, Survivor, and Transitional Benefits .. 172
Section 621—Transitional Compensation and Other Benefits for Dependents of Certain Members Separated for Violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice 172
Section 622—Prevention of Retired Pay Inversion for Members whose Retired Pay is Computed Using High-Three Average 172
Subtitle D—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 173
Section 631—Expansion of Protection of Employees of Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities from Reprisals 173
Section 632—Purchase of Sustainable Products, Local Food Products, and Recyclable Materials for Resale in Commissary and Exchange Store Systems 173
Section 633—Correction of Obsolete References to Certain Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities 173
Subtitle E—Other Matters 173
Section 641—Authority to Provide Certain Expenses for Care and Disposition of Human Remains Retained by the Department Of Defense for Forensic Pathology Investigation 173
Section 642—Provision of Status under Law by Honoring Certain Members of the Reserve Components as Veterans 174
Section 643—Survey of Military Pay and Benefits Preferences 174
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 174
OVERVIEW 174
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 174
Additional Therapeutic Treatment Activities Available Under Exceptional Care Health Option 174
Administration of Blood Products On-board U.S. Medical Evacuation Aircraft 175
Alcohol Abuse Prevention Programs 175
Department of Defense and Early Autism Diagnosis and Intervention for Military Families 175
Efforts to Advance Lower Extremity Prosthetics and Orthotics 176
Efforts to Improve Treatment for Post Traumatic Stress and Traumatic Brain Injury 176
Healthy Base Initiative 177
Military Health System Governance Reform Report 177
Report on Prostate Cancer Imaging Research 177
Report on Provider Referrals for Ancillary Services Under TRICARE 178
Review of the Military Health System Medical Training Consolidation 178
Therapeutic Service Dog Training Program 178
Trauma Clinical Research Repository 179
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 179
Subtitle A—Improvements to Health Benefits 179
Section 701—Mental Health Assessments for Members of the Armed Forces 179

Page

Section 702—Periodic Mental Health Assessments for Members of the Armed Forces ... 180
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration ... 180
Section 711—Future Availability of TRICARE Prime for Certain Beneficiaries Enrolled in TRICARE Prime ... 180
Section 712—Cooperative Health Care Agreements Between the Military Departments and Non-Military Health Care Entities ... 180
Section 713—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Integrated Electronic Health Record Program ... 180
Section 714—Pilot Program on Increased Third-Party Collection Reimbursements in Military Medical Treatment Facilities ... 180
Subtitle C—Other Matters ... 180
Section 721—Display of Budget Information for Embedded Mental Health Providers of the Reserve Components ... 180
Section 722—Authority of Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences to Enter Into Contracts and Agreements and Make Grants to Other Nonprofit Entities ... 181
Section 723—Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families ... 181
Section 724—Research Regarding Hydrocephalus ... 181
Section 725—Traumatic Brain Injury Research ... 181
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS ... 181
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 181
Advanced Technical Exploitation Program ... 181
Commercial Items Pricing Information ... 182
Competition in Air Force Network-Centric Solutions Contracts ... 182
Implementation of Requirement for Designation of a Lead Inspector General for Certain Contingency Operations ... 183
Online Reverse Auctions ... 184
Report on Operational Contract Support in Afghanistan ... 184
Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Source Selection Processes ... 185
Utilization of Standardized Services Contract Approval Form ... 186
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 187
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management ... 187
Section 801—Modification of Reporting Requirement for Department of Defense Business System Acquisition Programs when Initial Operating Capability is not Achieved within Five Years of Milestone A Approval ... 187
Section 802—Enhanced Transfer of Technology Developed at Department of Defense Laboratories ... 187
Section 803—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services ... 187
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations ... 187
Section 811—Additional Contractor Responsibilities in Regulations Relating to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts ... 187
Section 812—Amendments Relating to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts ... 188
Section 813—Government-wide Limitations on Allowable Costs for Contractor Compensation ... 188
Section 814—Inclusion of Additional Cost Estimate Information in Certain Reports ... 189
Section 815—Amendment Relating to Compelling Reasons for Waiving Suspension or Debarment ... 189
Section 816—Requirement that Cost or Price to the Federal Government be Given at Least Equal Importance as Technical or Other Criteria in Evaluating Competitive Proposals for Defense Contracts ... 189
Section 817—Requirement to Buy American Flags from Domestic Sources ... 189
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan ... 190
Section 821—Amendments Relating to Prohibition on Contracting with the Enemy ... 190
Section 822—Collection of Data Relating to Contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan ... 190
Subtitle D—Other Matters ... 190

Page

Section 831—Extension of Pilot Program on Acquisition of Military Purpose Non-Developmental Items 190
Section 832—Extension of Authority to Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan 191
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 191
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 191
Air Force Force Structure 191
Air Force Materiel Command Metrics 192
Air Sea Battle Office 193
Air Force High Consequence Information Technology Services 193
Assessment of Cyber Centers of Academic Excellence 194
Briefing to Congress on ICBM motor stockpile 194
Cadastral Geographic Information Systems Inventory 195
Comptroller General Review of the Department of Defense's Implementation of Civilian Personnel Furloughs 195
Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Cyber Resiliency 195
Comptroller General Review of Conduct of Roles and Missions Analysis 196
Coordination of Cyber and Electronic Warfare Capabilities 198
Cost Drivers in the Department of Defense 198
Critical Program Information 199
Cyber Standards Framework 199
Data Management and Protection 200
Defense Intelligence Collection Management 200
Enterprise Query and Correlation Pilot 201
Exploitation of Foreign Commercial Cellular Networks 201
Global Response Force 201
Guidance on the Use of Borrowed Military Manpower 202
Guidance Regarding the Conversion of Functions Performed by Nonappropriated Fund Employees 203
Input into National Intelligence Priorities Framework 203
Integrated Science and Technology Campus for the Defense Intelligence Agency 203
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Aircraft Utilization 204
Non-Perimeter Cyber Defenses 205
Open-Source Intelligence Utilization 205
Pilot to Counter Brokers of Transnational Criminal Organizations 206
Science and Technology Community Intelligence Needs Planning 206
Software Assurance Policy 207
Space Training 207
Technical Defense Intelligence Training 208
Training Standards for Department of Defense Cyber Missions 208
Vulnerability of Tactical Data Links in Denied Areas 209
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 209
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 209
Section 901—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 209
Section 902—Revisions to composition of transition plan for defense business enterprise architecture 209
Subtitle B—Space Activities 209
Section 911—National Security Space Satellite Reporting Policy 209
Section 912—National Security Space Defense and Protection 210
Section 913—Space Acquisition Strategy 210
Section 914—Space Control Mission Report 211
Section 915—Responsive Launch 211
Subtitle C—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Matters 211
Section 921—Revision of Secretary of Defense Authority to Engage in Commercial Activities as Security for Intelligence Collection Activities 211
Section 922—Department of Defense Intelligence Priorities 212
Section 923—Defense Clandestine Service 212
Section 924—Prohibition on National Intelligence Program Consolidation 212
Subtitle D—Cyberspace-related Matters 213
Section 931—Modification of Requirement for Inventory of Department of Defense Tactical Data Link Systems 213

Page

Section 932—Defense Science Board assessment of United States Cyber Command ... 213
Section 933—Mission Analysis for Cyber Operations of Department of Defense ... 213
Section 934—Notification of Investigations Related to Compromise of Critical Program Information ... 214
Section 935—Additional Requirements Relating to the Software Licenses of the Department of Defense ... 214
Subtitle E—Total Force Management ... 215
Section 941—Requirement to Ensure Sufficient Levels of Government Oversight of Functions Closely Associated with Inherently Governmental Functions ... 215
Section 942—Five-Year Requirement for Certification of Appropriate Manpower Performance ... 215
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS ... 215
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 215
Counter-Drug Activities ... 215
Counternarcotics Strategy in Central America ... 215
Humanitarian Efforts in U.S. Southern Command ... 215
National Guard Bureau Counter-drug Mission ... 216
Operation Martillo ... 216
Transition of Tethered Aerostat Radar System Program ... 217
U.S. Southern Command Assets ... 217
Other Matters ... 218
Assessment of Military Construction Project ... 218
Combatant Command Headquarters Personnel and Resources Requirements ... 219
Comptroller General Review of Functional Combatant Commands ... 220
Comptroller General Review of Medical Countermeasures Against Genetically Engineered Bio-Terror Agents ... 220
Comptroller General Review of Planning and Preparedness for Threats Posed by Non-Traditional Chemical Agents ... 221
Comptroller General Review of Role of the Army and the Marine Corps in Access-denied Areas ... 223
Comptroller General Review of U.S. Central Command Headquarters ... 223
Defense Forensic Enterprise ... 224
Detailed Report on Defense Efficiencies ... 225
Energy Security Assessments in the Quadrennial Defense Review ... 225
Humanitarian Mine Action and Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Technologies ... 225
Hybrid Airship Technology ... 226
Nuclear Deterrence Education in the Armed Forces ... 226
Nuclear Weapons Council and Commonality in Nuclear Forces and Nuclear Warheads ... 227
Personnel Growth at the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Staff, and the Service Secretariats ... 228
Preventing Unfair Trade Practices in Military Equipment Sales ... 229
Replacement Plan for E–4B ... 229
Report on Implementation of Acquisition Strategy to Minimize Costs for Defense Base Act Insurance ... 230
Report on Security Exemptions and Waivers for U.S. Nuclear Forces ... 230
Reporting Pursuant to the War Powers Resolution ... 230
Secure Internet Protocol Router Network for the Congressional Defense Committees ... 230
Sustainment of Sociocultural Understanding Capabilities ... 231
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 232
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ... 232
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority ... 232
Section 1002—Budgetary Effects of This Act ... 232
Section 1003—Audit of Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2018 Financial Statements ... 232
Section 1004—Authority to Transfer Funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to Sustain Nuclear Weapons Modernization ... 232
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities ... 232
Section 1011—Extension of Authority to Support Unified Counter-drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia ... 232

Page

Section 1012—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities 233
Section 1013—Two-Year Extension of Authority to Provide Additional Support for Counter-drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments . 233
Section 1014—Sense of Congress Regarding the National Guard Counter-narcotic Program 233
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 233
Section 1021—Clarification of Sole Ownership Resulting from Ship Donations at No Cost to the Navy 233
Section 1022—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships 233
Section 1023—Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards 234
Section 1024—Sense of Congress Regarding a Balanced Future Naval Force 234
Section 1025—Authority for Short-term Extension or Renewal of Leases for Vessels Supporting the Transit Protection System Escort Program 234
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 234
Section 1030—Clarification of Procedures for Use of Alternate Members on Military Commissions 234
Section 1031—Modification of Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program Reporting Requirement 234
Section 1032—Prohibition on Use of Funds To Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States To House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 235
Section 1033—Requirements for Certifications Relating to the Transfer of Detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities 235
Section 1034—Prohibition on the Use Of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 236
Section 1035—Unclassified Summary of Information Relating to Individuals Detained at Parwan, Afghanistan 236
Section 1036—Assessment of Affiliates and Adherents of Al-Qaeda Outside the United States 236
Section 1037—Designation of Department of Defense Senior Official for Facilitating the Transfer of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 236
Section 1038—Rank of Chief Prosecutor and Chief Defense Counsel in Military Commissions Established to Try Individuals Detained at Guantanamo 237
Section 1039—Report on Capability of Yemeni Government to Detain, Rehabilitate, and Prosecute Individuals Detained at Guantanamo who are Transferred to Yemen 237
Section 1040—Report on Attachment of Rights to Individuals Detained at Guantanamo if Transferred to the United States 237
Section 1040A—Summary of Information Relating to Individuals Detained at Guantanamo who Became Leaders of Foreign Terrorist Groups 237
Subtitle E—Sensitive Military Operations 238
Section 1041—Congressional Notification of Sensitive Military Operations 238
Section 1042—Report on Process for Determining Targets of Lethal Operations 238
Section 1043—Counterterrorism Operational Briefings 238
Subtitle F—Nuclear Forces 238
Section 1051—Prohibition on Elimination of the Nuclear Triad 238
Section 1052—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Reduction of Nuclear Forces 239
Section 1053—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Reduction or Consolidation of Dual-Capable Aircraft Based in Europe 239
Section 1054—Statement of Policy on Implementation of Any Agreement for Further Arms Reduction Below the Levels of the New START Treaty; Limitation on Retirement Or Dismantlement of Strategic Delivery Systems 239

Page

Section 1055—Sense of Congress on Compliance with Nuclear Arms Control Agreements 240
Section 1056—Retention of Capability to Redeploy Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles 240
Section 1057—Assessment of Nuclear Weapons Program of the People's Republic of China 241
Section 1058—Cost Estimates for Nuclear Weapons 241
Section 1059—Report on New START Treaty 241
Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 241
Section 1061—Enhancement of Capacity of the United States Government to Analyze Captured Records 241
Section 1062—Extension of Authority to Provide Military Transportation Services to Certain Other Agencies at the Department of Defense Reimbursement Rate 242
Section 1063—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Modification of Force Structure of the Army 242
Section 1064—Limitation on Use of Funds for Public-Private Cooperation Activities 242
Subtitle H—Studies and Reports 243
Section 1071—Oversight of Combat Support Agencies 243
Section 1072—Inclusion in Annual Report of Description of Interagency Coordination Relating to Humanitarian Demining Technology 243
Section 1073—Extension of Deadline for Comptroller General Report on Assignment of Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense as Advisors to Foreign Ministries of Defense 243
Section 1074—Repeal of Requirement for Comptroller General Assessment of Department of Defense Efficiencies 243
Section 1075—Matters for Inclusion in the Assessment of the 2013 Quadrennial Defense Review 244
Section 1076—Review and Assessment of United States Special Operations Forces and United States Special Operations Command 244
Section 1077—Reports on Unmanned Aircraft Systems 245
Section 1078—Online Availability of Reports Submitted to Congress 245
Section 1079—Provision of Defense Planning Guidance and Contingency Operation Plan Information to Congress 245
Subtitle I—Other Matters 245
Section 1081—Technical and Clerical Amendments 245
Section 1082—Transportation of Supplies for the United States by Aircraft Operated by United States Air Carriers 245
Section 1083—Reduction in Costs to Report Critical Changes to Major Automated Information System Programs 246
Section 1084—Extension of Authority of Secretary of Transportation to Issue Non-Premium Aviation Insurance 246
Section 1085—Revision of Compensation of Members of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force 246
Section 1086—Protection of Tier One Task Critical Assets from Electromagnetic Pulse and High-Powered Microwave Systems 246
Section 1087—Strategy for Future Military Information Operations Capabilities 246
Section 1088—Compliance of Military Departments with Minimum Safe Staffing Standards 247
Section 1089—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States 247
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 247
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 247
National Research Council Report on Chemical Biological Defense Programs Capabilities 247
Wage Grade Pay Parity at Joint Installations 247
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 248
Section 1101—One-Year Extension of Authority To Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas 248
Section 1102—One-year Extension of Discretionary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone 248

Page

Section 1103—Extension of Voluntary Reduction-In-Force Authority for Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense 248
Section 1104—Extension of Authority to Make Lump-Sum Severance Payments to Department of Defense Employees 248
Section 1105—Revision to Amount of Financial Assistance under Department of Defense Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) Defense Education Program 248
Section 1106—Extension of Program for Exchange of Information-Technology Personnel 248
Section 1107—Defense Science Initiative for Personnel 248
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS 248
OVERVIEW 248
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 251
Assistance to Civilians in Locations where U.S. Combat Operations Occur 251
Congressional Notifications Relating To Status of Forces Agreements 252
Governance in Afghanistan and the Afghan Presidential Elections 253
Importance of International Security Assistance Force Retrograde for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Role of U.S. European Command 253
Missile Defense Discussions between the United States and the Russian Federation 253
Missile Defense Programs of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China 254
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Commitment to International Security Assistance Force Mission 255
Semi-Annual Reporting on Russian Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapon Deployments 255
Report and Briefings on Declassification of Certain Missile Defense Information 256
Report on Operation Observant Compass 256
Report on Terms and Agreements for Retrograde of U.S. Equipment and Supplies Through the Northern Distribution Network and Pakistan 257
Report on U.S. Strategy in Afghanistan Post-2014 257
Report on U.S. Support to Advising Mission in Afghanistan 258
Resource Requirements For and Posture of Fleet Anti-Terrorism Security Teams and Commanders' In-Extremis Forces 259
Resource Requirements to Support U.S. Policy Objectives in Syria 259
RIMPAC 2014 Oversight 260
Security Assistance and the Leahy Law 260
Support for Military Information Sharing Agreement Between the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea and Related Initiatives ... 261
U.S. Extended Deterrence in Asia 262
U.S. Military Engagement with Burma 262
U.S. Policy and Interagency Strategy in Iraq 263
U.S. Strategic Partnership with Pakistan 263
U.S. Security Sector Assistance 264
Use of Missile Defense Declassification Authority by Director, Missile Defense Agency 264
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 265
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 265
Section 1201—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces 265
Section 1202—Three-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities 266
Section 1203—Global Security Contingency Fund 266
Section 1204—Codification of National Guard State Partnership Program 266
Section 1205—Authority to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Certain Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction in Syria and the Region 266
Section 1206—One-Year Extension of Authority to Support Foreign Forces Participating in Operations to Disarm the Lord's Resistance Army 267
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan 267

Page

Section 1211—One-Year Extension and Modification of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations 267
Section 1212—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Funds for Reintegration Activities in Afghanistan 268
Section 1213—Extension of Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan 268
Section 1214—Extension of Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq 269
Section 1215—One-Year Extension and Modification of Authority for Program to Develop and Carry Out Infrastructure Projects in Afghanistan 269
Section 1216—Special Immigrant Visas for Certain Iraqi and Afghan Allies 269
Section 1217—Requirement to Withhold Department of Defense Assistance to Afghanistan in Amount Equivalent to 100 Percent of All Taxes Assessed By Afghanistan to Extent Such Taxes Are Not Reimbursed By Afghanistan 270
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Afghanistan Post 2014 270
Section 1221—Modification of Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan 270
Section 1222—Sense of Congress on United States Military Support in Afghanistan 271
Section 1223—Defense Intelligence Plan 271
Section 1224—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Authorities for Afghanistan 272
Subtitle D—Matters Relating to Iran 273
Section 1231—Report on United States Military Partnership with Gulf Cooperation Council Countries 273
Section 1232—Additional Elements in Annual Report on Military Power of Iran 273
Section 1233—Sense of Congress on the Defense of the Arabian Gulf 273
Subtitle E—Reports and Other Matters 273
Section 1241—Report on Posture and Readiness of United States Armed Forces to Respond to Future Terrorist Attacks in Africa and the Middle East 273
Section 1242—Role of the Government of Egypt to United States National Security 274
Section 1243—Sense of Congress on Military Developments on the Korean Peninsula 274
Section 1244—Sense of Congress on Defense Cooperation with Georgia 274
Section 1245—Limitation on Establishment of Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers 274
Section 1246—Additional Reports on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea 275
Section 1247—Amendments to Annual Report Under Arms Control and Disarmament Act 275
Section 1248—Limitation On Funds to Provide the Russian Federation with Access to Certain Missile Defense Technology 275
Section 1249—Reports On Actions to Reduce Support of Ballistic Missile Programs of China, Syria, Iran, and North Korea 275
Section 1250—Congressional Notifications Relating to Status of Forces Agreements 276
Section 1251—Sense of Congress on the Conflict in Syria 276
Section 1252—Revision of Statutory References to Former NATO Support Organizations and Related NATO Agreements 276
Section 1253—Limitation on Funds to Implement Executive Agreements Relating to United States Missile Defense Capabilities 277
Section 1254—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Threat Reduction Engagement Activities and United States Contributions to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty Organization 277
Section 1255—Sense of Congress on Military-to-Military Cooperation Between the United States and Burma 277
Section 1256—Sense of Congress on the Stationing of United States Forces in Europe 277
Section 1257—Sense of Congress on Military Capabilities of the People's Republic of China 277

Page

Section 1258—Rule of Construction 278
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION 278
OVERVIEW 278
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 279
Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Focus 279
Cooperative Biological Engagement Program 279
U.S.-Russia Umbrella Agreement Negotiations 280
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 280
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 280
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 280
Section 1303—Extension for Use of Contributions to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program 281
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 281
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 281
Working Capital Fund Cash Balance Concerns 281
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 282
Subtitle A—Military Programs 282
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds 282
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund 282
Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 282
Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 282
Section 1405—Defense Inspector General 282
Section 1406—Defense Health Program 282
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 282
Section 1411—Use of National Defense Stockpile for the Conservation of a Strategic and Critical Materials Supply 282
Section 1412—Authority to Acquire Additional Materials for the National Defense Stockpile 282
Subtitle C—Other Matters 283
Section 1421—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois 283
Section 1422—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home 283
Section 1423—Cemeterial Expenses 283
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS 283
OVERVIEW 283
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 283
National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund 283
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Support for U.S. Special Operations Forces and Partner Nation Forces 284
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 284
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations 284
Section 1501—Purpose 284
Section 1502—Procurement 284
Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 284
Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance 284
Section 1505—Military Personnel 284
Section 1506—Working Capital Funds 284
Section 1507—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 286
Section 1508—Defense Inspector General 286
Section 1509—Defense Health Program 286
Subtitle B—Financial Matters 286
Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations 286
Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority 286
Subtitle C—Limitations and Other Matters 286
Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund 286
Section 1532—Future Role of Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization 287
Section 1533—Limitation on Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Support for Operation Observant Compass 287

Page

Section 1534—Report on United States Force Levels and Costs of Military Operations in Afghanistan 287
TITLE XVI—INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS 287
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 287
Apportionment of Small Business Funds under Continuing Resolutions 287
Carbon Nanotube Devices 288
Communication between the Department of Defense and Industry 288
Contracting for Textiles and Clothing 289
Defense Security Service Access to Information in Conducting the National Industrial Security Program 289
Export Control Reform 291
Foreign Commercial Satellite Services Review 291
Germanium Wafer Defense Industrial Base 292
Improving Information Technology Acquisition Outcomes 292
Monitoring and Enforcement of Mitigation Agreements Related to Foreign Investment in the United States 293
National Defense Stockpile Beryllium Upgrade 294
Next Generation Global Positioning System Receiver Equipment 294
Regional Commercialization Activities 294
Report on Diversification of Supply Activities Related to Rare Earth Elements 295
Report on Export of Night Vision Devices 296
Report on the Integrity of the Supply Chain for Nuclear Command and Control and Critical Defense Capabilities 296
Report on the Implementation of Rare Earth Elements Strategy in the Joint Strike Fighter Program 298
Risks to the Cruise Missile Industrial Base 298
Small Business Size Standards 299
Solid Rocket Motor Industrial Base 300
Space Surveillance Telescope 301
Specialty Metals Clause Waiver Processes and Notification 301
Transfer of International Traffic in Arms Regulations Controlled Missile Defense Technology to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 303
Trusted Sources of Microelectronics 303
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 304
Section 1601—Periodic Audits of Contracting Compliance by Inspector General of Department of Defense 304
Section 1602—Expansion of the Procurement Technical Assistance Program to Advance Small Business Growth 304
Section 1603—Amendments Relating to Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program 305
Section 1604—Strategic Plan for Requirements for War Reserve Stocks of Meals Ready-To-Eat 305
Section 1605—Foreign Commercial Satellite Services 305
Section 1606—Proof of Concept Commercialization Pilot Program 306

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 306
PURPOSE 306
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 306
Section 2001—Short Title 307
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law 307
Section 2003—Effective Date 307
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 307
SUMMARY 307
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 307
Explanation of Funding Adjustment 307
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 307
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 307
Section 2102—Family Housing 308
Section 2103—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 308
Section 2104—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Project 308
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project 308

Page

Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project ... 308
Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects ... 308
Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects ... 308
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ... 309
SUMMARY ... 309
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 309
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 309
Section 2202—Family Housing ... 309
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ... 309
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy ... 309
Section 2205—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project ... 309
Section 2206—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project ... 309
Section 2207—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project ... 310
Section 2208—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects ... 310
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ... 310
SUMMARY ... 310
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 310
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 310
Section 2302—Family Housing ... 310
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ... 310
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force ... 310
Section 2305—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project ... 311
Section 2306—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project ... 311
Section 2307—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project ... 311
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ... 311
SUMMARY ... 311
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 312
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ... 312
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 314
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations ... 314
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 314
Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects ... 314
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies ... 314
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations ... 314
Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide ... 314
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM ... 314
SUMMARY ... 314
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 314
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 314
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ... 315
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ... 315
SUMMARY ... 315
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 315
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ... 315
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 316
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ... 316
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 316
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 316

Page

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 316
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 316
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 316
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve 316
Subtitle B—Other Matters 317
Section 2611—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project 317
Section 2612—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects 317
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES 317
SUMMARY 317
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 317
Subtitle A—Authorization Of Appropriations 317
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 317
Subtitle B—Other Matters 317
Section 2711—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round 317
Section 2712—Elimination of Quarterly Certification Requirement Regarding Availabilty of Military Health Care in National Capital Region 317
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS 318
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 318
Air Education and Training Command 318
Air Force Institute of Technology Laboratory Recapitalization 318
Analysis of Type I and Type III Retro-Reflective Glass Beads 318
Blast Protection for Forward Military Locations in Contingency Operations 319
Foreign Materiel Exploitation 319
Dayton Peace Accord Exhibit 319
Department of Defense Joint Bases 320
Distributed Generation and Energy Security 320
European Consolidation Initiative 321
Industrial Control Systems Integration into the Department of Defense Networks 321
KC–46A Air National Guard Basing Strategy 321
Leased Space Assessment 322
Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization 322
Military Heritage Sites 323
Plan for Replacement of MQ–1 Aircraft of the National Guard 323
Report on Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment 323
Space Management 324
Study on Treating Defense Nuclear Facilities as Military Construction 325
Update to Master Plan for Camp Lemonnier, Djibouti 326
U.S. Air Force Space Command Infrastructure 326
Utilization of Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative 327
Vulnerability of Defense Infrastructure to Seismic Hazards 327
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 328
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 328
Section 2801—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Military Construction 328
Section 2802—Repeal of Requirements for Local Comparability of Room Patterns and Floor Areas for Military Family Housing and Submission of Net Floor Area Information 328
Section 2803—Repeal of Separate Authority to Enter into Limited Partnerships with Private Developers of Housing 328
Section 2804—Military Construction Standards to Reduce Vulnerability of Structures to Terrorist Attack 328
Section 2805—Treatment of Payments Received for Providing Utilities and Services in Connection with Use of Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing 329

Page

Section 2806—Repeal of Advance Notification Requirement for Use of Military Family Housing Investment Authority 329
Section 2807—Additional Element for Annual Report on Military Housing Privatization Projects 329
Section 2808—Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects in Certain Areas Outside the United States 329
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 329
Section 2811—Codification of Policies and Requirements Regarding Closure and Realignment of United States Military Installations in Foreign Countries 329
Subtitle C—Energy Security 330
Section 2821—Continuation of Limitation on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold or Platinum Certification 330
Subtitle D—Provisions Related to Guam Realignment 330
Section 2831—Change From Previous Calendar Year to Previous Fiscal Year for Period Covered by Annual Report of Interagency Coordination Group of Inspectors General for Guam Realignment 330
Section 2832—Repeal of Certain Restrictions on Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region 330
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances 330
Section 2841—Real Property Acquisition, Naval Base Ventura County, California 330
Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Former Oxnard Air Force Base, Ventura County, California 331
Section 2843—Land Conveyance, Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 331
Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Camp Williams, Utah 331
Section 2845—Conveyance, Air National Guard Radar Site, Francis Peak, Wasatch Mountains, Utah 331
Section 2846—Land Conveyance, Former Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia 331
Section 2847—Land Conveyance, Mifflin County United States Army Reserve Center, Lewistown, Pennsylvania 331
Subtitle F—Other Matters 331
Section 2861—Repeal of Annual Economic Adjustment Committee Reporting Requirement 331
Section 2862—Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies 332
Section 2863—Redesignation of the Graduate School of Nursing at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences as the Daniel K. Inouye Graduate School of Nursing 332
Section 2864—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio 332
Section 2865—Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in Riverside, California 332
TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 332
SUMMARY 332
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 332
Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Project 332
TITLE XXX—MILITARY LAND TRANSFERS AND WITHDRAWALS TO SUPPORT READINESS AND SECURITY 333
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 333
Subtitle A—Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana 333
Section 3001—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Lands for Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana 333
Section 3002—Management of Withdrawn and Reserved Lands 333
Section 3003—Special Rules Governing Minerals Management 333
Section 3004—Grazing 333
Section 3005—Duration of Withdrawal and Reservation 333
Section 3006—Payments in Lieu of Taxes 333
Section 3007—Hunting, Fishing and Trapping 333
Section 3008—Water Rights 334

Page
Section 3009—Brush and Range Fire Prevention and Suppression 334
Section 3010—On-Going Decontamination 334
Section 3011—Application for Renewal of a Withdrawal and Reservation 334
Section 3012—Limitation on Subsequent Availability of Lands for Appropriation 334
Section 3013—Relinquishment 334
Subtitle B—White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico 334
Section 3021—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico 334
Section 3022—Water Rights 334
Section 3023—Withdrawal 334
Subtitle C—Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California 335
Section 3031—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California 335
Section 3032—Water Rights 335
Section 3033—Withdrawal 335
Subtitle D—Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, California 335
Section 3041—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, California 335
Section 3042—Management and Use of Transferred Land 335
Section 3043—Realignment of Range Boundary and Related Transfer of Title 335
Section 3044—Effect of Termination of Military Use 335
Section 3045—Temporary Extension of Existing Withdrawal Period 336
Section 3046—Water Rights 336
Subtitle E—Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms, California 336
Section 3051—Designation of Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area 336
Section 3052—Limited Biannual Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms Use of Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area 336
Section 3053—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Southern Study Area, Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms, California 336
Section 3054—Water Rights 336
Subtitle F—Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada 337
Section 3061—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada 337
Section 3062—Water Rights 337
Section 3063—Withdrawal 337

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 337

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 337
OVERVIEW 337
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 337
National Nuclear Security Administration 337
Overview 337
Weapons Activities 337
Advanced manufacturing within the nuclear security enterprise 337
Budget tables for NNSA Production Office 338
Cyber Security 339
Clarification of Congressional Intent Regarding National Security Laboratories 339
Deferred Maintenance in the Nuclear Security Enterprise 339
Directed Stockpile Work 340
Exascale Computing 341
Ignition and Budget Prioritization 341
Livermore Valley Open Campus 341
Trilateral Cooperation 342
Risks within long-term schedule for life extension programs 342
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation 343
Follow-on to Global Threat Reduction Initiative 343
Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility Analysis 343

Page

Nonproliferation and arms control verification technology research and development ... 344
Naval Reactors ... 344
Fissile material stockpiles ... 344
Naval Reactors ... 344
Office of the Administrator ... 345
Office of Infrastructure and Operations ... 345
Plan and roadmap to address security problems ... 345
Reprogramming Procedure and Funding Control Levels ... 346
Environmental and Other Defense Activities ... 347
Overview ... 347
Defense Environmental Cleanup ... 347
Environmental Management Technology Development Program ... 347
Transuranic Wastes at Hanford Tank Farms ... 347
Other Defense Activities ... 348
Idaho Sitewide Safeguards and Security Program ... 348
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 349
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations ... 349
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration ... 349
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup ... 349
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities ... 349
Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance ... 349
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations ... 349
Section 3111—Clarification of Principles of National Nuclear Security Administration ... 349
Section 3112—Termination of Department of Energy Employees to Protect National Security ... 349
Section 3113—Modification of Independent Cost Estimates on Life Extension Programs and New Nuclear Facilities ... 350
Section 3114—Plan for Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposition of Tank Farm Waste at Hanford Nuclear Reservation ... 351
Section 3115—Enhanced Procurement Authority to Manage Supply Chain Risk ... 352
Section 3116—Limitation on Availability of Funds for National Nuclear Security Administration ... 352
Section 3117—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Administrator ... 353
Section 3118—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Global Threat Reduction Initiative ... 354
Section 3119—Establishment of Center for Security Technology, Analysis, Testing, and Response ... 354
Section 3120—Cost-Benefit Analyses for Competition of Management and Operating Contracts ... 355
Section 3121—W88–1 Warhead and W78–1 Warhead Life Extension Options ... 355
Section 3122—Extension of Principles of Pilot Program to Additional Facilities of the Nuclear Security Enterprise ... 356
Subtitle C—Reports ... 357
Section 3131—Annual Report and Certification on Status of the Security of the Nuclear Security Enterprise ... 357
Section 3132—Modifications to Annual Reports Regarding the Condition of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile ... 358
Section 3133—Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements ... 358
Subtitle D—Other Matters ... 359
Section 3141—Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise ... 359
Section 3142—Study of Potential Reuse of Nuclear Weapon Secondaries ... 359
Section 3143—Clarification of Role of Secretary of Energy ... 360
Section 3144—Technical Amendment to Atomic Energy Act of 1954 ... 360
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ... 360
OVERVIEW ... 360
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 360
Section 3201—Authorization ... 360
Section 3202—Improvements to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board ... 360
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ... 361

Page
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 361
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations 361
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 361
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 361
Title XI Ship Loan Guarantee 361
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 361
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2014 361
Section 3502—5-Year Reauthorization of Vessel War Risk Insurance Program 362
Section 3503—Sense of Congress 362

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES 362

Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables 362
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT 369
Section 4101—Procurement 369
Section 4102—Procurement for Overseas Contingency Operations 410
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 420
Section 4201—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 420
Section 4202—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for Overseas Contingency Operations 451
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 453
Section 4301—Operation and Maintenance 453
Section 4302—Operation and Maintenance for Overseas Contingency Operations 471
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL 482
Section 4401—Military Personnel 482
Section 4402—Military Personnel for Overseas Contingency Operations 483
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 484
Section 4501—Other Authorizations 484
Section 4502—Other Authorizations for Overseas Contingency Operations 487
TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 489
Section 4601—Military Construction 489
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 507
Section 4701—Department of Energy National Security Programs 507

Department of Defense Authorization Request 518
Communications from Other Committees 520
Fiscal Data 533
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 534
Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act 534
Committee Cost Estimate 535
Advisory of Earmarks 535
Oversight Findings 535
General Performance Goals and Objectives 535
Statement of Federal Mandates 537
Federal Advisory Committee Statement 537
Applicability to the Legislative Branch 537
Duplication of Federal Programs 537
Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings 537
Committee Votes 537
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 556
Additional Views 557
Dissenting Views 563

113TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
113–102

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

JUNE 7, 2013.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1960]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1960) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2014: (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; (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 2014 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Maritime Administration.

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, 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 bill 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 bill reflects the House Armed Services Committee's steadfast support of the courageous, professional, and dedicated men and women of the United States Armed Forces and the committee's appreciation for the sacrifices they make to accomplish their required missions. Events of the last year—ranging from on-going operations in Afghanistan, robust counter-terrorism efforts around the globe, to time-sensitive disaster and humanitarian responses—serve to highlight the United States military's flexibility and responsiveness in defending our nation's interests and addressing security challenges. The committee understands that the capabilities of our Armed Forces are underpinned by the dedicated civilian employees of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, as well as the defense industrial base. Each of these elements is required to enable the U.S. military to be the guarantor of peace and economic security that it has been for generations. 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 ensures our troops deployed in Afghanistan and around the world have the equipment, resources, authorities, training, and time needed to successfully complete their missions and return home; mandates greater transparency and accountability for sensitive military operations to Congress; provides our warfighters and their families with the resources and support they need, deserve,

and have earned; protects members of the Armed Forces from the unacceptable risk of sexual assault; invests in the capabilities and force structure needed to protect the United States from current and future threats; and incentivizes greater competition for defense dollars and greater fiscal responsibility within the Department of Defense.

Equipment, Resources, Authorities, Training, and Time To Accomplish Missions

The committee considers it critical that the capabilities and capacity of the Armed Forces continue to improve so these forces can accomplish the full range of diverse missions within a complex operating environment, minimize risks associated with such challenges and effectively engage in hostilities when necessary. Thus, a top priority remains ensuring that our military personnel continue to receive the best equipment, weapon systems and training. As such, H.R. 1960 would provide for both near- and long-term military personnel and force structure requirements.

The military continues to put pressure on Al Qaeda and its associated forces. The bill makes clear that Congress has a constitutional oversight role critical at each stage of sensitive military operations conducted to combat these forces. The committee includes a provision that would require an assessment of the affiliates and adherents of Al Qaeda and the evolving threat they pose to U.S. national security. The bill also would codify the requirement for notification and briefings following targeted lethal or capture operations by the Armed Forces overseas. The legislation would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an explanation of the legal and policy considerations and approval processes used in determining whether an individual or group of individuals could be the target of a lethal or capture operation conducted by the Armed Forces of the United States outside the United States. The committee bill also includes several additional provisions to extend detention policies and procedures.

While the committee continues its inquiry into the tragic events in Benghazi on September 11, 2012, the bill would ensure that the Department of Defense has begun to apply the lessons already learned. The committee bill also addresses concerns regarding the conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic and would ensure that Congress is kept informed of the resources required and risks associated with a variety of courses of action or inaction in Syria. Likewise, the committee expects that if the President determines that U.S. military involvement is required, the President will submit a supplemental funding request to Congress for consideration. Understanding that unilateral U.S. response to the Syrian crisis is not in America's best interest, the bill would authorize the Armed Forces to train and equip regional partners for weapons of mass destruction response.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee notes the continued threat posed by the Islamic Republic of Iran and the steps taken by the committee to address gaps in U.S. intelligence, expand information about Iran's global threat network, foster partnerships with the Gulf Cooperation Council nations, and express concerns about the strategic consequences of having only one carrier in the region of the Arabian Gulf. Likewise, the committee notes the rogue ac-

tions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which are unacceptable and contrary to international peace and stability and extends reporting on North Korea's military capabilities. The committee also reflects concerns regarding the modernization efforts of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), as reflected in testimony before the committee and the annual report on the Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China.

The ballistic missile threat continues to increase both qualitatively and quantitatively. Defending against ballistic or theater missile attack is an important priority for the committee. The committee bill would restrict the removal of missile defense hardware from East Asia, while requiring analysis on missile defense capabilities in Guam, invest in proven and vital systems like Iron Dome, and provide significant resources for other Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense programs, like Arrow 2, Arrow 3 and the David's Sling Weapon System. The legislation would provide authorization and funding for the deployment of an East Coast missile defense site, while the Missile Defense Agency undertakes siting and environmental studies.

Additionally, robust intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities are vital to current combat operations in Afghanistan, as well as emerging threats in North Africa and elsewhere. To ensure that use and availability of ISR resources are maximized, the bill would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan related to the drawdown of defense intelligence assets in Afghanistan and it would prevent the premature retirement of Global Hawk block 30 unmanned aircraft.

Finally, recent reports only enhance the committee's concerns about the threat posed by cyber attacks. The bill would require the Department of Defense to conduct a mission analysis for cyber operations and examine the proper balance of cyber capabilities across the national security organization, as well as a report on coordination of cyber and electronic warfare activities. The committee would also require the Department to provide congressional notification when investigations are initiated or completed regarding network cyber intrusions that result in the compromise of critical information. Additionally, the legislation would require the Defense Science Board to conduct an independent assessment of the organization, missions and authorities of U.S. Cyber Command, and require the Secretary of Defense to create standards for cyber operations training. The bill also would provide important authorities to the Department of Energy to ensure the integrity of its information technology supply chain—similar to authority available to the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community.

Combatting Sexual Assault in the Military

The American public holds the U.S. Armed Forces to the highest standards and in great esteem. Consequently, the scourge of sexual assault has no place within these ranks. The committee has made sexual assault prevention and prosecution a conerstone of this bill.

The bill would reform the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to strip commanders of their authority to dismiss a finding by a court martial or from reducing guilty findings to lesser offenses. The committee bill would also establish minimum sentencing guidelines for sexual assault-related offenses. Currently,

such guidelines only exist in the military for the crimes of murder and espionage. The proposed changes to the UCMJ would also enable the victim of a crime to provide the convening authority materials for the convening authority's post-trial consideration; set guidelines for defense council interviews of the victim; and articulate the rights of a crime victim.

Recognizing that victim support is as vital as prosecution, the legislation would allow victims of sexual assault to apply for a permanent change of station or unit transfer, while authorizing the Secretary of Defense to inform commanders of their authority to remove or temporarily reassign service members who are the alleged perpetrators of sexual assault. The committee bill would require the provision of victims' counsels, qualified and specially trained lawyers in each of the services, to be made available to provide legal assistance to the victims of sex-related offenses.

Moreover, the bill seeks to improve the climate for reporting of a sex-related offense by adding rape, sexual assault, and other sexual misconduct to the protected communications of service members with a member of Congress or an Inspector General. The committee recommends reforms to improve unit climate assessments, improve the performance evaluation process, increase commander accountability, and help establish a military culture intolerant of sexual assaults through improved security, as well as health and welfare inspections.

Finally, to ensure that the military is better positioned to deal with the crisis of sexual assault within its ranks, the committee bill would require both the Secretary of Defense and the independent panel established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to assess the current role and authorities of commanders in the administration of military justice and the investigation, prosecution, and adjudication of offenses under the UCMJ; direct the Government Accountability Office to review implementation of the Air Force corrective actions following the sexual misconduct at Lackland Air Force Base; and mandate the processing for administrative separation of any service member guilty of an inappropriate and prohibited relationship, communication, conduct, or contact, including when such an action is consensual, with a prospective member of the Armed Forces or a member undergoing entry-level processing or training.

Preserving Key Capabilities in a Time of Fiscal Austerity

In April 2011, the President announced his intention to seek over $400.0 billion in savings within the Department of Defense over the next decade. Subsequently, the Congress passed the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 111–25) (BCA) in August 2011. The BCA significantly reduced discretionary spending across the Federal Government and for the military in particular. The Department of Defense noted that cuts relating to the BCA amounted to $489.0 billion. In addition, sequestration went into effect across the Federal Government on March 1, 2013. Should sequestration remain in effect, funding for national defense will be cut by an additional $42.5 billion during fiscal year 2013 and approximately half a trillion dollars through 2021.

The committee is particularly concerned about readiness levels and threats to our national security once the full weight of seques-

tration is realized. History tells us that when readiness is low and our units ill-equipped and unprepared to fight, our troops pay the price with their lives. Areas of additional concern include the size and force structure of our armed forces and funding levels as we prepare to draw down in Afghanistan.

The committee is concerned about the Navy's overall fleet size and the continuous sustained demand for naval forces, especially in light of the Administration's strategic shift to operations in the Asia-Pacific. Therefore, the restriction precluding the Navy from retiring seven Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers and two amphibious ships well before the end of their expected service life continues for fiscal year 2014. The committee would provide additional funds to the Navy to properly modernize and maintain these critical naval assets. The committee notes that it is less costly to maintain existing assets than to procure new ones and this funding ensures the correct naval capabilities and fleet mix for the length of time originally authorized by Congress. The committee also would authorize multiyear procurements for the E–2D Advanced Hawkeye and the C–130J Super Hercules to ensure the Department is able to save significant resources over the term of the contract.

The committee also would fund needed ship construction to obviate the negative consequences of sequestration on the various ship construction programs. The committee would provide sufficient funds to support the acquisition of the 10th DDG–51 class destroyer of a multiyear procurement; additional funds to support the continued acquisition of two Virginia Class attack submarines; and additional funds associated with the completion of the DDG–1000 class destroyer, the Moored Training Ship, and the Joint High Speed Vessel.

In noting concerns about potential strike fighter shortfalls and combat aviation capability, the committee would preserve the Air Force and Navy strike fighter industrial base by supporting the continued development of the Joint Strike Fighter program, provide for additional advance procurement for the F/A–18 E/F Super Hornet, and address a critical Air Force unfunded requirement for strike fighter engines. The committee notes the importance of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) aircraft. The bill would retain the Air Force's Global Hawk Block 30 ISR aircraft, rather than shifting these assets to storage, as they are critical combat enablers for the deployed warfighter. The legislation would also provide additional funding for the Air Force Reaper UAS, a high-demand, low-density asset critical to Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee also recommends additional funding to allow for the continued sustainment of America's heavy armored vehicle production base by maintaining at least minimum sustained production for Abrams tank upgrades and heavy improved recovery vehicles. The committee also would preserve the continued operational capability of the National Guard and Reserve Components by providing additional funding to address National Guard and Reserve Component unfunded modernization requirements. These changes preserve capability in the Active Component, as well as the Guard and Reserve, but not at the expense of the readiness of the Active Component.

The committee would fund the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) at $85.8 billion, consistent with the House-passed fiscal year 2014 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 25, thereby taking a partial step to replenish underfunded readiness accounts within the OCO. In so doing, the committee was able to replenish shortfalls resulting from unexpected costs in fiscal year 2013 to important accounts supporting reset and reconstitution of the force after more than a decade of combat and enabling support for wartime operations. Specifically, the committee took steps to restore critical readiness shortfalls by providing additional resources for training activities, flight hours, facilities sustainment, critical spares, combat support forces equipment and sustainment, and the stabilization of fuel rates. The committee also provided funding for unfunded priority items like a new Marine crisis response force for Africa and growth in the Marine Security Guard program responsible for security at our diplomatic posts. The bill would restore $400.0 million in critical equipment reset funding in the OCO that would refurbish wartorn equipment, specifically for the Army.

In making these changes, the committee heeded the testimony of the service chiefs, who stressed the importance of ensuring the United States does not repeat the mistakes of the past by hollowing force structure in response to budget cuts. Therefore, for every change to force structure recommended by this bill includes funding for military personnel and operation and maintenance costs associated with such force structure. Moreover, each of these changes was funded within the top line funding allocation provided by the House-passed fiscal year 2014 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 25, which reduced overall discretionary spending below the fiscal year 2014 cap mandated by the Budget Control Act (Public Law 111–25).

Resources for Warfighters and Families

Recognizing the need to maintain a high quality all-volunteer combat-ready force, the committee bill supports current law, which mandates an automatic 1.8% annual increase in troop pay.

The committee bill would ensure that end strength requests are within the limitations for reductions set by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), reflecting concerns that budgetary pressures will force each service to reduce its end strength too quickly and to divest vital battlefield experience and know how.

Committee members believe access to quality healthcare during retirement is a benefit earned through prior service to our nation. Mindful of Congress' commitment to service members and their families, the legislation would reject proposals to increase some TRICARE fees or establish new TRICARE fees. The committee has already put TRICARE on a sustainable path through reforms enacted in several recent defense authorization acts. Those reforms connect TRICARE fee increases to retiree cost of living increases. The record of the Department of Defense in incorrectly calculating TRICARE costs and its repeated requests to transfer billions of unused dollars out of the program to cover other underfunded defense priorities raises questions about repeated claims by the Department that the Defense Health Program is unsustainable. The committee bill also would provide beneficiaries an opportunity to re-

main in TRICARE Prime after the Department of Defense reduces the availability of Prime to retired beneficiaries.

After a decade of honorable service in hostile environments, women have demonstrated a wide range of capabilities in combat operations. The committee bill would establish the definition of a gender-neutral occupational standards that would be used by each military service to develop the standards required for all military career designators.

Other provisions in the committee bill are designed to protect warfighters and their families from external threats, while ensuring that units and families are supported and prepared for deployments. The committee bill would require a minimum 120–day notification before deployment or the cancellation of a deployment for the operational reserves. It also would authorize the commander of U.S. Special Forces Command to provide additional family support services to U.S. Special Operations Forces and their families. The committee bill would take action on body armor, one of the most basic elements of protection provided to our troops. The bill would facilitate the development of ever more functional, lighter, and more protective body armor by requiring each service to create a separate procurement budget line for personal protective equipment, thus making body armor a more traditional weapon system acquisition program that can build on successive generations of innovation and investment, rather than the ad hoc procedure now in place. The bill also would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive study and assessment on ways to improve personal protective equipment for female service members.

Fiscal Responsibility, Transparency, and Accountability

The committee scrutinized the Department of Defense's budget and identified inefficiencies whose savings can be invested in higher national security priorities. The committee bill would reflect the fact that as a nation, we must make tough choices in order to provide for America's common defense by examining every aspect of the defense enterprise to find ways that we can accomplish the mission of providing for the common defense more effectively. The findings of the committee's Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform and the Panel on Business Challenges within the Defense Industry continue to guide the committee's consideration of legislation that would be included in this bill. The committee bill would include a number of provisions to strengthen fiscal responsibility, including direction to the Department of Defense to strengthen Item Unique Identification and other automated information and data capture initiatives which would lower total life cycle cost of items acquired and managed and save taxpayer money through improved accountability. The bill would also include the sense of Congress regarding the Department of Defense's ongoing Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness process and support the goal of audit readiness across the Department by 2017, which have only increased in importance as sequestration is implemented. To that end, the bill would require that a full and complete audit take place for fiscal year 2018. Furthermore, recognizing that any future contingency operation will be heavily reliant on contractors and incorporating the lessons learned from U.S. operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Re-

public of Afghanistan, the committee bill would encourage the Inspectors General of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID to establish a memorandum of agreement that would serve as a framework for designating a lead Inspector General for overseas contingency operations not later than 30 days after the commencement of certain military operations.

Controlling Costs and Making Wise Choices

The committee recognizes that in an era of constrained resources, controlling costs should be a key priority. At the same time, the committee sought to avoid false short term savings at the expense of vital long-term strategic capabilities.

The committee bill would require the Department of Defense to take several steps toward reducing wasteful bureaucracy. For example, the Secretary of Defense would be required to develop a plan for the future role of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization and to determine if the Air-Sea Battle Office is duplicative of efforts more efficiently carried out by the Joint Staff. The bill would also reduce general and flag officer billets by 24.

The bill would require greater accountability for cost overruns associated with troubled acquisition programs. The committee expresses concern regarding the design of the Arleigh Burke Class Destroyer Flight III and limits funding for the next stage of the Army's Ground Combat Vehicle until the Secretary of the Army submits a status report to Congress. Likewise, the committee would require the Secretary of the Army to develop a strategy to improve the fuel efficiency of the M1 Abrams Tank. The bill would also scrutinize plans for the sustainment of the Littoral Combat Ship and the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter.

Significant emphasis is placed on identifying additional efficiencies. The committee bill would task the Government Accountability Office (GAO) with carrying out several studies with an intent to reduce bureaucracy, including an examination of the headquarters functions of U.S. Central Command, all of the functional combatant commands, the office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and service secretaries. The bill would also require the Secretary of Defense to report back on actions taken to address the recommendations of the GAO with regard to similar reviews undertaken at the remaining geographic combatant commands last year. Moreover, the committee notes that the Department has failed to adequately conduct the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), nor has the Department submitted a mission based budget as required. Therefore, the committee would task GAO to examine contributing factors to this lack of compliance.

In addition, the committee would seek to increase cost savings through enhanced competition and alternative contracting mechanisms. Among other initiatives, the committee bill would direct a federally funded research and development center to conduct a study to identify and assess alternative and effective means for stimulating competition and innovation in the personal protection equipment industrial base, to include body armor. Other enhancements to competition would include the requirement to ensure a

fair evaluation of competing contractors in awarding a contract to a certified evolved expendable launch vehicle provider. The bill would also require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a 5-year pilot program for the multiyear procurement of tactical wheeled vehicles and authorize multiyear contracts for the E–2D Advanced Hawkeye and the C–130J Super Hercules. The committee would also direct a strategy to reduce the cost of commercial satellite services through multiyear awards.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 results from hearings that began on March 5, 2013, and that were completed on May 9, 2013. The full committee conducted 10 sessions. In addition, a total of 13 sessions were conducted by 6 different subcommittees.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On June 5, 2013, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 1960, as amended, by a vote of 59–2.

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 1960. 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.

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 $625.2 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the committee for fiscal year 2014. Of this amount, $526.6 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $80.7 billion was requested for the Overseas Contingency Operations requirements

covering the entire fiscal year, and $17.9 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 $630.2 billion in fiscal year 2014, including $85.8 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations. The base committee authorization of $544.4 billion is a $0.4 billion decrease below the levels provided for in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

The table preceding the detailed program adjustments in division D of this report summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2014 and compares these amounts to the President's request.

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2014 is $641.0 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 2014, and mandatory programs.

The table preceding the detailed program adjustments in division D of this report details changes to all aspects of the national defense budget function.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $98.2 billion for procurement. This represents a $900.0 million decrease over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends authorization of $99.6 billion, an increase of $1.4 billion from the fiscal year 2014 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 procurement program are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $5.0 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $5.2 billion, an increase of $135.1 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Apache helicopter transmission

The budget request contained $759.4 million for procurement of the Apache helicopter program.

The committee continues to support the AH–64E Apache helicopter program and believes that it provides a critical capability to the Army. The committee understands that the program has had production issues with the current transmission. The Apache transmission is a "single point-of-failure" component in that only one vendor is currently certified to make this particular transmission. The committee notes that the Army had to make difficult decisions to mitigate the impact to the industrial base and fielding schedule. The committee encourages the Army to continue its mitigation efforts with the prime contractor in regards to the transmission subcontractor meeting required production schedules. The committee also encourages the Army to work with the prime contractor and determine if the qualification of a second source is warranted considering the critical nature of the transmission.

The committee recommends $759.4 million, the full amount of the request, for the Apache helicopter program.

Lightweight combat medical evacuation systems

The committee is concerned about weight-related performance issues impacting rotorcraft systems used for medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) missions. The committee understands that current MEDEVAC rotorcraft are required to operate over long distances in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan as well as in other remote areas of operations. The committee is aware of recent efforts by the U.S. Army Aviation Research Laboratory under the Medical Research and Materiel Command and the Army Aviation Engineering Directorate at Redstone Arsenal to test ways to reduce the weight of MEDEVAC rotorcraft, including lightweight rack systems for the transport and treatment of injured military personnel. The committee notes that a lightweight rack system could provide flight medical personnel additional capabilities to accomplish critical evacuation missions by improving space, range, and altitude performance for the rotorcraft.

The committee encourages the Army to continue expedited testing of lightweight tactical, rapidly installable medical evacuation racks as one of many possible options to better manage rotorcraft weight and improve overall performance.

UH–72 Light Utility Helicopter

The budget request included $96.2 million for procurement of 10 UH–72 Light Utility Helicopters (LUH).

According to the Army, this is the final year of UH–72 purchases, truncating the total program buy at 315 aircraft, instead of 346 as originally planned. The committee notes that even though this ends production short of the original plan, the final buy fully meets the agreed upon UH–72 requirements of the Army National Guard.

The committee recognizes that funding constraints and assessments in investment priorities contributed to the Army's decision to end UH–72 LUH production early, but also recognizes the platform has performed very well in valuable mission scenarios, to include homeland security, patrol along the Southwest boarder, and state and regional emergency response. These scenarios are important to operations in the permissive U.S. environment. However, the committee is concerned that the Army's decision may have an impact on the UH–72 LUH industrial base that increase risks over time for the support of its fielded fleet of 315 aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends $231.3 million, an increase of $135.1 million, for procurement of UH–72 LUH. The committee acknowledges that the additional procurement funds complete the total requirement for the LUH program. The committee understands that while no further requirements for additional platforms have been formally identified by the National Guard Bureau; should additional requirements be identified, the committee expects the National Guard to use National Guard and Reserve Equipment account funds. In addition, the committee encourages the Army to assess the feasibility of transferring additional UH–72 LUH rotorcraft from the Active Component to the National Guard if additional requirements are validated.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $1.3 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.3 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $1.6 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.8 billion, an increase of $191.0 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Armor Brigade Combat Team force structure and industrial base

The committee notes that as a result of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), the Army is in the process of reducing its Active Duty end strength to 490,000. In addition, the Army has also announced plans to eliminate at least eight Active Component Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs), reducing the total number from 45 to 37. The active Army has 17 Armor BCTs (ABCT), 20 Infantry BCTs, and 8 Stryker BCTs. The Army has stated that at least two of the eight BCTs eliminated will be ABCTs. The committee notes that the ABCT, which is comprised of Abrams tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles, is the only full-spectrum force in the Army's force structure. With regard to the future utility of armored forces, the committee notes a Rand Corporation report from 2010 that concluded, "Heavy forces-based on tanks and infantry fighting vehicles-are key elements of any force that will fight hybrid enemies that have a modicum of training, organization, and advanced weapons. Light and medium forces can complement heavy forces, particularly in urban and other complex terrain; they do not provide the survivability, lethality, or mobility inherent in heavy forces. Quite simply, heavy forces reduce operational risks and minimize friendly casualties."

The committee is concerned that the Army may eliminate too many ABCTs based on resource constraints rather than meeting the needs of combatant commanders. The committee understands the Army has completed a force structure and BCT mix analysis. Although the committee has been informed that the Army will add a third maneuver battalion back into the Active Component Armor and Infantry BCTs which will also impact the total amount of BCTs, the committee has not been briefed on final force structure

and BCT mix decisions. The committee is supportive of all BCTs having a third maneuver battalion and notes that the committee opposed the Army's original decision of two maneuver battalions per BCT in the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007. The committee also notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, or his designee, to brief and submit a report to the congressional defense committees on how the Army's recent force structure and BCT mix analysis meet the needs of the combatant commanders. This information has not been provided to the congressional defense committees.

In addition to the mix of BCTs, the committee is also concerned about the Army's position that Foreign Military Sales (FMS) alone is sufficient to protect the armor industrial base until follow-on programs begin around the fiscal year 2019 time-frame. The committee believes that the associated impact this position has on the industrial base at both the prime contractor and vendor level poses an unacceptable level of risk. The ABCT industrial base is not dependent upon one platform. The committee continues to believe that insufficient information is available to Congress to make an informed decision regarding current and potential future risks to the armor industrial base at the prime and vendor levels. The committee understands that the Army believes that it will soon have the necessary analytical information required to make informed decisions about the industrial base. The committee needs to understand the ramifications to the future ABCT industrial base capabilities regarding the Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, Paladin howitzer, Hercules recovery vehicle, Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle, and the Ground Combat Vehicle. The committee needs to understand the Army's projected requirements in the fiscal year 2019 time-frame to maintain a public and private workforce to sustain the current level of ABCTs, and what capabilities the Army will need in the future to produce new or improved platforms.

The committee believes that FMS may help to mitigate some of the risk to the industrial base, but believes FMS alone will not be enough to ensure that the ABCT industrial base is maintained at viable levels until follow-on production efforts begin in the fiscal year 2019 time-frame. In the absence of a force mix BCT analysis, and a detailed quantitative analysis of the impacts to the ABCT industrial base, the committee recommends adjustments to the Army's budget request elsewhere in this report.

Abrams tank upgrades

The budget request contained no funding for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

The committee believes that the Army must maintain the ability for its Armored Brigade Combat Teams (ABCT) to over match any possible threat, and is concerned that the Army still does not have a realistic plan for maintaining the M1 Abrams tank industrial base for the future. The Army has testified, in support of the fiscal year 2014 budget request, that they do not have any plans to close

down the industrial facilities used to upgrade M1 Abrams tanks. The Army has also testified that they plan on proceeding with the next M1 Abrams tank upgrade program in 2019, which the committee assumes will require an active and healthy industrial base. In addition, the Army has testified that one of their top modernization programs, the Ground Combat Vehicle program, is also scheduled to enter production in the 2019 time frame and that the Army will need a viable industrial base to produce it as well.

While the committee understands that the Army assumes that Foreign Military Sales (FMS) alone are enough to keep the Abrams tank line "warm" until the 2019 time frame, based on current world events, the committee believes that reliance upon FMS alone poses an unacceptable level of risk to our heavy vehicle industrial base, and thus to our national security. As a result, the committee believes that the best course of action would be a combination of continued tank upgrades for the Army and ongoing FMS, the combination of which should maintain production lines and suppliers until the next Abrams tank upgrade program begins. To further mitigate risk to the industrial base, the committee encourages the Army to begin the next series of Abrams tank upgrades in the 2017 or 2018 time frame, rather than delaying to 2019.

With regard to the military need for more M1A2 tank upgrades, the committee notes that six National Guard ABCTs are currently equipped with a less capable version of the Abrams tank. In addition, the committee believes that in the future the National Guard's share of ABCTs in the Army will increase due to possible Active Duty reductions, making the Army more reliant on its National Guard brigades in case of a major conflict. Therefore, the committee believes that as long as the National Guard has a less capable version of the Abrams tank, there will be a requirement for additional modernized M1A2 Abrams tanks.

The committee recommends $168.0 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

Bradley fighting vehicle and transmission upgrades

The budget request contained $158.0 million for Bradley fighting vehicle modifications.

The committee encourages the Army to use fiscal year 2013 authorized and appropriated funds to convert Bradley M2 Calvary vehicles into Bradley M3 infantry fighting vehicles. The committee understands that if the Bradley fighting vehicle production line is shut down, then other currently funded combat vehicle programs, such as the Paladin integrated management and the M88A2 recovery vehicle, will experience cost increases.

The committee also notes that regardless of whether the Ground Combat Vehicle is developed and fielded on schedule, the Army must continue upgrades to the remaining fleet of Bradley fighting vehicles through the Bradley Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) program. If the Army chooses to upgrade the vehicle transmission as part of the ECP program, than the committee encourages the Army to conduct a competitive award process for a transmission provided as government furnished equipment, or to require the prime contractor to conduct a competition to select the trans-

mission used in the upgrade. The committee believes that such a competition will ensure that the Army gets the best possible transmission available at the lowest possible cost.

The committee recommends $158.0 million, the full amount requested, for Bradley fighting vehicle modifications.

Improved recovery vehicle

The budget request contained $111.0 million for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

The committee is aware that in order to provide greater protection for soldiers, the Army's current and future fleet of combat vehicles has grown significantly in weight. As a result, the M88A1 recovery vehicles are approaching their maximum capability with the current fleet, and its capability will be greatly exceeded by the future fleet. The committee supports the Army's decision to include funds in the budget request for procurement of additional M88A2 vehicles, but believes additional funds are necessary to maintain production. The committee believes this will provide the Army with ample time to finalize its force structure and Brigade Combat Team adjustments and to determine a more accurate requirement for the procurement of additional M88A2s.

The committee recommends $186.0 million, an increase of $75.0 million, for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

Carbine program

The budget request contained $70.8 million for the carbine program. Of this amount, $18.9 million was requested for 12,000 M4A1 carbines and $48.6 million was requested for 29,897 new, individual carbine weapons. The budget request also contained $10.3 million for M4 carbine modifications.

As noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee continues to support the Army's dual-path acquisition strategy for modernizing its inventory of carbine weapons, which would allow the Army to upgrade its current M4 carbines as well as procure a new carbine after the current individual carbine competition is complete. Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) required the Secretary of the Army to submit to the congressional defense committees a business case assessment before making a procurement decision regarding the individual carbine program. The committee has yet to receive this business case assessment. Therefore, the committee is concerned that the amount of procurement funding requested for new carbines is too high given the individual carbine program's current down-select and evaluation schedule as well as the requirement to provide a business case assessment.

The committee recommends $48.8 million, a decrease of $22.0 million for new carbine weapons, for the carbine program. The committee also recommends $10.3 million, the full amount of the request, for M4 carbine modifications.

M9 product improvement strategy

The budget request contained $0.3 million for the M9 pistol program.

The committee notes that the M9 pistol has been a reliable pistol with consistent and reasonable life-cycle costs. The committee understands that the development of a requirement to replace the M9 pistol has been slowed by budget constraints and system capability debates over the need for a replacement. The committee is aware that the Marine Corps has upgraded the M9 pistol with a series of product improvements that has extended the life-cycle of the program and improved the weapon's capabilities. The committee believes that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force should consider pursuing a similar product improvement program for their respective service's M9 pistol inventory based on the Marine Corps' experience and lessons learned. The committee expects that any product improvement program be managed and executed through a full and open competitive process.

The committee recommends $0.3 million, the full amount of the request, for the M9 pistol program.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $1.5 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.4 billion, a decrease of $74.5 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Acquisition strategy for 40mm ammunition

The budget request contained $55.8 million in procurement of ammunition, Army for 40mm cartridges.

The committee is concerned that the budget request for 40mm ammunition may disrupt 40mm cartridge production due to the potential changes in allocation between variants of 40mm cartridges. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report by February 15, 2014 to the congressional defense committees that provides a five year funding estimate and annual production profile for each 40mm cartridge variant, detailed information on proposed new variants, estimated production quantities, the associated acquisition strategies, strategies to avoid potential production gaps or workforce disruptions, and development and production schedules.

The committee recommends $55.8 million for procurement of 40mm cartridges.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $6.5 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $6.4 billion, a decrease of $54.3 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Army unmanned ground vehicle upgrades

The committee notes that over the past 10 years, the Army has procured more than 5,000 unmanned ground vehicles (UGVs) of various sizes and for numerous missions. The committee also notes that if modified, many of these UGVs could support engineering, military police, and chemical-biological-radiological-nuclear missions, as well as gives them uses in domestic support scenarios. However, the committee is concerned that the Army has not transitioned many of its UGV programs to base budget programs-of-record. For example, the PackBot and Talon systems continue to be managed primarily through Overseas Contingency Operations funding outside the Army's normal upgrade programs. The committee believes that the continued ad hoc nature of the UGV programs will not allow for proper sustainment and upgrades in the future. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to establish a formal acquisition program for fiscal year 2015 to properly facilitate repair, maintenance, and upgrades of the Army's UGVs. The program should comply with current Federal Acquisition Regulations and should be funded through budget lines for research, development, test, and evaluation, procurement, and modifications.

Civil Support Team information management needs

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD CST) currently field an information management system that provides a common operating picture, promotes information sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation, and supports the CST mission of assisting and advising first responders and facilitating communications with other Federal resources. The committee has noted that it believes this system should be expanded to follow-on forces, such as the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Explosive Enhanced Response Force Package and Homeland Defense Response Force units. However, this has not yet occurred to date. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the information management system needs of the Department of Defense WMD response forces, including the needs of both Active and Reserve Components.

Criteria on the Recertification and Quantity of GEM-Ts

The committee is aware that the Patriot Guidance Enhanced Missile Tactical (GEM-T) missile provides an affordable, but critical, capability within the Patriot missile family that includes a complementary interceptor to the Patriot Advanced Capability–3 (PAC–3) and PAC–3 Missile Segment Enhancement (MSE). At approximately $0.5 million per missile, the GEM-T provides a lower cost option to PAC–3 when used against the same threat and can make possible saving the PAC–3 inventory for other threats.

The committee encourages the Army to undertake a GEM-T recertification program when the GEM-T missile certification requires renewal in fiscal year 2015. The committee is aware GEM-T recertification could provide an additional 20 years of service life for the GEM-T missiles the Army believes it requires for its future interceptor inventory. The committee believes such recertification could also promote interoperatibility with allies in Asia and the Arabian Gulf, and it could enable an interceptor mix and inventory that more comprehensively addresses known threats in both quantity and characteristic.

The committee is concerned that the missile inventory, both currently maintained and planned, does not take into account the full range of threats facing forward deployed forces; nor does it reflect the fiscal constraints the Army is likely to face in both procurement and research & development in the future. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 15, 2013, on current and planned missile inventories, namely GEM-T. This report should review the proposed inventory criteria and quantity of GEM-T recertification. Additionally, it should include a cost-benefit analysis, including an assessment of whether or not recertification meets an Army requirement in a cost-effective manner, to address the full range of threats, including short range ballistic missiles, as well as sustainment and procurement costs of the recertified missiles. This report should be submitted in unclassified form with a classified annex as necessary.

Gunshot detection systems

The committee believes that gunshot detection systems have proven to be critical part of force protection of military personnel in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF). The committee notes that in response to joint urgent operational needs, these systems were rapidly fielded, in many cases, for use by soldiers and marines conducting mounted and dismounted operations in OEF and OIF. The committee is aware that these systems proved particularly effective in the sniper detection mission. The committee encourages the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Commandant of the Marine Corps to continue to resource and transition gunshot detection systems to official programs of record in order to continue to develop, test, and field Individual, Vehicle, and Helicopter-borne gunshot detection systems.

Joint Tactical Radio System Manpack radio production strategy

The budget request contained $382.9 million in other procurement, Army for procurement of Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS)

radios. Of this amount, $323.7 million was for procurement of 2,648 JTRS Manpack radios.

The committee notes that the amount of competition in the JTRS program has increased dramatically over the past 3 years. Specifically, the committee notes that the Army is now planning full and open competition for production of each element of the JTRS program, including the JTRS small airborne networking radio, the JTRS small airborne link 16 terminal, the mid-tier networking vehicular radio, the JTRS handheld "rifleman" radio, and the JTRS "Manpack" radio.

The committee also supports the Army's efforts to create a more flexible radio acquisition approach that allows multiple vendors to offer the best available communications technology to meet Army requirements in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations. The committee believes that such an approach may reduce cost through competition, and encourage private sector innovation at little or no cost to the Government. The committee notes that this approach is very different from the Army's traditional, "winner takes all" approach to radio competitions in the past, which usually resulted in a sole-source, multi-decade contract arrangements.

The committee notes with concern, however, that the Army still has not provided the congressional defense committees formal acquisition strategies that would document the planned awards for JTRS radios. The committee understands that in the case of the Manpack radio the Army may award a single vendor a 5-year contract for full rate production. While such a strategy does provide incentive for manufacturers to reduce radio prices, the committee believes that such an award could discourage losing vendors from competing again in the future. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to consider alternative JTRS Manpack acquisition strategies that would maintain two or more vendors in full rate production for no more than 3 years before the next round of competition if the business case analysis is in the best interest to the warfighter and taxpayer. Such a strategy could balance the need to maintain efficient and cost effective radio production with continued competition and technology improvement.

While the committee continues to support full and open competition for tactical radio systems, the committee also cautions the Army against sacrificing critical warfighter requirements to include size, weight, security protocols and life cycle cost of radios. The burden of winning any competition should fall on the manufacturer which must offer a proposal that is compliant with the Army's stated requirements. In addition, the committee encourages the Army to avoid procuring tactical radio systems that operate on proprietary waveforms, have not been tested by the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, and that have not been or are not procured through full and open competition.

The committee recommends $382.9 million, the full amount of the request, for JTRS radios.

Patriot Modernization Costs

The committee notes that the Army's Air and Missile Defense Strategy signed in September 2012 by the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff acknowledge that current Air and Missile De-

fense forces must be transformed due proliferated ballistic missiles growing in sophistication and growing threats from cruise missiles and unmanned aerial systems. Furthermore, the strategy reaffirms the need for 360-degree surveillance and fire control, a smaller and more expeditionary force, and integration of networked sensors and weapons. The strategy also stresses the need for modem, modular open architectures and admits that the Army's ability to defeat missile threats is complicated by the decision not to procure the Medium Extended Area Defense System (MEADS).

The committee is concerned that the alternatively proposed Patriot 30-year strategic modernization strategy is a significant expense, does not sufficiently address acknowledged air and missile defense capability gaps and includes no discernible intent to harvest the flight tested, modem, technically mature 360-degree sensors, 360-degree lightweight launchers, and battle manager software developed under MEADS, for which the US taxpayer has expended in excess of $2.4 billion. The draft Patriot modernization strategy proposes spending in excess of $1.0 billion over the next 5 years mostly on sole-source contracts, while deferring development and fielding of expeditionary 360-degree capability until 2029–2034.

Due to declining defense budgets, and consistent with the Department's better buying power initiatives, the committee therefore believes it is premature to commit to the Patriot modernization strategy without a comprehensive and independent life cycle cost analysis of the Patriot 30-year modernization strategy.

The committee directs the Congressional Budget Office to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than November 30, 2013, on an analysis of the estimated development and procurement costs associated with the Patriot modernization including integration activities to enable network operations and testing. Such analysis shall also include estimates of:

(1) Unit Level Personnel: The direct costs of all operator, maintenance, and other support personnel at operating units (or at maintenance and support units that are organizationally related and adjacent to the operating units);

(2) Unit Operations: The unit level consumption costs of operating materials such as fuel, electricity, expendable stores, training munitions, and other operating materials. Also to be included are costs of any unit-funded support activities, training devices, or simulator operations that uniquely support an operational unit, temporary additional duty/temporary duty associated with the unit's normal concept of operations, and other unit-funded services;

(3) Maintenance: The costs of labor (outside of the scope of unit level) and materials at all levels of maintenance in support of the primary system, simulators, training devices, and associated support equipment (this includes intermediate maintenance, depot support, and contractor support). Additionally, the cost of contractor labor, materials, and overhead incurred in providing all or part of the logistics support to a weapon system;

(4) Sustaining Support: Costs for support services provided by centrally managed support activities external to the units

that own the operating systems and that can be identified to a specific system (excludes costs that must be arbitrarily allocated);

(5) Continuing System Improvements: The costs of hardware and software updates that occur after deployment of a system that improve the system's safety, reliability, maintainability, or performance characteristics to enable the system to meet its basic operational requirements throughout its life. (Costs for system improvement identified as part of the acquisition strategy or a pre-planned product improvement program and included in the acquisition cost estimate are not included. Also, any improvements of sufficient dollar value that would qualify as distinct major defense acquisition programs are not included.); and

(6) Indirect Support: Installation and personnel support costs that cannot be directly related to the units and personnel that operate and support the system being analyzed.

Personal protection equipment acquisition strategy

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to reconsider its acquisition process for personal protection equipment (PPE), to include body armor. Given the warfighter's experiences during operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee notes that PPE, in particular body armor, constitutes an essential part of "warfighter equipment;" and therefore, it should be treated differently than other, more prosaic consumables, such as socks and undershirts, that are included in the Defense Logistics Agency operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts.

The committee encourages the Department to consider adhering to "best value" performance standards in soliciting and evaluating proposals for PPE contracts rather than using lowest priced, technically acceptable (LPTA) contract vehicles. The committee believes that categorizing PPE as "O&M" may decrease commercial interest in pursuing long-term commitments to developing next-generation PPE technology that could increase capability while also decreasing weight. The committee also notes that previous national defense authorization acts have directed the Department to establish dedicated research, development, test, and evaluation and procurement line items for body armor. The committee is disappointed that the Department has not sufficiently implemented congressional direction regarding this matter.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $17.9 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $18.0 billion, an increase of $30.0 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

F/A–18E/F advance procurement

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement of F/A–18E/F aircraft. The F/A–18E/F is a naval strike fighter aircraft designed for both air-to-air and air-to-ground missions.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy's strike fighter shortfall forecast has decreased from last year's predicted 56 aircraft in fiscal year 2025 to a prediction of 18 aircraft in fiscal year 2023 for fiscal year 2014. However, the committee understands that these revised shortfall numbers are based on a decreased projected rate of F/A–18 utilization, successful high flight hour inspections on the fleet of F/A–18A through F/A–18D aircraft that would extend their useful flight hours to 9,000, and a service life extension program for 150 F/A–18A through D aircraft that would extend the useful flight hours of those aircraft to 10,000. The committee further notes that the Department of the Navy considers its plan to maintain the required strike fighter inventory with some risk, and the committee believes that a fiscal year 2015 procurement of additional F/A–18E/F aircraft, which have a useful life of 9,000 hours, would reduce the Department of the Navy's risk in maintaining the required inventory of strike fighter aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million for advance procurement of F/A–18E/F aircraft and encourages the Department of the Navy to budget for 24 additional F/A–18E/F aircraft in fiscal year 2015.

MQ–8 Fire Scout

The budget request contained $48.7 million for MQ–8 research, development, test and evaluation, and $61.0 million for the procurement of one MQ–8 Fire Scout vertical take-off and landing unmanned aerial vehicle (VTUAV).

The MQ–8 Fire Scout VTUAV provides real-time and non-real time intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) data to tactical users without the use of manned aircraft or reliance on limited theater or national assets. The committee understands that the MQ–8 has successfully flown over 4,187 hours in support of the Afghanistan ISR Task Force and that MQ–8 maritime ISR support to special operations forces continues aboard the USS *Bradley* and USS *Roberts* in fiscal year 2013. The committee also understands that future weapons and radar capabilities are being integrated into the MQ–8 to meet U.S. Central Command Naval Component urgent operational needs. Additionally, the committee notes that the Department of the Navy plans to procure 34 MQ–8 VTUAVs between fiscal years 2012–18 to support U.S. Africa Command joint emergent operational needs.

The committee views the MQ–8 VTUAV as a critical ISR asset and encourages the Department of the Navy to fully execute its fiscal year 2014 and Future Years Defense Program plans for procurement and development of the MQ–8.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $3.1 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.1 billion, a decrease of $14.1 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $589.3 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $589.3 million, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $14.0 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $15.0 billion, an increase of $934.3 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Air and Missile Defense Radar deployment on naval vessels

The Navy has reported that the Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR) suite is being developed to fulfill Integrated Air and Missile Defense requirements for multiple ship classes. This suite consists of an S-band radar (AMDR-S), an X-band radar and a Radar Suite Controller. AMDR would provide multi-mission capabilities, simultaneously supporting long-range, exoatmospheric detection, tracking and discrimination of ballistic missiles, as well as Area and Self Defense against air and surface threats. For the ballistic missile defense capability, increased radar sensitivity and bandwidth over current radar systems are needed to detect, track, and support engagements of advanced ballistic missile threats at the required ranges, concurrent with Area and Self Defense against Air and Surface threats. For the Area Air Defense and Self Defense capability, increased sensitivity and clutter capability is needed to detect, react to, and engage stressing Very Low Observable/Very Low Flyer threats in the presence of heavy land, sea, and rain clutter.

According to the Government Accountability Office report "Assessments of Selected Weapons Programs" (GAO–13–294SP) from March 2013, "the Navy plans to install a 14-foot variant of AMDR on Flight III DDG 51s starting in 2019. According to draft AMDR documents, a 14-foot radar is needed to meet threshold requirements, but an over 20-foot radar is required to fully meet the Navy's desired integrated air and missile defense needs."

The committee supports the continued development of the AMDR capability, but is concerned about the physical limitations associated with the future deployment of this capability on the Arleigh Burke-class Destroyer Flight III. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, that addresses the following:

(1) The capability requirements associated with the AMDR;

(2) Required space, cooling and electrical distribution upgrades necessary to support AMDR on the Arleigh Burke-class Destroyer Flight III;

(3) An assessment as to whether the limitations associated with the Arleigh Burke-class Destroyer Flight III will negatively impact the deployment on AMDR;

(4) An assessment of the deployment of AMDR on other naval platforms including the San Antonio-class Amphibious Transport Dock; and

(5) An assessment of the expansion capacity of the Arleigh Burke-class Destroyer Flight III to support further spiral development associated with future weapons.

Joint High Speed Vessel report

According to the Navy's fiscal year 2014 budget documentation, the Joint High Speed Vessel is being procured as an intra-theater sealift asset. However, the committee has observed growing indications from Department of the Navy leadership that the Joint High Speed Vessel will serve as much more than a troop transport vessel. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2014, on the following items:

(1) A complete list of existing required operational capabilities for the JHSV approved by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC);

(2) The number of vessels to be allocated to each combatant commander area of responsibility under that plan;

(3) The overseas basing plan to fulfill combatant commander requirements and how dispersal of the vessels will affect each of the JROC-approved operational capability requirements; and

(4) An assessment of the future options for additional missions to be fulfilled by the Joint High Speed Vessel and their operational benefits to include the following missions: mine countermeasure operations; joint task force command and control; intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance; counter-piracy operations; counter-drug operations; and counter-smuggling operations.

Littoral Combat Ship radar capabilities

The committee is concerned that the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) radars are not being optimally used to provide maximum protection. The USS Independence variant's radar can rapidly and accurately detect and track small, fast-moving targets at all altitudes; small surface targets in severe clutter; and rockets, artillery, and mortars launched from shore-based threats. The radar also can perform air and surface surveillance, target identification for weapon systems, and high-resolution splash spotting. The radar has successfully demonstrated simultaneous detection and tracking of air, surface (swarming small boats) and mortar targets in the world's most challenging littoral environments. To ensure that the LCS program fully leverages the various capabilities of its modern radar technologies to protect this new class of ship, the committee encourages the Department of the Navy to fully utilize the capabilities provided by the current LCS radar suite and ensure that the embarked crew is fully trained on the radar's capabilities. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 3, 2014, on the steps the Navy has taken to enhance LCS sailors' training on the radar's full range of capabilities.

Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) oversight

The committee notes the Navy plans to acquire 52 Littoral Combat Ship seaframes and 64 mission packages at a cost of approximately $40.0 billion through 2035. Littoral Combat Ships 1–16 are under contract, and Littoral Combat Ships 17–24 are pending authorization. The committee further notes that the Navy's acquisition strategy for the Littoral Combat Ship seaframes has changed several times and continues to evolve as the Navy approaches its next major planned contract award in fiscal year 2016. The Navy has indicated that 10 of the 64 planned mission modules will be procured before the seaframe Milestone B and that this milestone continues to be delayed due to lack of an approved test plan and acquisition program baseline. The Navy expects to procure more than half of the Surface Warfare and Mine Counter Measure modules before it demonstrates they meet minimum requirements. The committee has significant concerns regarding the levels of concurrency associated with the mission modules and the expected delivery of the Littoral Combat Ship seaframes. This dichotomy in capability development appears excessive and the committee believes it should be better aligned to ensure future success of this program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare a report to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2014 on the current status of the Littoral Combat Ship program. This report should assess the following:

(1) Seaframe production and testing, including: (a) Seaframe developmental test activities and changes made to correct deficiencies identified during testing to date; (b) Weight management for both seaframe variants; (c) Planned Navy surrogate damage and survivability tests using aluminum structures; (d) Progress made in implementing commonality across both variants;

(2) Mission module development and testing, including developmental test activities and changes made to correct deficiencies identified during testing to date;

(3) Lessons learned and knowledge gained to date from the Singapore deployment;

(4) Results of Navy technical and requirements studies and any recommendations for changes to the design and/or capabilities of either current or future LCS;

(5) Navy studies, assessments, or potential plans to acquire the Joint High Speed Vessel to operate in conjunction with LCS or perform similar missions; and

(6) Role of LCS Council in acquisition oversight and decision-making.

Long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels

Pursuant to section 231 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense provided the annual long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels on May 10, 2013, as informed by the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) for fiscal years 2014–18. The Secretary also indicated that a force structure of "about 300 ships" would be necessary to support ongoing naval operations. The Secretary further highlights the "resourcing challenges outside the FYDP largely due to investment requirements associated with the SSBN(X) program". The Secretary acknowledges that these ship construction pressures will precipitate higher fiscal requirements in the mid-term planning period (fiscal years 2024–33) requiring an annual investment of $19.8 billion per year in fiscal year 2013 constant dollars.

The committee supports a robust shipbuilding plan that invests in the near and long term needs of our Navy, and considers the recapitalization of the SSBN fleet a challenging but necessary strategic priority. However, the committee is concerned that the Navy's ship construction accounts will face significant pressure in supporting long term ship requirements while also resourcing the *Ohio*-class replacement ballistic missile submarine program. The committee also believes that a significant increase to the ship construction accounts is unsustainable in times of budget challenges. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the average ship construction investment over the last 30 years, in current dollars, is $16.0 billion. Therefore, to better understand the significance associated with even sustaining the current ship construction investment throughout the long-range plan, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committee by March 1, 2014, that provides an update to the long plan for the construction of naval vessels based on $16.0 billion across the entirety of the long-range plan and to assess the corresponding reductions in the shipbuilding plan. The Secretary of the Navy should also provide an assessment of this investment in terms of the health associated with the industrial base, as well as a discussion of alternative strategies for the Navy and Congress to consider in alleviating any shortfalls between this assessment and the May 10 report.

Navy Close-in Weapon System (CIWS) modernization

The committee is aware of a backlog of overhauls and reliability, maintainability, and availability, (RMA) kits for ship self-defense systems including the Navy's Close-in Weapon System (CIWS). The committee is aware that CIWS is a last line of defense against missiles, rockets and mortars for the preponderance of naval vessels including cruisers, destroyers, and aircraft carriers. The committee also remains concerned about credible threats posed to sailors and marines that rely on these systems for protection in a time of heightened operational tempo. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to deliver a briefing no later than December 31, 2013 to the House Armed Services Committee which details the current situation pertaining to overhauls and RMA kits and efforts address the backlog of these systems.

Navy fleet oilers

The committee understands that most of the Navy's current fleet oilers are single-hulled, and in 2010, the Navy announced plans to recapitalize fleet oilers with construction of modern, double-hulled ships while leveraging commercial technologies. While the Navy announced plans to start procurement of the new TAO(X) oiler-class in fiscal year 2014, the Navy's fiscal year 2013 and fiscal year 2014 budgets have postponed procurement of the TAO(X) fleet oiler until fiscal year 2016.

However, the committee is concerned that the Navy budget plans show no Advance Procurement (AP) funding in fiscal year 2014 or fiscal year 2015 toward long lead-time material and components for the first TAO(X), and budget plans reflect a gap year between procurement of the first and second ships. Both actions, unless addressed, are likely to lead to higher costs and delayed delivery of required TAO(X) ships. The committee encourages the Navy and the Department of Defense to allocate fiscal year 2015 funds for AP of long-lead time material and components for the first TAO(X) ship in fiscal year 2016 and to look for ways to eliminate the gap year between first and second ships.

Use of fixed-price incentive fee contracts for ship construction contracts

The Navy has a history of moving from cost-plus to fixed-price incentive fee (FPIF) contracts after acquiring the first few ships of the class. While fixed-price contracts are generally less risky for the U.S. Government, the committee is concerned about continued cost growth under the FPIF contracts. FPIF contracts are intended to allow the U.S. Government to acquire needed items at lower costs, and with improved delivery or technical performance, by relating the amount of profit or fee to the contractor's performance. In particular, two specific intended outcomes of using incentive contracts are to motivate contractor efforts and to discourage contractor inefficiency and waste. The committee is particularly interested in understanding whether the Navy's use of FPIF contracts for shipbuilding are achieving the intended benefits to the U.S. Government.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, that assesses the following:

(1) To what extent has the Navy entered into FPIF contracts for shipbuilding over the past 5-years? To what extent have other contract types been used, including firm-fixed-price?

(2) What factors does the Navy consider in making decisions about contract type for shipbuilding programs, and what is the role of the program office, contracting officer, and others in these decisions?

(3) For selected recent shipbuilding acquisitions, how has risk been apportioned between the government and the contractor in FPIF contract sharelines? Practically speaking, how has the risk apportionment compared to that under a cost-plus incentive fee contract?

(4) Have the Navy's FPIF contracts served, as intended, to motivate shipbuilding contractors to improve performance and reduce inefficiencies? What visibility does the Navy have into these intended outcomes?

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $6.3 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $6.2 billion, a decrease of $26.2 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $1.3 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.3 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $11.4 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $11.7 billion, an increase of $310.2 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

A–10 oxygen delivery systems modernization

The budget request contained $47.6 million for A–10 aircraft modifications.

The committee supports ongoing modernization of A–10 oxygen delivery systems with On-Board Oxygen Generation Systems (OBOGS). The committee notes that liquid oxygen-based systems are manpower intensive and require significant maintenance and support equipment. The committee is also concerned that the Air Force, at times, must rely upon foreign sources of liquid oxygen when A–10 aircraft are deployed. The committee understands that retrofitting the remaining A–10 aircraft within the Active Duty and Reserve Components that have yet to be modernized with OBOGS could produce significant cost savings over the service life of the aircraft. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force to continue conversion of liquid oxygen-based systems to OBOGS in the A–10 fleet.

The committee recommends $47.6 million, the full amount of the request, for A–10 aircraft modifications.

B–52 Bomber modernization programs

The budget request contains $12.6 million in PE 101113F for B–52 Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT) development and $87.2 million for B–52 CONECT procurement of 10 kits, but no funds for the B–52 Strategic Radar Replacement (SRR) program.

The B–52 SRR program replaces the current B–52 fielded in the 1960s and then upgraded in the 1970s and 1980s. Although modified several times, it has never been totally replaced, and several parts of the system remain from the original design, such as the antenna reflector, feed, and casting. Although sustainable through the current service life of the B–52, the legacy radar system mean-time-between-failure continues to degrade and sustainment costs are expected to significantly increase after 2017. The SRR program is a radar replacement program that may take advantage of the advanced capabilities of modern non-developmental radars, maximizing commonality with other platforms. The B–52 SRR program would integrate, test, and field a modern radar system, which supports all weather targeting and navigation to support the requirements of keeping the B–52 combat capable for its extended service life. However, the SRR program was terminated in the budget request for fiscal year 2013 due to Air Force budget constraints and the need to fund other, higher priorities. Although the committee understands that affordability concerns was the primary driver for the SRR program termination, it is unclear to the committee how the Secretary of the Air Force intends to afford the legacy radar system knowing that sustainment costs are predicted to significantly increase after 2017. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to develop and implement an affordability strategy for maintaining radar capability on the B–52 aircraft through its predicted service-life of 2040 and to communicate that strategy to the congressional defense committees soon after the affordability strategy is developed.

Regarding the previously terminated B–52 CONECT program in the budget request for fiscal year 2013, the committee supports the Secretary's decision reinstating the program in the fiscal year 2014 budget request. However, the committee is concerned with the current plan to only fund and modernize 28 of 76 total aircraft with CONECT capability. The committee reminds the Secretary that section 137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the Secretary to maintain all B–52 aircraft in a common capability configuration. Realizing that the committee in the future may have to address not retaining the nuclear capability for a certain number of B–52 in order to comply with New START requirements, the committee intends to provide no flexibility for not maintaining B–52 aircraft in a common conventional capability configuration. A dissimilar capability configuration adds complexity to supply chain management, aircrew certification, training and employment, and would inherently complicate combatant commander operational planning and execution by having to account for dissimilar aircraft capabilities.

Battlefield airborne communications node

The committee notes that the battlefield airborne communications node (BACN) system was initially developed to meet an urgent warfighter need. The committee further notes that since its fielding, BACN has provided critical communications and information sharing capability between different tactical data and voice networks in support of operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee believes that the BACN is a needed capability for the future and encourages the Department of the Air Force to continue its effort to transition the BACN to a traditional program of record in fiscal year 2015.

C–130H Avionics and Propulsion System Modernization and Upgrade Programs

The budget request contained no funds for continuing low rate initial production of the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) for C–130H aircraft and $0.4 million in PE 401115F for C–130 airlift squadrons, but no funds for C–130H propulsion system upgrades.

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of the Air Force invested nearly $1.5 billion of taxpayer dollars for engineering, manufacturing, development, and testing of the C–130 AMP program and has entered Low Rate Initial Production, but has no plans to continue procurement and installation of C–130 AMP onto legacy C–130H aircraft. The Secretary also has no plans to modernize or upgrade the C–130H propulsion system in order to increase reliability, capability, fuel efficiency and on-wing time of the engine, as well as decrease the overall cost and maintenance burden of the current propulsion system. The Secretary has not articulated to the committee a coherent plan for fleet-wide recapitalization of the C–130H fleet or how they plan to maintain medium-sized intra-theater airlift capacity and capability within both the Active and Reserve Components. Knowing that the majority of the C–130H fleet resides within the Reserve Components of the Air Force and that the C–130H should remain reliable, capable, and

relevant to meeting current and future warfighter needs, the committee is concerned with the lack of initiative that the Secretary has taken with regard to the modernization and upgrade of C–130H aircraft. The committee also notes that through cost reduction initiatives and efficiencies gained in the C–130 AMP program over the past year, the cost data that the Secretary used as justification for canceling the C–130 AMP program in the budget request is no longer relevant.

Therefore, the committee recommends $26.4 million, an increase of $26.0 million, in PE 401115F for C–130H propulsion system propeller upgrades; $74.3 million, an increase of $15.7 million, for C–130H propulsion system engine upgrades; and $47.3 million, an increase of $47.3 million, for continued procurement of 8 C–130 AMP kits and installation onto C–130H aircraft. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would preserve the nearly $1.5 billion taxpayer investment in the C–130 AMP program and would prohibit the Secretary from canceling the C–130 AMP program. Finally, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to immediately obligate authorized appropriations provided in fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 to preserve the cost reduction initiatives and efficiencies gained in the C–130 AMP program over the past year.

Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft

The budget request contained $202.5 million in aircraft procurement, Air Force and research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force, for development and upgrade of Global Hawk unmanned aircraft. The budget request also contained $22.2 million in operation and maintenance, Air Force, for continued operation of Global Hawk unmanned aircraft.

In section 154 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), Congress prohibited the proposed retirement of Global Hawk Block 30 unmanned aircraft while also mandating their continued operations through 2014 to meet combatant command intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) operations. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee stated that this legislation was based on the committee's desire to maintain ISR capability to meet ever-increasing combatant command ISR needs, avoid the retirement of brand new aircraft procured at a cost of more than $100.0 million each, and support the Department of Defense's new strategy that requires long-duration, long-range ISR assets. The committee believes that even after the war in the Republic of Iraq and transition to a reduced U.S. military presence in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, long-range ISR aircraft will be in more demand, not less. The committee notes that as the number of Global Hawk missions in Afghanistan has declined missions in support of U.S. Africa Command, U.S. Central Command, and U.S. Pacific Command have increased. The committee believes that this is due to ongoing and growing demand for ISR of all kinds.

While the committee was pleased to see that the Air Force did request funding for Global Hawk Block 30 operations in the budget request for fiscal year 2014, the committee remains concerned that

the Air Force is not fully committed to retaining much needed ISR capability, and Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft in particular. As a result, the committee supports further extending Global Hawk operations through 2016 and expects the Air Force to maintain Global Hawk operations and support infrastructure, including active duty and reserve units, through at least this timeframe. Additionally, consistent with its position for fiscal year 2013, the committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to fully execute the fiscal year 2012 Global Hawk Block 30 program, including the procurement of 3 additional aircraft, in accordance with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74).

MQ–9 Reaper remotely piloted aircraft

The budget request contained $272.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for procurement of 12 MQ–9 Reaper remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) systems and $45.3 million for initial spares and repair parts for MQ–9 Reapers. The budget request also contained $30.0 million in research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for the extended range capability for MQ–9 Reapers.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) authorized procurement of 36 new MQ–9 Reapers and associated ground equipment in an effort to accelerate fielding of the upgraded Block 5 version of the MQ–9 Reaper and meet the Air Force's objective for increasing intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability. This represented an increase of 12 aircraft above the fiscal year 2013 budget request. The committee is concerned, however, that in response to this action, the Air Force chose to reduce the number of MQ–9 Reaper aircraft in the budget request for fiscal year 2014 from 24 to 12 aircraft.

The committee believes that the Air Force must continue to aggressively invest in ISR aircraft. The committee notes that even when the Air Force achieves its current goal of supporting 65 combat air patrols of MQ–1 Predator and MQ–9 Reaper RPAs, there will be significant unmet demand for ISR capability worldwide. While the committee understands the Air Force's desire to transition away from RPAs that are only capable of operating in permissive threat environments, it believes that the daily demand for both traditional ISR and strike missions in support of global counter-terrorism operations will not decline for many years. Furthermore, the Air Force's efforts to increase the operational range and endurance of the baseline MQ–9 Reaper will expand their utility (when accounting for basing constraints) and further increase demand for these platforms. Finally, the committee seeks to sustain the industrial base for remotely piloted aircraft to ensure that it will be available to build the next generation of RPA systems.

The committee recommends $352.2 million, an increase of $80.0 million, in aircraft procurement, Air Force for procurement of 18 MQ–9 Reaper RPA systems. The committee also recommends $56.3 million, an increase of $11.0 million, in aircraft procurement, Air Force, for initial spares and repair parts for these aircraft. The committee expects the Air Force to place all of the funding provided

on contract for new MQ–9 aircraft and associated ground equipment during fiscal year 2014.

Upgraded ejection seats

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of upgraded ejection seats for B–2 and F–16 aircraft.

The committee understands that aircraft aging and heavy operations tempo have produced fatigue and corrosion in legacy ejection seat designs which were designed and procured by the Department of the Air Force in the mid-1970s. The committee further understands that the incorporation of modern helmet mounted displays creates significant risk to pilot survival during high speed ejections because the aerodynamic forces of high-speed ejections could lift the modern helmet off the pilot and generate high neck tension loads. Today's state-of-the-art upgraded ejection seats can effectively address these risks while at the same time providing significantly improved ease of maintenance and increased aircraft availability.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to begin replacing the 1970s-designed ejection seats equipped in most legacy fighter and bomber aircraft with a low cost approach that would emphasize a form, fit, and function solution requiring minimal qualification in legacy Department of the Air Force aircraft. The committee believes that minimizing sustainment lifecycle costs through commonality with currently-fielded components should also be included as a prime determinant in selecting the upgraded ejection seat, and that the B–2 and the F–16 aircraft, which would require the least effort toward flight-worthy qualification of a new ejection seat, should be given upgrade priority.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $759.4 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $759.4 million, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $5.3 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $5.3 billion, a decrease of $0.7 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $16.8 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $16.8 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Remotely Piloted Aircraft Squadron Operations Centers for the Air National Guard

The budget request contained no funds for Remotely Piloted Aircraft Squadron Operations Centers (RSOC) for the Air National Guard.

The committee notes that the Air Force fiscal year 2013 force structure changes approved by the committee included plans to create numerous MQ–1 and MQ–9 remotely piloted aircraft remote-split operations and targeting squadrons in the Air National Guard. However, the committee notes with concern that the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6) did not include sufficient funding to begin acquiring the ground-based equipment necessary to stand up these units. Specifically, the committee understands that to reach full capability these units will need fully modernized RSOCs, and that the infrastructure provided by the RSOC supports hosting up to five ground control stations, intelligence analysts, weather personnel, and other critical personnel required for full operations.

The committee encourages the Air Force, starting by the fiscal year 2015 budget request, to fully fund RSOC and other equipment required to stand up fully modernized Air National Guard MQ–1 and MQ–9 remote-split operations and targeting units.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $4.5 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $4.6 billion, an increase of $107.0 million, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Concurrent fielding of equipment for the Army National Guard and Air National Guard

The budget request contained $2.7 billion for National Guard equipment modernization.

The National Guard and Reserve Components are no longer considered a "strategic reserve," and are now regarded as an "operational" force. Since September 2001, over 860,000 members of the National Guard and Reserve Components have been mobilized and served on Active Duty in support of Operation Noble Eagle, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn, of whom over 900 have been killed in action. Domestically, over 50,000 members of the National Guard responded to Hurricane Katrina and, more recently, more than 7,000 members of the National Guard and Reserve Components mobilized in support of Hurricane Sandy.

Recognizing the importance of an operational reserve force and the imperative to equip the National Guard and Reserve Components with modernized equipment, in recent years, the committee authorized funding for additional equipment for the Reserve Components to address chronic shortfalls in Army National Guard (ARNG) and Air National Guard (ANG) equipment inventories. Since 2007, Congress has provided approximately $9.2 billion in the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account to address this issue, in addition to other targeted funding increases. As a result of these funding increases and sustained investment in the ARNG and ANG, both components are currently at historic highs in terms of equipment-on-hand, with the ARNG at 87 percent and the ANG at 91 percent.

However, the committee notes that some of the equipment counted as on-hand is substitute or less-capable versions of the required equipment. The committee acknowledges that the National Guard faces mounting challenges regarding how to replace worn out equipment, legacy equipment that is becoming obsolete or irrelevant, and equipment that is aging through normal wear-and-tear. In addition, long-term gaps in funding remain. The "National Guard and Reserve Equipment Report for Fiscal Year 2014" identified an almost $29.7 billion shortfall for the ARNG for fully modernized equipment, approximately 26.6 percent of the total requirement. The report also found a $8.8 billion shortfall for the ANG for fully modernized equipment, which is 14.5 percent of the total requirement. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that these shortfalls may not be addressed based on current Army and Air Force procurement and fielding plans. For example, the committee understands that plans for fielding major weapons systems for the ANG, including the F–35 aircraft, remain far in the future. For the ARNG, fielding of the UH–60M and CH–47F helicopters are planned to stretch out over several decades.

The committee recommends that the Army and the Air Force reexamine their funding and fielding plans for all National Guard equipment procurement and that they re-balance those plans to provide the ARNG and the ANG with new equipment concurrent with fielding to Active Duty units. The committee believes that using the National Guard as an operational force, with planned rotations and mobilizations, makes it imperative that National Guard units be provided the necessary resources to man, equip, sustain, and train.

The committee recommends $2.7 billion, the full amount requested, for National Guard equipment modernization.

Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund

The budget request contained $98.8 million for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUON) Fund.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services have established a number of organizations and programs to respond to requests from units in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), units supporting other combatant commands, and from combatant commanders to rapidly develop and field solutions to a variety of capabilities, including development and transition of new technologies to the warfighter; support for Joint Experimentation Range Complexes; counter-improvised explosive detection and destroy; and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance sensors and systems. The committee notes each of these programs requests amounts for unspecified purposes for hundreds of projects in anticipation of requests from OEF units, other units in other combatant commands, and combatant commanders. The committee believes that this request lacks proper justification and is duplicative with other requests for rapid acquisition capabilities to address urgent operational needs.

The committee appreciates that the Department of Defense must find ways to rapidly fund urgent needs to address near-term and high-risk scenarios. As such, Congress provided the Department with Rapid Acquisition Authority in section 806(c) 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) and section 803 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) which provides the Secretary of Defense $200.0 million in authority, per fiscal year, to waive any statute hindering quick response to immediate warfighter capability requirements in response to combat fatalities. The committee understands the Department has rarely used this authority.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $98.8 million, for the JUON Fund.

Multiyear procurement authority for ground-based interceptors

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision concerning authority for the Director, Missile Defense Agency to enter into 1 or more multiyear contracts, beginning in fiscal year 2014, for the procurement of 14 ground-based interceptors and authority for advanced procurement associated with these ground-based interceptors.

The committee notes that the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that this provision would result in savings of 10 percent for the Department of Defense on the price of a ground-based interceptor, and that buying these interceptors under the current Missile Defense Agency plan of 14 interceptors under 7 annual contracts of 2 per-year would cost about $200.0 million more than a single multiyear contract.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for Procurement at the levels identified in section 4101 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Stryker Vehicle Program

This section would limit the obligation of procurement funds of the Stryker program to not more than 75 percent of the fiscal year 2014 requested amount until the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the Stryker vehicle spare parts inventory.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for E–2D Aircraft Program

This section would permit the Secretary of the Navy to procure up to 32 E–2D aircraft utilizing multiyear procurement authority for fiscal years 2014–18.

Section 122—Cost Limitation for CVN–78 Aircraft Carriers

This section would amend the statutory cost cap for the aircraft carrier designated as CVN–78 that was imposed by subsection (a)(1) of section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The cost cap for CVN–78 is currently $11.755 billion, having been adjusted by the Secretary of the Navy in 2010 using the authority granted by subsection (b) of section 122 of Public Law 109–364. This section would raise the cost cap to the Program Manager's most likely Estimate at Completion, as reported in the 2011 Selected Acquisition Report, to $12.9 billion. This section would also update the cost cap associated with CVN–79 and later *Ford*-class aircraft carriers.

The committee notes the receipt of a report to Congress required by section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) that provides cost-saving details that the Navy intends to incorporate into the acquisition strategy to provide better cost stability in CVN–78 and eventual incorporation into CVN–79 procurement process.

The committee remains concerned about the continued escalation in costs associated with *Gerald R. Ford*-class aircraft carrier and the negative consequences associated with this continued escalation on the entirety of the ship construction accounts. This escalation, when taken in the context of the 30-year shipbuilding plan that includes significant costs associated with the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine replacement, is unsustainable.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Multiple Variants of the C–130J Aircraft Program

This section would permit the Secretary of the Air Force to procure multiple variants of the C–130J baseline aircraft utilizing multiyear procurement authority for fiscal years 2014–18.

Section 132—Prohibition on Cancellation or Modification of Avionics Modernization Program for C–130 Aircraft

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from terminating the legacy C–130H Avionics Modernization Program.

Section 133—Retirement of KC–135R Aircraft

This section would permit the Secretary of the Air Force to remove KC–135E aerial refueling aircraft from flyable storage, which would permit the Secretary to utilize parts and components of retired KC–135E aircraft to enter the supply chain for maintaining and sustaining KC–135R aerial refueling aircraft. This section would also require the Secretary to maintain any retired KC–135R aircraft in a flyable condition that would permit recall to active flying service in the Department of the Air Force. This section would also permit the Secretary of the Air Force, on a "one-for-one" basis, to remove KC–135R aircraft from the flyable storage requirement for each new KC–46A aircraft delivered to the Department of the Air Force.

Section 134—Competition for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Providers

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop and implement a plan to ensure the fair evaluation of competing contractors in awarding a contract to a certified evolved expendable launch vehicle provider. This plan would include descriptions of how the following areas would be addressed in the evaluation: the proposed cost, schedule, and performance; mission assurance activities; the manner in which the contractor will operate under the Federal Acquisition Regulation; the effect of other contracts in which the contractor is entered into with the Federal Government, such as the evolved expendable launch vehicle launch capability and the space station commercial resupply services contracts; and any other areas determined appropriate by the Secretary.

This section would also require that the Secretary submit a report to Congress not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that includes the aforementioned plan or provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the plan. After the Secretary provides the report or briefing to Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the plan.

SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE-WIDE, JOINT, AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 141—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Ground-based Interceptors

The section would provide the Director, Missile Defense Agency with authority to enter into 1 or more multiyear contracts, beginning in fiscal year 2014, for the procurement of 14 ground-based interceptors. This section would also provide authority for advanced procurement associated with these ground-based interceptors. This section would also require that such contracts include a requirement that they be subject to the availability of appropriation for these purposes.

Section 142—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Tactical Wheeled Vehicles

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into a 5-year pilot program for the multiyear procurement of tactical wheeled vehicles. This section would also require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, their intent to award such a contract, and if not, justification for not pursuing the pilot program. If the program is implemented, this section would also direct the Secretary of Defense to submit, as part of the Department's justification materials in support of the President's annual budget request, detailed information on the status, progress, and challenges associated with implementation of the pilot program.

The committee notes that the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force have validated requirements for tactical wheeled vehicles. The committee also notes that the Department of Defense has procured certain tactical wheeled vehicles, including the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles, the Medium Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Replacement, and the Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles, through multiyear procurement contracts and achieved significant cost savings.

Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of RQ–4 Global Hawk Unmanned Aircraft Systems

This section would limit the use of funds to retire Global Hawk Block 30 unmanned aircraft systems and would require the Secretary of the Air Force to take all actions necessary to maintain the operational capability of the RQ–4 Block 30 Global Hawk through December 31, 2016.

Section 144—Personal Protection Equipment Procurement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that within each military service procurement account, a separate procurement budget line item is designated for personal protection equipment (PPE) investment and funding transparency.

Section 145—Repeal of Certain F–35 Reporting Requirements

This section would amend section 122 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by striking subsection (b), and re-designating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

Section 146—Study on Procurement of Personal Protection Equipment

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) to conduct a study to identify and assess alternative and effective means for stimulating competition and innovation in the personal protection equipment industrial base, to include body armor. This section would also require that within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the FFRDC shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report detailing the findings and recommendations from the study. In addition, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the findings and recommendations of the FFRDC study, along with the complete study.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $67.5 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation. This represents a $2.8 billion decrease over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends $68.0 billion, an increase of $559.2 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 research, development, test, and evaluation program are identified in division D of this Act.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $7.9 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army. The committee recommends $7.9 billion, a decrease of $47.0 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 research, development, test, and evaluation, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Active protection system research and development

The committee notes that as a result of the removal of a requirement for an active protection system (APS) on the Army's Ground Combat Vehicle that the budget request included no funding for APS research and development. The committee is concerned that

this lack of investment may soon create a critical capability gap for Army combat vehicles due to the rapid proliferation of advanced anti-tank guided missiles and next-generation rocket propelled grenades. The committee notes that there are numerous types of APS available, including some that have already been fielded on operational vehicles in other countries. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to establish and fund a program to conduct APS research and development starting in the fiscal year 2015 budget request.

Army advanced multi-purpose tank round program

The budget request contained $30.6 million in PE 63639A for tank and medium caliber ammunition research and development. Of this amount, no funding was requested for the Advanced Multi-Purpose (AMP) 120mm round program.

The committee notes that in response to an urgent need, the Marine Corps has initiated procurement of a new multi-purpose, high-explosive (MPHE) 120mm round for M1A1 Abrams tanks. The committee understands that this MPHE round has a data link allowing the crew to select different fuse settings, including point detonation, delay, and airburst, which combines the effects of several current rounds into one. The committee believes that this round could potentially also fulfill some of the Army's requirements for the Advanced Multi-Purpose 120mm round program, which went through initial testing in 2006 and may begin further development in fiscal year 2015. The committee encourages the Army to assess the current capability of the Marine Corps' MPHE round to potentially meet AMP requirements in order to potentially save funding and avoid starting a redundant program.

The committee recommends $30.6 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63639A for tank and medium caliber ammunition development.

Army air and missile defense

The committee is concerned that the Army's air and missile defense units may not have the capacity and capabilities to address threats in current and future anti-access, area denial environments. The committee believes that the Army should be prepared to provide missile and air defenses for both static locations and maneuvering forces inside a region facing a sophisticated A2/AD threat. The committee believes that mobility and creative employment concepts are vital to the future success of Army air and missile defenses. The committee also believes that the Army should seek to exercise its air and missile defense capabilities with allies in Asia Pacific region on a regular basis in order to enhance our capabilities and encourage our allies to develop more comprehensive air and missile defense systems.

Army cargo unmanned aerial system

The committee notes that the Marine Corps is conducting a successful demonstration using an unmanned aerial system (UAS) to move cargo loads of up to 4,500 pounds in remote areas of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The system in question has been deployed for 15 months to-date. The use of this cargo UAS has re-

duced the need to use manned aircraft or vehicles to provide supplies to remote operating locations, thus providing substantial force protection benefits.

The committee is concerned that the Army, despite having very similar logistical challenges, does not have a cargo UAS program. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by February 15, 2014, assessing the potential utility of an Army cargo UAS. Specifically, the report should address:

(1) How cargo UAS capabilities could be incorporated into the Army's logistics operations from point-of-supply through delivery to point-of-need;

(2) An estimate of the cost to procure, operate, and sustain cargo UAS in comparison to using manned rotorcraft for the same missions; and

(3) Any additional operational or logistical impacts to the Army of fielding a cargo UAS.

Army directed energy testing

The committee is aware of the U.S. Army's current test effort through the Solid State Laser Testbed (SSLT) program, to examine the utility of directed energy technology as a supplement to current capabilities for force protection of rocket, artillery, and mortar threats. The committee stresses the importance of directed energy research and encourages the Army's continuation of those efforts. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on SSLT program efforts. The briefing should include the following:

(1) Overview and results of the test campaign;

(2) The current status of plans to incorporate directed energy as a supplement to, or replacement for, the current counter-rocket, artillery, and mortar program of the Army;

(3) The projected mission utility based on current test results including the number of directed energy systems required to replace existing systems;

(4) Potential advantages and disadvantages in regards to magazine depth and associated costs; and

(5) Any logistical or operational challenges that remain to be addressed prior to deployment of a directed energy system, including satellite and aircraft interference as well as the maintenance of sophisticated laser technology in austere environments.

Army modernization strategy for tactical communications waveforms

The committee supports the Army's efforts to provide additional tactical network communications capability to the individual soldier. The committee believes that building a high-capacity, secure tactical Internet system will be useful in a range of military operations and will also enhance the warfighter's ability to communicate, survive, and fight. The committee notes that the Joint Tactical Radio System and the Warfighter Information Network-Tac-

tical programs are both critical parts to building the tactical Internet system and continues to support both programs.

The committee also notes that thus far, the Army has chosen to develop and use waveforms unique to the military for transmitting data, including the High-capacity Network Waveform (HNW), the Wideband Networking Waveform (WNW), and the Soldier Radio Waveform (SRW). While it recognizes the needs for this technology, the committee also encourages the Army to expand its research and development efforts to better leverage commercial wireless technology waveforms, such as second generation, third generation, and fourth generation long-term evolution cellular phone waveforms. The committee believes that these efforts could result in substantial savings for the Army by taking advantage of the vast amount of private sector research and development that already exists, both in terms of hardware and software technology. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to develop commercial waveforms for tactical communications that are compliant with the 3rd Generation Partnership Project and other applicable industry standards to the extent it is practical given military and security requirements.

Combat vehicle fuel efficiency engine development

The committee applauds the recent efforts of the Department of the Army to improve the fuel efficiency of the M1 Abrams tank. These efforts offer improved cost savings for the Department as well as increased operating capabilities. The committee encourages the Army to consider modern diesel technology for future applications into combat vehicles which would also take into account total life cycle costs.

Continued development of vehicle underbody protection systems

The committee recognizes the continued threat improvised explosive devices (IEDs) pose to ground combat and tactical vehicles. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to continue to study underbody vulnerabilities to combat and tactical vehicles posed by IEDs, in particular the high mobility, multi-purpose wheeled vehicle. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to continue to test and develop solutions that would improve survivability of vehicle underbodies, to include protective systems for fuel tanks and fuel bladders. The committee believes that there should be an emphasis on low-cost solutions that reduce the possibility of a post-blast fire while minimizing engineering changes to the vehicle. The committee also recognizes the recent advances in light composite materials with self-healing capabilities and encourages the Secretary of the Army to evaluate their use in new production vehicle programs and current vehicle recapitalization programs.

Fabric-based respiratory protective equipment

The committee notes that section 313 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) identified concern regarding soldier and civilian personnel exposure to environmental hazards, including burn pits, dust and sand, hazardous materials and waste. The committee notes that service

members who are deployed lack a flexible and wearable system to protect them from inhaled hazards, and therefore have to often resort to using shirts or other cloth to cover their faces in dusty or smoky environments. While the committee is aware of current Army filter-based protective equipment, such as gas masks, there are also potential fabric-based solutions to these hazards that are wearable variants of the material already used by the Army. The committee understands that these fabric-based solutions could be used to mitigate a significant amount of soldier exposure to the potentially hazardous effects of inhaling sand, dust, smoke, and pollutants, such as diesel exhaust and lead.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2014, evaluating the potential utility of fabric-based solutions to address soldier exposure to inhalation of sand, dust, smoke, and pollutants.

Improved turbine engine program

The budget request contained $81.0 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology.

The committee continues to support the operational and performance goals of the Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP) which includes a 50-percent increase in engine power and a 25-percent fuel savings. The committee understands that ITEP is designed to provide longer life, improved maintainability, and reduced costs to meet the operational requirements for the Army's current and next-generation vertical lift aircraft.

The committee recognizes and commends the Army for establishing a firm requirement for the ITEP engine and for successful completion of the Material Development Decision in 2012. The Army should continue to fund competitive prototyping at a minimum through milestone B. The committee believes that further competing to a preliminary flight rating test (PFRT) milestone, or preferably through a flight demonstration of each competing engine, will control costs, reduce programmatic risk and modeling/simulation shortfalls. Further, the committee believes maintaining competition through PFRT or beyond will allow the Army to make a more informed selection for an engine that will be in the operational force for decades. Selecting the appropriate point at which to down select to a single engine contractor is a crucial step to ensure the taxpayers and Department of Defense get the best value in investment and performance. Therefore the committee encourages the Army to take both competitive engines at a minimum through PFRT, and preferably through flight demonstration, to control development and program cost, mitigate technical risk, validate performance and ensure the warfighter receives the best possible solution.

The committee recommends $81.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology.

Innovative approaches in wound care research

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has identified a key research requirement for improved techniques for wound care, particularly for combat-related trauma. The committee

notes that there is preliminary data that suggests that plasma technologies have the potential for promoting wound healing by deactivating pathogens in the wound, stopping bleeding without damage to healthy tissue, and other effects that lead to rapid healing and tissue regeneration. The committee recognizes that further experimentation is essential to demonstrate the potential benefit of this technology, as well as to satisfy regulatory requirements of the Food and Drug Administration. Therefore, the committee encourages the Telemedicine and Advanced Technology Research Center to evaluate short-pulsed electric discharge plasma technology for potential use in military wound care settings.

Joint Air-to-Ground Missile program

The budget request contained $15.1 million in PE 65450A for Joint Air-to-Ground Missile (JAGM) research and development.

The committee continues to support the JAGM program based on the need for a replacement to the Hellfire missile program that provides an all-weather, long-range moving target capability. In addition, the continuation of the JAGM program would help sustain the tactical missile industrial base. Missile technology remains an area of asymmetric advantage for the United States that the committee believes must be retained.

The committee notes that the Army restructured the JAGM program to use an incremental approach starting in fiscal year 2012. Specifically, the Army decided to pursue only a "dual mode" seeker with limited capability as part of Increment 1 of the new acquisition strategy, with milestone B planned in fiscal year 2015. As part of this milestone B, the committee understands that the Army may decide to retain only one contractor during the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase for JAGM Increment 1. The committee is concerned that such an approach could prematurely narrow the Army's technology options and increase the risk that the JAGM program would never fully meet the requirements validated in 2012 by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. As a result, the committee encourages the Army to retain two contractors during Increment 1 EMD. The committee believes that employing an approach that retains competition during Increment 1 EMD would help lower costs and ensure the best possible weapon system performance. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2014, that details the funding required to maintain two contractors during JAGM Increment 1 EMD.

The committee recommends $15.1 million, the full amount requested, in PE 65450A for JAGM research and development.

Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System

The budget request contained $98.5 million in PE 12419A for the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System (JLENS).

The committee notes that in January 2012, the Army decided to not procure any JLENS orbits. However, the committee understands that the Army has used elements of the two orbits built

during system development for additional testing and capability demonstration purposes. The committee notes that in September 2012, the Army and Navy executed a joint live-fire event to demonstrate Naval Integrated Fire Control-Counter Air capability. In a December 2012 demonstration, JLENS showed its potential capability to track and detect ballistic missiles and large caliber rockets during their ascent phase. These successful demonstrations illustrate that JLENS could provide U.S. forces a significant operational advantage in areas like the Strait of Hormuz, the Republic of Korea, and elsewhere. Given these demonstration events, and the significant threat posed by cruise missiles, small boats, and ballistic missiles, the committee expects the Army to use the funding authorized in fiscal year 2014 to proceed with plans to conduct additional system demonstration efforts. The committee also notes, however, that the Army has now dropped plans for an initial operational test in fiscal year 2014. Absent realistic test events, the committee is not convinced that JLENS warrants any further development.

The committee recommends $68.5 million, a decrease of $30.0 million, in PE 12419A for the JLENS. With the funds provided, the committee expects the Army to prioritize additional demonstration events planned for fiscal year 2014.

M4 Carbine powered rail system

The committee has a long record of supporting Army research efforts aimed at reducing soldier equipment weight. The committee notes that the Army conducted a $2.7 million small business innovation research (SBIR) program starting in 2012 that sought to develop a soldier-carried electrical power solution integrated into the M4 carbine.

The purpose of this competitively awarded SBIR program was to provide more soldier power at less weight. The committee understands that the system has now been developed and tested, and that it has the potential to reduce weight carried by soldiers in the form of batteries and provide an integrated data transfer capability for M4 carbine accessories. However, the committee notes with concern that the Army has not yet decided to proceed to the next step with this program.

As the Army continues it's evaluation, the committee encourages the Army to proceed with an expanded user evaluation of this system to ensure that it has sufficient information to determine whether or not it warrants further development. The committee expects that should the Army decide to continue development of this system that any long term procurement decision will be based on full and open competition.

Man-portable electronic warfare

The committee is aware that current and future adversaries will continue to use radio-controlled improvised explosive devices (IED) and standard radio tactics to coordinate attacks on our troops and personnel. In many cases, forward-deployed small units and military intelligence units do not have small, compact, lightweight electronic warfare (EW) systems capable of responding to these threats. The committee believes that what is needed is a next generation,

compact, tactical EW system that provides more adequate soldier protection from wireless threats, target finding, and combat situational awareness is a man-portable unit.

The committee is also aware that the Department has significant investments in new EW capabilities, including Army investments to develop a small soldier-worn package for counter-IED, threat avoidance, and intelligence gathering capabilities. The committee recognizes that such a system for dismounted tactical combat operations will have great utility to all of the military services and agencies, including the special forces and military intelligence communities. The committee encourages the Department to continue development of such EW systems and to pursue deployment as rapidly as is practicable.

Modeling and simulation for advanced materials

The committee recognizes the importance of utilizing virtual reality and modeling and simulation tools to provide cutting-edge, cost-effective training and technology development for the Nation's warfighters. Leveraging these technologies is an especially relevant adjunct to live training given the future of declining defense budgets. The committee is pleased with the U.S. Army Research Laboratory's implementation of virtual reality centers as a coordinated effort to broaden use of virtual training methods. These centers include the use of a variety of training tools that give the warfighter and developers alike, a realistic training experience that contributes to improved readiness and system effectiveness. These centers will also allow for technology development through modeling and simulations prior to real product development.

The committee believes that centers like the Center for Cold Spray Research and Development, which simulates material and process development for technologies such as munitions enhancements, would benefit from increased utilization of virtual reality and modeling and simulations tools. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to continue its development and application of modeling and simulation concepts, tools and investments in order to maintain robust, cost-effective training capabilities.

Modular protective systems for wheeled vehicles

The committee understands that restoring equipment readiness is a key element of the Army and the Marine Corps equipment reset process. In current combat operations, vehicle and aircraft usage rates are several times greater than peacetime rates and the harsh environment also takes a toll on equipment, especially the Army and the Marine Corps's ground combat tactical vehicle fleets. The committee recognizes the critical need to repair, recapitalize, and replace damaged or worn out combat and tactical vehicles after 12 years of high operational tempo in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF). The committee also notes there is a critical requirement to continue to modernize the combat and tactical vehicle fleets. The committee supports ongoing modernization programs such as the Joint Light Tactical vehicle program, and the Ground Combat Vehicle program as being essential for long-term modernization of these fleets.

The committee understands the Army and the Marine Corps are developing long-term acquisition strategies for their respective combat and tactical vehicle fleets. The committee expects these strategies to include a long-term armoring strategy component that would adopt the lessons learned from OEF and OIF regarding the need for improved survivability for all vehicles. As the Army and the Marine Corps begin to recapitalize their vehicle fleets, the committee encourages both services to consider the cost and operational benefits of using modular, scalable protection kits as part of any long-term modernization plan and armoring strategy.

Multi-mission electronic warfare

Enemy communications, jammers, improvised explosive device triggers, and radar systems are constantly changing and becoming more and more difficult to counter. The proliferation of unmanned vehicles has also expanded the scope of electronic warfare (EW) threats facing our country today. The committee believes that in order to address these evolving threats, the next generation EW system must be designed to perform multiple types of EW missions such as detection and attack of modern equipment, coordination with tactical communications, intelligence gathering, differentiation of ground from air targets, and direction finding (DF).

The committee is aware that the Army Intelligence and Information Warfare Directorate is developing such an advanced technology. This technology will provide our warfighers with multi-mission integrated EW for high speed DF, advanced jamming, and signals intelligence all in one package. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense fully support this research and development effort and where possible, accelerate its deployment.

Nano-scale electronics and materials

The committee is aware of the potential benefits of electronics and other nanomaterials engineered at the nano-scale, including reduced size, weight, power consumption and other electrical properties. The committee is also aware that the Army Research Laboratory (ARL) supports work in this area to ensure warfighter benefits from the most advanced nano-enabled technologies, such as microchip-based energetics with controlled combustion reactions, carbon and organic conductor-based printable electronics, solar cells and high-energy density capacitors, nano-engineered integrated sensors for chemical, biological, and nuclear threat detection, and nanomaterial-based heat transfer and thermal management systems. The committee encourages the Army to continue investment in further developing these technologies incubated at ARL.

Night vision systems engineering development

The budget request contained $43.4 million in PE 64710A for night vision systems engineering development.

The committee notes that over the past 12 years the Army has invested significant levels of funding in thermal sights and other advanced night vision devices for small arms weapons. The committee understands that additional upgrades to existing night vision devices may be possible through development and modification

of clip-on retrofits, which could enhance optical device performance without the need to procure entirely new devices. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to consider funding efforts to evaluate and develop such retrofits as part of its overall night vision systems research, development, test, and evaluation efforts. The committee expects that any future development effort would be pursued through full and open competition.

The committee recommends $43.4 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64710A, for night vision systems engineering development.

Regenerative and rehabilitative engineering

The committee is aware that the human toll of 12 years of war has resulted in casualties that have maimed, disfigured and debilitated thousands of service members. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense has funded numerous medical research activities to improve the tactical combat casualty care of service members, as well as supporting the longer-term health needs of the military. Emerging areas of regenerative engineering and rehabilitative medicine are transforming military medical care and are quickly transitioning into the public health care sector.

The committee applauds efforts, such as the Armed Forces Institute of Regenerative Medicine (AFIRM) as a means to innovate in these emerging areas. AFIRM was established as a multi-institutional, interdisciplinary network including military institutions working closely with medical and research universities to develop advanced treatment options for severely wounded servicemen and women, such as face and limb transplants and burn treatment. The committee encourages the Department to continue to adequately fund AFIRM, and to continue researching, piloting and transitioning new techniques for regenerative and rehabilitative health care that will support both military members and the civilian population at-large.

Stryker survivability systems integration program

The budget request contained $50.0 million in PE 63653A for Stryker vehicle research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee supports the Army's plans for ongoing RDT&E for the Stryker vehicle. The committee notes that even with the procurement of a third brigade set of upgraded "double V" Stryker vehicles that the Army will have six brigade sets of less well-protected "flat bottom" Stryker vehicles. As a result, the committee supports innovative efforts to increase the protection level of these vehicles. In particular, the committee continues to support the ongoing program executive officer (PEO) ground systems Stryker vehicle survivability systems integration study program. The committee notes that this program is intended to deliver several integration studies reviewing the potential for adding occupant centric survivability technologies to the Stryker vehicle. The committee understands that these kit-based solutions could be installed during depot reset or in the field, providing maximum flexibility to the Army. The committee encourages PEO ground systems and the program manager Stryker to use Stryker RDT&E and modifica-

tions funds to develop and install technologies from this effort that enhance Stryker occupant safety.

The committee recommends $50.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63653A for Stryker vehicle RDT&E.

Tactical vehicle armor development program

The committee understands the tactical vehicle armor development (TVAD) program consists of the development and maturation of a lightweight, affordable ceramic/composite opaque armor solution for tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) ballistic threats, to include improvised explosive devices. The committee recognizes that although lightweight solutions for these threats exist, these solutions have been cost prohibitive for the TWV fleet because of high material prices and/or inefficient production manufacturing processes. The committee understands the goal of the TVAD program is to design a lightweight, affordable solution that utilizes low cost materials in a manner that is easy to transition the end product from prototype to full rate production at an affordable cost. The committee supports this effort, however the committee is concerned that the Army is inadequately funding this critical initiative. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to fully fund this program across the Future Years Defense Program.

Thermal injury protection in combat and tactical vehicles

The committee understands that the U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC) has established an occupant centric survivability program, with a goal of examining technologies that can significantly protect against vehicle occupant casualties. The committee supports this effort.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Director, TARDEC to provide a report to the congressional defense committees that outlined the status of the Army's evaluation of occupant centric survivability systems for combat and tactical vehicles. The committee has reviewed the report and has concerns regarding the development and application of systems that could be used to prevent thermal injury. The committee notes that technologies like fuel containment, fire retardants, fire suppression, fire prevention, and personal fire protection may improve occupant safety as well as vehicle survivability. These technologies are currently being applied in a limited scope. While the committee commends this effort, it believes that additional analysis over current thermal injury survivability requirements is still required.

The committee directs the Director, U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that outlines the advisability and feasibility of establishing objective and threshold survivability operational requirements for thermal injury prevention in ground combat and tactical vehicles. The committee expects the briefing to include, but

not be limited to: fuel containment; fire retardants; fire prevention; fire suppression; and personal protection.

Third generation forward-looking infrared sensors

The committee notes that second generation forward-looking infrared (FLIR) sensors currently deployed across the Army are a critical capability that provides U.S. forces significant advantages in combat. However, the committee understands that countermeasures continue to evolve that could degrade and potentially overmatch second generation FLIR capabilities. In addition, second generation FLIR technology is now 20-years old and is at risk of becoming obsolete. The committee believes the Army must continue to invest in third generation FLIR development and fielding, and that doing so requires the sustainability of the U.S. FLIR industrial base to meet the Army's next generation FLIR requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2014, that outlines the state of FLIR technology and requirements for ground systems including, but not limited to, the Ground Combat Vehicle program. The report should also include the Army's specific annual investment strategy to sustain the U.S. FLIR industrial base and to develop and produce third generation FLIR sensors.

Ultra Lightweight Reconnaissance Robotic capability

The committee understands that the Army has identified an operational need for an Ultra Lightweight Reconnaissance Robotics (ULRR) capability for forward deployed units currently operating in overseas contingency operations. The committee supports and encourages the rapid fielding of this capability to forward deployed forces and also directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2013 on the advisability and feasibility of incorporating this capability as part of an enduring requirement for all active and reserve component units.

Use of simulation technology in medical training

The committee appreciates the Department of Defense's work to reduce the use of live animals in combat trauma training courses when appropriate as detailed in the report to Congress on the "Strategy to Transition to Use of Human-Based Methods for Certain Medical Training". The committee acknowledges the Department of Defense's significant investment over the past decade in the development of simulation technology and shares its commitment to improve and modernize the training of military medical personnel without degradation to combat trauma care. A 2009 Department report projected that validated simulators for most "high volume/high value" medical procedures could be developed by 2014. The most recent report provides an updated and estimated timeline to 2017 and beyond. As such, the committee encourages the Department to continue a transition to human-based methods and to further refine the timeline for the replacement of the use of live animals in combat trauma training courses when appropriate, and where modern validated simulators are able to provide equally ef-

fective training that achieves established combat casualty survival rates without degradation to combat trauma care.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $15.9 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy. The committee recommends $16.0 billion, an increase of $58.1 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Acoustic intelligence collection capability

The committee believes that the ability to obtain acoustic intelligence on foreign submarines is a critical national security need. Specifically, the committee believes that it should be a priority to develop technology that is capable of burying undersea cables beneath the seabed, and that the development of this technology to the fleet could result in significant cost savings to the Navy. The committee encourages the Office of Naval Research to consider funding initiatives that could lead to development of a low-cost Array Burial Vehicle capable of installing acoustic intelligence systems, and which could be equipped with a real-time control system which provides shipboard operators information necessary to safely, reliably, and efficiently install complex multi-branch undersea cable systems.

Augmentation of ultra high frequency communications satellite systems using near space technologies

The committee is concerned that the Navy's constellation of ultra-high frequency (UHF) communication satellites and associated user terminals may not meet the tactical communications needs of the Department in the near future. This concern is based on the committee's belief that the current constellation of UHF satellites, the Ultra-High Frequency Follow-On program, is aging, fragile, and may be increasingly subject to sudden failures.

The committee notes that the Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) satellite system, which is intended to provide increased capability in this area, has been delayed. However, the committee is aware of alternative technologies that could potentially be used by the Navy, in concert with the MUOS program, to close potential gaps in tactical UHF communications.

Specifically, the committee notes the potential capabilities of high-altitude, near space systems, such as balloons, to bolster and complement existing UHF networks. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the committee, no later than October 1, 2013, on a review of existing high-altitude, near space technologies that could provide additional UHF capacity and outline the approximate cost, schedule, and feasibility of acquiring this additional capacity.

Carrier-based unmanned air vehicle system testing and development

The budget request contained $21.0 million in PE 64402N for the Unmanned Combat Air System (UCAS), and $146.7 million in PE 64404N for the Unmanned Carrier-launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) system.

The committee has noted in the past that the Secretary of the Navy has not fully leveraged technology development activities in the UCAS program that would reduce UCLASS program risk. The committee is aware that the Secretary of the Navy has again reduced the planned scope of technology development activities in fiscal year 2014 for the UCAS program by deleting the requirement for the X–47B aircraft to demonstrate unmanned autonomous aerial refueling from an airborne tanker, thereby increasing the development risk in the UCLASS program. The committee disagrees with the Secretary's approach to the UCAS program and disagrees with increasing the concurrency and developmental risk being sewn into the acquisition strategy of the UCLASS program.

Therefore, the committee recommends $41.0 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 64402N for the UCAS program. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy to demonstrate unmanned autonomous aerial refueling with the X–47B UCAS aircraft, and another provision that would prohibit the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics from approving a milestone A technology development contract award for the UCLASS program until 30 days after the Under Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the software and system engineering designs for the control system and connectivity segment and the aircraft carrier segment of the UCLASS system can achieve, at a low level of integration risk, successful compatibility and operability with the air vehicle segment planned for selection at milestone A contract award.

Cognitive wireless networks for naval applications

The committee recognizes that the increasing complexity of computing and telecommunications devices is providing emerging opportunities to improve and streamline Department of Defense processes. The committee notes that new methods for leveraging cognitive wireless networking systems will empower the ability of the Department to carry out diverse applications in new ways, as well as opening up the possibilities for entirely new applications. The committee encourages the Department to invest in research supporting the development and maturation of cognitive networking applications, such as environmental infrastructure and human health monitoring, ad-hoc networks using commercial mobile phones, smart camera networks, mobile cloud computing, and smart utility networks.

One area where the committee believes that improvements in cognitive wireless networking might be helpful is in naval ship machinery systems. The committee is aware that ships of the near future will have increased complexity in design and operation, as well as interaction and inter-dependencies with other systems. At the same time, demands for shipboard resources are expected to exceed installed capacity, requiring complex optimization of allocation

to shipboard loads. The committee believes that the development and implementation of a new generation of automatic control and communications on ships, including wireless networks, will allow for increased capacity with reduced manning.

Marine Corps unmanned airborne electronic attack systems

The committee notes that the Marine Corps plans to transition from using EA–6B Prowler aircraft as its primary airborne electronic warfare platform to a combination of F–35B Lightening II aircraft with built-in electronic warfare capability and other aircraft carrying electronic warfare pods. While the committee supports this plan, it also encourages the Marine Corps to develop electronic warfare capability for unmanned aerial systems (UAS). The committee believes a network of electronic warfare systems that combines manned and unmanned platforms would provide increased performance and flexibility for operational commanders.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commandant of the Marine Corps to provide a classified report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2014, that outlines the potential advantages and disadvantages of the use of UAS for electronic warfare, and any current plans the Marine Corps has to develop such systems. The report should also address, but not be limited to, estimated acquisition and operating costs, crew safety, and mission effectiveness of potential unmanned systems compared to available manned airborne electronic warfare systems.

Maritime Laser Weapon System

The committee applauds the Navy's efforts in directed energy research and encourages the continuation of those efforts. The committee is also encouraged by the recent decision to deploy the Laser Weapon System (LaWS) for further testing and evaluation on the USS *Ponce*, in a stressing maritime environment. The committee believes such operational testing is necessary to work out the technical challenges inherent in directed energy systems, in addition to identifying potential integration and policy challenges that might prove to be impediments to transitioning these types of systems to the fleet. Additionally, the committee recognizes that the Navy is developing other advanced technologies which will present similar integration challenges, in particular with regards to power generation, storage, and delivery. The committee encourages the Navy to begin developing a broadly applicable strategy for addressing these power challenges in order to facilitate technology integration onto naval vessels in the future. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the testing efforts related to the LaWS deployment. The briefing should include:

(1) An overview of the test campaign plans and success criteria;

(2) Details of weapon system use and performance;

(3) A comparison of system performance with conventional weapons systems;

(4) A discussion of the associated power requirements with a comparison of the anticipated power requirements for other advanced weapons systems; and

(5) Unforeseen challenges associated with system maintenance and longevity in a maritime environment.

Multi-Stage Supersonic Target development program

The budget request contains $53.0 million in PE 64258N for aerial target system development. Of this amount, $33.1 million was requested for the Multi-Stage Supersonic Target (MSST) development program.

The MSST emulates a threat adversary three-stage anti-ship cruise missile that has a subsonic bus vehicle which will separate during its terminal phase of flight from a supersonic sprint stage vehicle that will continue its flight to impact. The fielded MSST system will provide threat representation and will identify deficiencies in shipboard air defense systems.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee directed the Secretary of the Navy to notify the congressional defense committees if the MSST program's estimated Initial Operating Capability (IOC) is delayed more than 90 days, or if the costs associated with the program exceeds 10 percent of programmed funding. On February 8, 2012, the Secretary of the Navy notified the congressional defense committees that the MSST program would exceed the original acquisition program baseline cost by more than 10 percent, and in June 2012, the MSST prototype experienced a flight test failure which required the Secretary to put development efforts on hold. On April 18, 2013, the Secretary subsequently notified the congressional defense committees that a new IOC date of May 2016, instead of December 2014, has been established.

The committee recognizes the challenges associated with the development of a new threat target system given the assessed complexity and capabilities of the actual threat missile. But the committee also remains concerned that the Navy still does not have a threat representative target fielded in order to assess vulnerabilities and susceptibilities of naval air defense systems, as well as assess the effectiveness of potential countermeasures that could be developed to defend against an MSST threat.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary to maintain a robust and fully resourced MSST development strategy and encourages the Secretary to provide the committee frequent updates as the MSST program progresses toward its May 2016, IOC milestone.

Offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development

The budget request contained $136.0 million in PE 64786N for offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development.

In 2009, the U.S. Pacific Fleet validated an Urgent Operational Needs Statement for an over-the-horizon surface warfare missile that can be launched from aircraft or surface vessels and strike well-defended, moving maritime targets without reliance on external inputs. This need is even more relevant today and is critical to meeting national security objectives and rebalance to the Asia-

Pacific region. The committee supports the Secretary of the Navy's pursuit for the rapid development and deployment of a long-range, anti-ship missile that is capable of penetrating sophisticated enemy air-defense systems from long range. It should be capable of operating autonomously in a denied signal environment, without relying on input of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance or global positioning system signals.

However, the committee notes recent inconsistencies with the Department of Defense's acquisition strategy for this type of air-launched/surface-launched missile capability. Furthermore, the current effort does not appear to be consistent with the budget documentation materials provided with the submission of the President's fiscal year 2014 budget to Congress, and the committee understands that the Department of Defense has revised the acquisition strategy since the President's budget submission.

The committee recommends $136.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64786N for offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development, and calls into question the Secretary's ability to execute $86.0 million of those funds in fiscal year 2014 for product-development activities prior to achieving a milestone A for the program.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to submit to the defense committees by September 30, 2013, the most recent OASuW Analysis of Alternatives completed by the Department of Defense.

The committee also directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide to the defense committees by September 30, 2013, a report that: (1) outlines the Secretary's near-, mid-, and long-term capability and acquisition roadmaps for maintaining air-launched and surface-launched offensive anti-surface warfare weapon capabilities within the Department of Defense; (2) describes capability gaps and shortfalls of the Navy regarding current and future OASuW capabilities; (3) any supporting analysis that have informed the Secretary's roadmap; (4) any on-going technology experimentation, engineering, product development, or modification efforts within the Department of Defense that would enhance the Secretary's ability to develop and field future OASuW capabilities, and an assessment of the maturity and associated risks of those technologies and efforts; and, (5) updated budget estimates and life-cycle funding estimates of the Department of Defense required to develop, engineer, manufacture, test, field and sustain new or modified air-launched and surface-launched OASuW missile capabilities in the planned roadmaps. The report may contain a classified annex.

Precision Extended Range Munition Program

The budget request contained $139.6 million in PE 26623M for Marine Corps Ground Combat/Supporting Arms systems. Of this amount, the budget request contained $11.9 million for the development of the precision extended range munition (PERM) program.

The committee notes that the Marine Corps is seeking to spend $84.5 million between fiscal years 2013–18 to develop and field the PERM, which is a global positioning system (GPS) guided 120mm

mortar round with a threshold range of between 12–16 kilometers. The committee also notes that the Army has already fielded a very similar GPS-guided 120mm mortar round, the XM–395 as part of its Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative. In addition, the committee is aware that the Army's XM–395 has already demonstrated a circular error probable of less than 10 meters, which is twice the threshold accuracy requirement for the PERM program. Since the Army has already fielded this round as an urgent materiel release, and many other more accurate joint fires are available to engage targets in the range of the PERM, the committee believes that the Marine Corps' PERM program is redundant, and that modifying or fielding the Army's existing XM–395 instead would ensure that Marines have precision mortar capability as soon as possible.

The committee recommends $6.9 million, a decrease of $5.0 million, in PE 26623M for research and development of the PERM program.

Prepositioned expeditionary assistance kits

The committee notes that in 2011, the Marine Corps conducted an operational demonstration and joint capability technology demonstration (JCTD) with U.S. Southern Command to evaluate prepositioned expeditionary assistance kits (PEAK). The Marine Corps report on this evaluation stated the objective of the PEAK JCTD was to demonstrate and transition an array of capabilities for field distributed essential services including potable water, power, communications and situational awareness. The kits made maximum use of commercial, off-the-shelf technology renewable source power generation. The report concluded that the demonstration was a success and showed the potential of the PEAK kits to provide essential field services in an austere environment when operated by U.S. military personnel working with host nation forces. Based on this successful demonstration, the committee encourages the Marine Corps to consider initiation of a competitive development program for a PEAK kit that could allow expeditionary forces to provide effective and efficient operation beyond 72 hours after a disaster event.

Service Life Extension of Navy Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research vessels

The budget request contained $45.7 million in PE 62435N for the Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research program.

For academic research, the Navy operates and maintains Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research (AGOR) vessels. Three of these vessels require a mid-life overhaul, partial funding for which was provided in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6). The committee notes that funding provided to date does not fully support all of the items that the Navy has determined are necessary to fully extend the life of these AGOR ships to 40–45 years.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $63.7 million, an increase of $18.0 million, in PE 62435N for Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research, to procure the entirety of a mid-life overhaul. The committee notes that the inclusion of this authorization of appropriations is predicated on merit-based selection proce-

dures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures.

Unmanned Underwater Vehicle

The budget request contained $852.9 million in PE 63561N for the Advanced Submarines System Development program.

To maintain undersea dominance in maritime regions of significant economic and military importance to the United States, the Navy requires disruptive technologies that can be rapidly developed, demonstrated, evaluated, and fielded to counter expanding undersea capabilities by peer and near-peer maritime nations and to extend the Navy's reach and persistence. The committee is concerned that under the current acquisition plan, the Navy will not have the new technologies it needs to meet these requirements until after 2020. By accelerating the integration of Unmanned Undersea Vehicles and other autonomous undersea technologies and payloads into Undersea Warfare, it will expand the technology base and more rapidly provide warfighting options that are not currently achievable.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $874.9, an increase of $22.0 million, in PE 63561N for Advanced Submarine Systems Development in order to support innovative development, demonstration, evaluation, and fielding of promising undersea technologies for the delivery of new and needed capability to the undersea domain.

The committee notes that the inclusion of this authorization of appropriations is predicated on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $25.7 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force. The committee recommends $25.7 billion, an increase of $76.0 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Adaptive engine technology development

The committee is aware that the Air Force Research Lab has a significant demonstration project underway to mature technologies that combine the capabilities for high-speed thrust from fighter engines with the increased fuel efficiency of a long-distance, subsonic engine, known as the Adaptive Engine Technology Development (AETD) program. Such efforts are necessary to provide needed capabilities for future air vehicles, as well as to maintain science and technology programs that will sustain the military aircraft engine industrial base until development of the next generation of aircraft begins.

Furthermore, the committee is aware that in testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services in 2012, Air Force officials stated that AETD is purely a technology maturation program and is not a new "alternate engine" program for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter. While the committee is aware that the performance specifications for the AETD engine are structured around propulsion requirements for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, the AETD program is not limited to any particular form factor that would directly transition into an existing aircraft program.

While the committee believes it is logical to incorporate technology derived from AETD for incorporation into the F–35, the committee does not expect AETD to result in a design for an entirely new engine for the F–35. The committee encourages the Air Force to continue to focus AETD on technology maturation and new approaches for significant fuel savings that will support future generations of aircraft engines.

Aircraft engine component laser peening

The budget request contained $139.4 million in PE 27268F for the aircraft engine component improvement program.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee noted that laser peening technology had the potential to save significant funds through the reduction of fatigue failure, stress corrosion cracking, and component shape corrections in a wide range of military equipment, including aircraft. The committee believes that the Air Force should consider use of aircraft engine component improvement program funds to examine the potential benefits of laser peening for F–135 engine components in order to see if reliability could be improved and if engine life-cycle costs could be reduced.

The committee recommends $139.4 million, the full amount requested, in PE 27268F for the aircraft engine component improvement program.

F–35 aircraft program

The budget request contained $1.9 billion in PEs 64800F, 64800N, and 64800M for development of the F–35 aircraft. The budget request also contained $5.5 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force and Aircraft Procurement, Navy for procurement of 19 F–35As, 6 F–35Bs, and 4 F–35Cs.

The F–35 aircraft program is the largest acquisition program within the Department of Defense, with a current planned procurement of 2,443 aircraft for the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force to meet fifth generation U.S. fighter requirements. The committee continues to support the requirement for fifth generation fighter aircraft due to projected increases in the effectiveness and quantities of threat anti-aircraft ground systems and adversary aircraft and their associated air-to-air weapons. The committee notes that without advanced fifth generation aircraft that the United States may be significantly limited in its ability to project power in the future.

The F–35 program is approximately 34 percent through its flight test program which is planned to be completed in the first quarter

of fiscal year 2018. The committee notes that the F–35 program executive officer believes the F–35 program is now on a realistic baseline with slow, but steady progress being made. The committee also notes that the F–35 program executive officer has identified the software development for the final development software block, known as block 3F, as an area with some risk remaining. At a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on April 17, 2013, the witness from Government Accountability Office also identified block 3F software as an area of risk because of its complexity. The committee shares this concern. Accordingly, elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to establish an independent team consisting of subject matter experts to review the development of F–35 software and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 3, 2014.

Global Positioning System Next Generation Operational Control System

The budget request contained $383.5 million in PE 63423F for the Next Generation Operational Control System (OCX) for the Global Positioning System (GPS).

GPS provides positioning, velocity, and timing to military and civilian users worldwide. OCX will replace the current Operational Control System, maintaining backwards compatibility with the existing satellite constellation and enabling new modernized capabilities onboard the newer satellites. In addition, OCX will provide command and control of new capabilities, such as increased anti-jamming resistance, associated with the new GPS III family of satellites.

The committee recommends $383.5 million, the full amount of the request, in PE 63423F for the Next Generation Operational Control System program.

Hypersonic test facilities

The committee recognizes the importance that hypersonic technologies will play in meeting the defense needs of the future. As with any new technology, developing and maintaining the appropriate facility to conduct full-scale testing is a necessary precondition to effective technology development efforts. Thus, the committee supports a hypersonic program that develops the necessary workforce and testing facilities to support the research and ultimate deployment of a variety of hypersonic capabilities.

The committee reiterates the concerns it raised about the state of hypersonic testing facilities in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, as well as by the conferees in the conference report (H. Rept. 112–705) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. The committee also awaits the results of the study on the ability of national test and evaluation capabilities to support maturation hypersonic technologies for future defense systems required by section 1071 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). Until such time as that report is delivered, the committee expects

the Department of Defense to leverage existing capabilities within the Federal Government and not build new capabilities until a clear need has been established.

In-space solar electric propulsion

The committee believes that there may be enhanced utility for in-space solar electric propulsion (SEP) technology for national security space applications, especially as launch costs increase and weight requirements for satellites become more stringent. The committee believes that this technology may lead to reduced launch costs, enhanced payload capability, longer mission duration, and also provide risk mitigation redundancy. In particular, this technology proved valuable in mitigating some of the difficulties in getting the first Advanced Extremely High-Frequency payload to safely and successfully reach its intended orbit without reducing mission life for the payload, after unexpected launch problems caused technical challenges and nearly a year's delay.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to brief the congressional defense committees, the congressional intelligence committees, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, by December 15, 2013, on current and planned efforts to use SEP technology for national security space missions. In addition, the briefing should address the investments across the U.S. Government in further development of SEP technology as a possible means to save costs and extend satellite mission duration.

Joint Space Operations Center Mission System

The committee notes the importance of the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System (JMS) program in providing integrated, net-centric space situational awareness and command and control capabilities. The committee commends the Air Force on the significant advances it has made in fully deploying Increment 1 of JMS. Increment 1 provides: a service-oriented architecture with enhanced integration and display of space order of battle; improved high interest event tracking; dynamically configurable user-defined operating picture; and several web-based, space situational awareness tools to aid space operators in performing mission analysis.

The committee recognizes the efforts of the Air Force to leverage existing or easily-modified Government and commercial applications as noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. However, the committee is concerned that the current schedule does not fully take advantage of the potential for incremental upgrades to on-ramp the appropriate existing capabilities in the most expeditious manner. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to certify that the acquisition strategy for the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System program fully incorporates existing, mature technology products, based on warfighter requirements, in order to replace the legacy system in the most expeditious manner, utilizing efficient testing and valida-

tion methods. The Secretary should submit the certification to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee supports the Air Force's efforts to provide increased and advanced space situational awareness capabilities to the Joint Space Operations Center to address current and future threats to our national space assets.

Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System

The committee notes that the joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) aircraft and sensors are rapidly aging and in need of multiple, costly upgrades in order to maintain operational JSTARS capability in the future. The committee believes that the Department of the Air Force understands the challenges of maintaining the JSTARS aircraft and sensors, and notes that it has conducted an analysis of alternatives (AOA) to evaluate potential replacement platforms for the aging E–8C JSTARS aircraft which has concluded that a modern business jet using a fourth generation sensor system would be the preferred JSTARS replacement alternative. The committee understands that the business jet solution would provide substantial future cost savings, improve capabilities with more advanced sensors, and is readily available in the near term. Unfortunately, the budget request for fiscal year 2014 did not include any funds for replacing the JSTARS aircraft or sensors, and the committee is concerned that the critical JSTARS mission may not be accomplished if the Department of the Air Force does not replace the JSTARS aircraft in the near term.

Since the committee believes that the battle management command and control and ground moving target indicator missions performed by the Department of the Air Force JSTARS aircraft are critical to meet requirements of the National Military Strategy, the committee encourages the Department to begin a program to replace the JSTARS aircraft as soon as possible, but not later than in its budget request for fiscal year 2015.

Liquid rocket engine technology

The committee is pleased to learn of the combined U.S. Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) investment in rocket engine technologies being demonstrated under the Space Launch System Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction program. The existing Air Force Research Laboratory Hydrocarbon Boost technology program provides the underpinnings of this partnership between the Air Force and NASA on next generation advanced rocket booster technology. Moreover, this Air Force-NASA partnership is a model for maximizing limited taxpayer dollars in an austere fiscal environment.

The committee commends the Air Force and NASA and encourages the Air Force and NASA to sustain investment in this synergistic approach to develop and demonstrate rocket propulsion technology. Additionally, the committee recommends the Air Force seek future opportunities to engage in cooperative efforts with NASA for the development of rocket propulsion systems.

Metals Affordability Initiative

The budget request contained $39.6 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapons systems. Of this amount, $2.7 million was requested for the Metals Affordability Initiative (MAI).

The committee notes that the MAI is a public-private partnership that includes the entire domestic specialty aerospace metals industrial manufacturing base. Air Force participation with MAI has resulted in significant improvement in the manufacture of specialty metals for aerospace applications, including aluminum, beryllium, nickel-based superalloys and titanium. Because of the widespread uses and needs for the Department of Defense, the committee encourages the Air Force to engage with the other military departments and agencies to ensure they are able to leverage MAI for their specific needs. In addition, the committee encourages the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy to examine the MAI partnership model to determine if it might be relevant for the newly established Industrial Base Sustainment Fund.

The committee recommends $49.6 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63112F for the MAI program.

Operationally Responsive Space

The budget request contained no funds in PE 64857F for the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program.

The committee is disappointed with the Department's de facto proposal to terminate ORS, and is concerned that there is no enduring plan to address urgent military operational requirements for space support and reconstitution. The committee fully supports the ORS program to meet warfighter needs.

This is the second straight year that the Department has proposed to terminate the ORS program and to transfer the remaining efforts to other existing space programs. The proposed termination is not in accordance with section 2273a of title 10, United States Code, which provides that "the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, within budget program elements for space programs of the Department of Defense, that there is a separate, dedicated program element for operationally responsive space." The committee notes the Department's previous efforts to repeal the statutory requirement for ORS have been denied.

Further, the committee recognizes there are urgent warfighter space needs that the ORS program may help address. For instance, in 2012, U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) required operationally critical and expedited service for satellite communications bandwidth to cover a wide geographic coverage. At the time, the Department assessed that the only option to meet USAFRICOM's needs was to obtain a lease through a Chinese company with significant ownership interest from the Chinese government. After a year elapsed, the lease was renewed because the Department failed to take other measures, such as engaging the ORS office to address USAFRICOM's urgent requirements.

The committee notes that it has not received the detailed strategic plan, directed in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, regarding how the Air Force will implement the mission of

the ORS program as laid out in section 2273a of title 10, United States Code. Current law states the mission of ORS is to: (1) contribute to the development of low-cost, rapid reaction payloads, space busses, space lift, and launch control capabilities, in order to fulfill joint military operational requirements for on-demand space support and reconstitution; and (2) coordinate and execute operationally responsive space efforts across the Department of Defense with respect to planning, acquisition, and operations. The plan should address the required funding for implementing this mission and how it will preserve this program's alternative approach to space acquisition.

Therefore, the committee rejects the Department's de facto proposal to terminate the ORS program.

Overhead Persistent Infrared processing and exploitation

The budget request contained $352.5 million in PE 64441F for the Space-Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS) program. Of this amount, $22.5 million was requested for data exploitation.

The committee recognizes the tremendous value and significant investments in overhead persistent infrared (OPIR) systems. On March 19, 2013, the U.S. Air Force launched the second SBIRS satellite into geosynchronous orbit. This satellite joins other SBIRS assets currently in orbit, including another geosynchronous satellite and two hosted payloads in a highly elliptical orbit.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and the intelligence community have opportunities for additional exploitation of OPIR to support areas such as missile warning, missile defense, technical intelligence, and battlespace awareness. During the fiscal year 2014 budget request hearing for national security space activities, the Commander of Air Force Space Command was asked about SBIRS exploitation and responded that, "We have not even scratched the surface, I think, of the potential that's there. We have another sensor that we haven't fully exploited yet as part of that satellite. We're doing a good job on the scanning sensor. The staring sensor, which has much better fidelity, we really haven't fully wrung out yet, because we've been so focused on getting the scanning sensor calibrated and certified."

As an example, the committee believes that further data exploitation has the potential to enhance the effectiveness of the United States ballistic missile defense systems, particularly with the additional sensor data from the recent launch of the second SBIRS geosynchronous satellite.

The committee remains concerned about the current schedule for full performance of SBIRS. Despite the first SBIRS geosynchronous satellite being launched on May 7, 2011, the system won't be fully utilized until fiscal year 2018. Full performance, which is driven by the ground segment schedule, includes final software tuning, algorithm integration, real-time data fusion, and automated tasking and cueing. The committee urges the Department to make further efforts to accelerate the schedule of the full performance of the SBIRS system.

The committee recommends $42.5 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 64441F for further data exploitation of the Space-Based Infrared Systems.

Secure wireless networking applications

The committee recognizes that the Department has a number of requirements across all of the military services for new secure, short-range, wireless networking technologies, which would have wide-ranging, multi-service applications. For example, forward deployed forces could reduce size, weight, power and cabling requirements for necessary communications equipment, as well as for onboard aircraft and vehicles. The committee is aware that the Air Force is pursuing this kind of technology through its Secure/Covert Wireless Network Program, and believes such technology could reduce operations and maintenance costs for the Government each year. The committee encourages the Air Force to look at opportunities to transition this kind of technology throughout the force as quickly as it becomes available, and to share lessons from this program with other services and agencies of the Department of Defense.

Sense and avoid research for MQ–1 and MQ–9 remotely piloted aircraft

The budget request contained $128.3 million in PE 25219F for research, development, test and evaluation of MQ–9 Reaper remotely piloted aircraft (RPA). Of this amount, no funds were requested for research and development of sense and avoid capability.

The committee notes that the Air Force intends to eventually base some amount of the overall fleet of MQ–1 and MQ–9 RPAs in the United States in the future, and that many of these aircraft will be operated by Air National Guard units with Title 32 responsibilities. In addition, the committee notes that operations of any such aircraft will be significantly limited by domestic Federal Aviation Administration rules. Specifically, the committee understands that absent any sense and avoid capability that MQ–1 and MQ–9 aircraft could be largely restricted to restricted military airspace, which would greatly limit their potential use in support of domestic authorities in the event of a natural disaster or other domestic emergency. As a result, the committee encourages the Air Force to examine options for a sense and avoid capability for MQ–1 and MQ–9 RPAs, and to include a sense and avoid research and development effort in future year budget requests.

The committee recommends $128.3 million in PE 25219F, the full amount requested, for research, development, test and evaluation of MQ–9 RPAs.

Space Fence

The budget request contained $377.7 million in PE 64425F for Space Fence activities.

The committee recognizes the importance of the U.S. Air Force Space Situational Awareness (SSA) Space Fence program. The existing Air Force Space Surveillance System is a very high frequency-band system developed in the 1960s to detect space objects in low earth orbit. This system is reaching its end-of-life and will be replaced with the Space Fence program.

The committee is aware that the Space Fence will consist of up to two ground-based radars, which will provide timely detection of

small space objects, primarily in low earth orbit. It will expand uncued detection and tracking capacity over the current system by an order of magnitude. The first Space Fence radar site is planned to be put on Kwajalein Island in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, with initial operational capability planned for fiscal year 2017.

The committee recommends $377.7 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64425F for Space Fence activities in order to support a full operational capability by 2020.

Trusted autonomy for Unmanned Aerial Systems

The committee notes that increasing congested airspace will require current and future unmanned aerial systems (UAS) of all sizes the ability to operate safely and effectively in close proximity to other unmanned, as well as manned aircraft. As national security operations increasingly require expanded use of small, affordable UAS, the committee is concerned that the military will continue to be constrained from training in the National Airspace System due to the lack of a validated, effective Airborne Sense and Avoid (ABSAA) capability. The committee is aware that the services have demonstrated some recent advances in technology in which flight testing has demonstrated a highly reliable ABSAA capability. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue pursuing such technology efforts, such as those carried out by the Combating Terrorism Technology Support Office, in order to allow for significantly expanded ABSAA operational testing.

Unmanned Aerial Systems Development

The committee continues to encourage investment for unmanned aerial system (UAS) acquisition and research and development. The committee notes that the U.S. military will continue to use UAS for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions, as well as weapons delivery platforms. The committee also understands that current UAS platforms are primarily used in permissive environments, however future operations may require UAS platforms to operate in non-permissive environments. The committee is aware these systems have improved situational awareness and reduced many of the emotional hazards inherent in air and ground combat, thus decreasing the likelihood of causing civilian noncombatant casualties.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a field hearing on April 23, 2013, that reviewed UAS modernization and technology investment. As a result of the hearing, the committee notes that the migration of UAS aircraft and sensor technology to the civilian sector could provide for greater competition, innovations in technology for both civilian and military missions, and could eventually decrease costs for both the government and private sectors. The committee also notes with concern that the budget request is procuring 234 fewer UAS than fiscal year 2013.

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to pursue development of technologies which would support advances in UAS development to include developing UAS for use in non-permissive environments, and encourage the Secretary of the Air Force to

work collaboratively with the Federal Aviation Administration and National Aeronautics and Space Administration to support the integration of UAS into the National Airspace System.

Wide area surveillance strategy

The budget request contained $37.8 million in PE 35206 for development of airborne reconnaissance systems, but contained no funding for development of Gorgon Stare.

Gorgon Stare is the Department of the Air Force's only operational persistent day and night wide-area motion imagery (WAMI) capability. The committee understands the Blue Devil experimental WAMI and multi-discipline system has been terminated. The committee notes that Gorgon Stare was initially fielded as a podded quick reaction WAMI capability in response to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council Memorandum 106–08, to provide near real-time surveillance of city-sized areas. The committee further notes that the podded system approach allows for integration onto multiple aircraft types and the open systems architecture allows for insertion of multiple collection sensors. Accordingly, the committee believes that Gorgon Stare is the logical program to recapitalize the technologies, capabilities, and lessons learned from Blue Devil, and that the Air Force should evolve Gorgon Stare into an operational multi-discipline WAMI and near-vertical direction finding signals intelligence system leveraging Blue Devil ground processing, exploitation, and dissemination, as well as Gorgon Stare resources and lessons learned to achieve a persistent multi-discipline intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capability.

The committee also notes that the budget request for fiscal year 2013 included a projection of $112.4 million for further development of Gorgon Stare in fiscal year 2014. The termination of the Blue Devil system and no funds for Gorgon Stare in fiscal year 2014 raises a committee concern that the Department of the Air Force does not have a well-considered and funded plan to develop and field a fused multi-disciplined intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capability to support Army, Marine Corps, and Special Operations Forces in the future. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate by February 14, 2014, on the strategy for developing a multi-discipline intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capability with integrated wide area surveillance and near vertical direction finding signals intelligence capabilities.

The committee recommends $37.8 million, the amount of the budget request, in PE 35206 for airborne reconnaissance systems.

Wideband Global Satellite communications

The budget request contained $38.4 million in PE 33600F for the Wideband Global Satellite (WGS) communications system.

The committee notes the importance of the military satellite communications architecture, such as the operational WGS system. WGS provides flexible, high-capacity communications for the De-

partment of Defense as well as other national and international partners. These critical communications may be susceptible to electromagnetic jamming from foreign adversaries. The committee notes that there may be low-risk upgrades that can address these emerging threats and encourages the Air Force to fully evaluate the best method(s) to protect this critical capability.

The committee recommends $38.4 million, the full amount of the request, in PE 33600F for the Wideband Global Satellite communications system.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request contained $17.7 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends $18.1 billion, an increase of $472.1 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Advanced sensor application program

The committee is aware that the Department faces a number of irregular threats that are not well suited for the array of sensors developed and optimized for observing more conventional adversary threats. For example, narcotics trafficking and other smuggling in the U.S. Southern Command (USSOUTHCOM) area of responsibility poses a significant challenge for that combatant command, with global spillover effects. Recently, the Commander, U.S. Southern Command testified that through the efforts of USSOUTHCOM and regional partners, 152 metric tons of cocaine have been seized, representing over three billion dollars of potential revenue that could have supported transnational criminal organization, cartel violence in Mexico, and the destabilization of our Central American neighbors. The committee recognizes that such smuggling activities, fueled by the development of semi-submersible vehicles and safe havens in foreign sovereign territory unfriendly to the United States, can imperil the security of our homeland, as well as support global terrorism. The ability to counter these irregular threats, which require dedicated sensors, platforms and processing capability designed to counter those threats, is compounded by the effects of budget sequestration and fiscal austerity, which have reduced the deployment of aircraft to South America that would have been utilized to support counternarcotics missions in the region and train partner security forces. The committee believes that newly developed manned and unmanned air and surface platforms might be capable of employing innovative new intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance sensor systems focused on these target sets. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to examine smaller, more affordable platforms that could host or launch such systems to improve detection, tracking, targeting and engage-

ment of irregular threats as part of the Advanced Sensor Application Program.

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System

The budget request contained $937.5 million in PE 63892C for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS).

The Aegis BMDS is the world's most proven naval missile defense system and the sea-based element of the U.S. Ballistic Missile Defense System. Aegis BMD plays an active role in protecting the United States and U.S. deployed forces from enemy ballistic missile attack. The Aegis BMD system has been included in the Administration's Phased Adaptive Approach to European Defense and has undergone an extensive and successful testing regime. The budget request included funding to meet significant capability and test milestones related to the evolution of the Aegis Weapons System and the test and deployment of new missile defense capabilities, including Launch on Remote technology.

The committee recommends $937.5 million, the full amount of the request, in PE 63892C for Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense.

Request for multi-year procurement authority for Standard Missile–3 Block IB beginning in FY15

The committee notes the successful FTM–19 flight test on May 16, 2013, which again demonstrated the robust design and performance of the Standard Missile–3 Block IB missile. With over $4.0 billion programmed for this missile across the FYDP, the committee strongly encourages the Department to request multi-year procurement authority for SM–3 Block IB beginning in fiscal year 2015.

The committee notes there could be savings in a multi-year procurement, such a contractual arrangement for SM–3 Block IB could yield savings equivalent to an entire additional year of production at current planned rates. The Department is directed to report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2013, with a recommendation on whether SM–3 Block IB could use multi-year or advanced procurement authority beginning in fiscal year 2015. If such authorities are requested, an estimate of what cost savings would accrue shall be required.

Service Life Extension Program for Standard Missile–3 Block IA missile interceptor

The committee is aware that the United States has completed procurement of additional Standard Missile–3 block IA interceptors and is planning to begin procurement of the block IB interceptor, which has a more capable seeker than the IA interceptor.

The committee is also aware that the United States has acquired a substantial inventory of block IA interceptors, many of which will soon begin to reach the end-of-design-life. The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) is currently studying whether and how to conduct a service life extension program (SLEP) of the block IA interceptor and such a program could extend the lifetime of this substantial inventory of block IA missiles by approximately fifty percent.

The committee believes such a SLEP should therefore be carefully studied and, if the results are promising, such a program should be promptly carried out. The committee believes that by carrying out this SLEP, MDA could come closer to meeting the requirements of the combatant commanders for missile interceptor inventory.

Standard Missile–3 Block IB ballistic missile interceptor

The committee is aware that the Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) block IB program will be transitioning from development to production in the next calendar year, after several delays. The committee is eager that the combatant commanders receive the block IB missile, which will be more capable than the IA missile that is presently the mainstay of the Aegis ballistic missile defense system fleet. Combatant commanders continue to state their demand for additional assets in theater to support ballistic missile defense mission requirements.

According to the Missile Defense Agency, it will procure 52 of these improved missile interceptors in fiscal year 2014, and 72 missiles per year each year through the fiscal year 2014 Future Years Defense Program. The committee supports this procurement.

The committee is aware of the challenges moving to procurement and the challenges of significantly increasing delivery quantities. The committee expects to be informed of any challenges meeting the increased production rate. The committee also expects to be informed of the progress of the FTM–19, 21, and 22 tests, which are required to get the IB missile certified for full rate production. The committee is eager to see full rate production when these maritime flight test events are successfully completed.

Airborne weapons layer

The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency and the U.S. Air Force have been conducting a cost benefit analysis to assess the feasibility of the airborne weapons layer concept, which would use modified missile interceptors or air-to-air missiles for certain missile defense missions early in a threat ballistic missile's flight profile.

The committee is also aware that, in the committee reports (S. Rept. 112–196 and S. Rept. 112–077), the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate directed the Missile Defense Agency and the Air Force to conduct this study, and its results are now well overdue. The committee urges the Missile Defense Agency and the Air Force to quickly complete this study and brief the congressional defense committees on the results.

The committee believes that an effective and affordable boost phase missile defense program would contribute to the goal of deploying an effective layered ballistic missile defense system. The committee notes the technical and cost challenges associated with boost phase missile defense, including those noted by the National Academy of Sciences in its study last year; the committee references the absence of a boost phase missile defense program of record elsewhere in this report.

Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance Model 2 Radars

The budget request contained $62.0 million in PE 63884C for Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) AN/TPY–2 Radars. The budget request would fund the acquisition of initial spares for the current radar units.

The committee is aware that the AN/TPY–2 radar is among the most powerful sensors in the ballistic missile defense system sensor architecture. The radar is capable of being employed in a forward-based mode or as part of a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system. AN/TPY–2 radars are deployed in the Republic of Turkey, the State of Israel, Japan, and elsewhere to support the warfighter and are providing significant sensor coverage that contributes to regional and homeland missile defense.

The committee is also aware that the fiscal year 2013 budget request reduced the procurement of the AN/TPY–2 radar from 17 to 11 units. However, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 and the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6), funds were provided to procure a 12th AN/TPY–2 radar. The committee encourages the Missile Defense Agency to continue to examine the requirement from combatant commanders and the proper quantity of AN/TPY–2 radars that should be deployed in a forward-based mode and for THAAD battery deployments.

The committee recommends $62.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63884C for BMDS AN/TPY–2 Radars.

Ballistic Missile Defense Technology

Missile defense directed energy application development

The budget request contained $309.2 million in PE 63175C for Ballistic Missile Defense Technology; of this amount, $43.5 million is for Weapons Technology, Laser Development.

The committee is aware that the budget request would support next-generation high-energy laser development, as well as would enable new kinetic interceptor technology. According to budget justification materials, the budget request would also enable the conduct of experiments using high-altitude, low-mach platforms, including the Phantom Eye unmanned aerial vehicle, to validate directed energy modeling. Further, the request would support laboratory concept development of Diode-Pumped Alkali Laser technology and other technologies.

The committee supports this work and its potential for significant breakthroughs in missile defense sensor and ballistic missile kill technology. The committee is concerned that the focus of the Missile Defense Agency's (MDA) work may have tilted too far from defeat and destruction of ballistic missiles, and recommends that the Missile Defense Agency not lose sight of these development options. The committee notes the recent test successes by the U.S. Army High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and the previous test successes of the Airborne Laser, while being aware of the technical and cost challenges of that system.

The committee further encourages the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide more detail on the division between directed en-

ergy sensor work and directed energy ballistic missile defeat and destruction work as part of the fiscal year 2015 budget submission. Additionally, the Director is encouraged to evaluate moving directed energy work out of the Ballistic Missile Defense Technology office and into MDA program offices geared towards delivery of capabilities to the warfighter.

The committee recommends $43.5 million, the amount of the request, in PE 63175C for Weapons Technology, Laser Development.

Solid Divert and Attitude Control System

The budget request contained $309.2 million in PE 63175C for Ballistic Missile Defense Technology. Of this amount, $24.0 million was requested for the continued development, post SM–3 IIB termination, of an enhanced Solid Divert and Attitude Control System (SDACS).

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee expressed its concerns about the possibility of relying on a single provider of SDACS technology. The committee is pleased that, with the termination of the SM–3 IIB, the Missile Defense Agency is taking steps to ensure there is an additional opportunity for diversity in the industrial base for this critical technology.

The committee recommends $24.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63175C for development of Solid Divert and Attitude Control System technology.

Ballistic missile threat analysis

The committee understands the global threat environment involving ballistic missiles is increasing, and the recent actions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the Islamic Republic of Iran demonstrate the continued need to fund ballistic missile intelligence. The National Air and Space Intelligence Center is the primary Department of Defense producer of foreign aerospace intelligence and is the Department's best resource on foreign long-range ballistic missiles. Likewise, the Missile and Space Intelligence Center is the primary intelligence component for the Department on the threat of short-range ballistic missiles to U.S. forces its allies, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The committee directs the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that identifies the ballistic missile threats to the United States, its allies, and its deployed forces, as well as the gaps in our understanding of those threats. The committee further directs the Director to include an explanation for how the Defense Intelligence Agency intends to close the gaps identified in the report.

Common Kill Vehicle for missile defense

The budget request contained $309.2 million in PE 63175C for Ballistic Missile Defense Technology. Of this amount, $70.0 million

was requested for the Common Kill Vehicle Technology (CKVT) program.

The committee is aware that approximately $20.0 million of the funds appropriated for the Standard Missile 3 block IIB program in fiscal year 2013 are to be redirected to the CKVT program by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The committee understands that MDA's intention for the CKVT program is to: enable the consolidation of the development of kill vehicles; develop a modular, open kill vehicle architecture; transition a more capable kill vehicle to the Ground-based Interceptor and the Standard Missile 3; and evolve to a multiple kill vehicle payload. The committee supports these developmental goals.

The committee is also aware that, pursuant to section 225 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), the Missile Defense Agency is developing a plan for a next generation exo-atmospheric kill vehicle. Section 225 also requires the Director, Missile Defense Agency to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plan.

The committee finds that the budget justification material regarding the CKVT program was insufficient, lacked necessary details, and should be further revised to include a date for initial operating capability, as well as a plan to transition to a development program based on full and open competition in time to support current and future interceptor procurement. The committee directs the Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on such information by July 31, 2013, as well as for it to be included in the report required by section 225 of Public Law 112–239.

In addition, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to determine an alternate program element (PE) in the fiscal year 2015 budget submission to fund the Common Kill Vehicle Technology and Capability Development program. It should balance the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system equities in a potential Common Kill Vehicle Technology and Capability Development program, as well as those possessed by the Aegis ballistic missile defense program. In addition, the committee recommends a new PE for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $70.0 million, in PE 63175C for the Common Kill Vehicle Technology program. Further, the committee recommends $70.0 million, an increase of $70.0 million, in a new PE for the Common Kill Vehicle Technology and Capability Development program.

Conventional Prompt Global Strike

The budget request contained $65.4 million in PE 64165D8Z for Conventional Prompt Global Strike Capability (CPGS) development.

The fiscal year 2014 budget request is $45.0 million less than last year's budget request and nearly $135.0 million less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2013 in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6).

The committee notes that in his statement before the committee on March 5, 2013, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM), testified that, "[t]oday, the only prompt global strike

capability to engage potentially time-sensitive, fleeting targets continues to be ballistic missile systems armed with nuclear weapons. We continue to require a deployed conventional prompt strike capability to provide the President a range of flexible military options to address a small number of highest-value targets, including in an anti-access and area denial environment."

The committee is concerned that the budget request does not provide sufficient resources to develop and field a capability for which the combatant commander has testified there exists a requirement. The committee is aware that given sequestration, potential fiscal year 2013 reprogramming actions, and other matters, the department has yet to be able to fully determine budget impacts to many of its programs. The committee encourages the Department to provide a more detailed plan for the fiscal year 2014 request for PE 64165D8Z, including a plan for acquiring CPGS capability with a specific date of initial operating capability and the date at which there is a likely to be a Material Development Decision.

The committee notes that many of the technologies under consideration by the Department of Defense are dependent on acquisition decisions involving other programs that may not occur until the middle of the next decade or that depend on breakthroughs in low technology readiness level programs. The committee is aware, however, that there are near-term threats for which CPGS capabilities could be especially useful, especially with the proliferation of mobile ballistic missile capability, including involving regional actors, if it can be developed and deployed in an effective and affordable manner. The committee encourages the Department to consider what near-term CPGS capability should be considered to meet these near-term challenges and it expects to see that consideration reflected in the fiscal year 2015 budget request. The committee is interested to see the results of the upcoming second test of the Advanced Hypersonic Weapon, which was successfully tested in 2012.

The committee recommends $65.4 million in PE 64165D8Z for the Prompt Global Strike Capability Development.

Defense Science Board recommendations on Deterrent Response Capabilities

The committee is aware that the Defense Science Board (DSB) completed its report "Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat" in January 2013. As part of that review, the committee noted that the DSB made several observations relevant to U.S. deterrent response capabilities in the face of severe and/or catastrophic cyber attacks on the United States.

First, the committee is aware that the DSB concluded that the severity of certain types of cyber threats added further reason for a non-nuclear conventional strike capability. The committee continues to support expeditious development of conventional prompt global strike capabilities, as well as the supporting doctrinal and concept development to guide potential employment, and states its views on conventional prompt global strike in another section of this report.

In addition, the DSB observed that, "[p]resumably one would characterize a catastrophic Tier V–VI adversary cyber attack on the United States as 'extreme circumstances' in the public lan-

guage of the 2010 NPR, so that is not precluded in the stated policy, but it is not explicitly mentioned." The committee encourages the Department to consider cyber in the Nation's deterrence doctrine, including better articulation of what circumstances might fall within the "extreme circumstances" language of the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review.

Based on the findings of the DSB, the committee is concerned that the United States should make further progress in developing response options and capabilities to support a full-spectrum cyber deterrence strategy, including the potential leverage of both conventional and nuclear capabilities. Additionally, the committee awaits the response from the Department on their views of the DSB's findings and recommendations, as promised during the March 13, 2013, hearing with the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer and the Commander, U.S. Cyber Command. The committee encourages the Department to consider all of these concerns as they draft their response.

Defense research in remote sensing

The committee supports domestic university research in remote sensing including remote sensing systems, cutting edge remote sensing data analysis methodologies, and techniques that use remotely sensed data for a wide variety of applications relevant to the Defense community. Consistent with the National Academies report, "Priorities for GEOINT Research at the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency", the committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider funding remote sensing research in areas such as sensor systems, phenomenology, analytical techniques, image processing, collection strategies or tasking, imagery science, polarimetry, and hyperspectral science.

Detection and threat identification technologies

The committee is aware that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency continues to have a strong partnership with each of the services as well as with U.S. Special Operations Command to develop and field technologies that reduce, counter and eliminate the threat of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high-yield explosive materials (CBRNE). The committee remains concerned about credible threats posed by state and non-state actors in their attempts to acquire and weaponize CBRNE materials for use against the United States and its allies. Therefore, the committee encourages the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to continue the development, demonstration and deployment of innovative and emerging detection and threat identification technologies to ensure prompt transition of validated capabilities to address national security requirements.

The committee directs the Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by December 31, 2013, on their efforts to advance and make operational a lightweight, person-portable CBRNE detection and analysis device.

Distributed Common Ground System enterprise

The committee is aware that the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) is a family of systems fielded across the military departments and other partners to provide an integrated architecture for all intelligence systems. DCGS is the current program of record for intelligence analytic, processing and dissemination capabilities for tactical and operational users. The committee is also aware that the "DCGS Enterprise," as the family of systems is known, has been under development and deployment for a number of years, and the cost, schedule and requirements continue to grow without keeping pace with the demands of the users or the current state of the art in technology.

To better understand those challenges, the committee requested the Comptroller General of the United States to review the DCGS Enterprise. The review found that "unlike a traditional weapon system acquisition, the DCGS Enterprise by its very nature has no clear end point and relies on a complex governance structure under a 'community of the willing' approach. This governance structure has had some success . . . however, not all of the services have kept pace in developing their systems and implementing improved interoperability standards that are available."

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 1-year after the date of the enactment of this Act on the information sharing framework and implementation plan for the DCGS Enterprise. The report should include:

(1) The framework, including clearly defined criteria and metrics, to assess progress and outcomes pertaining to the level and quality of information sharing taking place across the DCGS Enterprise and its effect on intelligence operations;

(2) The applicability of this framework to non-DCGS Enterprise systems;

(3) An implementation plan that defines the way forward for getting to the desired end state for the DCGS Enterprise and articulates how the military services will be held accountable for doing their part in acquiring the systems necessary to achieve the end state. The plan should include the overall requirements, technologies, acquisition strategies, time frames, and investments needed by each of the military services to complete development and fielding of DCGS capabilities.

Electro Magnetic Rail Gun for Missile Defense

The committee notes that the U.S. Navy has been conducting long-term research into electromagnetic railgun technology to support naval surface fire support missions. The committee is aware that pursuant to section 243 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), the Secretary of the Navy provided an unclassified and classified report on the development, future deployment, and operational challenges of this technology. The committee is also aware that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition wrote in response to this reporting requirement that, "[p]reliminary analysis

shows that a tactical railgun . . . has the potential to provide lethal effectiveness . . . for antiship ballistic missile defense." The committee acknowledges significant challenges ahead in developing, integrating, and deploying such technology, as with many technology development programs.

Additionally, the committee is aware that the Department has established a new effort within the Strategic Capabilities Office in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to leverage the Navy's program to explore the development a land-based railgun. As noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) for the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2013, the committee is interested in the potential utility in accelerating some electromagnetic railgun efforts for land-based area defense.

The committee finds these developments encouraging, and urges the Director, Missile Defense Agency to examine these activities in order to determine their potential application, if they can provide additional capability, to broader ballistic missile defense missions of the Missile Defense Agency.

Enhancing participation at minority-serving universities and institutions

The budget request contained $30.9 million in PE 61228D8Z for supporting the development of research and scientific capabilities, including scientific professionals, for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions.

The committee is encouraged to see that the Department of Defense (DOD) is firmly committed to vigorous efforts to enhance the capability of our nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions (HBCU/MI), as defined under title III and title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–329), to perform leading edge research supporting national security requirements.

The committee is aware that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (ASD(R&E)) issued guidance on December 2, 2011, calling for the re-invigoration of the relationship between the Department and the HBCU/MIs. As part of that guidance, the ASD(R&E) called on the components of the Department to:

(1) Maintain statistics on success rates for HBCU/MIs under competitive funding opportunities;

(2) Increase awareness of these institutions for participation in all DOD-sponsored activities;

(3) Encourage use of Intergovernmental Personnel Act agreements or other personnel-detail mechanisms with HBCU/MIs to more effectively connect with their talent base; and

(4) Ensure HBCU/MI facility are recruited to serve on scholarship, fellowship, and research review panels.

The committee encourages the Department to socialize this guidance across the enterprise, and to collect the necessary supporting data to ensure adherence to this policy.

The committee is also aware that there has been confusion over the current authorities related to the HBCU/MI program of the Department of Defense. The committee reiterates the current authority is intended to provide the basis for a program that recognizes

the unique status and attributes of "covered institutions," as defined in section 2362(e), title 10, United States Code. The committee is concerned that some organizations within the Department have incorrectly interpreted the new statutory basis for the program in section 2362(e), title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that the Department's approach to the HBCU/MI program should not include aspects of the program as it existed under any prior authority, including the use of any form of funding goal or required percentage of overall funding. In addition, the Department should not include HBCU/MIs when determining goals or accomplishments under the requirements of the Small Business Act (Public Law 95–507), as amended, regardless of any legacy coverage in regulations or local policies. The committee believes HBCUs/MIs should be treated as institutions of higher education and as a special subset of such institutions, not considered as small or small disadvantaged businesses.

The committee applauds the Department's decision to move the HBCU/MI budget line into a basic research account. Such a move provides greater flexibility for the Department to carry out STEM activities across the continuum. The committee encourages the Department to evaluate and consider supporting established activities that foster the best and brightest underrepresented high school students into pursuing STEM fields that would support national security requirements.

The committee recommends $35.9 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 61228D8Z for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions.

Foreign directed energy threats to U.S. military systems

The committee recognizes the importance of directed energy technology as a means to maintain an asymmetric operational and cost advantage over our adversaries. The committee, however, is aware that the United States is not the only nation which is pursuing this technology and is therefore concerned regarding the ability of the United States to maintain an advantage over potential adversaries should they employ similar technologies against U.S. forces.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on foreign directed energy threats and U.S. vulnerabilities to those threats. The briefing should consist of two sections. The first section should provide details regarding potential threats, current and projected, to U.S. military systems due to foreign directed energy weapons including high-energy lasers and high-power microwave systems. The Secretary of Defense should consult with the Director of National Intelligence regarding the information content of this section. The second section should discuss vulnerabilities of U.S. systems posed by foreign directed energy efforts, and the Department's initiatives to mitigate these vulnerabilities. The briefing should include a description of science and technology development efforts for directed energy countermeasures, as well a description of any technologies which are currently in use. The briefing should also address both tactical and strategic assets as well as efforts to protect U.S. personnel against

directed energy attacks. The briefing should also identify any known technology gaps in directed energy countermeasures and any plans to address those gaps.

Future missile defense sensor architectures

The committee is aware of the decision by the Department of Defense to terminate the Precision Tracking Space System, which it addresses in another section of this report. The committee also discusses the terrestrial AN/TPY–2 radar system in another section of this report.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee also discussed the operational status of the Sea-based X-band radar as well as the employment of the Ground Based Radar Prototype (GBR–P) presently deployed at Kwajalein Atoll. The committee has been focused on the centrality of a robust missile defense sensor architecture in its oversight of budget requests for missile defense in previous fiscal years.

The committee is therefore pleased that the Missile Defense Agency and U.S. Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM), in consultation with U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), are engaged in a study to examine the near- and far-term direction of U.S. missile defense sensor architectures, including the role for terrestrial radar sensors, airborne sensors, and persistent overhead sensors. The committee believes consideration should be given for balancing the employment of scarce available resources, noting the availability of the SBX radar for potential stationary employment off the west coast and the GBR-P on the east coast. The committee welcomes the leadership of the Director, Missile Defense Agency, the Commanders of USSTRATCOM and USNORTHCOM in undertaking this study, especially as gaps have become clear against the North Korean and future Iranian ballistic missile threats. The committee expects to receive a briefing on the outcome of this study and to understand the implications for fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015 and beyond. The committee expects to be supportive of closing the previously mentioned sensor gaps.

Ground-based midcourse defense system

The budget request contained $1.0 billion in PE 63882C for the ground-based midcourse defense (GMD) system.

The budget request would provide for Capability Enhancement (CE) 2 Enhanced Kill Vehicle (EKV) Return to Intercept activities; interceptor reliability enhancements; sustainment of the weapons system; return to Ground-based Interceptor (GBI) deliveries, which were suspended after the intercept test failure of Flight Test GMD (FTG) 06 and 06–a; and, Missile Field (MF) 1 refurbishment. The committee states its views and concerns about the plan for MF–1 refurbishment elsewhere in this report.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee also recommends an increase of $107.0 million to support advance procurement of long-lead items (specifically, 14 booster motor sets) in fiscal year 2014. The committee supports the decision by the Director, Missile Defense Agency to procure additional GBIs after a successful intercept flight. The committee is aware that Controlled Test Vehicle (CTV)

test 01—CTV–01—was successfully completed on January 26, 2013. The committee supports the CE–2 intercept test, FTG–06b, as a critical step after the two flight test failures in 2010, and notes that this test is currently scheduled for December 2013. The committee encourages the Director to take all appropriate steps to prevent a further slip in this test.

The committee commends the investigation of the 2010 test failures and the rigorous return to flight plan. The committee awaits FTG–07 planned to occur in May 2013, which will be the first intercept test of the CE–1 EKV since 2008. The committee notes the Director, Missile Defense Agency is planning to undertake a pace of at least one intercept test per year of the GMD system, and supports this planned increased rate of testing. The committee agrees with this goal and believes this is the minimum level of testing required for the GMD system to ensure full confidence, including by the Commander, U.S. Northern Command in the homeland missile defense capability.

The committee is also aware that in the March 15, 2013, announcement on the U.S. missile defense strategy, the Secretary of Defense stated the Department would procure 14 new GBIs at a rate of 2 per year starting in fiscal year 2016. The committee notes that this appears to be a low-rate procurement plan and unnecessarily expensive given a known quantity of missiles to be procured. The committee believes there is efficiency through long-lead procurement and other efficiencies of scale, especially in the event of a successful test of the CE–II interceptor in late calendar year 2013. The committee supports the Director's planned efforts to examine how to increase efficiencies of scale and reduce costs, and includes a provision elsewhere in this Act that would enable the Director to more cost-effectively procure these GBIs.

The committee encourages plans by the Director, Missile Defense Agency and the Commander, U.S. Northern Command to consult and examine the appropriate mix of two- and three-stage GBIs for the additional procurements as it understands there are different and complementary capabilities of these two GBI configurations.

The committee recommends $1.0 billion, the amount of the request, in PE 63882C for the ground-based midcourse defense system.

East Coast missile defense site

The budget request contained no funds for the design, engineering, or construction of an East Coast missile defense site, including for the conduct of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process as required by section 227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

The committee believes such a site is critical to the defense of the United States. The committee is concerned that funding for the EIS process to implement section 227 is not included in the budget request, and notes that the Missile Defense Agency intends to treat it as an unfunded requirement. The committee also notes that section 227 does not require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to down-select to only a single site by the end of this year.

The committee recommends $140.4 million in PE 63882C, for site activities related to the development and deployment of an East

Coast missile defense site, as follows: $10.2 million for site activities; $25.0 million for site planning and design related to site concept and master plan development for design work; and $35.0 million for ground system development. The committee notes that remaining funds should be spent by the Director, Missile Defense Agency to accelerate site activities.

Fort Greely Missile Field 1

The budget request contained $82.0 million in PE 63882C to initiate the refurbishment, upgrade, and for other improvements to Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely, Alaska.

The committee is pleased with the budget request, as it adheres to the recommendation made in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. The committee is aware this refurbishment is required to fully implement the March 15, 2013, announcement by the Secretary of Defense to emplace an additional 14 Ground-based interceptors (GBIs) at Fort Greely.

The committee encourages the Director, Missile Defense Agency, when planning and undertaking the refurbishment of the missile field, to ensure that no action is taken that would prevent or complicate any additional emplacements of GBIs at Fort Greely in the future given the unique emplacement of interceptors at that field at the present time. The committee expects that if the Director determines that additional resources are required in fiscal years 2014–15, to refurbish the missile field that he will communicate the same to the congressional defense committees.

The committee recommends $82.0 million, the full amount of the request, in PE 63882C for refurbishment, upgrade, and other improvements to Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely.

Two-stage Interceptor for Ground-based Midcourse Defense

In the Administration's 2009 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, the continued development of the two-stage GBI was considered a hedge against the advancing threat. The committee notes that a two-stage variant of the Ground-based interceptor provides significant additional homeland defense performance and robustness against emerging threat capabilities by improving the battle-space capability through shorter engagement times. The committee also understands the value of deploying a mixture of two-stage and three-stage GBIs to the existing GBI missile fields for enhanced homeland defense.

The committee is concerned that the planned two-stage intercept flight test in 2014, FTG–08, will test a two-stage missile that cannot be operationally deployed. The committee directs the Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the committee prior to FTG–08 detailing the improvements necessary, cost and feasibility, to test a two-stage missile that can be operationally deployed.

High-powered microwave applications

The committee is aware the Department of Defense has been examining applications for use of high-powered microwave (HPM) systems to counter electronics and non-kinetically affect adversaries on the future battle ground. For example, the Air Force has

been demonstrating a Counter-Electronics High Power Microwave Advanced Missile Project through the Joint Capability Technology Demonstration, successfully completing that effort in fall of 2012. The committee is also aware that the Navy has explored applications for using high-powered microwave systems to combat the electronics in improvised explosive devices in order to pre-detonate those systems.

The committee encourages the Department to continue investing in the development of both the capabilities for attack tools using HPM, as well as the operational concepts for how those systems might be employed. The committee recommends that the Department examine more closely such issues as: possible effects of HPM weapons on targets such as integrated air defense systems, sensors, battle management networks, and other high-value, electronics-based military systems; assess the funding needs to transition existing developmental HPM technologies to a cruise missile-based weapon, as well as development of new approaches and delivery mechanisms; and, estimates of the time required for development and deployment of near-term and longer-term capabilities.

Highly integrated photonics

The committee recognizes the importance of highly integrated photonics (HIP) technology for Department of Defense applications. For example, modern military aircraft can have miles of heavily shielded copper wire cables that connect a multitude of components, resulting in both increased weight and limited bandwidth capability. The committee believes that HIP technology has the potential to provide for next-generation network architectures and processing capabilities, while dramatically reducing life cycle costs. The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, in conjunction with the Naval Air Systems Command, has an initiative underway to further demonstrate HIP technology that facilitates building or upgrading military aircraft and other aerospace platforms with a fiber-optic networking infrastructure that will offer many capabilities well beyond those of currently used copper- and multi-mode-fiber-based technologies. The committee encourages the Department to continue pursuing sustained development of HIP across the future years defense plan.

Human-computer interaction

The committee understands that the application of emerging neuroscience techniques, such as the use of non-invasive brain measurement called functional near-infrared spectroscopy, are leading to a better understanding of human-computer interaction. The committee is aware that the use of such techniques to passively study the brain, coupled with new neuroergonomic and human factors research, have the potential to lead to better methods for training cyber operators that would reduce the human errors, improved input devices for machine control, and potential applications for using brain measurement as a means for future biometric identification. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue investing in basic research to further explore and expand the understanding of functional near-infrared spectroscopy techniques, and their applications for defense needs.

Improving military medical innovation

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its innovative medical research and development program, which supports a combination of private sector, academic and in-house initiatives. The committee believes that this foundation could be further improved by examining means to augment this base program with a self-sustaining, equity sharing mechanism to enable continued health care advancements despite decreasing federal budgets. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives within 180 days after the enactment of this Act on the feasibility of establishing a federally supported, self-sustaining investment entity to support military medical innovation.

Individual equipment for female servicemembers

The committee notes that in January 2013, the Secretary of Defense announced a new policy regarding the eligibility of female servicemembers to serve in certain combat positions in which they were previously prohibited. The committee is concerned that despite the reality of female servicemembers serving in combat for many years, the military services have been slow to field individual equipment that is properly sized, weighted, and designed for use by female servicemembers. The committee believes that it is important that the Department of Defense ensure that female servicemembers have the equipment and clothing tailored to the physical requirements of women in order to operate effectively and not be hampered by equipment that is ill-fitting, uncomfortable, and potentially harmful during operations in the field.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee noted that it is aware of the concerns expressed by female members of the Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom that the current interceptor body armor system's design may not be as ergonomically effective for female soldiers. As a result, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to conduct an assessment as to whether there is an operational need to tailor the interceptor body armor systems fielded to female servicemembers specifically for the physical requirements of women. The committee expects to receive this assessment in July 2013. The committee understands the Army has begun fielding improved outer tactical vests specifically designed for female servicemembers, and that the Army has created and tested 13 female-specific coat sizes and 13 female-specific trouser sizes through the Army Combat Uniform-Alternate program that it will begin fielding in May 2013. The committee commends the Army for taking these actions and expects similar actions by the other military services.

Similar to the report referenced above, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committee by February 15, 2014, that details the Department's programs to develop and field individual equipment that is properly sized, weighted, and designed to accommodate its use by women across all of the military services. In particular, the report should include, but not be limited to, plans to provide a greater

range of clothing sizes for women servicemembers, the potential utility of rucksack frames and other carrying equipment designed specifically for women, as well as the advisability and feasibility of providing all female servicemembers with female urinary diversion devices as part of their standard issued set of personal equipment.

Inner-aural communications hearing protection capability development

The committee is concerned that hearing loss continues to remain one of the most prevalent long-term injuries for military personnel. As such, in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the current efforts of the Department of Defense in developing technology to reduce military service-related hearing loss. The committee understands this briefing is still being developed and looks forward to receiving it in July 2013.

The committee believes that the military services should consider additional investment in such technology. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the service chiefs, to develop a comprehensive policy for hearing protection and hearing enhancement across the military services in order to: (1) ensure all members of the military services are equipped with communications equipment that does not interfere with or prohibit the use of hearing protection; (2) reduce impediments to operational readiness that derive from hearing loss; and (3) reduce the number of service-connected disabilities resulting from inadequate hearing protection.

Iron Dome short-range rocket defense

The budget request contained $220.3 million in PE 28866C for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

The committee has supported the Iron Dome system since its inception. The committee is aware of the tremendous success of the Iron Dome system in defeating threat rockets fire at the State of Israel from the Gaza Strip in late 2012. The committee is aware that the Iron Dome system intercepted over 85 percent of the rockets launched from the Gaza Strip against defended areas in Israel, and is pleased with its success.

The committee associates itself with the remarks of former-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta in December 2012 regarding the system: "Iron Dome performed, I think it's fair to say, remarkably well during the recent escalation . . . Iron Dome does not start wars; it helps prevent wars."

The committee recommends $220.3 million, the full amount requested, in PE 28866C for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system. The committee believes the Director, Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, in consultation with the Israeli Missile Defense Organization, should use up to 50 percent of this amount for production of Iron Dome components by U.S. industry in the United States to meet Israel's defense requirements consistent with

each Nation's laws, regulations, and procedures. The committee believes co-production of parts and components can and should be done in a manner that will maximize interceptor and battery deliveries for Israeli defense needs.

Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Systems

The budget request contained $95.7 million in PE 63913C for Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Programs. Of this amount, $52.6 million was requested for the Israeli Upper Tier program known as Arrow 3; $10.6 million was requested for the Israeli Arrow Program; and, $32.5 million was requested for the Short-range Ballistic Missile Defense Program, also known as the David's Sling Weapons System.

The committee is aware that the United States has no closer ally in the Middle East than the State of Israel. The committee is also aware that the threat of ballistic missile attack on Israel is rising. The committee believes this threat must be met with the unequivocal support of the United States.

The committee recommends $268.7 million, an increase of $173.0 million, in PE 63913C for Israeli Cooperative missile defense programs, the same level recommended in fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends this increase be provided as follows: $117.2 million for the David's Sling; $22.1 million for the Arrow 3 program; and $33.7 million for the Israeli Arrow program. The committee recommends funding and policies regarding the Iron Dome system elsewhere in this report.

Medical research information sharing

The committee supports the breadth of medical research being conducted within the Department of Defense and the promising results of such research. However, the committee is concerned that compartmentalization of data, whether by military service or injury mechanism, may unnecessarily limit the efficacy of limited research dollars. History has shown that many medical breakthroughs, such as penicillin, are often the product of research in fields indirectly related to medicine. The committee believes that the emerging field of big data analytics could provide useful tools to support the development of new capabilities through greater exposure of data and research results. Therefore, the committee directs the Department to provide a briefing within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Act on how best to promote information sharing across the medical research community through the use of big data analytics, while preserving anonymity and privacy protection, and allowing patients, subjects, and researchers to opt-in or opt-out of specific research studies. The briefing should also address whether establishing a single Department-wide clearing house for medical research data would be an effective means for accomplishing this goal.

Microscale liquid plasmas

The committee recognizes the importance of systems to allow for the operation of defense electronics in harsh environmental conditions, which must be impervious to radiation or damaging electromagnetic pulses. The committee is encouraged with the advance-

ments the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has made in this area working with non-thermal microscale liquid plasmas (MLP) in demonstrating the ability of these electronics and signal processing devices to withstand damaging electromagnetic pulses and operate in extreme pressure and radiation environments. The committee recognizes that MLP may have application in other areas, such as the development of novel plasma actuators for aerodynamic control to improve performance of high-speed fixed-wing aircraft and rotorcraft. The committee encourages DARPA to continue this research to provide applications that can be used on various platforms to protect our military hardware against extreme pressure and radiation.

Missile defense cooperation with Japan

The committee is aware that the United States has more than 20 international missile defense partners, plus the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Of these, few have undertaken a more cooperative missile defense program with the United States than the Government of Japan.

This cooperation includes hosting missile defense radars, deploying Aegis ballistic missile defense sensor and shooter ships, and sharing the multi-billion dollar development of the Standard Missile 3 (SM–3) IIA missile, which is planned to be deployed by 2018. Upon completion of this cooperative program, the SM–3 IIA will be the most sophisticated missile interceptor deployed on any country's ships, with the capability to engage many intermediate-range ballistic missile types.

The committee was pleased when the Secretary of Defense announced on March 15, 2013, that, "[w]ith the support of the Japanese Government, we are planning to deploy an additional radar in Japan." The committee is aware that this radar placement was in consideration for over a year.

The committee considers it a testament to the strength of the U.S.-Japan alliance that the Government of Japan has agreed to host this second radar on its territory. The committee expects that with the addition of the second Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance-model 2 (AN/TPY–2) radar unit, the Missile Defense Agency and the Department of Defense will have an opportunity to examine how best to bore sight these two radars to ensure maximum support for the regional and homeland missile defense missions. The committee is encouraged by this virtually unparalleled cooperation and support from Japan. The committee would welcome more such U.S.-Japanese missile defense cooperation in the future.

Additionally, the committee encourages Japan to consider the proposal articulated by the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff to seek a "collaborative, trilateral ballistic missile defense architecture." The committee believes such an architecture could redound to the benefit of the three allied states to provide additional defensive capabilities against shared regional threats, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mitochondrial research

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has an interest in research related to mitochondrial disease and mitochondrial function. For example, the U.S. Army Research Office's life sciences program includes support for efforts that focus on mitochondrial regulation and biogenesis, and biomolecular power generation. Similarly, as the committee has previously noted, there is a growing body of evidence indicating that traumatic brain injury-related impairments may be the result of damage to human cell mitochondria and that an enhanced understanding of the functioning of post-injury mitochondria may help drive the development of therapeutic interventions that could delay or prevent additional impairment. The committee continues to encourage the Department to support mitochondrial research through its medical research activities in the various services.

Modeling and simulation concurrency

The committee is aware that modeling and simulation tools can provide powerful planning and training capabilities to expose our forces to the complexities and uncertainties of combat before ever leaving home station. The use of simulation training has yielded a military that is better trained, more capable, and more confident as compared to units that do not have access to modern simulation training devices. The committee believes that simulation training can be a cost effective means by which units can improve combat readiness, tactical decision-making skills and ultimately save lives.

Furthermore, the committee believes that a key to the effectiveness of simulation training is ensuring that training devices maintain concurrency with the capabilities and features of their counterpart operational systems and platforms. The committee is aware that maintaining concurrency using traditional funding approaches remains challenging in the current fiscal environment and is likely to become more so in the future. To ensure the greatest efficiency and effectiveness in our military today, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider using its existing flexibility to utilize "training as service" contracting as one approach to support operational readiness and maintain system concurrency. The committee believes that the Department could meet the training challenges of the future in a fiscally austere environment by leveraging simulation training that is a combination of both Government owned and operated simulators, coupled with simulation training services provided by a academia and industry.

Modeling and simulation grand challenges

The committee recognizes the value of modeling and simulation (M&S) to a wide range of activities within the Department of Defense. The committee believes that the Department could do more to harness the entrepreneurial and innovative spirit of industry, academia, and the organic research and engineering resources of the Department to facilitate progress in the state of the art for M&S. The committee recognizes that the issuance of grand challenges have been effective in other areas, such as the Grand, Urban and Balloon Challenges of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. The committee encourages the Department to de-

velop and promulgate a set of M&S Grand Challenges for the research community that would:

(1) Support increased inter-agency coordination;

(2) Improve efficiency and interoperability of specific M&S tools, as well as to replace, improve, or provide efficiencies to existing activities of the Department;

(3) Eeinvigorate use of simulation-based acquisition as an enterprise-wide strategy, including by using modeling and simulation for performing analyses of alternatives for major defense acquisition programs;

(4) Lower the operations and support costs of the Department; and

(5) Support risk mitigation activities.

National Defense Education Program

The budget request contained $84.3 million in PE 61120D8Z for the National Defense Education Program (NDEP) for the purposes of attracting, engaging, and developing current and future generations of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) talent to benefit the Department of Defense. Of this amount, $48.7 million was requested for the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) program, $35.6 million was requested for the National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship (NSSEFF) program, but no funds were requested for pre-kindergarten-to-12th grade (PK–12) STEM educational programs.

The committee cannot stress enough that the recruitment, retention and development of an experienced, technical workforce is a critical national security requirement for the Department of Defense and that these efforts must start at the earliest stages of the STEM pipeline. The committee also stresses that growth in STEM fields is important for the general economic health and competitiveness of the nation, but due to the special security requirements of Department of Defense employees, this need is especially acute.

The committee understands that as the demand for a diverse, highly skilled scientific and technical military and civilian defense workforce grows, the Department will need to continue to invest in strengthening local defense communities by enhancing student engagement in STEM initiatives that support the Department's research areas. The committee understands that NDEP K–12:

(1) Builds student interest in STEM fields and disciplines and in careers specific to the Department;

(2) Develops defense-relevant science, engineering and mathematics skills; and

(3) Provides a future talent pool to fulfill the Department's demand for highly skilled STEM professionals by increasing access to authentic STEM experiences.

The committee recommends $89.3 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 61120D8Z for the National Defense Education Program. Of these funds, the committee recommends $48.7 million, the requested amount for the SMART; $25.6 million for NSSEFF, a decrease of $10.0 million; and $15.0 million for PK–12 programs, an increase of $15.0 million. Of the funds request for PK–12, the committee recommends the Department use some of the funds to carry out STEM activities that will support school districts with high

concentrations of military dependent families. Such activities should include a focus on increasing teacher effectiveness as well as student achievement.

Next generation Aegis missile—Standard Missile 3 block IIB

The committee is aware that on March 15, 2013, the Secretary of Defense announced that the Administration would propose to restructure the Standard Missile (SM) 3 block IIB program in the budget request for fiscal year 2014. The Missile Defense Agency has made it clear that this decision was driven by congressional reductions in technology development in fiscal years 2012–13, as well as technical challenges related to the projected capability of the missile and related to sea-basing the prospective missile interceptor.

The committee is also aware that the Government and its industry partners both made significant investments in the development of the SM–3 IIB missile. The committee believes that it would be imprudent and short-sighted to walk away from these investments and to leave no program of record for the continued improvement of the SM–3 system. The committee encourages the Missile Defense Agency to use these investments as much as possible to improve and inform the development of the Aegis ballistic missile defense system SM–3 IIA interceptor, planned to be fielded in fiscal year 2018, as well as a follow-on system. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by November 15, 2013, on the potential for a concept development program for leveraging the investments made in the SM–3 IIB program by the United States and industry to continue to improve the SM–3 IIA missile through an evolved or iterative variant, for example an SM–3 IIA+.

Non-Lethal directed energy applications

The committee reiterates its support for the expeditious development and fielding of non-lethal technologies and capabilities, which can not only limit civilian casualties in irregular warfare and contingency operations but have applicability across the full range of military operations. In particular, active denial technologies offer numerous opportunities for defusing crisis situations in volatile environments. The committee supports the findings of the Accountability Review Board, which concluded that "the lack of non-lethal crowd control options . . . precluded a more vigorous defense" of the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya and which recommended that the State Department "rapidly and routinely" identify and procure "additional options for non-lethal deterrents in high-risk, high-threats posts."

However, the committee notes that the lack of a clearly defined policy regarding the deployment of directed energy technologies has been a contributing factor to the decision not to deploy systems such as the Active Denial System. Interim guidance issued by the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy regarding the operational employment of directed energy weapons acknowledges the benefits of directed energy technology and supports its continued development, but stops short of authorizing the use of new directed energy weapons without undergoing a comprehensive review and approval

process intended to ensure an acceptable risk of collateral damage and inadvertent casualties to personnel. The committee recognizes the importance of a thorough examination of these issues, however it is concerned that the acceptance criteria imposed in this process still appears to be ambiguous and ill-defined, and therefore may stifle the development of, and support for, promising technologies. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days of the enactment of this Act which identifies the policy, technology, and acquisition issues that have impeded the development, fielding, and employment of active denial systems in operational theaters where U.S. forces are currently engaged; and clarifies the specific policy requirements that must be met before directed energy weapons may be employed in both counter-materiel and counter-personnel applications.

Non-profit research institutions

The committee is aware that non-profit research institutions are critical components of the research ecosystem, and offer tremendous capabilities to the research and development portfolios of the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies. The committee is aware the Department is examining ways to better utilize their unique capabilities and expertise, especially in the area of transitioning innovation to commercialization. Additionally, the committee understands that the Department is evaluating how to better utilize the special authorities within the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations in order to better leverage the capabilities of the non-profit research community. The committee believes this is especially important in a time of fiscal austerity and uncertainty, and encourages the continued discussion between the Department and the non-profit research community.

Open architecture systems

The committee notes that under the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD/ATL) in 2009, the Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Task Force chartered the UAS Common Segment (UCS) Working Group, which has developed a common, open and scalable reference architecture for control of unmanned aircraft systems. Despite this effort and past encouragement from Congress, the services have continued, in some cases, to procure proprietary and closed architecture unmanned systems and ground control segments resulting in higher costs, fragmented and disjointed operations, and reduced operational effectiveness. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and coordinating with the services to require all future UAS groups two through five ground control stations be compliant with the most recent Office of the Secretary of Defense UCS reference architecture.

The committee also notes that both the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and USD/ATL have identified an open systems approach as a potential enabler for increasing competition and reducing costs on major weapons system acquisition programs. GAO

recently reported that an open systems approach is characterized as having a modular design with open standards for key interfaces. While the Department would reap the most benefits from adopting an open systems approach at the start of development, the committee further notes that both the GAO and USD/ATL believe that in certain circumstances, where appropriate, it may be more cost effective and efficient to convert proprietary systems to open systems even after they have been fielded. The committee believes that the Department of Defense has the potential to benefit from the use of an open systems approach for weapons systems acquisition programs. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 3, 2014, that:

(1) Assesses the costs and benefits of using an open systems approach for manned and unmanned aircraft acquisition programs;

(2) Identifies the specific plan the Department of Defense will use for implementing an open systems approach for new manned and unmanned aircraft acquisition programs;

(3) Assesses the costs and benefits of converting existing proprietary manned and unmanned systems to open systems; and

(4) Recommends any implementing legislation for congressional consideration.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General to study the use of best practices for using open systems in product development. The study should identify better ways of incorporating an open systems approach from the start of new acquisition programs, analyze challenges that the Department of Defense may have in implementing these practices in its weapons acquisition programs, and provide potential solutions to these challenges, including potential policy changes. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the findings by February 3, 2014.

Potential missile defense cooperation with the Republic of Korea

The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and the Republic of Korea are conducting phased studies of ballistic missile defense architecture options for that country. The committee is encouraged by this effort as it represents an additional example of cooperation in missile defense development between the United States and its allies.

As the phased studies come to a conclusion, the committee encourages the Government of South Korea to consider purchasing U.S. missile defense technology that could provide proven solutions to the ballistic missile challenges that it is confronting and allow interoperability between South Korea and the United States. Additionally, the committee encourages South Korea to think about the proposal of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff to seek a "collaborative, trilateral ballistic missile defense architecture." The committee believes such an architecture could redound to the benefit of the three allied states to provide additional defensive capabilities

against shared regional threats, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Precision Tracking Space System

The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has proposed terminating the Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS) in the fiscal year 2014 budget request. The committee agrees with the Department's judgment that the termination is the appropriate action in view of the rising cost and acquisition uncertainties of this system, both prominent explanations for the committee's actions in the committee reports (H. Rept. 112–78 and H. Rept. 112–479) as well as in section 224 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

The committee views the termination of PTSS as an opportunity for the Department of Defense. The committee is aware that PTSS follows on the heels of the Space Tracking and Surveillance System (STSS) as a missile defense space sensor architecture that hasn't been operationally deployed. The committee believes that a persistent overhead sensor system is a must for the ballistic missile defense system.

The committee notes the priority of improving discrimination, and is encouraged by the MDA plan for an Integrated Space Layer Study and the joint MDA-Strategic Command "vision study" initiated by the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, on which the committee provides further views elsewhere in this report. The committee expects to be briefed this summer upon the conclusion of the post-PTSS scoping study as well as to be kept informed of the progress and interim findings and conclusions of the Integrated Space Layer Study.

The committee expects the Director to ensure that the taxpayer investments made in the PTSS system will not be lost or wasted and that the cutting edge sensor work being done on this system will be leveraged into a follow-on program that could be recommended by the aforementioned space sensor study. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require an analysis of alternatives on the Integrated Space Layer Study in order to ensure that future MDA plans do not follow PTSS and STSS into failure.

Quantum information science

The committee is aware that research into quantum scale effects offer great potential for the storage, processing and communication of information, including for a wide range of applications that include weak-signal sensing and imaging to quantum computing and cryptography. The committee recognizes that quantum information science offers potentially disruptive new technologies for national security needs, but that recent advances in quantum communications have resulted in some early commercial products.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee directed a review of quantum computing research within the Department of Defense. This report indicated that in fiscal year 2010, the Department had an investment between $50.0 and 55.0 million per year, which represented 30–40 percent of the Federal

investment in this area. Most of these projects were funded as single university investigator projects, but also included some Multidisciplinary University Research Initiatives.

The committee encourages the Department to sustain its investment in quantum information science research, especially in such areas as the development of novel quantum devices superconducting circuit technology for the purpose of quantum measurement and improving understanding of issues that are fundamental to quantum sensing and quantum computing. The committee believes that such efforts are needed to maintain the Nation's technological leadership internationally.

Report on boost phase missile defense options

Elsewhere in this report, the committee notes that it is aware that there is presently no boost phase missile defense program of record in the Ballistic Missile Defense System architecture planned by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA). The committee is aware that the Kinetic Energy Interceptor and the Airborne Laser were terminated in fiscal year 2009, though there were notable successes, as well as challenges, by both developmental programs. The committee notes that such an absence means the United States is currently not pursuing one of the three central layers of missile defense architecture.

The committee is also aware of the findings of the National Academy of Sciences in its report, "Making Sense of Ballistic Missile Defense: An Assessment of Concepts and Systems for U.S. Boost-Phase Missile Defense in Comparison to Other Alternatives," which concludes, by relying on its own "notional data," that boost-phase defense "could be technically possible in some instances but operationally and economically impractical for almost all missions." The committee is aware of the significant advantages, and the difficulties of intercepting a threat ballistic missile in the boost phase, including those articulated by the National Academy of Sciences report.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the the congressional defense committees by October 15, 2013, that assess the findings of the National Academy of Sciences study and the options that the Director believes the Missile Defense Agency should consider in an analysis of alternatives or other study that could inform a boost phase missile defense program as part of the budget request for fiscal year 2015.

Report on HALT/HASS Testing of Ballistic Missile Defense Systems and Components

The committee continues to be concerned by issues of reliability in the design and development of critical ballistic missile defense (BMD) system components and subcomponents as well as the potential for counterfeit parts to enter into the missile defense supply chain.

Effective utilization of modern methods and equipment for highly accelerated life testing and highly accelerated stress screening (HALT/HASS) during early design stages has been demonstrated to yield significant improvements in reliability and more effective product designs, as well as cost savings. Through modern HALT/

BASS testing, key components and subcomponents are subjected to overstresses, revealing latent design flaws (including those based on the use of faulty or counterfeit parts) that can go undetected with legacy testing approaches.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency, to conduct an assessment of the value, feasibility, and cost of greater utilization of modern HALT /HASS testing equipment and processes to shorten design and development timelines, reduce system and component testing and lifecycle costs, and enhance reliability of critical missile defense systems and components. In addition, the assessment should consider whether and to what extent greater utilization of modern HALT/HASS testing equipment and processes could help address the growing problem of detecting and preventing the introduction of counterfeit parts into critical missile defense systems, components, and subcomponents. Additionally, based on the findings of this assessment, the Director should provide the committees his recommendations regarding use of HALT/HAS. The committee directs that the results of this assessment be briefed to the congressional defense committees by not later than January 15, 2014.

Ribonucleic acid technology research

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense faces a significant challenge with infectious diseases, which hospitalize more service members each year than are wounded in combat. The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has initiated a program to address treatment for infectious diseases based on techniques utilizing ribonucleic acid (RNA). That program focuses on encoding an element of an antigen or antibody on an RNA molecule to initiate the desired immune response. The committee encourages the Department to continue this and similar research, and to look at opportunities to expand this research into new areas such as equipment that enable RNA target characterization, software development for in silico screening of molecule libraries against RNA targets, and assay development for in vitro high throughput screening and validation.

Soft biometrics for non-cooperative identification of personnel

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has developed and acquired biometric capabilities that rely primarily on fingerprint and iris recognition, but are increasingly including additional modalities such as facial recognition or identification of latent deoxyribonucleic acid material. The current generation of biometric identification devices is also primarily focused on cooperative sampling of target populations, which require samples to be taken by service members deployed in potentially dangerous environments. The committee understands that there are also additional "soft" biometrics, such as gait, keystroke, or analysis of body markings, which could also be useful in identifying specific individuals, and could be done from greater stand-off distances. The committee notes that some research has been conducted by the Air Force Research Laboratory, as well as other civilian research agencies to better characterize the utility and operational challenges of such modalities, but that the current biometrics architecture does

not yet integrate any of these capabilities. The committee encourages the Department to examine all biometric modalities as it develops its future biometrics architecture.

Special operations technology development

The Special Operations Technology Development program enables U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) to conduct studies and develop laboratory prototypes for applied research and advanced technology development, as well as leverage other organizations' technology projects. Similarly, the Special Operations Advanced Technology Development program delivers emerging technologies into the hands of Special Operations Forces, through the rapid prototyping and advanced demonstrations of these new technologies in realistic operational environments. The committee believes that these programs are vital tools that develop and rapidly deliver special operations specific technology to support special operations forces (SOF) in emerging as well as existing requirements. The committee believes that these programs would benefit from a formalized collaboration between USSOCOM and trusted academia, which in turn would serve as a catalyst to advance the introduction of new technologies that would contribute to SOF mission areas.

Standardization of directed energy weapon systems characterization

The committee is aware of several research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) programs which pursue the development and eventual deployment of directed energy weapon systems. The committee understands the importance of the services and defense agencies' ability to leverage RDT&E investments whenever possible to maximize the mutual benefit of these investments. Therefore, the committee encourages the services and defense agencies to continue to work synergistically in the development of these systems whenever possible. However, the committee is concerned about the inconsistency of definition of system performance among the different programs which make comparison of technologies and identification of leveraging opportunities between programs difficult. System descriptors such as "beam quality" for laser systems have multiple definitions within the directed energy community at large, and are not directly comparable between different systems. Some descriptors may only be applicable to a limited subset of missions and therefore inhibit the extrapolation of system performance to other missions. The ability to perform such comparisons is vital in the assessment of the different laser technologies applicability for missions of national interest.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a common set of parameters to describe directed energy weapon system performance with standardized definitions to be employed on all Department of Defense directed energy programs. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, which provides the rationale behind directed energy weapon system performance definitions.

Synthetic protein development

The committee is aware that the U.S. Army's Walter Reed Institute of Research (WRAIR) has established a collaborative research and development agreement (CRADA) to examine a new biochemical process that would prevent bacteria from responding to their environment and becoming harmful. This new process relies upon use of a protein molecule as a roadblock or 'switch' to disrupt the behaviors bacteria use to become virulent. The committee believes that this new discovery could have widespread implications to help reduce combat wound casualties caused by infection. The antimicrobial process has an added advantage over traditional antibiotics currently in use in that the switch mechanism makes it extremely difficult for bacteria to do an "end run" around the process as can happen with some traditional antibiotic-resistant microbes. The committee applauds WRAIR's efforts with this potentially lifesaving research and expects the Secretary of Defense and the Department's medical research enterprise to fully support this important new therapeutic approach.

Technology harvesting of the Medium Extended Air Defense System

The committee is aware that one of the frequent justifications for completion of the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Proof of Concept (PoC) was the harvesting of specific technologies for the modernization of the Patriot air and missile defense system. For example, in a letter to the congressional defense committees from then-Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, on November 30, 2012, the Secretary stated, "[t]he U.S. Army is already considering ways to link the knowledge gained from the tri-national MEADS PoC program to its future air and missile development plans." With the final funding of the MEADS PoC, the committee is anxious to learn what technologies will be harvested for Patriot modernization, at what date in the modernization program, and at what cost to take advantage of the significant U.S. taxpayer investment in PoC.

The committee was disappointed to learn that the Army would not include this information in the report required by section 226 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). The committee understands the Army is interested in evaluating potential technology harvesting as part of the assessment of the results of the upcoming FT–2 test, but it believes such evaluation is central to the intent of the requirement under section 226. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide an evaluation to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the completion of FT–2, or February 15, 2014, whichever comes later, of MEADS technology harvesting opportunities based on the report directed by section 226 of Public Law 112–239. This report should also include: 1) A review of current Army and joint requirements to which MEADS technology might be applied; 2) The Army's timeline for completion of an Analysis of Alternatives to these technologies; and 3) An overview of the Army's planned competitive milestones in the acquisition strategy.

Tele-medicine applications for ophthalmic injury

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is developing capabilities that would provide telemedicine and remote physiological monitoring for casualty care of deployed forces. The committee recognizes that such telemedicine capabilities can provide useful reach-back support for complex injuries, especially for sensitive organs where combat medics and surgeons may not have in-depth specialty training, such as ophthalmic injuries. The committee encourages the Department to experiment with and examine ways to utilize emerging telemedicine capabilities to allow for consultation with outside experts or specialty institutions to provide soldiers on the battlefield with access to high quality, tertiary ophthalmic care for complex and difficult eye injuries. The committee believes that partnering with subject matter experts could provide direct, real-time consultation between geographically-dispersed military and civilian ophthalmologists for urgent, complex ophthalmic diagnostic and surgical problems, as well as allow conferencing for complicated but less urgent patient management decisions.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense System

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has deployed the first operational Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system battery to Guam for its defense from the North Korean threat. The committee is gratified to see this capability operationally deployed providing missile defense protection to U.S. warfighters and U.S. territory.

The committee is also aware that the fiscal year 2013 budget request reduced the procurement of THAAD batteries from nine to six. The committee is not aware of any diminution of warfighter requirement for this capability. The committee encourages the Missile Defense Agency and the Missile Defense Executive Board to continually reexamine the availability of resources and the warfighter requirement for the THAAD system and to ensure future budget requests in future fiscal years seek to increase the number of THAAD batteries that will be procured by the United States. The committee also encourages the Missile Defense Agency, subject to the availability of resources, to ensure that THAAD interceptor procurement is matched and paced to the procurement and availability of THAAD batteries. The committee noted both of these concerns in 2012 as part of the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its robust missile defense cooperation with the United Arab Emirates. The committee is aware that ongoing and prospective foreign military sales with the United Arab Emirates, including the THAAD system, will greatly expand the U.S.-allied interoperable missile defense architecture to deal with regional threats. At the same time, the sales will produce significant cost-savings to the United States for its THAAD program.

Three dimensional integrated circuits

The committee is aware that the pressure to place more functionality on increasingly smaller integrated circuits is a challenge the Department of Defense is faced with as it tried to place more processing power on smaller platforms, such as unmanned systems and signal new sensors. The committee is also aware that the development of three dimensional integrated circuits (3D ICs), which allow for functionality to be stacked onto circuits and provide both horizontal and vertical functionality, holds promise for defense applications. The committee is concerned that recent microelectronics strategies from the Department have not addressed the role 3D ICs might fill, nor the gaps that might exist in commercially developed 3D ICs and where Department of Defense investment may be needed.The committee encourages the Department to comprehensively evaluate the place 3D ICs might fit in the Department's overall microelectronics strategy to understand how they might best be used to the benefit of defense systems.

U.S. Special Operations Command undersea systems strategy

The undersea systems strategy of the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has been a subject of focus by the committee over the past several national defense authorization acts. The committee believes that the research and development phase has reached a point of stability, which validates the progress of USSOCOM and their communication with Congress in a joint endeavor to provide warfighters with unmatched clandestine maneuverability in denied maritime areas.

Increased authorization from the congressional defense committees for fiscal year 2013 afforded additional resources for dry combat submersible development of a near-term prototype that will give USSOCOM new capability. The dry variant will afford increased range and alleviate the human factors that are unavoidable while operating wet submersibles in cold environments on a long-distance commute to an objective. It is the intent of this committee to continue supporting and tracking with great interest the progress of a dry variant capable of deploying from multiple platforms to include a submarine.

Additionally, section 156 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) mandated reporting requirements for the Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program and continued coordination between USSOCOM and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict. The committee looks forward to receiving these mandated reports and reaffirms the need for continued communication with the congressional defense committees to ensure programmatic success across the undersea systems enterprise and program.

Vertical Lift Consortium

The committee understands that the Vertical Lift Consortium (VLC) is an open and competitive forum that leverages all sectors of the vertical lift aircraft community to encourage teaming of innovative small business and non-traditional contractors with major defense firms and academia. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to submit a report to the congressional defense committees providing the status of the Department's engagement with the VLC on related technology requirements and development strategies for next-generation vertical lift aircraft.

The committee notes that the required report was delivered to the congressional defense committees on May 13, 2013. The committee agrees with the Department's assessment that the VLC is an integral part of the future vertical lift initiative and supports VLC members continued opportunities to compete and participate in prototype technology projects for next generation vertical lift aircraft. The committee recognizes incremental improvements or upgrades to current Department rotorcraft will not fully meet future Joint service operational requirements. The committee supports the development of future vertical lift aircraft and encourages the Department to expand the prototyping program to include vertical lift aircraft.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained $186.3 million for operational test and evaluation, Defense. The committee recommends $186.3 million, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2014 operational test and evaluation, Defense program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Assessment of the Army Distributed Common Ground System

The committee shares numerous concerns related to the performance and program management of the Distributed Common Ground System-Army (DCGS–A) program. The committee has endeavored to better understand those concerns and find ways to integrate lessons learned to improve the DCGS–A program as it moves forward. The committee awaits the report required by section 923 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as well as a review by the General Accountability Office. Elsewhere in this bill, the committee directs further actions to improve visibility into the DCGS enterprise, and updates in key areas of performance.

The committee strives to continue improving its understanding and assessment of key attributes of DCGS–A, and therefore directs the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) to review the DCGS–A program and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 27, 2013. That report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the ability of the system to synchronize data across separate locations around the world in disconnected, interrupted or low-bandwidth data environments, including use of cloud edge nodes, and to manage and enrich

data collaboratively across the enterprise into a fused common operational picture;

(2) An analysis of how the Tactical Entity Databases (TED) are synchronized;

(3) An assessment of the system to meet the data interoperability standards set by the intelligence community.

Furthermore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with Performance Assessment and Root Cause Analysis office, to provide a briefing by October 18, 2013 providing an additional assessment of the DOT&E report. This report shall include an assessment of the results of the DOT&E report, including comments on any recommendations made; and an analysis of how the lessons learned from the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan were incorporated into DCGS–A, including the ability of the system to respond to joint urgent operational needs.

Test and evaluation capabilities for electromagnetic pulse vulnerabilities

The committee is aware that an electromagnetic pulse (EMP), both man-made and naturally occurring, as well as high-powered microwave (HPM) systems poses a significant challenge to the assurance of critical Department of Defense missions and assets. The committee recognizes that adequate test and evaluation facilities and capabilities are needed to maintain the standards for individual systems, as well as the networking of systems and infrastructure of the Department.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not adequately invested in the underlying infrastructure needed to support these test and evaluation capabilities, as well as the modeling and simulation tools required to support combatant commanders, war games, military exercises and other assessments. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Test Resource Management Center to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the test and evaluation capabilities to support identification and mitigation of EMP and HPM vulnerabilities to the Department. The briefing should include identification of the existing capabilities and their sustainment levels, as well as identification of any gaps in those capabilities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4201 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Ground Combat Vehicle Engineering and Manufacturing Phase

This section would prohibit the Army from obligating post-Milestone B funds for the Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) program until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the congressional defense committees.

The committee supports the Army's need to modernize its ground forces equipment. The GCV is one of the Army's top priorities and will eventually replace the Bradley Fighting Vehicle. The committee expects the Army to execute an acquisition strategy that meets the needs of the warfighter and minimizes the risk to the Government. The Army's recent acquisition strategy is to down select to one contractor at the beginning of the Engineering, Manufacturing, and Development (EMD) phase instead of funding two contractors until the end of the EMD. The committee notes that officials from the Government Accountability Office have testified before the committee on numerous occasions that weapon system programs that enter EMD too early without enough "knowledge" can pose a significant risk to the Government. "Knowledge" is defined as the combination of technology maturity, a thorough understand of requirements, and realistic cost estimates. The committee expects the Army to ensure that it has enough "knowledge" before it down selects to one contractor in order to minimize the cost, schedule, and performance risk to the Government and the taxpayer.

Section 212—Limitation on Milestone A Activities for Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike System Program

This section would prohibit the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics from approving a Milestone A technology development contract award for the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) program until 30 days after the Under Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the software and system engineering designs for the control system and connectivity segment and the aircraft carrier segment of the UCLASS system can achieve, at a low level of integration risk, successful compatibility and operability with the air vehicle segment planned for selection at Milestone A contract award.

Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Air Force Logistics Transformation

This section would restrict the obligation and expenditure of Air Force procurement and research, development, test, and evaluation funds for logistics information technology programs until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the modernization and update of Air Force logistics information technology systems following the cancellation of the expeditionary combat support system.

Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defensive Cyberspace Operations of the Air Force

This section would limit the funds the Air Force may obligate or expend for Defensive Cyberspace Operations in Program Element 0202088F to not more than 90 percent until a period of 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the Air Force's plan for sustainment of the Application Software Assurance Center of Excellence across the Future Years Defense Program.

Section 215—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Precision Extended Range Munition Program

This section would limit obligation of 50 percent of fiscal year 2014 funds for the precision extended range munition (PERM) program. This section would include a waiver for the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics pending written certification to the congressional defense committees.

Section 216—Limitation on the Availability of Funds for the Program Manager for Biometrics of the Department of Defense

This section would restrict the obligation or expenditure of funds for fiscal year 2014 for research, development, test, and evaluation by the Department of Defense program manager for biometrics for future biometric architectures or systems to not more than 75 percent for a period of 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees assessing the future program structure for biometrics oversight and execution and architectural requirements for biometrics enabling capability.

Section 217—Unmanned Combat Air System Demonstration Testing Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to demonstrate unmanned, autonomous aerial refueling testing and evaluation with the X–47B aircraft.

Section 218—Long-Range Standoff Weapon Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a follow-on air-launched cruise missile to the AGM–86 that achieves initial operating capability for both conventional and nuclear missions by not later than 2030 and is certified for internal carriage and employment for both conventional and nuclear missions on the next-generation long-range strike bomber by not later than 2034.

Section 219—Review of Software Development for F–35 Aircraft

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to establish an independent team consisting of subject matter experts to review the development of software for the F–35 aircraft program, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 3, 2014.

The committee continues to support the F–35 development and procurement program, and believes a software development review by the Department will ensure that the F–35 program remains on schedule to provide a fifth generation capability in support of our national security strategy.

Section 220—Evaluation and Assessment of the Distributed Common Ground Station

This section would require that beginning in fiscal year 2015, future budget submissions include separate project codes for each capability component within each program element for each service version of the distributed common ground station. Furthermore, this section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to conduct an analysis of commercial link analysis tools that could be used to meet the requirements of each of the service versions of the Distributed Common Ground Station program; and if one or more commercial link analysis tools are found to meet the requirements of the program, the responsible service secretary shall initiate a request for proposals.

Section 221—Requirement to Complete Individual Carbine Testing

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to complete all required tests, user evaluations, and business case assessments for the individual carbine program and report those results to the congressional defense committees upon completion.

Section 222—Establishment of Funding Line and Fielding Plan for Navy Laser Weapon System

This section would ensure that future defense budgets submitted to Congress for fiscal years 2018–28 include a funding line and fielding plan for a Navy laser weapon system. In the event that the state of the technology does not warrant a program of record, the Secretary of the Navy can waive the requirements of this section by providing written justification for that decision.

Section 223—Sense of Congress on Importance of Aligning Common Missile Compartment of Ohio-Class Replacement Program with the United Kingdom's Vanguard Successor Program

This section would make a series of findings and express the sense of Congress regarding the importance of aligning the common missile compartment of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine program with the Vanguard-class successor program of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Polaris Sales Agreement of 1963 has been a cornerstone of the U.S. alliance with the United Kingdom for 50 years and has brought significant benefits to both parties. Under a 1982 extension of the agreement, the United Kingdom purchases the Trident missile system from the United States for use in its submarines. Both Nations will field the Trident II/D5 strategic weapon system in their respective next generation of submarines. These new submarines will share a common missile compartment that is currently being developing through a cost-shared program conducted

by the Navy. In fiscal year 2013, the Navy delayed the Ohio-class replacement program by 2 years due to fiscal constraints, but decided to keep the common missile program on the original schedule to meet its obligation to provide the compartment to the United Kingdom in time for insertion into the Vanguard-class successor. The committee applauds this decision and encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy to continue to prioritize the common missile compartment such that it stays aligned with the Vanguard-successor program. The committee believes that keeping this common missile compartment program aligned with the Vanguard-successor program is critical to ensuring the United States fulfills its longstanding obligation to a crucial ally.

Section 224—Sense of Congress on Counter-electronics High Power Microwave Missile Project

This section would express the sense of Congress that the results of the counter-electronics high power microwave missile project should be considered as part of any analysis of alternatives for development of a high power microwave weapon, but could also be used as a near-term capability for combatant commanders should a requirement emerge.

SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Section 231—Prohibition on Use of Funds For MEADS Program

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS).

This section would also provide that the Secretary of Defense may not carry out technology harvesting from the MEADS system until 120 days after the Secretary of the Army provides the congressional defense committees a report on matters related to Army requirements for MEADS technologies, and other matters.

Section 232—Additional Missile Defense Site in the United States for Optimized Protection of the Homeland

This section would require the Missile Defense Agency to construct and make operational in fiscal year 2018 an additional homeland missile defense site capable of protecting the homeland to deal more effectively with the long-range ballistic missile threat from the Middle East. This section would be carried out while continuing to meet the requirement to prepare environmental impact statements and a contingency plan under section 227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) for the missile defense sites in that section. This section would require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to submit a report to Congress on such missile defense site, including an estimate of the funding to be required for construction and deployment.

Section 233—Limitation on Removal of Missile Defense Equipment from East Asia

This section would state that it is the policy of the United States that the missile defenses of the United States defend the United States, its allies, and deployed forces against a multitude of threats, including multiple regional actors. This section would also limit the use of funds to remove U.S. missile defense capabilities from East Asia until 180 days after the date that the President has certified that nuclear weapons and ballistic missile threats to U.S. allies have been verifiably eliminated, and, the President has consulted such allies. This section would provide that the President may waive such certification if he determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States and he provides an unclassified explanation, in writing, detailing the basis for his determination. This section would exclude Aegis ballistic missile defense equipped cruisers and destroyers from this requirement.

Section 234—Improvements to Acquisition Accountability Reports on Ballistic Missile Defense System

This section would amend section 225 of title 10, United States Code, to include a requirement that the Director, Missile Defense Agency include in the annual Ballistic Missile Defense System Accountability Report certain operation and support costs, and statements as to the quality estimate level of each cost estimate as well as the steps the Director will take to ensure these estimates reach the "high-quality estimate" level established by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Section 235—Analysis of Alternatives for Successor to Precision Tracking Space System

The section would strike section 224 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) and replace it with an updated analysis of alternatives requirement to reflect the termination of the Precision Tracking Space System in the President's request for fiscal year 2014.

The committee notes that this section would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to consider the opinions of private industry in carrying out the analysis of alternatives. The committee considers this requirement to necessitate only listening to the input of industry members that have long-standing and proven experience in the often difficult world of space acquisitions.

Section 236—Plan To Improve Organic Kill Assessment Capability of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System

This section would require the Director, Missile Defense Agency and the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to jointly develop options to achieve an organic kill assessment capability for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system by December 31, 2019, and a plan to deploy such capability in at least some of the upcoming acquisition of new Ground-based Interceptor missiles.

This section would also require the Director and the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to jointly develop a plan for an interim capability for improved hit assessment for the GMD system that can be integrated into near-term Enhanced Kill Vehicle upgrades and refurbishments.

This section would require these plans be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2014.

Section 237—Availability of Funds for Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense Program

This section would authorize the obligation of $15.0 million for enhancing the capability for producing the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system in the United States, including for infrastructure, tooling, transferring data, special test equipment, and related components.

Section 238—NATO and the Phased, Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense in Europe

This section would require, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that the President shall consult with the North Atlantic Council and the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on the funding of the Phased, Adaptive Approach to missile defense in Europe to establish a plan for NATO to provide at least 50 percent of the costs of operations and maintenance, and infrastructure, of Phase I of that system.

This section would further require the President to use the NATO Military Common-Funded Resources process to seek at least 50 percent funding support of the costs for Phases II and III of that missile defense system. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, if he determines it useful, to seek establishment by NATO of a common pool of Aegis Standard Missile 3 missile interceptors.

Section 239—Sense of Congress on Procurement of Capability Enhancement II Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle

This section would state the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should not procure a Capability Enhancement II exoatmospheric kill vehicle for deployment until after the date on which a successful operational flight test has occurred, unless such procurement is for test assets or to maintain a warm line for the industrial base.

Section 240—Sense of Congress on 30th Anniversary of the Strategic Defense Initiative

This section would express the Sense of the Congress on the 30th Anniversary of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Section 251—Annual Comptroller General Report on the Amphibious Combat Vehicle Acquisition Program

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an annual review of the Amphibious Combat Vehicle acquisition program and provide the results of the review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, and annually thereafter through 2018.

Section 252—Report on Strategy To Improve Body Armor

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a comprehensive research and development (R&D) strategy for achieving significant weight reductions for both hard and soft body armor components to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 125 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) required a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) to generate a technical report on ways to lighten current body armor systems. The report and FFRDC analysis found that the only way to achieve significant reductions, 20 percent and higher, without sacrificing safety and survivability would be through robust, sustained R&D funding over a number of years that focuses on developing new materials, as well as pursuing a modular, tailorable approach to body armor systems.

The committee expects the Secretary's strategy to include but not be limited to: (1) costs, schedules, and performance requirements for all solutions currently under development for body armor weight reduction, R&D funding profiles for these solutions; (2) solutions and materials currently under evaluation by the Department, the feasibility and technology readiness levels of these materials and solutions, resourcing strategy for future initiatives; (3) how the Department is considering a "systems of system" approach to include modular and tailorable solutions for weight reduction efforts; and (4) all courses of action being considered to coordinate weight reduction initiatives for body armor among the military services.

Section 253—Report on Main Battle Tank Fuel Efficiency Initiative

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on an investment strategy to accelerate fuel efficiency improvements to the engine and transmission of the M1 Abrams tank.

Section 254—Report on Powered Rail System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that comprehensively reviews and compares powered rail systems for the M4 Carbine program.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 261—Establishment of Cryptographic Modernization Review and Advisory Board

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a senior-level body, to be known as the Cryptographic Modernization Review and Advisory Board, to assess and advise the cryptographic modernization activities of the Department of Defense.

Section 262—Clarification of Eligibility of a State to Participate in Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research

This section would modify the eligibility requirements for the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research to include states that are also eligible under section 113 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1862g).

Section 263—Extension and Expansion of Mechanisms to Provide Funds for Defense Laboratories for Research and Development of Technologies for Military Missions

This section would modify section 219 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note) by allowing funds for infrastructure revitalization projects to be available until expended. Use of such authority must be reported to the congressional defense committees with the total cost of the project before it commenced. Total cost of individual projects may not exceed $4,000,000. Funds under this authority may be accumulated only after the date of enactment of this Act and may be accumulated for not more than five years. This section would extend section 219 authority to September 2020.

Section 264—Extension of Authority to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements

This section would extend the authority of the Department of Defense to award prizes for advanced technology achievements until September 30, 2018.

Section 265—Five-Year Extension of Pilot Program to Include Technology Protection Features During Research and Development of Certain Defense Systems

The section would extend the pilot program established by section 243 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), as amended by section 252 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), from October 1, 2015, to October 1, 2020.

Section 266—Briefing on Power and Energy Research Conducted at University Affiliated Research Centers

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on power and energy research conducted at university affiliated research centers.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

At a time when Air Force combat-coded squadrons are grounded; when Navy carrier strike group presence in the Middle East has been reduced; when Army collective training rotations above the company level have been cancelled; when depot-level and field-level maintenance have been deferred and reduced in all the military services; and when base operating services and facilities sustainment have been reduced, all due to the impacts of sequestration, the bill would authorize $174.6 billion for operation and maintenance, including additional funding for operational tempo, flying hour programs, facilities sustainment, corrosion prevention, control, and mitigation, depot maintenance, and joint and coalition exercises. Additionally, the bill would authorize $67.1 billion in operation and maintenance funding for Overseas Contingency Operations, with $4.2 billion in additional funding for depot-level maintenance, fuel costs, and equipment spares and reset.

During the past 12 years, the Army—Active, Guard, and Reserve—has deployed more than 1.1 million soldiers to combat with more than 4,500 soldiers making the ultimate sacrifice. Another 32,000 soldiers have been wounded, 9,000 of whom require long-term care. In that time, soldiers have earned more than 14,000 awards for valor to include seven Medals of Honor and 22 Distinguished Service Crosses. After more than a decade of protracted counterinsurgency operations and cyclic combat operations in the Middle East, the Army must find a way to return to full-spectrum operations, reset and reconstitute the force, responsibly draw down operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and fully develop its role under the new Defense Strategic Guidance despite tighter budgets and the compounding challenges of sequestration, and with a smaller force structure.

The Navy faced a $4.5 billion shortfall in its fiscal year 2013 operation and maintenance accounts which was further exacerbated by unanticipated bills resulting from rising fuel prices. In February, the Navy deferred deployment of the nuclear aircraft carrier the USS Truman to the Persian Gulf and reduced its carrier presence to 1.0. In March, the Navy cancelled five ship deployments and next-to-deploy forces are also being affected in that two carrier air wings have reduced monthly training to the "tactical hard deck," the minimum level of training required to maintain basic air proficiency and the ability to safely operate the aircraft. As ship and aircraft maintenance availabilities are reduced or outright cancelled, the Navy will be challenged to reconstitute requirements in the very near future due to lack of capacity at its shipyards. Ultimately, this results in significantly shorter service life for the assets, particularly when coupled with the impacts of the sustained surge in recent years which has taxed both equipment and personnel at rates significantly higher than anticipated. The tenuous progress the Navy has made over the past two years to reverse degraded surface fleet material readiness threatens to be undone by sequestration.

Despite slight improvements in Marine Corps readiness levels following the drawdown of forces in the Republic of Iraq and the ongoing drawdown from Afghanistan, the Marine Corps will be challenged to meet global commitments, reconstitute its force and equipment, and sustain high operational tempo as it downsizes to 182,000 personnel and faces a nearly $1.0 billion funding cut. The challenges will be compounded by the need to support new, important missions such as the forward deployment of a special Marine Air Ground Task Force in Spain to support U.S. Africa Command and the expansion of critical legacy missions such as the Marine Security Guard program slated to grow to protect an increasing number of embassies in high-risk areas around the globe.

Air Force officials told the committee that "allowing the Air Force to slip to a lower state of readiness, [thus] requiring a long buildup to regain full combat effectiveness, negates the essential strategic advantages of airpower and puts joint forces at risk." One-third of Air Force fighter and bomber forces are currently standing down, and more and more pilots are not ready or trained and qualified to meet operational mission requirements such as those on the Korean peninsula where the Air Force and Army work as critical partners to assure peace and stability.

The operation and maintenance funding authorized by this title seeks to address many areas of concern for depleted force readiness levels and related high levels of assumed risk, and makes several requests of the Department of Defense to report on plans to achieve full-spectrum readiness. The bill attempts to address the readiness shortfalls exacerbated by sequestration and choices driven by what Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel described during the Department of Defense's fiscal year budget rollout as a necessary component of a "comprehensive deficit reduction plan."

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

Office of Economic Adjustment

The budget request includes $371.6 million for the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) to provide assistance to states and communities that are affected by Department of Defense changes, including the Department's Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) actions. Of these amounts, $273.3 million was requested for Guam civilian water and wastewater infrastructure improvements. The committee remains supportive of the Department of Defense requirements to provide support for civilian infrastructure funding on Guam. The infrastructure is needed to support and sustain the current and future military growth on Guam. The budget request includes $246.0 million for upgrades to the Northern District Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Hagatna Wastewater Treatment Plant to full secondary treatment, as well as $19.8 million to address critical wastewater collection system deficiencies and $7.5 million for technical support and project development.

The committee notes that the Fiscal Year 2013 Consolidated Appropriations Act (Public Law 113–6) eliminated authorization for transfer of $119.3 million in OEA funding, making the funding for

fiscal year 2013 not executable. As a result, the Department of Defense was unable to make initial investments in the wastewater system, also making the full fiscal year 2014 request not executable. Accordingly, the committee recommends a funding level in fiscal year 2014 of $217.7 million, a reduction of $153.9 million for the Office of Economic Adjustment. Funding authorized shall include $119.3 million for civilian improvements on Guam, consisting of $55.0 million for phase 1 improvements at the Northern District Wastewater Treatment Plant, $51.4 million for water system distribution system repairs and replacements, and $12.9 million for a Regional Public Health Laboratory.

LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT ISSUES

Air Force Fuel Leak Maintenance Efficiencies

It is the committee's understanding that aircraft readiness is regularly challenged by fuel leaks and that current procedures for identifying and repairing these leaks is both costly and inefficient. Furthermore, the committee is aware that the Air Force Research Laboratory has undertaken an independent evaluation of alternative, commercially available technologies that yield more accurate, timely, and cost-saving results for identifying, sealing, curing and validating leak repairs. The committee is encouraged by the Air Force's pursuit of greater efficiencies in the fuel leak maintenance process and the promise it holds for achieving savings and a higher rate of aircraft readiness across the fleet. As such, the committee encourages the Air Force to fully implement approved commercially available technologies to reduce aircraft downtime caused by fuel leaks, and to increase life-cycle savings across the full-spectrum fuel leak detection and repair process.

Anti-corrosion Protective Covers for Military Hardware

The committee continues to push the Department of Defense to confront its hardware corrosion challenge. Corrosion remains the largest preventable cost to the U.S. military, a cost which exceeds $23.0 billion per year. Corrosion results in decreased readiness, increased manpower requirements, and significantly higher life-cycle sustainment costs. In the current budget environment, it is critical that the Department of Defense focus on affordable sustainment of its hardware. Failing to protect the Department of Defense's hardware from the preventable problem of corrosion leaves hardware susceptible to the damage and degradation associated with exposure to heat, dust, ultraviolet rays, and moisture. The committee encourages the military services to follow the lead of the Department of the Navy and set a comprehensive, service-wide strategy to mitigate corrosion that includes fielding more waterproof, breathable anti-corrosive cover technologies that have been shown to significantly reduce corrosion and have demonstrated effectiveness in overseas contingency operations and at units' home stations. The committee encourages the military services to incorporate commercially available capabilities in developing requirements for low-cost protective covers that provide protection from water and particulate intrusion; elimination of microclimates in

covered objects; mold and mildew protection; ultraviolet ray resistance; flexure and handling ability in extreme climates; and durability.

Army Logisticians

The committee recognizes that the projection of power, the deterrence of threats, the response to crises, and the protection of strategic U.S. interests requires a robust set of logistics capabilities. The committee believes that the U.S. Army, in order to sustain its presence across vast distances, must be supported by a logistics infrastructure commensurate with the missions it undertakes. The committee also recognizes that logistics support is critical to currently deployed combat units and those which may be deployed in a future contingency. The committee believes that the United States cannot be allowed to lose the capacity to both surge and sustain military forces across considerable distances for extended periods of time, which requires a robust set of logistics capabilities.

Comptroller General Littoral Combat System Sustainment Review

The committee notes the critical nature of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program and the importance of the initial deployment of the USS Freedom to the Republic of Singapore to test and refine operational support and sustainment concepts. The LCS class takes a unique approach to maintenance which relies heavily on contractor-provided maintenance in contrast to other Navy ship classes, which typically use the Navy's organic capabilities and U.S. shipyards to provide maintenance. The Navy established an LCS Council to address major concerns raised by several Navy reports on problems with the LCS's manning, training, and maintenance concepts, among other issues. This council has developed a plan of action with milestones to bring high-level attention to resolving these issues as the LCS class is introduced into the surface combatant fleet. Given the central role of the LCS for the future of the surface fleet, the committee has concerns about the Navy's long-term sustainment plan. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze and review:

(1) Plans to collect and analyze data during the USS Freedom's Singapore deployment, as well as any mid-point or final reports of lessons learned from the deployment;

(2) Projected costs associated with providing preventive and depot maintenance including, but not limited to, an analysis of the alternatives considered in the use of contractor fly-away maintenance teams and U.S. Government and commercial shipyards;

(3) Progress on meeting targets established in the LCS plan of action and milestones;

(4) Lifecycle cost estimates for the variants of the LCS and their associated mission modules compared with other Navy ship classes; and

(5) Any other issue that the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the sustainment of the LCS platform and its associated mission modules, including modifica-

tions and improvements to reduce long-term sustainment costs and improve efficiencies.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide to the congressional defense committees a preliminary briefing by March 3, 2014, on the above factors, with a report or reports to follow by May 30, 2014.

Continuous Technology Refreshment

The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) provided expanded authority to the Department of Defense to foster use of technology-enhanced maintenance capabilities with Working Capital funds. The accompanying Joint Explanatory Statement (Committee Print 5) specifically discussed Continuous Technology Refreshment (CTR), which is a proven post-production sustainment acquisition strategy to acquire technologically improved replacement parts and to significantly reduce long-term ownership costs. The committee notes that the Army Aviation and Missile Life Cycle Command is projected to achieve $254.0 million in sustainment cost savings over a 10-year period on just a limited a set of legacy helicopter parts. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has been slow to implement robust CTR programs, to expand their use beyond this one Army command, and to take full advantage of the Working Capital authorities provided in law which have become much more important due to national budget pressures.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the congressional defense committees, not later than April 30, 2014, on the Department's Continuous Technology Refreshment initiatives for improving the quality and significantly lowering the cost of replacement parts for Department weapon systems. The briefing should address:

(1) The guidance provided to the military services on the use of Working Capital authorities for technology-enabled maintenance capabilities;

(2) Information on the results achieved to date from developing modern parts to replace obsolete legacy parts using CTR with the resulting associated estimated cost savings; and

(3) The plans of each military department and appropriate Defense agencies to develop and implement CTR acquisition strategies in fiscal year 2014 for obsolete parts most likely to achieve significant cost savings.

Defense Logistics Agency Roles and Missions Assessment

The committee is concerned that the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission process may have placed the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) in roles and assigned missions outside its core competencies which may be resulting in suboptimal support of its customers. In particular, the committee is concerned about the operational and readiness impacts to customers of DLA's continued challenges in effectively managing the supply chain. The committee notes that supply chain management, supply inventories, materiel distribution, and asset visibility, in particular, continue to be "high risk" areas within the Department of Defense, according the 2013

Government Accountability Office's High Risk Report. While the committee notes the significant progress DLA has made in reducing excess inventory and improving its business processes, the committee has been made aware of persistent challenges in the timely provision of specialized, low-quantity parts and supply chain management, which the committee believes could be a result of a misalignment of roles and missions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the roles and missions of the DLA. The assessment may, at the election of the Secretary, be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) or an independent, non-governmental institute which is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, and has recognized credentials and expertise in national security and military affairs appropriate for the assessment. The assessment should include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) An examination of the roles and missions currently assigned to the DLA;

(2) An assessment of the DLA's ability (resources, structure, workforce, etc.) to adequately accomplish those roles and missions outside of DLA-Energy;

(3) Identification of any DLA functions, roles, missions, activities, or initiatives that could be more efficiently performed by the military departments or other defense agencies;

(4) A transition plan for any activities recommended for migration;

(5) An assessment of functions, roles, missions, activities, or initiatives that could be most efficiently performed by DLA that are currently performed by other military departments or defense agencies; and

(6) Any other recommendations on ways the DLA could further improve its support to customers, management practices, demand forecasting, its use of modeling to determine the optimal number and inventory management.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to deliver this assessment in conjunction with the annual budget submission for fiscal year 2015. Further, to enable the committee to provide the necessary oversight, the committee directs the Department to brief the congressional defense committees on the strategy within 30 days of its delivery to Congress.

Disposition of Retrograded Equipment from Afghanistan

As the Department continues the drawdown of U.S. forces from Afghanistan, the committee is aware of continued interest by local communities, law enforcement agencies, and other eligible domestic entities in the reuse of excess defense articles.

The committee supports close coordination between the Department and the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property in connecting interested eligible domestic entities with surplus military equipment at no cost to the government. However, in conducting oversight on the progress of drawdown in Afghanistan, the committee believes that the Department can do more to

provide real-time information on the availability, location, and condition of surplus materials available to interested eligible entities.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees no later than October 1, 2013, on the Department's plans to make excess defense articles from the drawdown in Afghanistan available to eligible domestic entities at no cost to the government. This briefing shall specifically include planned improvements to real-time information sharing with interested eligible parties regarding what equipment might be available, when, where, and in what condition.

F–35 Sustainment Plan

The committee recognizes the importance of the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Program to our national defense. This advanced fighter aircraft will replace a variety of existing aircraft in the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. In 2012, the Department of Defense reported that sustainment of the F–35 aircraft fleet could cost more than $1.0 trillion (in then-year dollars) over the planned 30-year service life. However, the Department has said that it is actively engaged in evaluating opportunities to reduce life-cycle sustainment costs based on concerns about the affordability of the program. Past experience has shown that decisions made during the development of a weapon system can influence, positively or negatively, the cost of sustaining that system over its life cycle. Considering the magnitude of the estimated sustainment costs for the F–35, the committee is concerned about whether the Department has established comprehensive sustainment plans, developed appropriate cost analyses, and identified potential options to control and/or minimize future sustainment costs for the aircraft program. Given the fiscal uncertainties facing the Department and growing concerns related to the affordability of the F–35's long-term sustainment costs, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the Department's ongoing F–35 sustainment planning efforts. This review should include:

(1) The extent to which the Department has developed comprehensive sustainment plans, including a Life-Cycle Sustainment Plan, and regularly updated these plans to reflect program changes;

(2) The extent to which the Department has utilized appropriate analyses of operating and support costs, including a business case analysis, to evaluate the full range of sustainment options available for the F–35 program;

(3) The extent to which the Department is pursuing additional opportunities, such as competition for sustainment contracts, to reduce long-term sustainment costs; and

(4) Any other issues that the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the sustainment of the F–35.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a preliminary briefing by March 14, 2014, on the above factors, with a report or reports to follow.

Item Unique Identification and Automated Information and Data Capture

The committee is aware that numerous Government Accountability Office audits have found that significant improvements are needed in the tracking, management, and accountability for assets deployed across the Department of Defense. The committee believes that Item Unique Identification (IUID), Radio Frequency Identification (RFID), biometrics, and other automated information and data capture (AIDC) technologies have the potential for realizing significant cost savings and improving management of defense equipment and supplies throughout their life cycles. Further, the committee judges that the use of the implementing technologies can secure supply-item data for logistics and engineering analysis; improve item intelligence for operational warfighter planning; upgrade access to historical item data across life cycles; lower total life cycle cost of items acquired and managed; save taxpayer funding through improved productivity, efficiency, maintenance, and logistical planning; and combat the growing problem of counterfeit parts in the military supply chain.

The committee understands that in 2003, the Department of Defense initiated the IUID initiative, which requires the marking and tracking of assets deployed throughout the Armed Forces or in the possession of Department contractors, but implementation has been fragmented, incomplete, and not enforced. The committee believes the Department of Defense must improve its efforts to capture meaningful data and optimize the benefits of Item Unique Identification and other AIDC initiatives to include the investment of sufficient resources and continued training and leadership.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to promulgate rules and regulations sufficient to enforce compliance with section 252.211–7003 (entitled "Item Identification and Valuation") of the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, on Item Unique Identification, which requires unique identification for all delivered items meeting the standards set forth in the regulation.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2014, on current compliance rates with section 252.211–7003 of the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, measures being taken to improve compliance, and a projected date for full compliance.

Laser Peening Technology

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee noted that "laser peening technology, a surface enhancement processing treatment for metals, has achieved considerable success in commercial aerospace and power-generation applications, reducing costs by enabling improvements in the metal structure and mitigating high-cycle fatigue failures of a system, thus extending the system's lifetime." In that report the committee also encouraged the Department of Defense "to examine the potential cost savings that may be derived from adopting this technology

broadly across the military services, particularly for use on engines, aircraft structures, land vehicles and weapon systems." However, the committee is concerned that some military departments have not fully explored the use of such technologies to reduce costs associated with problems of fatigue failure, stress corrosion cracking, and component shape corrections. The committee further encourages the Department to explore such technologies for use in aircraft engines to slow the rate of replacement of highly stressed components and parts.

Logistical Support to the Department of Defense

The committee is concerned with the current downsizing at the General Services Administration's (GSA) Eastern Distribution Center (EDC) and its impact on military readiness. As described by the General Services Administration (GSA), the EDC "provides an integrated pipeline that sustains GSA's armed forces and civilian customers around the world with innovative and tailored logistics services that are ever improving in terms of cost, timeliness, and relative value." It has been estimated that 75 percent of shipments from the Eastern Distribution Center are for Department of Defense purposes. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to examine the important work at this facility to ensure the EDC maintains its ability to sustain the readiness of our Armed Forces.

Long-term Investment Plan for Land, Facilities, and Equipment of Former Guam Ship Repair Facility

In testimony before the committee in April 2013, the Chief of Naval Operations highlighted the importance of a ship repair capability on Guam to support increased naval operations in the western Pacific region as key to the national security strategy. The committee understands that maintaining a depot-level ship repair capability on Guam will require significant investment. The committee is concerned that the Navy has been unable to provide a detailed investment plan for upgrading and modernizing the former Navy ship repair facility on Guam. The committee notes that a failed long-term lease approach would have required private industry to provide capital improvements estimated at nearly $150.0 million. Therefore, the committee anticipates that a similar level of investment would be needed by the Navy to provide the necessary depot-level repair capability for the western Pacific region. The committee believes that improvements to these facilities will be critical to ensuring the long-term viability of a depot-level ship repair capability in the western Pacific.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Chief of Naval Operations, to submit to the congressional defense committees no later than December 31, 2013, a long-term investment plan for the land, facilities, and equipment of the former Guam ship repair facility. The plan should include:

(1) A description of how the Secretary of the Navy will prioritize the improvements made to land, facilities, and equipment under the plan, including an explanation and estimated cost and schedule for each such improvement; and

(2) An identification of the accounts from which funds will be used for such improvements.

Navy Fleet Readiness

The committee is pleased with the U.S. Navy's progress in reversing the years of degraded surface fleet readiness trends. The Navy has made progress in documenting the existing shortfalls and maintenance requirements through its development of Class Maintenance Plans and Technical Foundation Papers to identify specific requirements by hull. However, to supplement its organic capability, the committee notes the Navy's success has been partially reliant on external support to address its knowledge gaps and prepare the assets for operations. Engineering Readiness Assessment Teams (ERATs), manned in part by retired Navy master chiefs, have complemented the organic capacity with their unique expertise to assist ships' crews in best practices, safe operation of ship systems, and identification, documentation, and repair of failed equipment and broken systems. With decades of experience, the teams' goal is to improve readiness by providing younger sailors with critical institutional knowledge, mentorship, technical help, quality control, and environmental program compliance. The committee recognizes the importance of this relationship and the invaluable contribution. However, the committee encourages the Navy to institutionalize these lessons learned in its training process.

In light of constrained fiscal resources, the committee recognizes the Navy could potentially lose traction on the success it has achieved to date, due to the impact of a sustained surge and lack of time and resources to support required maintenance. Therefore, the committee encourages the Navy to continue to provide the necessary funding and expertise, through a complement of organic and private sector capacity, to sustain the progress in surface ship readiness, reduce lifecycle maintenance costs, and improve warfighting readiness at lower total ownership cost to reach expected service life.

Submarine Propeller Repair and Overhaul

The committee notes that the Navy has indicated that "funding requirements for propeller repair and overhauls are estimated based on historical and current year expenditures" and that "sustaining out-year funding for Ready for Issue (RFI) spare propellers at required levels would help maintain inventory and limit risk to readiness." The Navy has indicated that lower-than-targeted levels of healthy RFI propellers pose "medium to high risk to attack and strategic submarine operational readiness." The committee further notes that the Navy continues to request partial funding to support this effort in the Overseas Contingency Operations account. The committee encourages the Navy to identify the necessary funds to ensure an adequate supply of ready propellers when projecting Future Years Defense Program base budget requests.

READINESS ISSUES

Advanced Situational Awareness Training

The committee understands that the Army has successfully incorporated a module to train deploying units to detect changes in human behavior through Advanced Situational Awareness Training (ASAT). The committee commends the Army for its leadership in developing and broadening soldier training in this area and is encouraged by the reported benefits of increased situational awareness, improved effectiveness in positive identification of threats, reduced time to gain a decisive advantage, enhanced use of existing optical equipment, and reduction of civilian casualties. The committee believes this type of training imparts enduring and important skills at both the individual and unit level, and represents a cost-effective method for training soldiers across a broad range of military operations.

Combat Training Centers

The committee recognizes the important role that national combat training centers play in producing combat-ready forces. The committee further recognizes that these centers provide an important resource for other Government agencies, allies, and both conventional and special operations forces. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to closely examine how such centers can serve as a model for future operational readiness and training, and work to ensure their long-term viability by providing appropriate resources and adequate staffing.

Comptroller General Encroachment Study

The committee is concerned about military readiness and preserving the Department of Defense's ability to train and operate in the air, at sea, and on land. U.S. military force readiness is directly dependent on many factors, including realistic training for a variety of missions in myriad environments worldwide. An important component of military readiness is timely and routine access to training ranges that permit realistic training without hindrance from activities that can limit access to, encroach upon, or at times compromise security of the ranges. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) previously reported in "Military Training: Compliance With Environmental Laws Affects Some Training Activities, but DOD Has Not Made a Sound Business Case for Additional Environmental Exemptions" (GAO–08–407) that the requirement to comply with environmental laws has affected some training activities and how they are conducted. Specifically, the GAO found some instances where training activities were cancelled, postponed, or modified in order to address environmental requirements. While the GAO also reported at the time that readiness data did not indicate an impact on readiness from these instances, it also reported that the Department was developing systems to measure the impact.

Limitations on access to training ranges and encroachment of national security interests can take many forms:

(1) Environmental limitations, both land- and sea-based, involve endangered species that may be present through nesting or migration at or near training ranges.

(2) Urban encroachment can consist of commercial or residential construction in the civilian economy in proximity to or adjacent to military bases.

(3) Encroachment from energy-generation projects can occur both adjacent to installations and also in the Outer Continental Shelf, potentially affecting the military's ability to train and operate both on installations and at sea. The installation of renewable energy-generation facilities, including wind turbines and solar power facilities, can be incompatible with the installations' missions.

(4) Competition for the electromagnetic spectrum through the proliferation of consumer demand for wireless devices, including smart phones and tablet computers, and the associated data-intensive applications, is increasingly conflicting with the Department's need to use the electromagnetic spectrum for modern military training and assurance of proper functioning of some weapon systems.

(5) National security interests may be threatened when range security becomes a concern based on the nature of the encroachment. For example, ocean observing systems may be used for marine mammal and weather research, climate research, tsunami warning/verification, and seismic/earthquake monitoring. The littoral nature of Navy training ranges, and the unique types of activity that occur there, make the ranges valuable for data gathering in each of those categories. However, the open nature of the high seas also makes it possible for data to be gathered that may exploit an operational vulnerability. Similarly, land-based development can lead to security concerns due to incompatible development adjacent to or in near proximity to ranges and ownership of such development that raises security concerns.

The Department's actions to prevent or mitigate the impediments to realistic training are vital to ensuring adequate range access and ensuring U.S. forces remain at a high state of readiness. However, the committee wants to ensure that the Department is effectively preventing or mitigating these restrictions to ensure that U.S. force readiness remains high. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake a review of the Department's activities to prevent or mitigate environmental limitations and man-made encroachment, and ensure adequate security of training ranges and operations. At a minimum, this study should address the following:

(1) What are the types of restrictions, and how do they affect the Department's ability to train and operate?

(2) What authorities does the Department have, or need, to be able to protect its ability to train and operate?

(3) To what extent has the Department identified restrictions on its air-, land-, and sea-based training ranges, and how has the Department prevented or mitigated such restrictions?

(4) How does the Department collaborate with local governments, private companies, and/or other federal agencies to pro-

tect its ability to train and operate? And, what areas require improvement?

(5) How effective are the Department's systems to measure the effects of environmental limitations and man-made encroachment and to what extent do opportunities exist to improve these systems?

(6) What options does the Department have to mitigate impacts of environmental limitations and man-made encroachment, and at what cost?

(7) How does the Department identify and mitigate any relevant security issues related to training range restrictions?

(8) Which ranges are at highest risk? And, which ranges should be the highest priority to protect from encroachment due to unique training environments and/or ability to minimize electromagnetic spectrum interference?

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 3, 2014, on the findings of the study.

GAO Review of DOD Readiness and Risks

With the drawdown of forces first from the Republic of Iraq, and now from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan the military has faced a new set of challenges as it plans for an uncertain future with less resources. In its January 2012 strategic guidance, Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense and related documents, DOD called for a smaller, lighter, flexible joint force able to conduct a full range of activities but no longer sized to conduct large and protracted stability operations. It also called for a rebalancing of forces to the Asia Pacific region along with the Middle East and several other changes. In March 2013, the Secretary of Defense directed the Deputy Secretary of Defense to work with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a Strategic Choice and Management Review to examine the choices that underlie the defense strategy, posture, and investments, including all past assumptions and systems. Shifts in strategy or assumptions can have a material impact on the way DOD portrays its readiness and the risks it faces.

To help inform the committee's oversight and its consideration of the Department's budget request, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review DOD's readiness and the risks the department faces and to report the results of this review to the congressional defense committees. The review should specifically address:

(1) The current and historical readiness status of each of the military services including any trends in reported readiness;

(2) The current and historical readiness status of each of the current geographic and functional combatant commands, including any trends in reported readiness;

(3) The key factors that impact readiness, and how these factors contributed to any reported changes in readiness between March 1, 2013, when sequestration went into effect, and the December 2013 readiness reports; and

(4) Changes in strategic and military risk levels between 2011 and 2014, including any changes in the way the Chair-

man of the Joint Chiefs of Staff evaluates and reports strategic and military risks.

In reporting on these four elements, the Comptroller General may take a phased approach, reporting on elements (1), (2), and (3) by March 15, 2014 and reporting on element (4) 45 days after DOD delivers the annual Chairman's Risk Assessment and, if applicable, the Secretary of Defense's Risk Mitigation plan to the congressional defense committees.

Identification of Foreign-Language Competency

The committee recognizes that foreign-language training is expensive and time-consuming. If there is a need to surge skills in a particular language, the place to start is with people who already demonstrate proficiency in the needed language. This promotes efficiency and lowers training costs by making use of language knowledge already acquired by service members. To provide decision-makers with greater visibility of the language skills and cultural knowledge of service members that could inform force management processes, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Secretaries of the military services to query service members returning from deployment to a non-English-speaking country regarding language skills acquired or improved while deployed, and to allow service members to rate their own competence in speaking, oral understanding, reading, and/or writing a foreign language, using a language proficiency self-assessment scale like the one used to assess proficiency standards throughout the U.S. Government. Additionally, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the military services to allow a service member who acquired a speaking knowledge of a language to be tested on oral proficiency alone. The data collected from these language competency self-assessments and tests should be made accessible to service commanders and others who need to identify a pool of potential candidates for advanced language training to meet force management requirements.

Missile Defense Capabilities for Guam

The committee recognizes the strategic importance of providing ballistic missile defense for Guam and the current U.S. assets based there. The committee further recognizes that as part of bilateral negotiations with the Government of Japan, the U.S. military presence on the island and the need to protect it from a missile threat are projected to increase. The committee notes that the Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation contains a recommendation to base an Army Air and Missile Defense Task Force (AMDTF) on Guam as part of the realignment of U.S. Marines from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. The committee also notes the actions of the Department of Defense of temporarily stationing a Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile defense capability on Guam to respond to immediate threats of missile launches from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea toward U.S. military assets on Guam.

The committee is concerned that despite projected growth in the U.S. military population on Guam and the President's new Defense Strategic Guidance focusing on the U.S. Pacific Command area of responsibility, the Army has not provided any resources for the basing of an AMDTF or other missile defense capability on Guam in the current year budget proposal or in the Future Years Defense Program. The committee is aware that Aegis-based missile defense capabilities or other land-based missile defense capabilities also could, if required, provide coverage and defense for assets on Guam. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the appropriate military services, to brief the committee by December 1, 2013, on:

(1) Any analysis the Department of Defense has conducted to determine which missile-defense capability or capabilities are best suited for the defense of Guam and the recommendations from that analysis;

(2) The Department's timeline for resourcing and establishing an AMDTF or other missile-defense capability on or for Guam, including the number of required personnel billets and costs;

(3) An assessment of which component of the military—Active or Reserve—would be most appropriate to support the mission, either fully or partially; and

(4) A description of permanent and other missile defense capabilities in the Asia-Pacific region that could provide protection to U.S. military assets on Guam.

Navy Expeditionary Combat Command

The committee recognizes the important contribution of the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC) as a scalable force that facilitates securing strategic access and global freedom of action. Specifically, the Naval Construction Battalion plays a critical role in support of operating forces through efforts such as construction of roads, bridges, bunkers, airfields, and logistics bases in addition to civic action projects. The committee is concerned that the Navy's planned force-structure reduction of 8,000 positions could hinder the strategic capabilities of the Navy. The Naval Construction Battalion represents approximately 50 percent of the total NECC manpower, and as a high-demand, low-density asset, the committee encourages the Navy to consider the important contribution of these forces.

Military Ocean Terminal Concord

The committee is concerned about the readiness status of the Military Ocean Terminal Concord (MOTCO), California. The port's net explosive weight limitation, combined with its other facilities such as magazines, rail lines, piers, and staging areas, gives it the capacity to handle common user ordnance load-out requirements for the military services and combatant commanders during wartime and contingency operations. Consequently, it is a key national asset essential to military readiness, and the committee recognizes its need to be maintained.

The Government Accountability Office in its May 13, 2013, report "Defense Logistics: The Department of Defense's Report on Strategic Seaports Addressed All Congressionally Directed Elements," cited significant deficiencies that impair the port's capability to support required missions. Information provided to the committee by the Department of the Army, which is responsible for the operation and maintenance of MOTCO, indicates port facilities and equipment need major rehabilitation and modernization. While the Army has been directed by internal Department of Defense documents to fund equipment and facility improvements and pier replacements, the committee notes these efforts will not return the port to full operational status until 2018 at the earliest.

Because the lack of this critical mobility infrastructure could delay support of operational plans, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide to the congressional defense committees an assessment of:

(1) The current physical condition of Military Ocean Terminal Concord;

(2) The ability of the port to successfully execute mission requirements of the military services and the combatant commanders;

(3) The repairs required to bring the port to full mission capability, to include total cost and timeline and options to expedite the timeline;

(4) The risk associated with failing to make equipment and facility improvements and pier replacements in a timely fashion; and

(5) Options available to mitigate any shortfalls, including munitions supply, load-out, and transportation options, and potential statutory or regulatory waivers.

As part of the assessment, the Comptroller General shall consult with the combatant commanders regarding their operational requirements. The report shall be submitted no later than December 31, 2013, and may be submitted in a classified format if necessary.

The committee also directs the Secretary of the Army to provide to the congressional defense committees a summary of the current equipment and facilities conditions MOTCO. The report shall include: a status of the Environmental Impact Statement; a projects list identifying requirements necessary to address infrastructure deficiencies by fiscal year and funding amounts required; the design initiation associated with the project list; and a time line for completion of the infrastructure improvements. This report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2013. The report may be submitted in a classified format if necessary.

Report on Career Progression of U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps Advisory Personnel

For the past several years, the U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps have been providing forces to support security force assistance missions in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and other locations around the world. To conduct these missions, the services have relied on a number of non-doctrinal approaches. For example, in Afghanistan, the U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps have increasingly

relied on larger units, such as brigade combat teams, to provide advisory teams. In addition, the U.S. Army is beginning to execute its regionally aligned force concept, which aligns specific brigades to specific regions and calls for the deployment of small groups of leaders to conduct security force assistance activities while the rest of the unit remains at the home station.

The committee is concerned about the career implications for U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps personnel assigned to security force assistance-related activities as well as the ability of these units to conduct these activities while maintaining readiness requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to examine and report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2014, on the impact of the U.S. Army's and U.S. Marine Corps' approaches to the security force assistance mission, including:

(1) To what extent the U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps have policies or procedures to identify personnel with advising or other security force assistance-related skills and experience;

(2) To what extent the assignment of U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps officer and senior enlisted personnel to advising or other security force assistance-related activities has affected the career progression of these individuals, including opportunities for command positions, promotions, or other career development opportunities; and

(3) What impact, if any, the U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps' approaches of relying on units to provide personnel for advising and other security force assistance-related activities have had on the units' ability to maintain readiness.

Sustainable Range Planning

The committee notes that section 2802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) requires the Department of Defense to provide installation master plans for a period not to exceed 10 years that, among other things, shall address sustainable range planning. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense submits the annual Sustainable Range Report, prepares Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans for military installations, and works with other Federal, State, and local government entities, Indian tribes, non-governmental organizations to address situations both on and in the vicinity of military installations and ranges that impact the ability of the Department to perform its mission. These efforts are essential to avoiding or reducing encroachment, sustaining military readiness, and ensuring the continued viability of military test and training ranges. The committee encourages the Department to leverage these existing sustainable range planning efforts as an integral part of installation master plans.

Water Egress Training

The committee recognizes the need to ensure that the Department of Defense provides its rotary-wing aviators with the best survivability training available. The committee is concerned that not all services have the facilities and capabilities necessary to en-

sure adequate training and throughput. The committee believes that a reassessment of the Department's capabilities is especially important given the new defense strategic guidance shifting departmental focus to the Pacific Rim.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a formal assessment and report back to the congressional defense committees, not later than April 1, 2014, on the state of the Department's rotary-wing water egress training capabilities. At a minimum, this assessment should include:

(1) Training facilities and infrastructure;

(2) Disparities and commonalities among the military departments;

(3) Current training capacity and its adequacy to meet future requirements; and

(4) Any capacity shortfalls in meeting water egress training requirements.

OTHER MATTERS

Concerns Related to Fuel Rate Determinations

The committee continues to be concerned with the insufficient funding of fuel within the operation and maintenance accounts based on inadequate fuel rate determinations by the Department of Defense and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) within the Defense Working Capital Fund (DWCF). In fiscal year 2012, $1.0 billion was reprogrammed from other accounts to the DWCF to support cash balances within the fund and to avoid increasing the cost charged to the Department of Defense customer as a result of fully burdened costs for fuel exceeding budget estimates. In fiscal year 2013, the Department requested an additional $1.4 billion be reprogrammed to cover costs not captured in the budgeted fuel rates. The committee believes these significant reprogramming requests were due to the Department underestimating the fully burdened cost of procuring and distributing refined fuel. The committee is aware that the Office of Management and Budget provides the Department with a budgeted price per crude barrel (an estimated projection of the market rate) from which the Department builds the fully burdened rate charged to customers. However, estimates of the fully burdened rate have been well short of the market rates, requiring reprogramming or price adjustments during the fiscal year to maintain solvency within the fund. This will perpetuate into fiscal year 2014, as Department officials have stated that the shortfalls relating to the cost of refined fuel have not been resolved within the current budget request. This practice of poor estimation disrupts congressional oversight, promulgates faulty budgeting practices, and leaves the readiness of the military services at risk in the year of execution.

Based on the current budgeted rate for refined fuel, the Government Accountability Office has estimated that funds in fiscal year 2014 are understated by approximately $536.0 million, which would generate significant shortfalls in the operation and maintenance accounts if the Department raises rates during the fiscal year. The committee encourages the Department to revise processes for fuel rate determination to better capture market indica-

tors for refined fuel pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, prior to submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2015. In the interim, the committee has recommended authorization of additional funds to support the anticipated shortfalls due to the inadequate budgeted rate for 2014.

Furthermore, if the Department fails to reform its budgeting practices related to fuel rates, and subsequently requests a reprogramming due to shortfalls within the DWCF specifically tied to the fully burdened costs of refining fuel, the committee will not look favorably upon such a request.

Department of Defense Travel Restrictions

The committee commends the Department of Defense's efforts to promote efficiency and reduce expenses. The committee further commends the Department's efforts to increase scrutiny on travel, training, and conference spending by elevating approval authority and implementing a tiered approval structure. However, the committee is concerned that designated approval authorities may be subjectively restricting travel to specific geographic locations, and that these determinations are a product of perception rather than cost efficiencies or misalignment with training requirements, professional military education, or support to combatant commanders. As such, the committee encourages the Department to continue its efforts to increase scrutiny and accountability of travel, training, and conference spending, but recommends that the Department not prohibit travel to specific geographical locations without case-by-case consideration and to develop objective guidance and accounting measures for approving travel, training, and conference spending.

Navy Arctic Roadmap

The committee continues to be concerned about the Department of Defense's resources and preparedness for accessing, operating in, and protecting national interests in the Arctic. The Navy currently estimates that between 2020 and 2030, the Arctic could be ice free for one month during the summer which may lead to an increase in trans-Arctic passage for vessels seeking to reduce transit distance by utilizing the Northern Sea Route and the Northwest Passage. The Navy's Strategic Objectives for the Arctic was signed in May 2010 and is referred to in both the Navy Arctic Capabilities Based Assessment, approved in September 2011, and the Navy Arctic Environmental Capabilities Based Assessment, approved in December 2012. Those objectives include ensuring Navy forces are capable and ready, contributing to the safety, stability and security in the region, safeguarding U.S. maritime interests, protecting critical infrastructure and key resources in the Arctic, and strengthening and fostering new cooperative relationships in the region. As a global Nation, the United States needs to ensure that the Navy is adequately prepared to preserve U.S. national security interests and collaborate with other Arctic nations if and when the region will be open for passage with increased traffic.

The committee recognizes the importance of transparency of action without seeking to militarize the region. Therefore, the com-

mittee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a roadmap for future activities and costs for training and operating in the Arctic. This roadmap should be a derivative of the National Security Strategy, and shall identify proposed exercises (including table top exercises), to include the frequency, cost, and a more detailed investment strategy across the Program Objective Memorandum through fiscal years 2020 to support a timeframe leading to increased operations in the region between 2020 to 2030. Additionally, the Navy should include details regarding international forums in which they participate. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide this roadmap to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2014.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 included $31.2 million in operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ). The committee notes that this request reflects a transfer of NSHQ authorized funding from operation and maintenance, Army, to operation and maintenance, Defense-wide. The committee does not support this transfer and as such maintains the NSHQ authorization within operation and maintenance, Army.

Operations and Maintenance of the Ballistic Missile Defense System

The committee is concerned with the increasing share of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) budget being consumed by operations and maintenance. According to MDA budget documents, this will amount to $1.47 billion over the fiscal year 2014 Future Years Defense Program (FYDP); these costs are increasing over the fiscal year 2014 FYDP.

The committee is aware that former Deputy Secretary of Defense William Lynn issued a Memorandum for Secretaries of the military departments on June 10, 2011, that established funding responsibilities for the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS). Under this memorandum, the MDA will fund sustainment of BMDS-specific mission equipment and initial spares, as well as the first 2 years of operations of BMDS-specific mission equipment.

The committee understands that with the maturation of missile defense systems, the MDA and the military departments are grappling for the first time with the division of responsibility in these long-term operations and maintenance costs; the now operational Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system, which was deployed to Guam as of April 21, 2013, is one example.

The committee expects to be kept informed of any difficulty in the appropriate division of operations and maintenance funding responsibility between MDA and the military departments.

Weather Data and Modeling

The committee is aware that weather forecasting plays a vital role in mission readiness, and that the Department of Defense has taken steps to improve its forecasting. However, weather models are only as effective as the underlying data which inform them.

The military relies largely on weather balloons for data gathering. Further, the committee is aware of recent advances in data gathering methods already in use in the private sector which promise to deliver more accurate data, and thus, more precise forecasts.

In an asymmetric warfare environment, inclement or unanticipated weather phenomena can have a dramatic impact on U.S. and coalition forces, especially with regard to air superiority and special operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a brief on existing commercial meteorological data gathering technologies, their adaptability to military usage, practicality in a combat environment, and accuracy of data. The brief should also include estimated costs associated with acquisition, maintenance, and licensing, where applicable, of these commercially available technologies.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize appropriations for operation and maintenance activities at the levels identified in section 4301 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Section 311—Deadline for Submission of Reports on Proposed Budgets for Activities Relating to Operational Energy Strategy

This section would modify amend section 138c(e) of title 10, United States Code, to revise the date of submission for the report on the proposed budgets for that fiscal year that were not certified.

Section 312—Facilitation of Interagency Cooperation in Conservation Programs of the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and Interior to Avoid or Reduce Adverse Impacts on Military Readiness Activities

This section would amend section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to permit a recipient of funds under the Sikes Act to be able to use the funds for matching funds or cost-sharing requirements of conservation programs. This section would also expire the authority on October 1, 2019, but permit any agreements that were entered into prior to September 30, 2019 to continue according to its terms and conditions.

Section 313—Reauthorization of Sikes Act

This section would extend the authority of the Sikes Act through 2019.

Section 314—Cooperative Agreements Under Sikes Act for Land Management Related to Department of Defense Readiness Activities

This section would amend section 103A of the Sikes Act, section 670c–1 of title 16, United States Code, to permit lump sum payment and accrual of interest used for the purposes of the original agreement. This section would also permit the cooperative agreements to be used to acquire property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States Government, and sets limitations on agreements that are not on military installations. Finally, this section would also expire the authority on October 1, 2019, but permit any agreements that were entered into prior to September 30, 2019 to continue according to its terms and conditions.

Section 315—Exclusions from Definition of "Chemical Substance" under Toxic Substances Control Act

This section would modify section 2602(2)(B) of title 15, United States Code, to add to the exclusions any component of any article including shot, bullets and other projectiles, propellants when manufactured for or used in such an article, and primers.

Section 316—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement

This section would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (Section 42 of United States Code 17142) to exempt the Department of Defense from the requirements related to contracts for alternative or synthetic fuel in that section.

Section 317—Clarification of Prohibition on Disposing of Waste in Open-Air Burn Pits

This section would codify the definition of covered waste as it relates to the requirements established by section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; title 10 of United States Code 2701 note).

Section 318—Limitation on Plan, Design, Refurbishing, or Construction of Biofuels Refineries

This section would require the Department of Defense to obtain a congressional authorization before entering into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery.

Section 319—Limitation on Procurement of Biofuels

This section would limit the Department of Defense's ability to purchase or produce biofuels until the earlier of either the date on which the Budget Control Act of 2011 is no longer in effect, or the date on which the cost of biofuel is equal to the cost of conventional fuels. This section would provide an exception for biofuel test and certification and research and development.

SUBTITLE C—LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT

Section 321—Littoral Combat Ship Strategic Sustainment Plan

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to create a Strategic Sustainment Plan for the Littoral Combat Ship and submit this plan to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 322—Review of Critical Manufacturing Capabilities within Army Arsenals

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review current and expected manufacturing requirements across the Department of Defense to identify critical manufacturing capabilities which could be executed by Government-owned arsenals, and to brief the results of the review to the congressional defense committees.

The committee supports efforts to improve utilization of Army arsenals by the military services and Defense agencies. The committee encourages greater use of Army arsenals across the Department of Defense to meet manufacturing requirements and applauds efforts to increase visibility of the manufacturing capabilities provided by Army arsenals in order to support national security requirements.

Section 323—Inclusion of Army Arsenals Capabilities in Solicitations

This section would require Program Executive Officers and Program Managers to solicit information from Government-owned arsenals when undertaking a make-or-buy analysis, notify Government-owned arsenals of the requirement, and allow arsenals that have the capability to fulfill a manufacturing requirement to submit a proposal for the requirement.

The committee notes that in addition to directly soliciting information from the arsenals, Program Executive Officers and Program Managers may utilize the Materiel Enterprise Capabilities Database (MEC–D) and other organic industrial base enterprise-wide capabilities information. The committee notes that utilization of the MEC–D provides quick access to organic industrial base capabilities information and assists in consideration of manufacturing and repair requirements. The committee commends the Army for development of the MEC–D and encourages its use.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Section 331—Additional Reporting Requirements Relating to Personnel and Unit Readiness

This section would amend the report required under section 482 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the ability of the geographic and functional combatant commanders to successfully meet their respective contingency and operational plans and key mission essential tasks. This section would also require the report to include an assessment by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs

of Staff of the level of risk incurred by using contract support in contingency operations. In addition, this section adds a quarterly readiness reporting requirement for the defense combat support agencies to section 482 of title 10, United States Code. These reports would have to include readiness trends and indicators and an assessment of an agency's ability to execute formal operational plans and to support contingency operations.

The committee is concerned that it does not receive comprehensive reporting on the geographic and functional combatant commanders' ability to successfully execute the full range of their respective operational and contingency plans. The committee believes that absent this information, its ability to make informed oversight decisions regarding the readiness of U.S. forces may be degraded. The committee understands that this lack of visibility may be, in part, due to classification issues. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to submit multiple annexes as required to provide complete and timely readiness information to the congressional defense committees.

The committee is also concerned that it lacks visibility on the readiness of the various combat support agencies. These agencies are a key readiness enabler, and the inability to understand how they contribute to military readiness limits the ability of Congress to provide effective oversight of military readiness.

Section 332—Repeal of Annual Comptroller General Report on Army Progress

This section would repeal the requirement that the Comptroller General of the United States report on the Army's progress in moving to a modular force design as the Army has completed the transition.

Section 333—Revision to Requirement for Annual Submission of Information Regarding Information Technology Capital Assets

This section would amend the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 10 U.S.C. 221 note) to align Department of Defense high-threshold information technology Capital Asset reporting with the Department's Major Automated Information Systems reporting and its Exhibit 300 reporting to the Office of Management and Budget.

SUBTITLE E—LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY

Section 341—Limitation on Reduction of Force Structure at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from reducing the force structure at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, based on the force structure in existence on October 1, 2013, until the Secretary of Defense briefs the congressional defense committees. This brief shall specifically assess the efficacy of Lajes Air Force Base, Azores in support of the United States overseas force posture.

Section 342—Prohibition on Performance of Department of Defense Flight Demonstration Teams Outside the United States

This section would place a 2 year moratorium on the Department of Defense use of funds for airshows outside the United States.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 351—Requirement to Establish Policy on Joint Combat Uniforms

This section would establish as national policy a requirement for all the U.S. military services to use a joint combat camouflage uniform, with certain exceptions.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has not complied with section 352 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) which required the military departments to establish joint criteria for future ground combat uniforms. Rather than continue on a course that does not, as the Government Accountability Office reported, meet statutory requirements for the development of service-unique uniforms that provide service members equivalent levels of performance and protection nor minimize risk to individuals operating in the joint battle space, the committee instead adopts a path that would provide standardization and economies of scale while at the same time ensuring new uniforms are joint, effective, compatible with troops' personal equipment, and suitable to operational needs.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

OVERVIEW

Although the committee supports the President's fiscal year 2014 budget request for end strength for the Active and Reserve Components, it continues to have concerns with the amount and pace of reductions over the next 3 years and the impact this will have on force structure. The budget request reduces the Active Duty end strength authorizations by little more than 40,000 from the fiscal year 2013 authorized levels. However, the actual reduction levels will be closer to 15,000 since the Army will end fiscal year 2013 at approximately 530,000 (about 22,000 below the fiscal year 2013 authorized levels) and the Marine Corps will end the year at approximately 193,000 (about 4,300 below the fiscal year 2013 authorized levels). The Army and Marine Corps requests are within the minimum levels on end strength prescribed in section 402 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). The Air Force will make minimum reductions in its Active Component. The Navy has a slight growth of 900 sailors from its fiscal year 2013 authorization, but remains undermanned by almost 4,000 sailors, well below minimum end strength levels. While the Navy believes that it will achieve its authorized end strength at the end of fiscal year 2013, that has yet to be seen, and could continue to impact the Navy's ability to meet force structure requirements in fiscal year 2014.

The budget request includes a reduction of 8,100 for the Reserve Components. The Army National Guard (4,000) and the Navy Reserve (3,400) make up the majority of the reductions. Both requests are consistent with the fiscal year 2013 end strength reduction plan submitted with last year's budget request. The Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve have minimal reductions pending the results of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force.

The committee remains concerned that unfettered reductions in end strength will have a detrimental impact on force structure and, ultimately, operational mission capability and capacity among the services. The committee recognizes that the Army and Marine Corps have implemented planned end strength reductions over the next several years, and cautions the services not to abruptly change this course of action and break faith with those who have served this Nation in war.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Operational Reserves

The committee understands that the Army and Air Force are reducing end strength and rebalancing force structure in response to the drawdown in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, reduced budgets, and the effects of sequestration. However, as has been stated in previous years, the committee remains concerned with increased potential reductions in the Reserve Components, specifically for the Army and the Air Force. The Reserve Components have been and remain an integral capability of the total force that must continue to be embraced as an operational reserve through periodic mobilization for real-world missions. Such employment sustains the skills and competencies to enable the Reserve Components to respond to crises or combat requirements in a timely manner. As the focus shifts from Afghanistan, the potential for persistent conflict remains. Thus, the committee continues to encourage the Secretary of Defense and the military services to ensure rigorous analysis is used when assessing the capabilities of the total force. Such analysis should be conducted if further reductions to force structure are necessary, and should include an assessment of the ability to meet the requirements of the combatant commands and those of the Federal Government and the States for homeland security and natural disasters.

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, 2014:

Service	FY 2013 Authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2014 Request	FY 2013 Authorized
Army	552,100	520,000	520,000	0	–32,100
Navy	322,700	323,600	323,600	0	900
USMC	197,300	190,200	190,200	0	–7,100
Air Force	329,460	327,600	327,600	0	–1,860
DOD	1,401,560	1,361,400	1,361,400	0	–40,160

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, 2014. The committee recommends 520,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Army, 323,600 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Navy, 190,200 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 327,600 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, 2014:

Service	FY 2013 Authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2014 Request	FY 2013 Authorized
Army National Guard	358,200	354,200	354,200	0	–4,000
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	62,500	59,100	59,100	0	–3,400
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	105,700	105,400	105,400	0	–300
Air Force Reserve	70,880	70,400	70,400	0	–480
DOD Total	841,880	833,700	833,700	0	–8,180
Coast Guard Reserve	9,000	9,000	9,000	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, 2014:

Service	FY 2013 Authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2014 Request	FY 2013 Authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	32,060	32,060	0	0
Army Reserve	16,277	16,261	16,261	0	–16
Naval Reserve	10,114	10,159	10,159	0	45
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,765	14,734	14,734	0	–31
Air Force Reserve	2,888	2,911	2,911	0	23
DOD Total	78,365	78,386	78,386	0	21

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, 2014:

Service	FY 2013 Authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2014 Request	FY 2013 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	22,180	21,875	21,875	0	–305
Air Force Reserve	10,400	10,429	10,429	0	29
DOD Total	68,185	67,909	67,909	0	–276

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2014 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, 2014:

Service	FY 2013 Authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2014 Request	FY 2013 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of Reserve Component personnel who may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty during fiscal year 2014 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by section 401 or section 412 of this Act unless the duration on Active Duty exceeds the limitations in section 115(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

Service	FY 2013 Authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2014 Request	FY 2013 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 appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in the funding table in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee has taken a number of actions to address areas of concern. With regard to military justice, the committee fundamentally reformed the way that the Department of Defense must address sexual assault in the Uniform Code of Military Justice and provides significant additional support to victims of this terrible crime. Specifically, with regard to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the committee limited the convening authority's discretion to change a court-martial finding and sentence; eliminated the 5-year statute of limitations on trial by court-martial for sexual assault and sexual assault of a child; and, established dismissal (for officers) and dishonorable discharge (for enlisted personnel) as the mandatory minimum sentence for service members convicted by court-marital of rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, or attempts at those offenses. To improve support to victims, the committee mandated that each of the Armed Services establish Victims' Counsels to provide dedicated legal assistance to victims of sex-related

crimes. Furthermore, the committee expanded whistleblower protections by adding reports of rape, sexual assault, or other sexual misconduct as protected communications by members of the Armed Forces with Members of Congress or an Inspector General.

A number of initiatives reflected the committee's concerns about the number of general and flag officers serving at a time when military manpower is being reduced. Thus, the committee reduced the number of general and flag officers on Active Duty, mandated a review of the requirements and authorizations for Reserve Component general and flag officers in an active status, and directed the Comptroller General to assess trends in the costs of general and flag officers on Active Duty.

In support of military families, the committee authorized the Commander of the U.S. Special Operations Command to conduct family support pilot programs for the immediate family members of military personnel assigned to Special Operations Forces. The committee also authorized transitional compensation and other benefits for dependents of retirement eligible service members who are separated from military service for violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

With regard to the Reserve Components, the committee established a 180-day minimum notification requirement for members of the Reserve Components before deployment to or cancellation of a deployment to a contingency operation. Furthermore, out of concern for the time that Reserve Component members were spending in the disability evaluation system, the committee directed a review of the Integrated Disability Evaluation System.

Finally, the committee adopted the Stolen Valor Act, which would make it a crime to fraudulently claim to be a recipient of certain decorations or medals with the intent to obtain money, property, or other tangible benefits.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Air Force Education Programs

Air Education and Training Command (AETC) provides basic military training, initial and advanced technical training, flying training, and professional military and degree-granting education. The committee recognizes the importance of defense- and technical-focused education and is concerned that, as budget pressures force the services to reevaluate their priorities, AETC may be forced to shift resources to training and reduce its commitment to professional and technical degree-granting education. Such action could have long term implications on the professionalism of the Air Force. Section 245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the National Research Council to review specialized degree-granting graduate programs of the Department of Defense in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and management. The report required a review of existing organizational structures, including reporting chains, to manage the graduate education needs within the military departments. Until the committee receives this report, the committee encourages the Air Force to continue its traditional em-

phasis on education and maintain its Air Force education programs.

Assessing the Trend in Costs of General and Flag Officers on Active Duty

While the committee understands efforts are underway in the Department of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military services to control the numbers of general and flag officers on Active Duty, the committee is concerned about the costs associated with sustaining that general and flag officer population as the size of the military forces decreases. According to the Department of Defense, there were 917 general and flag officers on Active Duty in fiscal year 2013. To better understand the costs of maintaining a sizable senior military officer population, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the trends in costs from fiscal year 2001 through fiscal year 2013 of the general and flag officers of the Armed Forces on Active Duty for each fiscal year. The Comptroller General shall provide the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than April 15, 2014.

In making this assessment, the Comptroller General shall, as a minimum, assess both the direct and support costs associated with general and flag officers. In assessing the direct costs, the Comptroller General shall include basic pay, basic allowance for subsistence, basic allowance for housing and, to the extent practicable, the tax advantage associated with those allowances; and, all other compensation paid to general or flag officers as reflected on military leave and earnings statements; the travel and per diem costs of such officers; the official entertainment and representation expenditures of such officers; and, other direct costs the Comptroller General, in coordination with the committee, determines to be appropriate. For support costs, the assessment shall include the direct costs, as described above, of all officer and enlisted aides assigned to or supporting general or flag officers; the travel and per diem costs of such aides; the annual expenditures for military housing provided the general and flag officers; and other support costs the Comptroller General, in coordination with the committee, determines to be appropriate.

Clarification of Conferees Statement on the Assignments of Military Officers as Academic Instructors at Military Service Academies as Joint Duty Assignments

The committee recognizes that the conferee statement contained in Sense of Senate on inclusion of assignments as academic instructors at the military service academies as joint duty assignments, on page 758 of the conference report (H. Rept. 112–705) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, is contrary to section 668 of title 10, United States Code. The committee recognizes that the Secretary of Defense must adhere to the requirements in law and that the law takes precedence over directive report language contained in a conference report. Therefore, the committee seeks to clarify for the Secretary of Defense that he must comply with section 668 of title 10, United States Code, when

determining joint duty assignment designations in accordance with section 661 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee recognizes that the directive report language in the conference report stemmed from concern that Naval officers with expertise in military science and humanities may be deterred from service on the faculty of the United States Naval Academy (USNA) due to their inability to obtain promotion opportunities and joint duty credit requirements in the course of their career. To ensure that the USNA continues to attract and retain mature and skilled instructors with successful Navy careers, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to assess the barriers faced by instructors at the USNA and to develop a plan to mitigate those challenges, including ways to achieve expanded promotion opportunities and joint duty assignments. This plan shall include assignment policies to ensure the highest quality Naval officers who seek assignments as USNA instructors remain competitive for promotion and that the Navy has a method for ensuring the quality of instructors assigned to the academy is not degraded. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit the findings and plan to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 2014.

Community-Based Youth Organizations

The committee commends the numerous community-based youth organizations, such as the Boys & Girls Clubs of America, and others that have stepped forward to support military children and dependents. Children of military personnel face many challenges stemming from frequent moves due to changes in permanent stationing, to dealing with a deployed parent or parents, trying to support an injured, ill or wounded parent who is recovering, or from losing a parent. Community-based youth organizations provide needed support to our military families. These organizations are valuable assets in providing consistent and stable education and prevention programs that constitute positive experiences in the development of our military children. While the Department of Defense is confronting difficult decisions as the budgets decline, the committee urges the Department to continue to partner with community-based youth organizations to provide youth education and development programs for military children.

Comptroller General Review of Recommendations to Prevent Sexual Misconduct at Lackland Air Force Base and Other Basic and Technical Training Facilities

The sexual misconduct by Military Training Instructors (MTIs) at Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas has been one of the largest sexual misconduct investigations within the military with nearly 60 victims from basic and technical training. To date, over 32 MTIs have been investigated and 18 have been convicted. While the cases continue to be prosecuted, the Air Force undertook a significant effort to understand the circumstances that lead to this environment, and what steps needed to be taken to correct the situation and prevent such assaults from occurring in the future. A Command-Directed Investigation led to 46 recommendations, of

which the Air Force proposed to implement 45. In addition, the Air Force conducted an investigation focused on senior leadership and organization actions in response to the delayed reporting of sexual assault allegations. The committee remains focused on efforts to ensure that such sexual misconduct does not occur at basic military training or technical training bases across the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the actions taken by the Air Force as a result of the investigations in order to provide a status of the recommendations; to assess the effectiveness of the implemented recommendations; and to conduct an assessment of best practices from among the services that can be shared to prevent sexual misconduct at basic and technical training. The review should also identify challenges and other potential improvements or recommendations for services to review to prevent sexual misconduct from occurring at basic and technical training bases. The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit the results of the review by April 1, 2014, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Consistency Among Exceptional Family Member Programs

The 2013 Annual Report to Congress on the Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council, as required by section 1781a of Title 10, United States Code, contained a number of recommendations to improve support to military families, such as establishing evaluation criteria to ensure that programs are effective based on outcome measurements that are aligned with program objectives. The Council also recommended that the services standardize their Exceptional Family Member Program (EFMP) offerings to ensure parity across the services, the need for which have become apparent at joint bases. While the committee supports efforts to improve parity and standardization of the services provided under EFMP, the committee urges the services and the Department to work together to ensure that such standardization and parity does not result in the minimization of program offerings to EFMP families.

Disposition of Remains by Host Nations

The committee recognizes that there are instances in which a host nation under Status of Forces Agreements may require the retention of the remains of a service member killed while stationed overseas. However, the committee believes that the services have a responsibility to ensure that such remains are returned as quickly as reasonably possible while complying with the terms of the Status of Forces Agreement. The committee understands there are Status of Forces Agreements that do not address or include specific regulations or guidance on mortuary affairs. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to work with the Department of State to review this issue and determine whether inclusion of such guidance and regulation, including providing technical assistance, will help to ensure the expeditious return of service members remains when the Department of State updates Status of Forces Agreements with host nations. Further, the committee di-

rects the Secretary of Defense to brief the committee on Armed Forces of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than December 31, 2014, on the results of the review conducted with the Department of State.

Domestic Violence and Child Abuse

The committee recognizes the improvements the Department of Defense and the services have made over the past several years to address domestic violence and child abuse among the force. However, the committee remains concerned that the stress on the force continues to take its toll and may be manifested in increasing incidents of domestic violence, child abuse, and neglect. The committee appreciates the actions the Department has taken to address the recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States, which were included in the "Report to Congressional Defense Committees on Improvements to Department of Defense Domestic Violence Program", dated April 2012. These actions included hiring additional Domestic Abuse Victim Advocates; expansion of the New Parent Support Home Visitation Program; hiring of additional clinical providers and staff to oversee programs and personnel; implementation and tracking of chaplain domestic violence training; and development of a formalized oversight framework for domestic violence programs to improve management and delivery of services. The committee understands that the Department is moving forward on an incident-based reporting system that would accurately track domestic violence incident, and recommends that the system also be able to track child abuse incidents as well. The committee looks forward to the update on the status of recommendations in the near future.

Department of Defense Efforts To Ensure Operation of Current Prohibition on Accrual of Interest on Direct Student Loans of Members of the Armed Forces Receiving Imminent Danger Pay

The committee is strongly supportive of the current prohibition on accrual of interest for service members serving in a combat zone. However, the committee is concerned that lack of information regarding this benefit and the administrative burden placed on service members in order to receive it may be preventing more members of the armed services from participating. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that all service members, when assigned to duty in an area for which special pay is available, are made aware of the benefits provided under section 455(o) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(o)), and include this information in the out-processing checklist, briefings and counseling that all deploying service members receive.

Foreign Exchange Program for Reserve Officer Training Corps Cadets and Critical Military Language Training

The committee commends the Army for establishing a Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) cadet foreign exchange program that provides cadets an unprecedented and valuable training opportunity in a non-contingency, deployed environment to learn for-

eign cultures and languages. The committee understands that the program is relatively new and is still maturing; however, the committee remains concerned in several areas. First, there is a lack of consistency in the programs among the various foreign nations. Second, efforts to develop greater coordination with the various combatant commands (COCOMs) are disjointed. Third, it is unclear to the committee that the overall mission and goals of the program are in step with the security cooperation strategy. The committee urges the Army, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide greater oversight and support of this important leadership development program to ensure that it is meeting the needs of the cadets, the service, and the missions of the COCOMs. The Department of Defense has highlighted over the past decade, and more recently in the fiscal year 2014 budget submission, the strategic importance of language and cultural programs in order to build international partnerships as well as the successful outcomes across the full spectrum of operations. The committee believes the ROTC cadet foreign exchange program, as well as the use of Language Training Centers at accredited universities in support of the Defense Language Transformation Roadmap, National Security Education Program, and the Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps, are instrumental in achieving the Secretary of Defense's goals.

Fully Burdened Life Cycle Cost of Military Personnel

The committee applauds the Department of Defense's efforts to standardize costing models for Active Duty and civilian personnel across the Department. The committee understands the Secretary of Defense is finalizing a Department of Defense Instruction to formalize the policy, as well as implement a costing tool, Full Cost of Manpower (FCoM), to reduce the myriad of calculations required under current guidelines and reduce errors in costing of Active Duty and civilian personnel. The committee is encouraged by the Department's effort to expand this model to include the full cost of reserve manpower as well. As fiscal pressures become the focus in operational planning and force structure development, it is crucial to understand the cost of the total force in order for leaders to make informed decisions to fulfill combatant commander requirements, as well as homeland defense and natural disaster response. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to incorporate at a minimum all of the existing elements of the FCoM tool for the reserve model and encourages the Secretary to include as many comparable factors between the Active Duty and Reserve Component in the FCoM tool as possible to ensure the most efficient use of resources and manpower.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than 180 days after implementation of the reserve costing model. The report shall include an explanation of the elements required in the costing model; the criteria used to determine the elements; how the reserve model compares to the model used for Active Duty; and a comparison of the cost of a similar Active and Reserve unit for each of the services, including the training and mobilization costs of the Reserve unit, with the as-

sumption that an operational Reserve unit will mobilize and deploy once every 5 years, and an Active Duty unit will mobilize and deploy once every 3 years as required by current policy.

Mental Health Professional on a Physical Evaluation Board

The committee continues to have concerns with the Department of Defense's evaluation of service member physical evaluation board cases that may involve post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury or other mental health conditions. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to ensure that a behavioral health professional is included as a member of the board on any physical evaluation board that considers issues of post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, or other mental health conditions. The behavioral health professional should normally take the place of the medical member of the board, unless as a result of the health related issues before the board, the board would benefit from the presence of both a behavioral health professional and medical member. In this context a behavioral health professional means a clinical psychologist, psychiatrist, licensed clinical social worker, or psychiatric advanced practice registered nurse.

National Support for Service Members, Veterans, Retirees and their Families

The committee recognizes that after more than a decade of war, the Department of Defense and the services have undertaken many initiatives to address the myriad of issues that have been brought to the forefront, such as ensuring the appropriate amounts of equipment and training are available, improving medical evacuations from theater, new treatment for post-traumatic stress and traumatic brain injury, building resiliency among the force and family members, and improving transition assistance programs for service members back into civilian communities. While the committee commends the services for their recent efforts to enhance and improve programs and policies that strengthen the resilience of the force, there still remain gaps in the Nation's support for and recognition of service members and their families. When less than 1 percent of the population of our society serves in uniform, it is important for the civilian communities in which they live, work, and return, to understand the challenges uniformed members confront in their service to our Nation. To address these gaps, the committee believes there has to be not only a whole-of-government approach, but also a national approach to improve the myriad of programs that are available to service members, retirees, veterans, and their families through the Government and many civilian organizations and communities. There needs to be an improved recognition of the sacrifices this small population endures for our Nation. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to work with Federal, state, local, and non-profit organizations to expand the network of support to ensure not only a whole-of-government approach to supporting and recognizing our Armed Forces but a national effort.

Navy Sea Cadet Corps Sustainment

The committee recognizes the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps as an exemplary, cost effective program that assists the U.S. Navy by creating a favorable image of the U.S. Navy on the part of American youth and ensuring a high-quality source of future sailors for both enlisted and commissioned service. To ensure the viability of this valuable program, the Secretary of the Navy is strongly urged to ensure that the program is fully funded for fiscal year 2014, and beyond. This amount should take into consideration additional funds that may be necessary as a result of program growth and annual inflation as determined by the U.S. Navy, in conjunction with the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps.

Relocation Assistance Program Resource Access Review

The committee is concerned with the availability and access to resources provided by the Department of Defense's relocation assistance program to members of the Armed Forces. Acknowledging that some of these services are inherently governmental, the committee, in light of the constrained current and future budgets, directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the current relocation services provided by the Department, and how those services are fulfilling the provision under section 1056 of title 10, United States Code. Included in this report should be an evaluation of whether the present system, including a review of applicable Federal regulations, is utilizing the best practices from both governmental and nongovernmental agencies, and incorporating innovative ideas that allow for the most current, easily accessible, and accurate local area information and services to be provided to service members and their families in the most cost effective manner. The report should be provided to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Reserve Component Temporary Duty Assignments

The committee has concerns with the Department of Defense's use of permanent change of station (PCS) orders in lieu of temporary duty orders for Reserve Component members (not including Active Guard and Reserve when activated). Current Department of Defense directives set 180 days as the limit for temporary duty orders. Beyond 180 days, the orders become PCS orders. The committee is concerned that the services have taken advantage of these rules when mobilizing some reservists by either calling them to Active Duty through PCS orders for 181 days or changing the orders from temporary duty to PCS after the member has taken the assignment. This practice, when selectively applied to reservists mobilized for temporary duty from a high cost-of-living area to a low cost-of-living area, allows the services to save money at the expense of the service members and their families. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to ensure that if a Reserve Component member receives temporary duty orders, the orders are not changed to PCS orders without required notification and processing. This will protect members of the Reserve Component by en-

suring that they are compensated appropriately during their Active Duty service. Furthermore, it will ensure they are able to maintain, without disruption, their full-time households.

Review of Programs for Male Victims of Sexual Assault in the U.S. Military

In 2010, the Department of Veterans Affairs reported that approximately 1 in 100 service men indicated that they experienced sexual trauma in the military. During that same year, the veteran health facilities documented 244,074 occasions in which male veterans were provided military sexual trauma-related outpatient care. In its latest Report on Sexual Assault in the Military Services, the Department of Defense estimates that only about 14% of its service members who are sexually assaulted report that they were a victim of this crime. Reporting a sexual assault is difficult for any victim, but for males in the military, it may be especially daunting. The committee is concerned that the DOD has not focused on efforts to assist male service members to ensure victims receive the specialized care that may be needed. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake a review to determine to what extent (1) does the culture of the U.S. military pose unique challenges for preventing and responding to sexual assaults of male service members, (2) what steps the DOD has taken steps to address the incidence of and response to male service members who are sexually assaulted, and (3) whether the DOD established policies and protocols for the provision of medical and mental healthcare to address sexual trauma given the unique requirements for male victims of sexual assault. The Comptroller General shall submit the results of the review by May 30, 2014.

Suicides and Military Families

Over a decade of conflict has contributed to an increase in suicides among military members. Efforts by the Department of Defense to combat suicide among military members continue; however, what is less known is the impact on military families. The committee is concerned that there may be a corresponding increase in suicides among immediate family members. Currently, the Department of the Army is the only service that attempts to track the number of military dependents that commit suicide. Yet, such collection and validation remains a challenge for the Army. Suicide among the force has a direct impact on military readiness, and suicide among dependents can have a direct impact on individual readiness. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the ability of the services to collect information and perform analysis on suicide among immediate family members as part of their suicide information retention and analysis. The Secretary shall submit a report on the feasibility, including the potential costs, of collecting and retaining such data to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 2014.

Support for the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children

The committee understands the challenges that military dependent children face when they move, as a result of military orders, from one local educational agency and school district to another. For that reason, the committee supported the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children, as originally expressed in section 539 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). The committee reaffirms its support for the compact and encourages the Secretary of Defense to work with the remaining non-signatory states to join the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children.

Transition Assistance Program

The committee applauds the Department of Defense's revamped Transition Assistance Program to provide assistance to career ready military members transitioning for a career or education following military separation. The new Transition-Goals, Plans, Success (Transition-GPS) is an enhanced program established to assist members with their transition as the military draws down. Transition-GPS gives the Department the flexibility and authorities required to execute its role in providing information, counseling, tools, and training for service members to transition from the military. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continuously improve and build the program by, among other things, partnering with the education community for opportunities to increase interest in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education and medical programs; and with the veterans community to allow for valuable feedback from recently separated veterans to be incorporated into the program. The committee also supports the Administration's Information Technology (IT) Training and Certification Partnership that will allow service members to obtain IT certifications before they transition from military service, and the new grant program that will allow service members with health care experience to pursue a career in nursing. The committee also encourages the Secretary to use existing authorities to continue to partner with private industry, vocational and technical training centers, and state and professional licensing and credentialing agencies to assist military personnel in obtaining technical skills, licenses, or credentials applicable to their military skill as well as post military employment opportunities. The committee looks forward to the results of, and report on, the pilot program on receipt of civilian credentialing for skills required for Military Occupational Specialties required by section 558 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Tuition Assistance

The committee recognizes the important value Military Tuition Assistance provides the All-Volunteer Force. An educated force provides increased capability to an already dynamic and highly technical military. The committee supports efforts to afford opportunities to service members to further increase their education while in

the military. The committee is concerned that the increased fiscal pressures will impact the viability of the Tuition Assistance Program in the long-term, if the Department of Defense and the military services do not put into place measures to control rising costs. Therefore, requiring service oversight of individual education plans and the use of cost share methods is reasonable action that the services can take to ensure Federal resources are spent efficiently, and ensure that service members maintain a vested interest in their education. The committee also supports efforts by the secretaries concerned to execute their programs to the needs of the individual service, recognizing that how each service views the use of tuition assistance differs based on culture, training, and retention requirements. A Department-wide policy, while worthy, may not be the most efficient or effective method of managing this program. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to maintain flexibility in prescribed regulations and policies to allow the Secretaries of the military departments to execute and maintain a tuition assistance program that will remain viable during a period of budget constraints without impacting the opportunities of deserving service members.

U.S. Special Operations Command Educational Initiatives

The committee supports U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) education initiatives that provide Special Operations Forces (SOF) with additional professional military education opportunities that serve to professionalize the force. While the committee supports these initiatives, it expects the educational opportunities to address requirements unique to SOF and that they will not duplicate educational opportunities provided by the military services unless the utilization tour required by the services for that educational opportunity proves burdensome for the SOF student. The committee is aware that USSOCOM is in the process of formalizing educational agreements with the Secretaries of the military departments to ensure effective coordination and to establish a process to formalize SOF education requirements.

The committee is pleased with this coordination, encourages a rapid coordination process, and looks forward to continued dialogue on the future of SOF education initiatives. Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, outlining all SOF-unique educational requirements, recommendations for meeting those requirements, and how the proposed USSOCOM educational initiatives compare to service-offered educational opportunities.

Use of Radio in Department of Defense Advertising

The Department of Defense spent $450.1 million in advertising in fiscal year 2012. The focus of the Department's commercial advertising expenditures were recruiting and reaching influencers. A review of advertising expenditures shows that the Department spends less than 2 percent of its advertising budget on radio, compared to the 10.1 percent the average national commercial adver-

tiser usually spends. Radio reaches 92 percent of all Americans each week. Thus, the broad reach of radio makes it an effective media vehicle to utilize to reach both recruits and influencers. Radio reaches diverse racial and ethnic communities in our Nation, because there are many stations and networks that target these diverse communities. The committee encourages the Department to examine its commercial advertising expenditures to determine whether greater utilization of radio to reach a larger target audience among diverse communities would be cost-effective.

Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program

The committee commends the Department of Defense Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program Office for its efforts over the past 5 years to assist the military services by providing information, support, and best practices to maintain a ready Reserve Component with stronger and more resilient service members and families. As the Nation reduces its overseas commitment in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee believes there will continue to be a requirement for the utilization and mobilization of the Reserves in support of combatant commanders and contingency operations for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense ensure that the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program remains current, flexible, and viable by maintaining the appropriate expertise, knowledge, and resources in order to meet the requirements of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended, to support the operational reserves.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

Section 501—Limitations on Number of General and Flag Officers on Active Duty

This section would reduce by 14 the total of the number of general and flag officers authorized to be on Active Duty in the military services, and by 10 the number of general and flag officers authorized to be assigned to joint duty assignments. The reductions would take effect on October 1, 2014. The committee is aware that reductions in the number of general and flag officers are proceeding as a result of previously directed actions by the Secretary of Defense. For example, based on data provided by the Department of Defense, there were 889 general and flag officers on Active Duty in 2001. That number grew to 971 in 2011, but will decrease to 908 in 2013 and is projected to be 869 in 2016. Given both the projected decrease and the known reductions in active end strength, the committee believes the reductions required by this section are prudent.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Minimum Notification Requirements for Members of Reserve Components Before Deployment or Cancellation of Deployment Related to a Contingency Operation

This section would require the service secretaries to provide Reserve Component members or units notification 120 days in advance of being ordered to deployment or being notified that such deployment has been canceled, postponed, or otherwise altered. If the service secretary fails to meet the 120-day notification requirement, the Secretary of the military service must submit, within 30 days after the date of the failure, written notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives explaining the reason for not meeting the required minimum notification and the units and members of the Reserve Component affected.

Section 512—Information to be Provided to Boards Considering Officers for Selective Early Removal from Reserve Active-Status List

This section would amend Section 14704 of title 10, United States Code, by aligning the statutory procedures for a board convened to consider officers with sufficient qualifying service for early removal from the reserve active-status list with the procedures required for an Active Duty selective early retirement board. The statutes governing Active Duty selective early retirement boards, sections 638 and 638a of title 10, U.S. Code, provide the Secretary of the military department concerned discretion to limit the zone of officers eligible for selective early retirement based on date of rank and to exclude officers with approved voluntary or involuntary retirements from consideration. The proposed amendment would extend this authority to reserve selective early removal boards.

Section 513—Temporary Authority to Maintain Active Status and Inactive Status Lists of Members in the Inactive National Guard

This section would provide temporary authority for the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain an active status and an inactive status list of members in the inactive National Guard. This section would also limit the number of members that may be carried on the active list of the inactive National Guard to no more than 4,000 at any one time. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to commission an independent study to evaluate the effectiveness of using an active status list for the inactive National Guard to improve the readiness of the Army and Air National Guard. The study would also assess the impact of using the temporary authority with personnel who have permanent profiles and are non-deployable to improve the time necessary to complete the Integrated Disability Evaluation System (IDES) process. The temporary authority under this provision is available between October 1, 2013, and December 31, 2018. Prior to implementation of the authority provided by this section, the Secretary of Defense would be required to submit to the Com-

mittees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the implementation guidance to execute this authority. The Secretary of Defense would also be required to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of the study required by this section within 180 days of the completion of the study.

Section 514—Review of Requirements and Authorizations for Reserve Component General and Flag Officers in an Active Status

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report the findings and recommendations of a review of the requirements for Reserve Component general and flag officers in an active status. The section would require the report to be provided to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary of Defense's efficiencies review in 2011 projected that such a review would be completed by the end of 2012. However, a lack of funding and incomplete Reserve Component force structure and organizational studies postponed the review. Under current law, 422 such officers are authorized. They are in addition to the Reserve Component general and flag officers on Active Duty and in addition to those general officers serving in the National Guard Bureau or as adjutants general in the Army and Air National Guard. The committee has provided funding for this study in the tables accompanying this Act.

Section 515—Feasibility Study on Establishing a Unit of the national Guard in American Samoa and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a unit of the National Guard in American Samoa and a unit of the National Guard in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Section 521—Review of Integrated Disability Evaluation System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the backlog of Reserve Component cases in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System and consider improvements to the system, and to submit a report on the results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 522—Compliance Requirements for Organizational Climate Assessments

This section would require verification and tracking of the organizational climate assessments mandated as part of the Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program, as required by section 572(a)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to

the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the progress in developing, and estimated completion of, a tracking system to ensure compliance.

Section 523—Command Responsibility and Accountability for Remains of Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps Who Die Outside the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that there is a continuous military command responsibility and accountability for the remains of each deceased member of the military services who died outside of the United States.

Section 524—Contents of Transition Assistance Program

This section would amend section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring information about disability-related employment and education protections to be provided to service members during the transition assistance program. This section would also require any member who plans to use educational assistance entitlements under title 38 to receive instruction on an overview of those entitlements, courses in post-secondary education appropriate for the member and compatible with the member's goals, and how to finance the member's education. Implementation of this section would occur not later than April 1, 2015. In addition, this section would require, within 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of a feasibility study of providing instruction described in subsection (b) of section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, at all overseas locations.

Section 525—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel Decisions Relating to Correction of Military Records

This section would establish procedures for judicial review for any final decision regarding records correction made under sections 1034(f) or (g) and section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the service member to exhaust administrative relief procedures before seeking judicial review for correction of military records or decisions granted by the boards for the correction of military records. Additionally, this section would require that service members be notified of their right to judicial review and of the statutory time limits associated with judicial review of correction board decisions.

Section 526—Establishment And Use of Consistent Definition of Gender-Neutral Occupational Standard For Military Career Designators

This section would amend section 543 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160) by adding definitions for gender-neutral occupational standard and military career designator. This section would also consistently

apply the gender-neutral occupational standard and military career designator throughout the amended section.

Section 527—Expansion and Enhancement of Authorities Relating To Protected Communications of Members of The Armed Forces and Prohibited Retaliatory Actions

This section would add rape, sexual assault, or other sexual misconduct to the protected communications by members of the Armed Forces with Members of Congress or an Inspector General. In addition, this section would clarify that a communication would not be excluded from protections because of the time, place, method off communication, or the motivation of the individual providing information. Further, this section would require a determination as to whether a prohibited personnel action took place and recommendations for the disposition of the complaint be included in a report of the investigation. This section would require the Secretary of the military department to take disciplinary action against an individual who commits a prohibited personnel action and to correct the record of the person experiencing a prohibited personnel action. This section would also establish as the burden of proof for any investigation by an Inspector General or review by the secretary concerned to be that specified in section 1221(e) of title 5, United States Code.

Section 528—Applicability of Medical Examination Requirement Regarding Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Traumatic Brain Injury to Proceedings Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would strike subsection (c) of section 1177 of title 10, United States Code. Subsection (c) allows a military service an exception to the requirement for a medical examination in connection with the administrative discharge of a service member, diagnosed with or reasonably asserting post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury, who is facing court-martial or proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. By taking this action, the committee ensures that service members are not disadvantaged due to combat related injuries.

Section 529—Protection of the Religious Freedom of Military Chaplains to Close a Prayer Outside of a Religious Service According to the Traditions, Expressions, and Religious Exercises of the Endorsing Faith Group

This section would permit chaplains in the Armed Forces to close a prayer, outside of a religious service, according to the traditions, expressions, and religious exercises of the chaplain's endorsing faith group.

Section 530—Expansion and Implementation of Protections of Rights of Conscience of Members of the Armed Forces and Chaplains of Such Members

This section would amend section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239),

which mandates the accommodation of the beliefs of a service member that stem from the member's conscience, moral principles, or religious beliefs and prohibits adverse action against a service member for those beliefs. This section would expand the accommodation and prohibition against adverse action to a member's actions and speech. Furthermore, this section would change the standard that would trigger disciplinary action from beliefs, speech, or action that threaten good order and discipline to beliefs, speech, or action that actually harm good order and discipline. Finally, this section would require that the Secretary of Defense issue regulations to implement section 533 within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 530A—Service Members' Accountability, Rights, and Responsibilities Training

This section would establish a set of rights and responsibilities for each member of the Armed Services, and would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a formal means for a service member to acknowledge those rights and responsibilities at certain times in a member's military career.

Section 530B—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Review of Separation of Members of the Armed Forces who Made Unrestricted Reports of Sexual Assault.

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct a review to identify all members of the Armed Forces who, since January 1, 2002, were separated from the Armed Forces after making an unrestricted report of sexual assault. The review would seek to determine the circumstances of and the grounds for the separation and whether the separation was in retaliation or influenced by the unrestricted report. The Inspector General would then submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives concerning the results of the review.

Section 530C—Report on Data and Information Collected in Connection with Department of Defense Review of Laws, Policies, and Regulations Restricting Service of Female Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report containing the results and data produced by the review required by section 535 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Section 530D—Sense of Congress Regarding the Women in Service Implementation Plan

This section would express the sense of Congress that no later than September 2015, the Secretaries of the military departments should develop, review, and validate occupational standards in

order to assess and assign members of the Armed Forces to units, including Special Operations Forces, and should complete all assessments by January 1, 2016.

SUBTITLE D—MILITARY JUSTICE AND LEGAL MATTERS, INCLUDING SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Section 531—Limitations on Convening Authority Discretion Regarding Court-Martial Findings and Sentence

This section would amend section 860 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the command prerogative and sole discretion of the court-martial convening authority with regard to the findings and sentence of a court-martial. Specifically, with regard to the findings of a court-martial, this section would prohibit the convening authority from dismissing a finding, or from reducing a guilty finding to guilty of a lesser included offense, except for qualifying offenses. This section would define a qualifying offense as any in which the maximum sentence for the offense does not exceed 2 years and the adjudged court-martial sentence does not include dismissal, a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge, or confinement for more than 6 months. This section would exclude any offense under section 920, Rape and Sexual Assault, of title 10, United States Code, from being a qualifying offense.

With regard to sentences, this section would prohibit, with some exceptions, the convening authority from reducing, disapproving, commuting, or suspending a mandatory minimum sentence, or an adjudged sentence of confinement or a punitive discharge. With regard to those exceptions, when the accused has provided substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person and upon the recommendation of the trial counsel, this section would allow the convening authority to reduce a sentence below a mandatory minimum sentence, to reduce a confinement sentence, or to disapprove, commute, or suspend the adjudged sentence in whole or in part. This section would also permit the convening authority to reduce, dismiss, or suspend an adjudged sentence of confinement as part of a plea bargain, if a mandatory minimum sentence does not exist. Furthermore, when an adjudged sentence includes punishments in addition to the mandatory minimum sentence, this section would permit the convening authority to modify, disapprove, commute, or suspend those additional punishments. Finally, this section would require that if the convening authority acted to change a finding or sentence, then the convening authority's written rationale for the action would be provided at the same time and made part of the record of trial.

Section 532—Elimination of Five-Year Statute of Limitations on Trial By Court-Martial for Additional Offenses Involving Sex-Related Crimes

This section would add sexual assault and sexual assault of a child, offenses covered respectively by section 920(b) and section 920b(b) of title 10, United States Code, to the list of offenses in the Uniform Code of Military Justice that may be tried and punished

at any time without limitation. This section would apply to offenses committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 533—Discharge or Dismissal for Certain Sex-Related Offenses and Trial of Offenses by General Courts-Martial

This section would establish dismissal (for officers, commissioned warrant officers, cadets, and midshipmen) or dishonorable discharge (for enlisted personnel and warrant officers who are not commissioned) as the mandatory minimum sentence for a person subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice who is convicted by court-martial of rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, or an attempt to commit those offenses. Given such mandatory minimum sentences, this section would also limit jurisdiction for trial of the cited offenses to only a general court-martial. The changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice made by this section would be effective 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and apply to offenses committed after that date. This section would also require the independent Response Systems Panel established by section 576(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to assess the appropriateness of establishing additional mandatory minimum sentences for other offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Furthermore, this section would require the independent Judicial Proceedings Panel established by section 576(a)(2) of Public Law 112–239 to assess the implementation and effect of mandatory minimum sentences established by this section.

Section 534—Regulations Regarding Consideration of Application for Permanent Change of Station or Unit Transfer by Victims of Sexual Assault

This section would require the Secretary concerned to issue regulations to provide for timely determination and action on an application for consideration of a change of station or unit transfer submitted by a member of the Armed Forces serving on Active Duty who is a victim of sexual assault.

Section 535—Consideration of Need for, and Authority to Provide for, Temporary Administrative Reassignment or Removal of a Member on Active Duty Who is Accused of Committing a Sexual Assault or Related Offense

This section would authorize the Secretary concerned to provide guidance for commanders regarding authority for temporary reassignment or removal of an individual from a position of authority who is alleged to have committed a sexual assault or other sex-related offense under section 920, 920a, 920b or 920c of title 10, United States Code. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to include information on the use of such authority as part of training for new and prospective commanders.

Section 536—Victims' Counsel for Victims of Sex-Related Offenses and Related Provisions

This section would require Victims' Counsels, who would be qualified and specially trained lawyers in each of the Armed Forces, to be made available to provide legal assistance to victims of sex-related offenses, which include rape and sexual assault, stalking, and rape and sexual assault of a child. The legal assistance authorized by this section would include accompanying the victim at any proceedings related to the reporting, military investigation, and military prosecution of the sex-related offense, as well as legal consultation on the military justice system, the potential criminal liability of the victim stemming from the sex-related offense, the Victim Witness Assistance Program, potential civil litigation by the victim, medical support, and mental health counseling. This section would allow the victim the option of declining the assistance without prejudicing a later decision to seek such assistance. This section would require Victim's Counsels to be available within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives with a report on how the Armed Forces will implement this section. The report would be due within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Furthermore, this section would require the independent Response Systems Panel, established by section 576(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to assess whether the legal assistance authorized by this section should be expanded to include legal standing to represent the victim during investigative and military justice proceedings. Finally, this section would task the independent Judicial Proceedings Panel established by section 576(a)(2) of the cited public law to assess the implementation and effect of the Victims' Counsel program established by this section.

Section 537—Inspector General Investigation of Allegations of Retaliatory Personnel Actions Taken in Response to Making Protected Communications Regarding Sexual Assault

The section would add rape, sexual assault, or other sexual misconduct to the protected communications of members of the Armed Forces with Members of Congress or an Inspector General.

Section 538—Secretary Defense Report on Role of Commanders in Military Justice Process

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to assess the current role and authorities of commanders in the administration of military justice and the investigation, prosecution, and adjudication of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This section would also require the Secretary to report the assessment, together with his recommendation whether the role and authorities of commanders should be further modified or repealed, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 539—Review and Policy Regarding Department of Defense Investigative Practices in Response to Allegations of Sex-Related Offenses

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to review of the practices of military criminal investigative organizations regarding the investigation of alleged sex-related offenses involving members of the Armed Forces. The review would include an assessment of the extent to which the investigative organizations make a recommendation on whether an allegation of a sex-related offense appears founded or unfounded. This section would also require the Secretary to develop a uniform policy regarding the use of case determinations by the investigative organizations to record the results of the investigation of a sex-related offense. In developing the policy the Secretary shall consider the feasibility of adopting case determination methods used by non-military law enforcement agencies.

Section 540—Uniform Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a uniform curriculum, to include lesson plans, to ensure that sexual assault prevention and response training and education for members of the Armed Forces are uniform across the Department of Defense.

Section 541—Development of Selection Criteria for Assignment as Sexual Assault Response and Prevention Program Managers, Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish selection qualifications for members of the Armed Forces or civilian employees for assignment to duty as Sexual Assault Response and Prevention Program Managers, Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates. In addition, this section would require the Secretary of each military department to assign at least one Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners-Adult/Adolescent to each brigade or equivalent unless the Secretary of Defense determines that it is more practicable and effective for assignment to other units. This section would also require that personnel assigned as Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners-Adult/Adolescent be members of the Armed Forces or civilian employees of the Department of Defense. Further, this section would require the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners-Adult/Adolescent be trained and certified.

Section 542—Extension of Crime Victims' Rights to Victims of Offenses Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would set out the rights of a person who was a victim of an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The articulated rights and procedures are similar, but not identical to those set forth in section 3771 of title 18, United States Code. The section would also require that, within 1 year of the date of the en-

actment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense would not only submit to the President recommended changes to the Manual for Courts-Martial needed to carry out this section, but would also prescribe regulations to promote compliance with the section. Finally, the section would task the independent panel established by the Secretary of Defense under section 576(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to assess the feasibility and appropriateness of incorporating into the Uniform Code of Military Justice additional crime victims' rights set out in section 3771, but not incorporated into the Uniform Code of Military Justice by this section.

Section 543—Defense Counsel Interview of Complaining Witnesses in Presence of Counsel for the Complaining Witnesses or a Sexual Assault Victim Advocate

This section would require that if the defense counsel in connection with proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice desires to interview a complaining witness, then the request for the interview must be placed through the trial counsel. Furthermore, if the defense counsel interviews the complaining witness, the section would require that the interview take place in the presence of the counsel for the witness or a Sexual Assault Victim Advocate.

Section 544—Participation by Complaining Witness in Clemency Phase of Courts-Martial Process

This section would enable a complaining witness, who is a person who has suffered a direct physical, emotional, or pecuniary harm as a result of the commission of an offense, to submit matters for consideration by the convening authority following a court-martial and prior to the convening authority taking action on the findings or sentence of that court-martial.

Section 545—Eight-Day Incident Reporting Requirement in Response to Unrestricted Report of Sexual Assault in Which the Victim is a Member of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy for a written incident report, by a person designated by the Secretary, to detail the actions taken or in progress to provide the victim of a sexual assault the necessary care and support, to refer the alleged assault to the proper military criminal investigative organization, and to provide initial notification to the chain of command above the unit in which the victim served, when such notification had not already taken place. This section would require the incident report to be provided within 8 days of the unrestricted report of a sexual assault. Furthermore, this section would require that the Secretary of Defense prescribe regulations to carry out the policy within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 546—Amendment to Manual for Courts-Martial to Eliminate Considerations Relating to Character and Military Service of Accused in Initial Disposition of Sex-Related Offenses

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, to recommend to the President a change to the Manual for Courts-Martial that would strike the words "the character and the military service of the accused" from the list of factors contained in the manual's Rule 306, Initial Disposition, when that rule was applied to sex-related offenses.

Section 547—Inclusion of Letter of Reprimands, Nonpunitive Letter of Reprimands and Counseling Statements

This section, in order to provide increased visibility to commanders and to identify and prevent trends of unacceptable behavior at an early stage, would direct the Secretary of Defense to require commanders to include letters of reprimand, nonpunitive letters of action, and counseling statements involving substantiated cases of sexual harassment or sexual assault in the performance evaluation of a member of the Armed Forces.

Section 548—Enhanced Protections for Prospective Members and New Members of the Armed Forces During Entry-Level Processing and Training

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a policy that uniformly defines and prescribes what constitutes an inappropriate and prohibited relationship, communication, conduct, or contact, including when such an action is consensual, between certain members of the Armed Forces, such as recruiters, military personnel assigned to a military entrance processing center, or drill instructors in basic training centers, and a prospective member of the Armed Forces or a member undergoing entry-level processing or training. This section would also require that substantiated violations of the policy by a member would result in the member being automatically processed for administrative separation from military service. Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to propose an amendment to the Uniform Code of Military Justice that would address violations of the policy.

Section 549—Independent Reviews and Assessments of Uniform Code of Military Justice and Judicial Proceedings of Sexual Assault Cases

This section would require the independent panel established under section 576(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to assess the impact, if any, that removing from the chain of command the disposition authority for charges preferred under the Uniform Code of Military Justice would have on overall reporting and prosecution of sexual assault cases. This section would also require the independent panel to review the report of the Secretary of Defense, which is mandated by section 538 of this Act, on the role of military com-

manders in the military justice system. Finally, this section would require the independent panel to render its report of findings and recommendations within 1 year of the panel's first meeting.

Section 550—Review of the Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity Role in Sexual Harassment Cases

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity for the purposes of identifying resource and personnel gaps in the office, the role of the office in sexual harassment cases, and evaluating how the office works with the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office to address sexual assault in the Armed Forces.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY FAMILY READINESS

Section 551—Department of Defense Recognition of Spouses of Members of the Armed Forces Who Serve in Combat Zones

This section would require the design of a spouse-of-a-combat veteran lapel button, approved by the Secretary of Defense, to identify and recognize the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is serving or has served in a combat zone for a period of more than 30 days. In addition, this section would authorize the Secretary concerned to use appropriated funds to procure spouse-of-a-combat-veteran lapel buttons and to provide for their presentation to eligible spouses of members.

Section 552—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements For Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces

This section would amend title II of the Service Members Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 521) to require a court that issued a temporary custody order based solely on the deployment or anticipated deployment of a service member to reinstate the custody order that was in effect immediately preceding the temporary order, unless the court finds reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child. This section would also prohibit a court from using deployment or the possibility of deployment as the sole factor when determining the best interest of a child.

Section 553—Treatment of Relocation of Members of the Armed Forces for Active Duty for Purposes of Mortgage Refinancing

This section would amend section 303 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to expand certain mortgage protections for service members, surviving spouses, and veterans; to make knowing violations of these protections a criminal offense; and to increase civil penalties for violations of these protections.

Section 554—Family Support Programs for Immediate Family Members of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Special Operations Forces

This section would authorize the Commander, United States Special Operations Command, consistent with regulations that the Sec-

retary of Defense may prescribe, to conduct up to three pilot programs to assess the feasibility and benefits of providing family support activities for the immediate family members of the Armed Forces assigned to special operations forces. This section would require that family support programs provided by pilot programs not duplicate those family support programs being provided by the Secretary of a military department. This section also would authorize the pilot programs for fiscal years 2014 through 2016. It is the committee's intent is that any pilot program initiated under this section be completed by the end of fiscal year 2016. The section would also limit to $5.0 million the amount that may be spent on the pilot programs in a fiscal year, and require the Commander, United States Special Operations Command to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of the completion of a pilot program initiated under this section.

SUBTITLE F—EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 561—Inclusion of Freely Associated States within Scope of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Program

This section would amend section 2031(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to establish and maintain a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps at a secondary education institution in the Freely Associated States, if the conditions of section 2031(b) of title 10, United States Code, are met.

Section 562—Improved Climate Assessments and Dissemination and Tracking of Results

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the results of command climate assessments are provided to the relevant commander and the next higher level of command. This section would also require the Secretary to include in the performance evaluation of a commander evidence of compliance with the requirements for conducting climate assessments. Additionally, this section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to develop a system to track command compliance. Unit commanders would be required to develop a compliance report that will include an overview of the unit members' concerns, data showing how the leadership is perceived and a detailed plan on how leadership will address unit concerns.

Section 563—Service-wide 360 Assessments

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to develop an assessment program modeled after the current Department of the Army Multi-Source Assessment and Feedback program ("360–degree approach") including individual counseling as part of the performance evaluation process.

Section 564—Health Welfare Inspections

This section would require the Secretary of each military department to conduct health and welfare inspections on a monthly basis

to ensure and maintain security, military readiness, and good order and discipline.

Section 565—Review of Security of Military Installations, Including Barracks and multi-family residences.

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of security measures on military installations specifically with regard to barracks and multi-family housing units. Elements of the study would include identifying security gaps on military installations, evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of 24–hour electronic monitoring or placing security guards at points of entry to barracks and military family housing.

Section 566—Enhancement of Mechanisms to Correlate Skills and Training for Military Occupational Specialties with Skills and Training Required for Civilian Certification and Licenses

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to make information on civilian credentialing opportunities available to members of the Armed Forces, including during the transition assistance program. This section would also require the Secretaries of the military departments to make available to accredited civilian credentialing agencies information on military courses and skills.

Section 567—Use of Educational Assistance for Courses in Pursuit of Civilian Certifications or Licenses

This section would amend section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, by placing limitations on when educational assistance may be used to pursue civilian certifications and licenses. This section would also authorize the use of educational assistance authorities under sections 2007, 2015, 106A, 2183, 1606 and 1607 of title 10, United States Code, to pursue civilian certifications and licenses.

SUBTITLE G—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION

Section 571—Continuation of Authority To Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would authorize $20.0 million for continuation of the Department of Defense assistance program to local educational agencies (LEAs) that are impacted by the enrollment of dependent children of military members and Department civilian employees. This section would also authorize $5.0 million for assistance to LEAs with significant changes in enrollment of school-aged dependents of military members and civilian employees due to base closures, force structure changes, or force relocations. Furthermore, this section would extend the authority for assistance to LEAs impacted by base closures, force structure changes, or force relocations by 1 year to September 30, 2015.

Section 572—Support for Efforts to Improve Academic Achievement and Transition of Military Dependent Students

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide grant assistance to non-profit organizations that provide services to improve the academic achievement of military dependent students, including those non-profit organizations whose programs focus on increasing the civic responsibility of military dependent students and their understanding of the Federal Government through direct exposure to the Government.

Section 573—Treatment of Tuition Payments Received for Virtual Elementary and Secondary Education Component of Department of Defense Education Program

This section would amend section 2164(l) of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to retain the tuition payments made by participants in the Department of Defense virtual elementary and secondary education programs. The retained tuition would be used to provide support for the virtual education programs authorized by section 2164(l).

SUBTITLE H—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Section 581—Fraudulent Representations about Receipt of Military Decorations or Medals

This section would amend title 18, United States Code, to make fraudulently claiming to be a recipient of certain decorations or medals with the intent to obtain money, property, or other tangible benefits a crime.

Section 582—Repeal of Limitation on Number of Medals of Honor That May Be Awarded to the same Member of the Armed Forces

This section would authorize a service member to receive a Medal of Honor for each subsequent valorous act that results in the award of a Medal of Honor.

Section 583—Standardization of Time-Limits for Recommending and Awarding Medal of Honor, Distinguished-Service Cross, Navy Cross, Air Force Cross, and Distinguished-Service Medal

This section would modify the Army and Air Force time limits to 3 years for recommending and 5 years for awarding a soldier or airman a Medal of Honor, Service Cross, or Distinguished-Service Medal, thereby standardizing those limits for all services.

Section 584—Recodification and Revision of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard Medal of Honor Roll Requirements

This section would require the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to establish and maintain a Medal of Honor Roll and enter the name of each person on the roll who has served on Active Duty in the Armed Forces and who has been awarded the Medal of Honor. This section would also require the Secretary concerned to furnish the Secretary of Veterans Affairs a certified copy

of each certification of enrollment. This section would repeal sections 1560 and 1561 of title 38, United States Code.

Section 585—Treatment of Victims of the Attacks at Recruiting Station in Little Rock, Arkansas, and at Fort Hood, Texas

This section would require the Secretary of the military department concerned to award the Purple Heart to members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the attacks that occurred at the recruiting station in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009, and at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009. Furthermore, this section would deem the members of the Armed Forces killed or wounded in those attacks to have been killed or injured in a combat zone and the Department of Defense civilians to have been killed or wounded in a contingency operation. The effect would be to make those members and civilians eligible for additional monetary benefits.

Section 586—Retroactive Award of Army Combat Action Badge

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Army Combat Action Badge to a person who, while a member of the Army, participated in combat during which the person personally engaged, or was personnally engaged by, the enemy at any time during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on September 18, 2001.

Section 587—Report on Navy Review, Findings, and Actions Pertaining to Medal of Honor Nomination of Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on the Navy review, findings, and actions pertaining to the Medal of Honor nomination of Sergeant Rafael Peralta to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Section 588—Authorization For Award Of The Distinguished-Service Cross To Sergeant First Class Robert F. Keiser For Acts Of Valor During The Korean War

This section would waive the statutory time limitation under section 3144 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Distinguished Service Cross to Robert F. Keiser, who served in the United States Army during the Korean War. The committee takes this action based on the written confirmation by the Secretary of the Army that the actions of Robert F. Keiser merit the award of the Distinguished Service Cross.

SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Revision of Specified Senior Military Colleges to Reflect Consolidation of North Georgia College and State University and Gainesville State College

This section would amend section 2111a(f) of title 10, United States Code, to reflect the name change of North Georgia College and State University to The University of North Georgia.

Section 592—Authority to Enter into Concessions Contracts at Army National Military Cemeteries

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into concession contracts for transportation, interpretative, and other services in support of visitors at Arlington National Cemetery and the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. This section would also require that each concession contract include terms that the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure the protection, dignity, and solemnity of the cemetery at which services are provided. Furthermore, the section would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from instituting a concession contract for operation of the gift shop at Arlington National Cemetery without subsequent authorization. In providing for transportation services at Arlington National Cemetery, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to ensure that service provides visitors with access to the Custis Lee Mansion.

Section 593—Commission on Military Behavioral Health and Disciplinary Issues

This section would establish a 10-member commission to study whether the Department of Defenses' mechanisms for disciplinary action adequately address the impact of service-connected mental disorders and traumatic brain injury. Specifically, this section would require the examination of those members diagnosed with or reasonably asserting post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury that have been deployed overseas in support of a contingency operation during the previous 24 months, and how that injury or deployment may constitute matters in extenuation that relate to the basis for administrative separation under conditions other than honorable or the overall characterization of service of the member as other than honorable.

Section 594—Commission on Service to the Nation

This section would establish a commission to be known as the "Commission on Service to the Nation" to study the effects of warfare on members of the Armed Forces, their families, and communities, and the gaps between the military and the rest of civilian society.

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, All-Volunteer, combat-ready force. Accordingly, the committee supports a 1.8 percent military pay raise for fiscal year 2014, in accordance with current law, in order for military pay raises to keep pace with the pay increases in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index. The committee believes that future pay-raise proposals that are below the Employment Cost Index may have long term affects on the recruiting and retention of a high-quality All-Volunteer Force. Additionally, to sustain the All-Volunteer Force, the committee recommends that the authorities for a wide array of bonuses, special and incentive pays, and other compensation benefits set to expire on December 31, 2013, be extended for an additional year.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Military Exchanges, Commissaries, and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Activities

The committee considers the military exchanges, commissaries, and the morale, welfare and recreation (MWR) activities to be quality of life benefits that are important to the welfare of military communities around the world and key factors in maintaining the All-Volunteer Force. The committee remains concerned that the growing fiscal pressures on the Department of Defense and the military services will increase efforts to reduce or divert to other priorities the minimal amount of appropriated funding the military resale community receives. Such a reduction would reduce the benefit to patrons and dividends to MRW activities, and adversely impact the quality of life for service members and their families. The committee commends the commissaries for being forward-leaning in reducing overhead costs and increasing internal efficiencies to maintain the benefit for military and retiree patrons with reduced appropriated funding. The committee encourages the military resale community and MWR activities to continue to refine their business processes and create efficiencies in order to reduce the reliance on appropriated funding, and maintain and protect the important quality of life benefit these programs have brought to the service members and their families.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances

This section would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rate of basic allow-

ance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

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, income replacement payments for Reserve Component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for Active Duty service, and the authority to reimburse travel expenses for inactive duty training outside of normal commuting distance until December 31, 2014.

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, 2014.

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, 2014.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend 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 incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units until December 31, 2014.

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, 2014.

Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authority to Provide Incentive Pay for Members of Precommissioning Programs Pursuing Foreign Language Proficiency

This section would authorize payment of incentive pay for members of pre-commissioning programs who are pursuing foreign language proficiency.

Section 617—Authority to Provide Bonus to Certain Cadets and Midshipmen Enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

This section would extend from December 31, 2012, until December 31, 2015, the authority for a student attending the senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Leaders Course, who executes a written agreement to accept a commission or an appointment as an Officer of the Armed Forces and to serve on Active Duty, to receive a bonus.

SUBTITLE C—DISABILITY, RETIRED PAY, SURVIVOR, AND TRANSITIONAL BENEFITS

Section 621—Transitional Compensation and Other Benefits for Dependents of Certain Members Separated for Violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would amend section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the provision of transitional compensation and other benefits for the dependent of a member of the Armed Forces when the member, after completing more than 20 years of service, is separated from the Armed Forces because of a violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and forfeits all pay and allowances.

Section 622—Prevention of Retired Pay Inversion for Members Whose Retired Pay is Computed Using High-Three Average

This section would clarify the application of the Tower amendment, section 1401a(f) of title 10, United States Code, to the computation of retired pay for service members who first entered military service on or after September 8, 1980. The Tower amendment was enacted in 1975 to prevent the loss of military retired pay for members who were eligible to retire earlier than their actual retirement date under the Final Pay Retirement System. The High-36 Retirement System enacted in 1980 obviated the need for applica-

tion of the Tower amendment. This section would clarify that Tower amendment does not apply in the application of the High-36 retirement calculations, but will continue to be used when calculating retired pay under the Final Pay Retirement System.

SUBTITLE D—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Section 631—Expansion of Protection of Employees of Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities from Reprisals

This section would amend section 1587(b) of title 10, United States Code, to include "threaten to take" as an adverse personnel action. This amendment would bring whistleblower protections for non-appropriated fund instrumentality employees in line with protections afforded to members of the Armed Forces.

Section 632—Purchase of Sustainable Products, Local Food Products, and Recyclable Materials for Resale in Commissary and Exchange Store Systems

This section would require the governing body giving oversight and management direction to the military exchange and commissary systems in accordance with section 2481(c) of title 10, United States Code, to establish guidelines for the identification of fresh meat, poultry, seafood, produce, and other products raised or produced through sustainable methods that are not harmful to the ecology. This section would require the guidelines to be established not later than 2 years from the date of the enactment of this Act. The committee believes the guidelines should consider the impact of implementing sustainable product policies on the cost of goods and the pricing of the products offered to patrons. This section would also require the governing body to establish, not later than September 30, 2018, goals for all exchange and commissary stores to purchase sustainable products, local food products, and recyclable materials.

Section 633—Correction of Obsolete References to Certain Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

This section would amend section 2105(c) of title 5, United States Code, to strike obsolete Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities references to the Army and Air Force Motion Picture Service and Navy Ships Stores Ashore, and update with an accurate title of the Navy Ships Store Program.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 641—Authority to Provide Certain Expenses for Care and Disposition of Human Remains Retained by the Department of Defense for Forensic Pathology Investigation

This section would amend sections 1481 and 1482 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to pay for expenses incident to death for certain decedents whose deaths are investigated by the Armed Forces Medical Examiner System (AFMES) under section 1471 of title 10, United

States Code, when payment of such expenses is not otherwise authorized by law. Currently, when the AFMES removes decedent remains to a Department of Defense mortuary for a forensic pathology investigation pursuant to section 1471, title 10, United States Code, some decedent's next of kin must pay for the mortuary services, including transportation costs, which may otherwise not be available under section 1482 of title 10, at the conclusion of the investigation.

Section 642—Provision of Status Under Law by Honoring Certain Members of the Reserve Components as Veterans

This section would honor as veterans those retired members of the Reserve Components who, because of age, are not yet eligible to receive retired pay. This honorary designation as a veteran would not entitle the retiree to any benefit.

Section 643—Survey of Military Pay and Benefits Preferences

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out an anonymous survey of random members of the Armed Forces regarding pay and benefits, including the value that members place on forms of compensation, relative to one another, including basic pay, allowances for housing, bonuses and special pay, healthcare benefits, and retirement pay.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to strongly support a high-quality and cost-effective military health system that provides members of the Armed Forces, retirees, survivors, and their families access to quality health care. The committee remains committed to ensuring service members and their families have access to mental health care and that every opportunity is utilized to screen service members for mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury. In that regard, the committee mandated periodic mental health assessments for all service members serving on Active Duty and increased the frequency of mental health assessments for deployed personnel. The committee also required the Department of Defense to conduct research focused on drug development to halt neurodegeneration following traumatic brain injury. To further the committee's focus on addressing suicide by members of the Armed Forces, the Department is authorized to carry out collaborative programs to respond to suicide and combat stress, substance addiction, risk-taking behaviors, and family violence.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Additional Therapeutic Treatment Activities Available Under Exceptional Care Health Option

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to explore the possibility of providing additional rehabilitative therapies pursuant to subsection (a)(17) of section 1077 of title 10, United States Code,

or through inclusion within the Exceptional Care Health Option (ECHO) program to expand the utilization of non-traditional modalities, including a horse, balance board, ball, bolster, and bench. The Secretary is required to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 2014, on the results of his review to expand additional therapeutic treatment activities.

Administration of Blood Products On-board U.S. Medical Evacuation Aircraft

The committee recognizes the major advances in military medicine that have significantly reduced the mortality rate among combat wounded personnel. The most critical time to respond to battlefield casualties remains the first hour after injury, the so-called golden hour. The committee recognizes that the military services have committed tremendous resources and training in order to provide service members the best possible treatment at the point of injury. The committee is aware of a recent demonstration project conducted by a limited number of Army MEDEVAC aviation components in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to administer blood products to injured soldiers during the soldiers' en-route medical care and movement to a medical facility. Preliminary data suggest that these in-flight blood transfusions have greatly increased the probability of survival for injured soldiers. The committee understands the Army as a result has expanded this capability across MEDEVAC units in the operational area. The committee is interested in understanding the underpinning analysis that was conducted to support this change. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the program, including the timeline toward outfitting MEDEVAC aviation units with blood products to improve en-route patient care.

Alcohol Abuse Prevention Programs

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense and the military services recognize the deleterious effects of alcohol abuse on service members, families and military readiness. However, the committee remains concerned with the incidence of alcohol abuse by members of the military and their families. The committee believes that applying best practices across the military services may allow for more effective alcohol abuse prevention programs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military services, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees, a report on alcohol abuse prevention programs to include a cost benefit analysis detailing the most effective methods for preventing alcohol abuse.

Department of Defense and Early Autism Diagnosis and Intervention for Military Families

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its continued efforts to ensure that military families have access to au-

tism diagnosis, intervention, and treatment services. The committee encourages the Department to continue to assist military families with autistic children to receive the full and expanding range of evidence-based intervention and treatment approaches. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that sufficient priority is given to efforts to provide services specifically for autistic children of military families living in rural or under-served communities.

Efforts to Advance Lower Extremity Prosthetics and Orthotics

Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) have been the number one threat to the men and women who have served and are currently serving in contingency operations in the Middle East. The committee understands that the incidence of significant traumatic injuries to lower extremities as a result of IED blasts has led to innovative and improved care of these injuries. Recognizing that lower extremity injuries often require long-term and continuous care, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue looking for new and innovative prosthetic and orthopedic technologies to assist service members adapting to these significant injuries. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the Department of Defense's effort to advance lower extremity prosthetics and orthotics, and the process by which such advancements are made available to members of the Armed Forces in a timely manner. This report should also include information on research efforts and funding for powered prosthetics and orthotics for service members with a lower extremity amputation or other lower extremity injuries with limb salvage. The Secretary of Defense shall submit the report within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Efforts to Improve Treatment for Post Traumatic Stress and Traumatic Brain Injury

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has made great strides in research and development of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) over the past decade. The current budget climate will have an impact on continued research and development efforts and the committee urges the Department to consider a systems medicine approach that will better leverage the limited resources that will be available in the future. Systems medicine promotes a comprehensive, interdisciplinary approach that includes clinical care, professional education, and the interaction between genetics, the external environment, and individual behaviors to focus on prevention of diseases. Many large research universities and hospitals have found that employing systems medicine has made tremendous progress on informing its research efforts. The committee believes that such a comprehensive approach may improve the research and development of PTSD and TBI to better support our service members.

Healthy Base Initiative

The committee recognizes that a healthy and fit force is essential as service members must be physically prepared to deploy in a moment's notice, often to locations that are extremely austere and with demanding conditions. The committee commends the Department of Defense for initiating its Healthy Base Initiative (HBI) demonstration program which promotes and supports the overall health and wellness of service members, families, and civilians through improved nutritional choices, increased physical activity, obesity reduction and control, and efforts to decrease tobacco use. In addition, the committee commends the Department of the Army for initiating the Performance Triad designed to improve stamina, readiness and health through enhanced activity and improved nutrition and sleep. The committee believes that supporting healthy lifestyle choices will positively impact troop and family readiness and may result in an overall increase in the health of service members and their families.

Military Health System Governance Reform Report

The committee received the March 2013 report of the Department of Defense on the Military Health System governance reform implementation plan as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). That public law required that the report provide detailed goals that were to be achieved while carrying out reforms. Those reforms included improving clinical and business practices and reducing costs, infrastructure, and personnel. The report also required a detailed schedule for meeting the goals. While the goals for the reform of the Military Health System included in the report address the statutory requirements, the report does not clearly describe the linkage of the goals to the responsibilities of the newly established Defense Heath Agency. In addition, the report neither provides the information to understand how the Department developed its goals, nor did the report provide a detailed schedule as required. The establishment of a Defense Health Agency is a major transformation, and its success is dependent upon greater system integration. The committee remains concerned that the Defense Health Agency could result in greater costs and personnel expenditures if the goals are not clearly linked to the roles and responsibilities of the Agency, and if a complete schedule is not clearly linked to the goals. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to address the shortcomings identified above with the required elements of the report that is due not later than June 30, 2013, or by separate letter to the committee within 30 days of the latter suspense.

Report on Prostate Cancer Imaging Research

The committee notes the encouragement to the Department of Defense to intensify research on the advancement of prostate imaging technologies that is contained on page 180 of House Report 112–479, the report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (H.R. 4310). The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives

on research either conducted by or funded by the Department of Defense to advance technology for the detection of prostate cancer.

Report on Provider Referrals for Ancillary Services Under TRICARE

The committee remains concerned with the long term viability of the TRICARE benefit for service members and their families. In that regard the committee is committed to ensuring that adequate protections are in place to make certain that the Department of Defense is not paying excessive costs for ancillary services through referrals by TRICARE providers. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, no later than April 1, 2014, to report to the committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the policies and procedures in place to avoid paying excessive costs for provider referred ancillary services under TRICARE and the effectiveness of such policies and procedures in avoiding excessive costs.

Review of the Military Health System Medical Training Consolidation

The Services established a memorandum of agreement for the governance of the recently established Medical Education and Training Campus (METC) in 2011. The establishment of METC consolidated the Department of Defense's five enlisted medical training campuses at one location in San Antonio, Texas and, according to the Department of Defense, over half of its programs of instruction. While the Department has reported it realized savings from this effort, it remains unclear if there are additional efficiencies to be gained in medical training consolidation. Further, it is unclear whether the individual programs of instruction have been consolidated into a joint program of instruction. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the consolidation of the Department of Defense's medical training. The review should include at an minimum: (1) the extent to which enlisted and officer medical training have been consolidated and standardized and what, if any, financial savings has the Department achieved; (2) the extent to which there are further opportunities for consolidation of enlisted medical training; (3) the extent to which the Department has examined consolidation of officer medical training, including an estimate of potential financial savings; and (4) an assessment of the lessons learned from the Medical Education and Training Campus consolidation that could apply to future consolidation efforts in the military health system's governance. The Comptroller General shall submit the results of the review no later than April 18, 2014 to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Therapeutic Service Dog Training Program

The committee is aware that recovering service members in treatment at the National Intrepid Center of Excellence (NICoE) and Walter Reed National Military Medical Center are reporting improvement in their symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) when participating in

the service dog training programs currently operating in those facilities. In addition, clinical observations support the benefits of this animal-assisted therapy modality to psychologically injured service members, including: decreased depressive symptoms, improved emotional regulation, improved sleep patterns, a greater sense of purpose, better reintegration into their communities, pain reduction, and improved parenting skills. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consider making this promising new therapeutic intervention more available to service members suffering from the invisible wounds of PTSD and TBI. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct such studies as may be necessary to evaluate the efficacy of service dog training as an adjunctive treatment for PTSD and TBI and to maximize the therapeutic benefits to recovering members who participate in the programs. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a report not later than March 1, 2015 to update the congressional defense committees on this research.

Trauma Clinical Research Repository

The committee recognizes that trauma-related deaths impact our military services, as well as the general civilian population. The committee understands that advancements in trauma care are the results of research conducted across the public-private spectrum by Federal, academic, and private institutions. The life-saving impact of this research can be seen on the battlefield and in civilian trauma. However, in an era of constrained medical research budgets and a shrinking defense budget, it is imperative that trauma research funding be used efficiently and for the greatest good. The committee believes that to continue the advancement in trauma care the collective research data should be maintained centrally so it can be accessed by both public and private researchers for future use. A trauma clinical research repository would provide an opportunity to make widely available the data resulting from current and future clinical trauma research in both the military and civilian sectors that could lead to significant advances in treatment and improved outcomes in both the military and civilian populations. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to work with other Federal agencies and the private sector to establish a trauma clinical research repository to share and maximize critical trauma research data.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—IMPROVEMENTS TO HEALTH BENEFITS

Section 701—Mental Health Assessments for Members of the Armed Forces

This section would amend section 1074m of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide person-to-person mental health screenings once during each 180-day period in which a member is deployed.

Section 702—Periodic Mental Health Assessments for Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide periodic mental health assessments to each member of the Armed Forces serving on Active Duty.

SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

Section 711—Future Availability of TRICARE Prime for Certain Beneficiaries Enrolled in TRICARE Prime

This section would authorize a one time opt-in to TRICARE Prime for beneficiaries who are eligible for TRICARE Prime as of September 30, 2013, provided the beneficiary remains in the same ZIP Code as the ZIP Code the beneficiary resided in at the time of the opt-in, notwithstanding eligibility for enrollment based on the location at which the beneficiary resides.

Section 712—Cooperative Health Care Agreements Between the Military Departments and Non-Military Health Care Entities

This section would permit the Secretaries of the military departments to establish cooperative health care arrangements and agreements between military installations and local and regional non-military health care entities.

Section 713—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Integrated Electronic Health Record Program

This section would limit the amount of funds the Secretary of Defense may obligate or expend for procurement, or research, development, test and evaluation of the integrated electronic health record until 30 days after the date that the Secretary submits a report detailing an analysis of alternatives for the plan of the Secretary to proceed with such program.

Section 714—Pilot Program on Increased Third-Party Collection Reimbursements in Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program for 3 years at military installations to assess the feasibility of using revenue-cycle management processes, including cash flow management and accounts-receivable processes to increase amounts collected by military treatment facilities from third party payers. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit a report of the results of the pilot program to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after completion of the pilot program.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 721—Display of Budget Information for Embedded Mental Health Providers of the Reserve Components

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include in the documents that support the President's annual budget, a budg-

et justification display for embedded mental health providers of the Reserve Components that includes the amount for each component.

Section 722—Authority of Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences to Enter Into Contracts and Agreements and Make Grants to Other Nonprofit Entities

This section would clarify the authority of the Secretary of Defense, with regard to the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences, to enter into contracts and agreements and make grants to nonprofit entities.

Section 723—Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out collaborative programs to respond to suicide and combat stress related arrest rates of members of the Armed Forces as well as to train Active Duty members to recognize and respond to combat stress disorder, suicide risk, substance addiction, risk taking behaviors, and family violence.

Section 724—Research Regarding Hydrocephalus

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to consider selecting research projects relating to hydrocephalus under the Peer Review Medical Research Program.

Section 725—Traumatic Brain Injury Research

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out research, test, and evaluation activities regarding drug development to halt neurodegeneration following traumatic brain injury.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Advanced Technical Exploitation Program

The committee is aware the National Air and Space Intelligence Center (NASIC) is seeking to alter the acquisition strategy for the follow-on contract for the Advanced Technical Exploitation Program (ATEP). The committee is also aware that the objective of this follow-on contract, referred to as ATEP II, is "to provide contract services to support the NASIC mission in Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT) and non-nuclear Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) Tasking, Collection, Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination activities. This includes up to 24x7 intelligence operations, reach-back advanced data exploitation support, and cutting-edge GEOINT and MASINT research and development for NASIC and mission partners throughout the Department of Defense and intelligence communities."

The committee is also aware that the Air Force intends to use a lowest price, technically acceptable (LPTA) acquisition strategy for ATEP II and is planning to set this contract aside for small

business concerns. The committee is concerned that the scope, scale, complexity and mission criticality of this work is inappropriate for an LPTA source selection and may not be well-suited for small business participation at the prime contract level. When those strategies are combined and used to procure complex, mission critical services, the risk of acquisition failure rises.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to examine the Air Force's acquisition strategy related to provision of these services and to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2013, that includes a detailed description of the following: (1) the acquisition strategy; (2) rationale and justification for using such strategy; (3) summary of market research methodology and findings performed during the development of the acquisition strategy; (4) assessment of risks related to such strategy; and (5) a description of the management and oversight structure necessary to ensure successful performance of the contracted activity throughout the period of performance.

Commercial Items Pricing Information

The committee remains confident that sections 2379 and 2306a(d) of title 10, United States Code, provide the Department of Defense with adequate authority for obtaining cost and pricing information to evaluate the price reasonableness of certain commercial items that are procured to support a major system, and the committee looks forward to issuance of the guidance mandated by section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) on use of that authority. The committee notes that inconsistent use of the authority granted by sections 2379 and 2306a(d) within the Department of Defense continues to foster uncertainty among vendors, as recently evidenced by factors leading to the corrective action taken by the Department of the Army in amending its solicitation for overhaul services for certain fuel pumps in light of a protest filed with the Government Accountability Office. The committee expects that the Department of Defense's forthcoming guidance and the plan of action for training and developing the acquisition workforce, also required by section 831 of Public Law 112–239, will address inconsistencies in exercising the authority granted by sections 2379 and 2306a(d) to avert further complications in contracting for commercial items.

Competition in Air Force Network-Centric Solutions Contracts

The committee is aware of reports that the Air Force may be inappropriately using sole source and brand name procurement solicitations and contract awards in the Network-Centric Solutions (NETCENTS), Air Force contract vehicles. The committee is concerned that these decisions may be negatively impacting competition between NETCENTS–1 and NETCENTS–2 contract vehicles. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to review NETCENTS vehicles and provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The review should detail the Air Force's

use of "sole source" and "brand name only" procurement solicitations and contract awards under NETCENTS–1 and NETCENTS–2 contracts, as well as the extent to which the Air Force met the statutory requirements of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 6.303 and/or FAR 16.505, as applicable. The review should also detail remedial steps to be taken when the requirements of FAR 6.303 and/or FAR 16.505 have not been met, as applicable.

Implementation of Requirement for Designation of a Lead Inspector General for Certain Contingency Operations

The committee applauds the work done by the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) and the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR). Both have done much to provide independent and objective oversight of reconstruction projects and activities through the conduct of audits and investigations. The committee believes they have promoted efficiency and effectiveness in reconstruction programs and have detected and prevented waste, fraud, and abuse. They have also provided valuable recommendations to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness during contingency operations and have aided the development of policies to prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse during those operations. However, the committee notes that SIGIR was not established by law until October 2004 and SIGAR was not established by law until January 2008, years and months after the United States began contingency operations and reconstruction activities in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The committee recognizes that future contingency operations will likely be heavily reliant on contractors, including contracts for the procurement of locally available goods and services, to support and assist the U.S. mission in such operations, and therefore certain contingency operations could benefit from the designation of a lead Inspector General (IG) early in the operation. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) included a provision, section 848, which requires the designation of a lead IG for overseas contingency operations not later than 30 days after the commencement of certain military operations.

The committee is aware that the offices of the Inspectors General of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) have initiated preliminary interagency discussions on the implementation of section 848. The committee applauds this effort and recognizes that development of a framework for section 848 implementation is a complex and challenging endeavor. Such challenges include establishing a process for requesting funding to support the activities of the lead IG once a contingency operation is declared; resourcing and manpower considerations, including the ability to surge when needed; maintaining a workforce that is skilled and trained to conduct IG responsibilities in a wide variety of potential contingency operations; and keeping open lines of communication so as to foster relationships between the three agencies' Inspectors General during peacetime.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Inspectors General of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID to establish a memorandum of agreement that would serve as a framework for implementation of section 848 and execution of the responsibilities described therein. The committee requests to be kept informed of progress and notified of obstacles related to the implementation of section 848. Furthermore, the committee specifically requests to be notified of the need for any changes to law or regulation in order to better enhance oversight of future contingency operations.

Online Reverse Auctions

The committee is aware that the military services have been increasingly utilizing online reverse auctions for the procurement of certain commodities and simple services. This procurement strategy, when used effectively and appropriately, can result in savings to the Federal Government versus estimated prices. According to Federal Times, Naval Supply Systems Command recently piloted a reverse auction program, saving approximately $2.0 million in the first year of the program.

In view of the serious fiscal challenges facing the Department of Defense, acquisitions strategies which provide the same level of goods and service to the warfighter at reduced costs to the taxpayer are commendable. The committee would encourage the services to consider increasing their use of reverse auctions for certain types of acquisitions that lend themselves to this model and meet this standard, but to also review their own studies, including that of the Corps of Engineers, that may provide additional guidance regarding the best utilization of this procurement methodology.

Report on Operational Contract Support in Afghanistan

The Department of Defense has begun its drawdown of troops and equipment from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. For the past 11 years, the Department of Defense has spent billions of dollars on operational contract support in Afghanistan and continues to employ over 100,000 U.S. personnel, third country nationals, and Afghans as contractor employees in Afghanistan. Additionally, there is potentially a large amount of contractor-managed Government-owned equipment in Afghanistan, which must also be disposed. The Comptroller General of the United States' previous work on the drawdown of U.S. troops in the Republic of Iraq highlighted the difficulties the Department of Defense had in planning and executing the drawdown of contractors from Iraq. The drawdown of contractors in Afghanistan is likely to be more complex than that which the Department of Defense faced in Iraq due to continuing combat operations and the need to plan operational contract support for the post-2014 advise and assist mission.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by January 10, 2014, that reviews the processes and procedures that the Department of Defense is using to plan and execute the drawdown of contractors and their equipment in Afghanistan. The committee

is particularly concerned with how the Department of Defense is ensuring that its contractor drawdown is done in the most cost-effective manner. The report should include, but is not limited to, the following:

(1) How the Department is applying operational contract support lessons learned as it begins its drawdown of contractors and their equipment in Afghanistan;

(2) How the Department and U.S. Forces-Afghanistan have established processes and procedures to draw down its contractor workforce and associated equipment and the extent to which these processes are synchronized with established milestones and other guidance;

(3) How the Department is using cost and other information to help ensure it is making cost-effective operational contract support drawdown decisions, including decisions on the disposition of contractor-managed, Government-owned equipment;

(4) How the Department has taken actions to ensure that there are sufficient personnel in place to oversee contractors as it reduces the number of military forces in Afghanistan; and

(5) How the Department and U.S. Forces-Afghanistan have planned for the use of contractors after December 31, 2014, and the extent to which the Department has considered post-2014 contractor requirements and costs in such planning.

Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Source Selection Processes

The committee applauds recent efforts by the Department of Defense to cut costs and save taxpayer dollars. These efforts, such as "Better Buying Power" initiatives, seek to achieve greater efficiencies through affordability, cost control and the elimination of unproductive processes or bureaucracy. Such efforts also seek to promote competition. However, the committee is concerned that this well-intentioned effort by the Department to lower costs frequently results in the inappropriate awarding of contracts based on a lowest price, technically acceptable (LPTA) standard instead of a best-value tradeoff approach.

According to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the goal of the acquisition system is to "deliver on a timely basis the best value product or service to the customer, while maintaining the public's trust and fulfilling public policy objectives." In certain circumstances, pursuing the lowest cost in the short term can result in significant operational and financial costs in the long term. In October 2010, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report on the Department's use of best value processes. In that report (GAO–11–8), GAO found that the Department used a best-value tradeoff approach for about 70 percent of its new, competitively awarded contracts in fiscal year 2009. An LPTA approach was used for about 25 percent of these contracts.

The committee believes that awarding contracts based on an LPTA basis should not become the default position of the Department. Instead, careful consideration must be given to each contract to ensure that there is an appropriate weighing of cost versus other considerations. When a requirement is well defined and the risk of poor contract performance is minimal, it may be appropriate to use

price as the primary basis for awarding a contract. However, when the requirement is complex, performance risk is high, or failure to perform has significant consequences (such as in the case of intelligence or private security services, or development and procurement of personal protective equipment and critical safety items, or development of emerging or critical technology), then a best-value tradeoff approach may be more appropriate.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Department's recent use of source selection processes, including LPTA. Such a review should, at a minimum, examine the following:

(1) Guidance and directives, including those of the military services, related to the use of appropriate source selection approaches, including LPTA;

(2) Sufficiency of training of the acquisition workforce (to include training offered at the Defense Acquisition University) on the appropriate use of source selection approaches;

(3) Implementation of recent efficiency initiatives, to include "Better Buying Power" initiatives to influence the use of LPTA source selection procedures;

(4) Risks associated with implementing the reverse auction method as part of any LPTA approach for the procurement of critical safety items, personal protective equipment and other complex technologies; and

(5) Waiver guidance and frequency of use on contracts awarded using LPTA procedures.

In conducting the review, the committee encourages the Comptroller General to obtain the views of defense contractors to gain insight into how the use of LPTA source selection procedures affects business decisions and to identify the unintended consequences, if any, resulting from the use of this approach. The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide the findings of the review, along with recommendations to improve the Department's contracting practices, to the congressional defense committees by June 30, 2014.

Utilization of Standardized Services Contract Approval Form

The committee recognizes that the Department of the Army has promoted compliance with important sourcing and management laws through the establishment of a Request for Services Contract Approval Form, which is, essentially, a checklist which conveniently and concisely integrates those laws in one form. Accordingly, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination and consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, to issue policies for implementing a standard checklist to be completed prior to the issuance of solicitation for any new service contract or exercising of any existing contract option for services, including services provided under a goods contract. In implementing a standard checklist, the committee directs the Department to model, to the maximum extent practicable, its policies and checklist on those already used by the Department of the Army.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Section 801—Modification of Reporting Requirement for Department of Defense Business System Acquisition Programs when Initial Operating Capability is not Achieved within Five-Years of Milestone A Approval

This section would amend the reporting requirement imposed on defense business systems (DBS) acquisition programs by section 811 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by clarifying the separate treatment of Major Automated Information Systems (MAIS) DBS and non-MAIS DBS. Specifically, this section would clarify that section 811 is inapplicable to MAIS DBS acquisition programs because such programs are independently subject to critical change reporting under section 2445c of title 10, United States Code. This section would also modify the requirement for non-MAIS DBS reporting a failure to achieve initial operational capacity (IOC) within 5-years of milestone A approval from a critical change report to a report to the Department of Defense pre-certification authority explaining the causes and circumstances surrounding the failure to achieve IOC within the required time.

Section 802—Enhanced Transfer of Technology Developed at Department of Defense Laboratories

This section would establish a 5-year pilot program to allow Department of Defense (DOD) laboratories to license DOD-owned intellectual property that may or may not be patented, and to retain associated royalties consistent with existing statutes on patent licensing, section 209 of title 35, United States Code, and royalties, section 3710c of title 15, United States Code.

Section 803—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services

This section would extend limitations on contract services under section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 111–84), through 2015.

SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 811—Additional Contractor Responsibilities in Regulations Relating to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts

This section would amend section 818 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to provide that the costs associated with the use of counterfeit electronic parts, and the subsequent cost of rework or corrective action that may be required to remedy the use or inclusion of such parts, are allowable costs under Department of Defense contracts if the counterfeit electronic parts were procured from an original manufacturer or its authorized dealer, or from a trusted supplier.

Section 812—Amendments Relating to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts

This section would amend section 818 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to expand the conditions under which covered contractors can qualify for exemption from strict liability associated with rework and corrective action related to counterfeits of obsolete electronic parts.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a section that would further amend section 818 Public Law 112–81.

Section 813—Government-wide Limitations on Allowable Costs for Contractor Compensation

This section would amend section 2324(e)(1)(P) of title 10, United States Code, and section 4304(a) of title 41, United States Code, to replace the current statutory benchmark compensation formula used to determine the amount of contractor compensation that is considered an allowable cost for a federal contract, with the current compensation benchmark amount for fiscal year 2013 of $763,209. This section would limit additional changes to the current compensation baseline to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Employment Cost Index (ECI). This section would also make unallowable the entire cost of compensation for the five most-highly compensated employees of a contractor that was awarded more than $500.0 million in federal contracts in the previous fiscal year.

The committee believes the application of the current formula by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy is flawed, as it has resulted in an escalation of $422,559, or nearly 225 percent, in the 15 years since the compensation cap was established in law. The committee does not believe this escalation reflects the actual adjustments in compensation for defense contractors over this same period due to inflation and other market factors. The committee notes that section 1127 of title 41, United States Code, directs the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy to "review commercially available surveys of executive compensation and, on the basis of the results of the review, determine a benchmark compensation amount to apply for each fiscal year." The Administrator is also directed to consult with the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency and other officials from executive agencies in making the determination. However, rather than using all available data and input from appropriate officials to inform decision-making, it appears that the Administrator has interpreted the requirements of section 1127 to require that the benchmark compensation amount be established at an amount equal to the median amount of the total compensation (total amount of wages, salary, bonuses and deferred compensation) accrued over a 12-month period for the top five highest paid employees in management positions at each home office and each segment of publicly traded U.S. companies with annual sales over $50.0 million. According to the Congressional Budget Office, if the current approach remains in place the compensation cap could be raised to as high as $1.6 million by fiscal year 2020.

Section 814—Inclusion of Additional Cost Estimate Information in Certain Reports

This section would amend section 2432 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the program's baseline cost estimate, along with the associated risk curve and sensitivity of that estimate be provided in the quarterly selected acquisition reports. In addition, this section would require that the reports include the current point estimate bounded by the the low-end and high-end estimates and the associated sensitivity of those estimates, and identification of the primary risk parameters associated with that point estimate. Furthermore, this section would require reporting of estimated termination liability remaining on the contract. Finally, this section would amend section 2334(f) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, to review the information required by this section and to include trend information, a summary of findings and recommendations to improve the cost estimates of the Department of Defense in the annual report to Congress on cost assessment activities.

Section 815—Amendment Relating to Compelling Reasons for Waiving Suspension or Debarment

This section would amend section 2393(b) of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of Defense to make available on a publicly accessible website any determination that there is a compelling reason to solicit an offer from, award a contract to, extend a contract with, or approve a subcontract with an offeror or contractor that has been debarred or suspended by a Federal agency.

Section 816—Requirement that Cost or Price to the Federal Government be Given at Least Equal Importance as Technical or Other Criteria in Evaluating Competitive Proposals for Defense Contracts

This section would amend section 2305(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the head of an agency of the Department of Defense, in prescribing the evaluation factors to be included in each solicitation for competitive proposals, assign importance to cost or price at least equal to all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined. This section would allow the head of an agency to waive the requirement, and it would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress, not later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year, a report containing a list of each waiver issued during the preceding fiscal year.

Section 817—Requirement to Buy American Flags from Domestic Sources

This section would amend section 2533a(b) of title 10, United States Code, to include "a flag of the United States of America" to the list of items that the Department of Defense may not procure unless the item is grown, processed, reused, or produced in the United States.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONTRACTS IN SUPPORT OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ OR AFGHANISTAN

Section 821—Amendments Relating to Prohibition on Contracting with the Enemy

This section would amend section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), regarding the authority of the Secretary of Defense to void a contract upon a determination that a foreign entity performing on the contract is engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners, to:

(1) Lower the threshold for covered contracts from $0.1 million to $0.05 million;

(2) Provide the authority to certain other geographic combatant commands during a contingency operation as defined by section 101(a)(13) of title 10, United States Code; and

(3) Make the authority permanent.

Section 822—Collection of Data Relating to Contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan

This section would amend section 861 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended, to allow for imposition of a penalty on any contractor that does not comply with the policies, guidance or regulations issued pursuant to that section. This section would also amend section 863 of Public Law 110–181 to require that the Annual Joint Report on Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan include information on any penalties imposed on contractors for failing to comply with requirements under section 861(e) of Public Law 110–181.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 831—Extension of Pilot Program on Acquisition of Military Purpose Non-Developmental Items

This section would amend section 866 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by extending the program authority to December 31, 2019.

In February 2013, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics reported to the congressional defense committees that the pilot program for acquisition of military purpose non-developmental items (MPNDI) had not been used even though the Secretary of Defense implemented it through the Defense Federal Acquisition Supplement in June 2011. The committee is aware that there may be confusion about the requirement in section 866 of Public Law 111–383 for a contract under the MPNDI pilot program to be awarded using competitive procedures in accordance with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that section 866 of Public Law 111–383 is clear that any exception to competition requirements provided in the Competition in Contracting Act (10 U.S.C. 2304) applies to MPNDI acquisitions because section 2304(c) is part of chapter 137. However, the committee is concerned that the program has been imple-

mented in a manner that either discourages use of the MPNDI authority, or infers that section 2304(c) of title 10, United States Code, does not apply. The committee encourages the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to review the MPNDI implementation guidance and to clarify that the standard exceptions to competition may be used as appropriate.

The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense has not yet utilized the authorities provided by section 866 of Public Law 111–383, and it continues to believe that, if implemented, the MPNDI program could improve rapid acquisitions of privately-developed, militarily-useful items. This potential for improvement includes prospects for reducing costs, eliminating developmental periods, and expanding the industrial base by including non-traditional contractors.

Section 832—Extension of Authority to Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan

This section would amend section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as amended by section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by extending the authority to acquire products and services produced in countries along a major route of supply in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan through December 31, 2015.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Air Force Force Structure

The committee recognizes the challenges the U.S. Air Force confronts as a result of sequestration, a restricted budget with limited resources to modernize, and an aging aircraft fleet. The committee believes that the Air Force must remain a premier fighting force. To this end, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) created the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force following extensive debate during the last budget cycle regarding the Air Force's Total Force Plan submitted with the President's fiscal year 2013 budget request and as revised in November 2012.

The commission is undertaking a comprehensive study of the structure of the Air Force to determine whether, and how, the structure should be modified to best fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements in a manner consistent with strategy and available resources. The considerations of the commission, outlined in section 363(a)(2) of Public Law 112–239, state that the commission shall give particular consideration to evaluating a structure that:

(1) Meets current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands;

(2) Achieves an appropriate balance between the regular and Reserve Components, taking advantage of the unique strengths and capabilities of each;

(3) Ensures that the regular and Reserve Components have the capacity needed to support current and anticipated homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States;

(4) Provides for sufficient numbers of Active Duty members of the Air Force to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the Reserve Components of the Air Force could be recruited;

(5) Maintains a peacetime rotation force to support operational tempo goals of 1:2 for active-duty members of the Air Force and 1:5 for members of the Reserve Components; and

(6) Maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness.

As the committee awaits the report by the commission due by February 1, 2014, the committee seeks to understand the measures the Air Force is taking to retrain airmen affected by the elimination of weapons systems and equipment under the November 2012 Total Force Plan to ensure mission readiness. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, by October 1, 2013, the plan to transition qualified airmen, whose weapons systems or positions are being terminated, to new skills and weapons systems.

Air Force Materiel Command Metrics

The committee notes that the Air Force is undertaking a significant reorganization of Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) that the Secretary of the Air Force indicates will improve warfighter support, drive standard processes, improve life-cycle acquisition management, and reduce overhead. Specifically, the Air Force is reducing more than 1,000 positions across the command at an estimated annual savings of more than $100.0 million.

As the Air Force implements this reorganization, the committee expects the Secretary to adhere to the reporting requirements in section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, and the reporting requirement in section 2814 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). While the committee agrees it is imperative to generate efficiencies across the Air Force enterprise, the committee also believes it is essential to preserve critical functions and capabilities at AFMC installations.

The committee notes that RAND Project Air Force, in its 2012 report "Air Force Materiel Command Reorganization Analysis," recommended AFMC develop and use a suite of metrics to track mission performance against goals. These metrics would facilitate root-cause analysis of any inefficiencies resulting from the reorganization. The committee is pleased that AFMC, through the AFMC corporate governance structure outlined in the 2013 AFMC strategic plan, currently uses these metrics to monitor progress towards meeting AFMC's enduring priorities.

The committee seeks to better understand how AFMC is measuring organizational successes and identifying challenges arising

from the new 5-Center construct. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to adopt an additional metric which measures progress on AFMC objectives against a designated pre-reorganization baseline. The committee also directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by January 1, 2014, on AFMC's internal metrics. The report should include, but not be limited to, command metrics, tracking, and data collected as of the report due date. The report should be submitted quarterly and in an unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary. Updated reports should be submitted to the aforementioned committees on a quarterly basis through January 1, 2015.

Air Sea Battle Office

The committee is aware that the military services established the Air Sea Battle (ASB) office in 2012 as a result of the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) disestablishment. USJFCOM had an office focused on the Air Sea Battle concept integration, specifically as it related to requirements, capability gaps and shortfalls, projects and programs directly related to effectively employing in an anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) contingency operation.

The committee is concerned whether the placement of the current ASB office outside of the Joint Staff is the most logical and effective location for integrating ASB concepts across the services. The committee believes the Secretary of Defense should evaluate the ASB office to see if it is accomplishing its goals to enable and prepare the U.S. military to effectively operate in an A2/AD environment, and whether the office provides a unique function and perspective or it duplicates other efforts carried out elsewhere in the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to determine the effectiveness of the ASB office and whether the office is carrying out a unique function or duplicates other efforts. Should the Secretary conclude that the ASB office is effective and non-duplicative of other efforts, the Secretary should determine whether the ASB office should continue as is, be modified, or placed within the Joint Staff. The committee directs the Secretary to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2014, on the results of the analysis and the future of the ASB office.

Air Force High Consequence Information Technology Services

The committee is aware that while currently Air Force Space Command can rapidly contract for mission critical high consequence information technology needs, new contracting mechanisms may negatively impact that current capability. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by October 1, 2013 on its plan to preserve and sustain the high consequence, mission critical information technology services procurement for fiscal year 2014 and beyond. This plan should address how the Air Force, including Air Force Space Command, will provision for rapidly contracting for mission critical, high consequence, network command and control (C2), cyber, nu-

clear-related, and combatant commander mission support responsibilities.

Assessment of Cyber Centers of Academic Excellence

The committee is aware that the cyber security and information assurance manpower needs are growing increasingly in both total numbers as well as in disciplines where new skills are needed.

In order to develop an adequate pool of appropriately skilled individuals, the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security have jointly established a program to certify institutions of higher learning that provides curricula for information assurance education. The certification program for Centers of Academic Excellence (CAE) includes a rigorous application and screening process, which focuses on identifying schools offering a highly technical and interdisciplinary curriculum. The committee believes that leveraging CAEs may help the Department of Defense achieve its near-term goals of increasing the number of qualified cyber personnel. However, the committee believes that the current certification program should be assessed to determine its strengths as well as areas where improvement is needed.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration/Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military services and the Director, National Security Agency, to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the National Security Agency/Department of Homeland Security Centers of Academic Excellence program. The report should include an assessment of criteria for certification of institutions, mechanisms for increasing collaboration between Department of Defense and certified institutions, and mechanisms for increasing the number of graduates from CAE-certified institutions into the Department of Defense's cyber workforce.

Briefing to Congress on ICBM motor stockpile

The committee understands the need for cost savings, but is concerned about the impact that budget cuts, industry consolidation, and lack of sufficient and stable demand have had on the industrial base for strategic solid rocket motors. The committee believes that a healthy solid rocket motor industrial base is critical. However, the committee is also aware of commercial launch systems that use surplus solid-fuel intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) motors, in accordance with existing laws and restrictions.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the status of the surplus ICBM motor stockpile. The briefing should include, at a minimum, the current inventory of surplus ICBM motors; a cost-benefit analysis of using surplus ICBM motors for space launch versus acquisition of new motors, including potential taxpayer savings and the associated costs such as surplus motor maintenance, modification for space launch, and possible destruction; and the potential effects on the solid rocket motor industrial base as well as on civil, govern-

ment, and military launch vehicle markets of adjustments to the existing laws and restrictions.

Cadastral Geographic Information Systems Inventory

The committee recognizes and supports the efforts of the Installations and Environment Business Enterprise Integration (I&E BEI) to modernize the parcel and land inventory or "cadastral" records to meet the challenges of the future. The work accomplished thus far to develop, modernize, and consolidate the Department of Defense's real property asset inventory should continue to be a high priority, particularly given that real property asset management continues to be a GAO High Risk activity (GAO–13–359T) and the Department of Defense still cannot accurately account for its real property assets or the environmental liabilities thereon (GAO–13–271R). The committee recommends that the Department of Defense I&E BEI work with other agencies within the Federal Government to develop a current, accurate, interoperable cadastral geographic information systems based inventory that eliminates duplicate and obsolete activities.

Comptroller General Review of the Department of Defense's Implementation of Civilian Personnel Furloughs

The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense waited so late in the fiscal year to explore options and the potential impact resulting from the required reductions in spending in accordance with the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25). The Department's civilian workforce is key to carrying out its roles and responsibilities. The Department has announced that it will implement furloughs of the civilian workforce in order to meet its required reductions. According to the Secretary of Defense's May 14, 2013, memorandum, certain civilian employees will be excepted from furloughs. In light of this, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess what criteria were used in the determination of which civilian employees to except from furloughs and how the Department planned for, implemented, and is monitoring furloughs of the civilian workforce to include what challenges the Department has faced in its implementation and cost savings realized. The Comptroller General should submit the results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 10, 2014.

Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2013, on the steps that the Department is taking to minimize any negative impact on the morale of the civilian workforce and long-term consequences on recruiting and retention of the civilian workforce.

Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Cyber Resiliency

The committee notes that the national and economic security of the United States depends on the ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to conduct its mission-essential functions across a wide range of potential emergencies, including localized natural

disasters and accidents, as well as technological and/or attack-related emergencies. Historically, nuclear threats to DOD locations led to the development of leadership succession plans and identifying alternate work facilities. However, events such as Hurricane Katrina, have demonstrated that the need for effective continuity of operations planning on a broader scope is necessary. Further, the committee is concerned that as the cyber threat continues to evolve and escalate, the information systems and networks upon which the Department's operations and continuity plans are dependent may become unavailable, infiltrated, and/or destroyed.

The committee is aware that the Department's Continuity Program requires the Department to develop continuity of operations plans that would allow it to conduct its mission-essential functions under any circumstances across the spectrum of threats on the assumption that no warning of attack or event will be received. Such plans should identify, among other things, information systems and networks that are needed to execute their plans, and those information systems should have contingency plans that recognize their support to the ability to maintain continuity of operations. The Department's Continuity Program also requires the Department to exercise its plans to validate planning assumptions and to take action to address deficiencies that are identified. Given the number of cyber incidents occurring within the Department and the sophisticated nature of the threats, the committee is concerned about the extent to which the Department of Defense has developed and exercised its continuity of operations plans for a degraded cyber environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Department of Defense continuity of operations planning for a degraded cyber environment, and to submit a report on the findings to the review to the congressional defense committees by January 7, 2014. The review should include the following:

(1) The extent to which the Department has oversight of DOD component efforts to plan for and conduct continuity of operations in a degraded cyber environment;

(2) The extent to which the Department has identified information systems and networks that are necessary to support DOD's continuity of operations;

(3) The extent to which the Department has coordinated its continuity of operations planning efforts with the Department's information system and network contingency planning efforts;

(4) The extent to which the Department has exercised its continuity of operations plans in a cyber degraded environment through identification and action to address any deficiencies; and

(5) Any additional matters that the Comptroller General determines to be relevant.

Comptroller General Review of Conduct of Roles and Missions Analysis

Section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) created section 118b of title 10, United States Code, which requires a comprehensive assessment of

the roles and missions of the Armed Forces and the core competencies and capabilities of the Department of Defense to perform and support such roles and missions. The committee notes this section contains specific requirements for the conduct of the Quadrennial Roles and Mission Review (QRMR) and is disappointed that the Department has failed to fully comply with the law. By statute, the Secretary of Defense, after giving appropriate consideration to recommendations of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, is to identify:

(1) The core mission areas of the Armed Forces;

(2) The core competencies and capabilities that are associated with the performance or support of such core mission areas;

(3) The elements of the Department that are responsible for providing the core competencies and capabilities;

(4) Any gaps in the ability of the elements of the Department to provide for core competencies and capabilities;

(5) Any unnecessary duplication of effort; and

(6) A plan to address identified gaps and reduce unnecessary duplication of effort.

Rather than conduct the QRMR in 2011, as mandated, the Secretary provided the committee with a summary of the results of a presidentially-directed strategic review over 5 months after the deadline for the 2012 QRMR report to Congress. While the committee is pleased that the Department took steps to identify strategic interests in an attempt to guide defense priorities and spending for the coming decade, the strategic guidance is not a substitute for the QRMR. Furthermore, while the strategic guidance does broadly identify primary missions of the U.S. Armed Forces, such as counterterrorism, deterring and defeating aggression, and projecting power despite anti-access/area denial challenges, it does not address items (2) through (6), as noted above and required by section 118b of title 10, United States Code.

Moreover, section 222 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a future years mission budget at the same time as, and in addition to, the submission of the budget pursuant to section 1105 of title 31 for any fiscal year. The future years mission budget is required to organize the military programs of the Department of Defense on the basis of both major force programs and the core mission areas identified under the most recent QRMR. The committee notes that the Department has also failed to consistently meet this requirement. In a partial attempt to comply with it, the Department provided the committee with a document this year which merely highlighted certain areas of the budget request for fiscal year 2013 which could be connected to the primary missions identified in the strategic guidance.

The committee believes the failure to identify core mission areas, core competencies, capability gaps, unnecessary duplications, and plans for addressing any such gaps or duplications, undermines national security and wastes valuable defense funds in a time of constrained budgets. The committee is disappointed that the Department did not leverage the requirement for the 2012 QRMR as a tool for reducing waste, while also improving its joint warfighting capability. The committee is also aware that in March 2013, the

Secretary of Defense announced that the Department would undertake a "Strategic Choices and Management Review". While the committee applauds active leadership on these matters, the committee notes that title 10 of United States Code, provides for a detailed and continuous framework for such reviews. The committee is concerned that although section 118b of title 10, United States Code, was enacted in January 2008, it appears that little has been done to improve QRMR processes to enhance subsequent reviews or to inform the Quadrennial Defense Review, resulting in the self-initiation of several other duplicative, short-term reviews by the Department.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the processes used by Secretary of Defense in the conduct of the 2012 QRMR and the preparation of the fiscal year 2013 future years mission budget. The Comptroller should provide a report to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2014, on the findings of the review, along with recommendations for improving the Department's conduct of future QRMRs and preparation of the future years mission budget.

Coordination of Cyber and Electronic Warfare Capabilities

The committee notes that significant advances have been made in both the cyber and electronic warfare (EW) domains. The committee is aware that there is increasing overlap between these domains, particularly with the advanced capabilities of next-generation EW platforms. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the status and level of coordination of research, development, test and evaluation efforts within the EW and cyber disciplines that bridge, or have corresponding dependencies, across these fields.

Cost Drivers in the Department of Defense

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense is not like a commercial entity, though in many ways it can benefit from analysis and best practices also present in the commercial sector. In a time of fiscal austerity, the committee believes that the Department should do more to understand the major cost drivers within its business practices in an effort to contain costs and ensure efficiency. The committee also recognizes that there will be instances where effectiveness will be more important than efficiency, and will rightly accept increased costs for things that it needs, particularly when they pertain to the security of the Nation or protecting the life and limb of our service members. The committee believes, however, that such decisions should be made consciously and with full understanding of the risks, rewards, and subsequent costs. The committee encourages the Department to utilize tools such as the Strategic Management Plan to increase attention and collection of data on the cost drivers within the business processes of the Department.

Critical Program Information

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has issued guidance related to the protection of critical program information, including requirements for the development and implementation of program protection plans for significant developmental activities where the risk of compromise of that information would allow an adversary to clone, counter, or defeat crucial capabilities. However, the committee is concerned about reports indicating that many recent designs of weapon systems have been compromised by foreign nation-state adversaries. For example, as noted elsewhere in this report, the 2012 Defense Security Service report, "Targeting Technology: A Trend Analysis of Reporting from Defense Industry", indicated that there are increases in aggressive cyber collection activities which target cleared contractor networks in attempts to obtain sensitive U.S. information and technologies. The committee is also aware that in a January 2013 report, "Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat," the Defense Science Board (DSB) observed that the Department's poor cyber hygiene and lack of personal and command accountability for cyber actions pose serious threats to the secure use of defense networks and systems. Furthermore, the DSB called for development of more effective policies, operational rules and consequences for breeches of policy, including the development and tracking of performance measures, such as tracking of computer security violations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by August 1, 2013, that details the known network cyber intrusions resulting in compromise of critical program information related to Department of Defense weapon systems, information systems development, or other research and development initiatives from January 1, 2000, until August 1, 2013. The briefing should include:

(1) Information on the critical program information that was compromised;

(2) The source of the network that was compromised;

(3) What systems or developmental activities were compromised; and

(4) The suspected origin of the cyber intrusion.

Cyber Standards Framework

The committee is aware of the recent Executive Order "Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity," included language that directs the development of a framework for reducing cyber risks to critical infrastructure within the next year. The committee expects that the Cybersecurity Framework, developed under the leadership of the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, will incorporate a set of standards, methodologies, procedures, and processes that align policy, business, and technological approaches to address cyber risks, including, where possible, voluntary consensus standards and industry best practices. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to explore ways in which to incentivize, wherever possible, the adoption of the Cybersecurity Framework, such as through contracts and other agree-

ments with relevant outside vendors and utilities. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on actions being considered to encourage adoption of the Cybersecurity Framework.

Data Management and Protection

The committee is aware that the military departments have significant requirements for data usage, as well as data and information protection, for the development, acquisition, sustainment, maintenance, sale, and final disposition of nearly all military equipment and services. The committee is concerned that the combatant commands and the services generally do not view data management as a military critical function necessary for the efficient and effective operation of the services, and thus do not place a high enough priority on the investment of people or resources to carry out those tasks. The services spend a significant amount of time and resources on data collection, cleansing, and organization for individual acquisition and sustainment programs, but little time is spent looking at data management at an enterprise level to manage data standardization and interoperability across networks, platforms, or domains to ensure entrance of appropriate and accurate data into support enterprise activities and individual programs. With the emergence of the Joint Information Environment (JIE), the committee sees an opportunity for the Department of Defense to implement a comprehensive, enterprise-wide capability that will provide for data collection, management, and protection that can be utilized across the Department's functional communities for human resources, finance, logistics, intelligence, and materiel development. The committee believes such a data management and protection strategy should be a core tenet in the development and implementation of the JIE. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to work with the affected functional communities to ensure that the JIE provides the data interoperability, enterprise management, and life cycle sustainment to maintain the support community, requirements generators, training forces, warfighters, and materiel developers throughout the military.

Defense Intelligence Collection Management

The committee recognizes the importance of effective collection management in the Department of Defense to enable optimal collection against intelligence targets that are a priority of the military services and combatant commands. The committee is aware that the Department identifies a collection management strategy as the method used by a collection manager to establish, prioritize, and submit collection requirements in a deliberate, focused, integrated, and synchronized manner across multiple intelligence disciplines. The goals of this strategy are: (1) to identify, allocate, and apply national, theater and tactical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance resources and capabilities; (2) to task these resources, submit requirements, and collect in a way that effectively and efficiently answers the priority intelligence requirements; (3) to

support analytic intelligence information shortfalls and gaps; and (4) to support the development of effective and responsive collection plans to ground the adaptive planning process.

Based on feedback from the combatant commands, the committee is concerned that the Department has not established the proper tools and training to fully enable the most effective collection and mission management. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide a briefing to the congressional defense and the congressional intelligence committees by February 1, 2014, on the Department's activities to support effective intelligence collection management and mission management.

Enterprise Query and Correlation Pilot

The committee applauds the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence for implementing the Enterprise Query and Correlation Pilot required by section 925 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee supports the goals of this pilot to demonstrate cross-agency, large scale, distributed information query and correlation. The committee anticipates that the end result of this pilot will deliver reusable services with validated mission utility through the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue providing adequate resources for this effort in order to ensure timely completion and, as applicable, to incorporate the results into current intelligence systems.

Exploitation of Foreign Commercial Cellular Networks

The committee recognizes that foreign commercial cellular networks have posed a significant challenge as a source of command and control for insurgent forces in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as well as providing critical initiation techniques for improvised explosive devices. The committee understands that U.S. forces will continue to face similar threats in other parts of the world and must be positioned with the necessary technologies to combat these different threat environments. The committee believes that future force protection will require the ability to both exploit and defend against modern commercial cellular networks. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to examine the various regions within the different geographic combatant commands to understand the possible threats from the commercial cellular environment, and to ensure that the Department has the capabilities to exploit and defend against any vulnerabilities.

Global Response Force

The committee considers it a national priority to maintain the capability to rapidly project military power in support of our national interests. To that end, the committee seeks to provide the support necessary to maintain a robust expeditionary capability. A global response force that is ready to deploy at any time, to any location, by forcible entry, if required, is a critical element necessary to fulfill the U.S. national security objectives. A fully capable global re-

sponse force provides strategic depth in order to provide effective crisis response and serves as a creditable deterrent, supporting diplomatic initiatives and the application of national power.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to prioritize the identification of the current operational requirements and capability gaps for an effective global response force and ensure that a fully developed joint operational concept is in place to support the national military strategy. Further, the committee encourages additional investment in joint training programs and joint exercises that are necessary to further develop an effective global response force capability in accordance with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Joint Force 2020 construct.

Guidance on the Use of Borrowed Military Manpower

As the Department of Defense (DOD) makes reductions in its Total Force workforce composition, military, civilians, and contractors, the committee is increasingly concerned about the use of military manpower to perform functions previously performed by either civilians or contractors. While the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force have indicated they do not anticipate wholesale substitutions using military personnel, the Secretary of the Army, in testimony before the committee in April 2013, predicted that the Army could use as many as 8,000 uniformed personnel to fill positions during the current fiscal year because reduced funding for training has created time gaps in the duty day and freed up soldiers for other duties. The committee understands the need for temporary, limited local command use of military personnel performing civilian work to accomplish mission objectives, but the committee notes that use of military manpower outside the service member's military occupational specialty poses risks to readiness and training, and raises issues of unsustainable costs.

Consistent with "Guidance Related to the Utilization of Military Manpower to Perform Certain Functions," issued March 2, 2012, by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, the committee expects the Department of Defense to calculate the cost of using military personnel in lieu of civilian personnel or service contractors to perform non-military tasks in accordance with Directive Type Memorandum (DTM)–09–007, "Estimating and Comparing the Full Costs of Civilian and Military Manpower and Contract Support" or any succeeding guidance. For the purposes of this direction, military tasks are as defined in DOD Directive 1100.4, DOD Instruction 1100.22, and any successor or amplifying guidance as issued by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the use of borrowed military manpower (BMM) and to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 30, 2014, regarding the impacts on military readiness and training in fiscal year 2013, including how the Department weighed operational risks and capabilities and readiness levels with BMM calculations and decisions. The Comptroller General also should examine the extent to which manpower costs were calculated using the DTM 09–00. The committee understands that the Government

Accountability Office is undertaking an extensive body of work regarding the impacts of sequestration on the Department of Defense and further directs the Comptroller General to include the use of BMM as a part of this effort.

Guidance Regarding the Conversion of Functions Performed by Non-appropriated Fund Employees

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–439) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Department of Defense to clarify that the December 2011 guidance entitled Prohibition on Converting Certain Functions to Contract Performance "applies as well to functions performed by Non-Appropriated Fund employees, which is consistent with section 2461 of title 10, United States Code." Section 2461 ensures that work performed by Department of Defense civilian employees is not outsourced without first conducting a formal cost comparison process; the committee notes that the law includes no exceptions for Non-Appropriated Fund employees. However, the committee is aware that the Department has not clarified the guidance and directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to issue the clarification guidance by July 8, 2013.

Input into National Intelligence Priorities Framework

The committee continues to support and commend efforts of the Department of Defense and the intelligence community to further integrate and coordinate intelligence activities. The committee believes that as integration continues, it is essential to periodically assess and ensure that the Department of Defense and the intelligence community are meeting the intelligence needs of the warfighter.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman, Joints Chiefs of Staff to submit an assessment to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by October 1, 2013, evaluating the extent to which the coordination process for the National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF) incorporates the intelligence priorities of the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments. Such assessment should include a description of the input from the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments regarding significant intelligence priorities; the process used to communicate such input; and the results of such input. The assessment should also include specific feedback from each of the combatant commands and military departments regarding the NIPF coordination process and any recommendations for improving the input of the Joint Staff, combatant commands, and military departments to that process.

Integrated Science and Technology Campus for the Defense Intelligence Agency

The committee recognizes the important role that science and technology research play in advancing the mission of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA). As threats become increasingly more complex and sophisticated, DIA science and technology programs will need to work in synergy and leverage assets available in the

interagency, academic, and industrial research community to address new interdisciplinary challenges.

The committee believes that the Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) 2005 vision of an integrated science and technology campus for DIA is critical component of its ability to provide indications and warning of future technology threats, as well as in-depth analyses that could monitor and develop countermeasures or mitigation measures for those threat technologies, as necessary.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the progress of the BRAC 2005 vision. The briefing should address the following:

(1) How DIA is leveraging other Government agency expertise to fulfill its mission;

(2) How DIA is utilizing or plans to utilize, academic, industry, and non-profit research organization capabilities to enhance its science and technology focus;

(3) To what extent DIA is at space capacity at its current facilities;

(4) What facilities have been considered, designed, or constructed to realize the integrated campus; and

(5) What resources are required to achieve the BRAC 2005 vision.

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Aircraft Utilization

The committee is concerned that there is a growing divide between combatant commanders' day-to-day utilization of airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) aircraft and the Department of Defense's current formal requirements generation process that focuses on meeting specific contingency plan-related metrics. The committee believes that non-combat, "peacetime" ISR demand is at least as important, if not more important, than highly speculative predictions regarding ISR demand during combat operations. For example, the committee notes that the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 proposal to retire RQ–4 Block 30 Global Hawk aircraft was based on changes to contingency plan requirements rather than on daily, ongoing ISR missions and unfulfilled combatant command ISR needs.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a classified briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by November 1, 2013, that includes a detailed layout of ISR aircraft utilization in fiscal year 2013. The briefing should address all manned ISR aircraft, and all unmanned ISR aircraft in the MQ–1/9 and larger class of UAS. The briefing should specify the number of systems, types of missions, flight hours, and other operational data.

Non-Perimeter Cyber Defenses

The committee notes that the Department of Defense continues to make progress in securing its networks from cyber threats. In order to combat new and evolving threats, the committee believes

that new tactics, techniques, and technologies will be needed to increase the cyber security of defense information systems. Recent reports from commercial computer security firms indicate that U.S. adversaries increasingly are using techniques that can compromise "perimeter defenses." The committee is concerned that the Department's cyber security posture will continue to be weakened without the investigation and implementation of new, emerging protection technologies.

The committee encourages the Department to look at new cyber security approaches, such as "dynamic maneuvering" or "moving target" technologies that can help to proactively reduce the attack surfaces of the Department and increase mission resiliency and survivability. The committee is particularly interested in how these technologies might be incorporated into existing networks, as well as the future Joint Information Enterprise. The committee encourages the Department to examine these technologies and include their findings in future quarterly cyber operations briefings.

Open-Source Intelligence Utilization

The committee notes that open-source intelligence (OSINT) is intelligence that is produced from publicly available information collected, exploited, and disseminated to an appropriate audience for the purpose of addressing a specific intelligence requirement. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) directed the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for OSINT to be incorporated into the larger military intelligence strategy. The committee recognizes that the accessibility of open-source information has increased significantly in recent years due to rapid growth of international internet use and consideration as a global commons. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide a briefing to the congressional defense and the congressional intelligence committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the current status of the OSINT strategy and operations within the Department of Defense. The briefing should include the following:

(1) An overview of the current strategy for OSINT collection, to meet the intelligence priorities of the military services and combatant commands;

(2) A description of all OSINT activities within the military services and combatant commands including the level of coordination and deconfliction between ongoing joint efforts;

(3) A description of the current level of coordination with the Director of National Intelligence Open Source Center;

(4) Gaps in OSINT capabilities within the Department;

(5) Research, development, test and evaluation efforts in the Department related to collection, processing and sharing of open-source intelligence; and

(6) Recommendations for future improvements in the Department's OSINT strategy and efforts.

Pilot to Counter Brokers of Transnational Criminal Organizations

The committee is aware that the complex pathways and instrumentalities of the global economic system provide both a source of revenue and backdrop in which to hide for a number of nation-state and non-state actors. In particular, Transnational Criminal Organizations (TCOs) have increasingly been able to use the global economic environment to their advantage. TCOs have grown more complex over time, and so has our ability to defeat them, however, this complexity has challenged our ability to access and use collective information available.

The committee believes that criminal cartel organizations are hosting themselves in U.S. cities and may be teaming with terrorists also embedded in the United States to fund terror networks overseas. These networks provide sustained and substantial funding to pay operatives, support families, purchase and traffic weapons, indoctrinate and recruit new members, train, travel, and bribe officials and also perpetrate billions of dollars worth of fraud against banks, businesses and Governments. The list of crimes that the new international criminal organizations are involved in includes the trafficking of narcotics, humans, weapons, illegally poached animal remains, and chemical, biological, and nuclear material. Disrupting the means and mechanisms through which these networks move money will significantly disrupt their operations, but remains the most challenging piece of the puzzle to unravel.

The key to dissecting these financial networks is to identify the "brokers;" a category of individuals who facilitates financial activities. Brokers may be employees of a single TCO, such as a terrorist group or drug cartel, or they may be independent operators charging variable fees based on external factors such as interest rates, dollar amount, and denomination of currency. These individuals may work in banking, real estate, insurance, own small businesses, or simply have legitimate access to the financial system. The information needed to unravel these global networks is available through various technical, commercial, open source and Government-owned means, yet require experienced subject matter experts to "connect the dots;" an ability directly proportional to their access to information across the community of interest.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, to establish a pilot program to determine the information requirements for identifying and countering TCO brokers, and to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act on the results of the pilot program.

Science and Technology Community Intelligence Needs Planning

The committee applauds recent efforts by the Department of Defense science and technology (S&T) community to reinvigorate its relationship with the intelligence community. The committee is aware that in 2010, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering drafted an Intelligence Needs Plan in order to formally convey the S&T communities' intelligence requirements

to the intelligence community. The committee believes that such efforts are important in order to position science and technology for the development of capabilities for new and emerging threat areas. The committee is concerned that the focus of intelligence activities for the past 10 years has been primarily focused on near-term, operationally-oriented support that consequently, the capabilities to do long-term, open-ended estimations have atrophied. Creating a demand signal for such analyses would both rebuild needed intelligence skills and support better S&T planning.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate by February 1, 2014, on the intelligence requirements of the science and technology community, as well as the process by which the intelligence community would satisfy those requirements.

Software Assurance Policy

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is in the process of developing a baseline software assurance policy for the entire life cycle of covered systems in response to section 933 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). The committee believes that any such guidance and direction for Department program managers should conform with internationally recognized, consensus-based security assurance standards, and should explore options for accepting both self-certification or third-party certification for compliance purposes. For example, the committee believes that this software assurance policy should be developed in compliance with the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum for Chief Information Officers and Senior Procurement Executive's regarding Technology Neutrality dated January 7, 2011. The committee also believes that any future software assurance policy that include requirements concerning Federal participation in the development and use of voluntary consensus standards should be conducted in accordance with the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, section 272 of title 15, United States Code, and the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–119.

Space Training

The committee notes that the U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) commissioned a study on the Joint Space Individual Training and Education Needs Assessment (JSITENA). This study, which concluded in September 2012, defined and analyzed the joint space training and education environment and recommended solutions to existing gaps, shortfalls, and redundancies in preparation of officers and enlisted personnel to support joint space missions.

The committee commends STRATCOM on the study and supports the recommendations identified in the JSITENA which improve integration, find efficiencies, and identify opportunities to

better meet joint requirements across the services and combatant commands.

Technical Defense Intelligence Training

The committee supports training for the Defense intelligence workforce, particularly in the area of technical intelligence, as a critical investment in national security. The expansion of advanced sensors and platforms is increasing the volume of technical intelligence and the demand for intelligence exploitation. When necessary, based on Government capacity, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider appropriately cleared non-Government providers of specialized technical intelligence training if providers can meet Defense intelligence needs and reduce Government costs.

Training Standards for Department of Defense Cyber Missions

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is in the process of staffing a number of national cyber forces under U.S. Cyber Command, including national mission teams, combatant command mission teams, and cyber protection platoons. The committee is also aware that as part of this process, the Department is working to establish a joint standard to provide some level of standardization and compatibility among forces being supplied by the military services. The committee encourages the Department to continue developing these training standards for cyber forces, but believes that the Department should consider the scalability and sustainability of such training. The committee is aware that the Department already faces serious challenges in building and sustaining its cyber forces, and the increased demands from U.S. Cyber Command make that challenge even more acute. Furthermore, the committee recognizes that the military services already have training demands to meet their own statutory requirements to man, train and equip forces for their networks, and that those requirements must be taken into consideration as well.

The committee is concerned that the process for determining a joint training standard may be settling on a proposed standard too quickly, without sufficient analysis to support the scalability demands on the services. In addition, the committee believes that such a standard should include an assessment of the current training and education capabilities inherent in the services to determine if the current infrastructure meets the personnel training pipeline, as well as if there are any gaps that will need to be resourced in the future. The committee also notes that any standard should include the means for leveraging commercial standards and certifications to reduce the burden on departmental infrastructure.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the cyber force training needs of the Department. The briefing should include the current and proposed training standard and the Department's process for expanding the training across the force. The committee also expects that future quarterly cyber operations briefings will include

updates on the manning and training metrics for U.S. Cyber Command national mission teams.

Vulnerability of Tactical Data Links in Denied Areas

The committee believes that future conflicts against threats with anti-access/area-denial capabilities could see significant threats to U.S. airborne and ground tactical data links. However, the committee is concerned that many such data links are not currently designed or funded to operate against a robust electromagnetic warfare threat. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, to provide a classified briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2013, that describes the potential vulnerabilities of current and planned tactical data links, along with a summary of development efforts to address these vulnerabilities.

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 re-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—Revisions to composition of transition plan for defense business enterprise architecture

This section would revise the definition for legacy systems in section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to align with the updated business systems investment review process.

SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Section 911—National Security Space Satellite Reporting Policy

This section would amend chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code, to add a notification, required of the Secretary of Defense, of each attempt by a foreign actor to disrupt, degrade, or destroy a U.S. national security space capability.

The notification shall be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 48 hours after the Secretary determines that there is reason to believe such attempt occurred. Not later than 10 days after the date on which the Secretary determines that there is reason to believe such attempt occurred, further information should be provided including the name and a brief description of the national security space capability that was impacted by such attempt; a description of the attempt, including the foreign actor, the date and time of the attempt, and any related ca-

pability outage and the mission impact of such outage; and any other information considered relevant by the Secretary.

The appropriate committees are defined as the congressional defense committees, and with respect to a U.S. national security space capability that is intelligence-related, the congressional intelligence committees.

The committee notes the Director of National Intelligence's 2013 Statement for the Record Worldwide Threat Assessment that threats to vital United States space services will increase during the next decade as disruptive and destructive counter-space capabilities are developed.

Section 912—National Security Space Defense and Protection

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council to conduct a review in response to the near-term and long-term threats to the national security space systems of the United States. The review should include:

(1) The range of strategic options available to address such threats, in terms of deterring hostile actions, defeating hostile actions, or surviving hostile actions until such actions conclude;

(2) Strategies and plans to counter such threats, including resilience, reconstitution, disaggregation, and other appropriate concepts; and

(3) Existing and planned architectures, warfighter requirements, technology development, systems, workforce, or other factors related to addressing such threats.

The National Research Council should also identify recommend courses of action to address the threats, including potential barriers or limiting factors in implementing such courses of action.

This section would also modify section 911(f)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2271), to include a description of how the Department of Defense and the intelligence community plan to provide the necessary national security capabilities, through alternative space, airborne, or ground systems, if a foreign actor degrades, denies access to, or destroys U.S. national security space capabilities.

Section 913—Space Acquisition Strategy

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, in consultation with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, to establish a strategy for the multi-year procurement of commercial satellite services to include:

(1) An analysis of financial or other benefits to multi-year acquisition approaches;

(2) An analysis of the risks associated with such an approach;

(3) An identification of methods to address planning, programming, budgeting, and execution challenges to such an approach, to include consideration of methods to address poten-

tial termination liability or cancellation costs associated with these types of contracts;

(4) An identification of any changes needed in the requirements development and approval processes of the Department of Defense to facilitate effective and efficient implementation of such strategy; and,

(5) An identification of any necessary changes to policy, procedures, regulation, or legislation in order for such strategy to be successful.

This section would also require the strategy and the elements supporting it to be provided to the congressional defense committees by the Under Secretary not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 914—Space Control Mission Report

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the space control mission of the Department of Defense.

Section 915—Responsive Launch

This section would require a study by the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space on responsive, low-cost launch efforts to include a review of existing and past operationally responsive, low-cost launch capabilities; a technology assessment of various methods to develop an operationally responsive, low-cost launch capability; and an assessment of the viability of any other innovative methods, such as secondary payload adapters on existing launch vehicles. In addition, this section would require a report from the Executive Agent for Space regarding the results of the above mentioned study, as well as a consolidated plan for development within the Department of an operationally responsive, low-cost launch capability.

The committee notes that there are multiple ongoing efforts in the Department, including Air Force, Army, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs. The committee is concerned that these efforts may be duplicative and are not fully coordinated across the Department.

SUBTITLE C—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 921—Revision of Secretary of Defense Authority to Engage in Commercial Activities as Security for Intelligence Collection Activities

This section would amend current statutory authority for the Secretary of Defense to authorize the conduct of those commercial activities necessary to provide security for authorized intelligence collection activities abroad undertaken by the Department of Defense. This section would:

(1) Delete the requirement that the Secretary of Defense designate a single office within the Defense Intelligence Agency to be responsible for the management and supervision of all com-

mercial activities authorized by the intelligence commercial activity statute (10 U.S.C. 431–437);

(2) Change the annual audit requirement to a biennial audit requirement;

(3) Add the congressional defense committees to the reporting requirement; and

(4) Insert a definition of "congressional intelligence committees" for purposes of section 437 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 922—Department of Defense Intelligence Priorities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a written policy governing the internal coordination and prioritization of intelligence priorities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments to improve identification of the intelligence needs of the Department of Defense. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to identify any significant intelligence gaps of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments. The Secretary would provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees regarding the policy established under this section and any identified significant intelligence gaps.

Section 923—Defense Clandestine Service

This section would prohibit the use of 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014 for the Defense Clandestine Service to be obligated or expended for the Defense Clandestine Service until such time as the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate that the Defense Clandestine Service is designed primarily to fulfill priorities of the Department of Defense that are unique to the Department of Defense or otherwise unmet; and provide unique capabilities to the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to: design metrics that will be used to ensure that the Defense Clandestine Service is employed in the manner certified; provide annual assessments for 5-years based on the metrics established; submit prompt notifications of any significant changes; and provide quarterly briefings on deployments and collection activities.

Section 924—Prohibition on National Intelligence Program Consolidation

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2014, to execute: the separation of the portion of the

Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program from the rest of the Department of Defense budget; the consolidation of the portion of the Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program within the Department of Defense budget; or the establishment of a new appropriations account or appropriations account structure for such funds.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to jointly brief the congressional defense and intelligence committees not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act on any planning relating to future execution that has occurred during the past two years and any anticipated future planning and related efforts.

The committee is concerned that the executive branch has failed to notify the appropriate congressional committees about its continuing efforts to pursue consolidation of the portion of the Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program.

SUBTITLE D—CYBERSPACE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 931—Modification of Requirement for Inventory of Department of Defense Tactical Data Link Systems

This section would modify the current requirement for an inventory of Department of Defense tactical data link systems to include an assessment of vulnerabilities that the systems may encounter in anti-access or area-denial environments.

Section 932—Defense Science Board assessment of United States Cyber Command

This section would require the Defense Science Board to conduct an independent assessment of the organization, missions, and authorities of U.S. Cyber Command.

Section 933—Mission Analysis for Cyber Operations of Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a mission analysis of Department of Defense cyber operations and to provide a report on the results of the mission analysis to the congressional defense committees. It would also require the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to provide an assessment of the role of the National Guard in supporting Department of Defense cyber missions.

The committee notes that the Defense Science Board recently completed a report titled Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat. In particular, the committee recognizes the need to address a key recommendation in the report that would require the Department to determine the mix of cyber, protected-conventional, and nuclear capabilities necessary for assured operation in the face of a full-spectrum adversary by designating a mix of forces necessary to conduct assured operations, including systems such as penetrating bombers, submarines with long range cruise missiles, Conventional Prompt Global Strike (CPGS), and surviv-

able senior leadership command and control. The committee believes the Department will need to address this recommendation as it conducts the mission analysis required by this section.

In addition, the committee is aware that there is interest from the Department as well as Congress on how best to leverage the Reserve Component, including the National Guard, in the Department's organizing construct for cyber operations. While the committee supports these considerations, it is also concerned that current legislative proposals to dictate National Guard units for each of the states and territories is premature and may be detrimental to the overall national effort. In addition to the hefty price tag, which is estimated to be about $400.0 million per year, current proposals only address National Guard participation and do not include the Reserve Component. Whereas only the Army and the Air Force have National Guard units, all of the military services have Reserve Components that have unique authorities and capabilities that should be addressed by the national effort. The committee believes that more time is needed to evaluate full participation of the Reserve Components, including the implications and limitations of using National Guard forces in a "title 32" capacity, before broader action is taken. The committee encourages the Department to examine these issues in the course of the mission analysis required by this section.

Section 934—Notification of Investigations Related to Compromise of Critical Program Information

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense provide written notification to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of the initiation of any investigations carried out related to the potential compromise of Department of Defense critical program information related to weapon systems and other developmental activities, and within 30 days of the completion of any such investigations. Additionally, this section would require a report to be submitted to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on all of the known network cyber intrusions from January 1, 2000, until August 1, 2013, resulting in compromise of critical program information.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee would require the Secretary to provide a briefing on related information.

Section 935—Additional Requirements Relating to the Software Licenses of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense to revise the reporting requirements of section 937 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 10 U.S.C. 223 note) to include new elements that would verify that the format of the process was verified by an independent third party, implement processes for validating and reporting registration and deregistration of new software, and update the timeline for implementation based on these new requirements.

SUBTITLE E—TOTAL FORCE MANAGEMENT

Section 941—Requirement to Ensure Sufficient Levels of Government Oversight of Functions Closely Associated with Inherently Governmental Functions

This section would amend sections 129a and 2330a of title 10, United States Code, to ensure that sufficient levels of government oversight are in place for contracted services and aligns current Department of Defense policies related to Total Force Management.

Section 942—Five-Year Requirement for Certification of Appropriate Manpower Performance

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to certify that all contractor positions performing inherently governmental functions have been eliminated.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Counternarcotics Strategy in Central America

The committee acknowledges the rise of crime and instability in Central America. In particular, countries such as the Republic of Honduras and the Republic of Guatemala are experiencing the brunt of a "balloon effect" of illicit trafficking and networking caused by both the stabilizing of the Republic of Colombia and the ongoing security issues in the United Mexican States. Central America now has the highest murder rates in the world, and is faced with constant violence and government instability.

The committee recognizes the significant budget constraints throughout the U.S. Armed Forces. However, the committee also recognizes the national security implications of turmoil within the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, the committee supports the efforts in the region of the Department of Defense and the Department of State, and more specifically U.S. Southern Command. An ongoing strategy and vision for partnership with Central American nations is vital to securing regional safety and security. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by October 1, 2013, on the Department of Defense's strategy for combating the corruption, illicit trafficking, and violence in the Central American region that could affect U.S. national security. This briefing should outline partnership opportunities with neighboring nations, current intelligence, and future metrics of success in the region.

Humanitarian Efforts in U.S. Southern Command

The committee again notes the absence of a hospital ship deployment to the U.S. Southern Command area of responsibility for the second consecutive year. The committee also recognizes the difficult

budget environment facing the U.S. Navy and all military services. As the Department of the Navy weighs its priorities, the committee notes the vital presence the USNS Comfort or USNS Mercy bring to nations all over the Western Hemisphere. Humanitarian missions carried out by hospital ships are a key tool in developing relationships and partnerships with the neighbors of the United States.

As a result of the vacuum the lack of humanitarian presence has created, other nations have stepped in to fill the need, including the deployment of a Chinese hospital ship in the Caribbean sea in the fall of 2011. The committee continues to encourage the Department of the Navy to consider an ongoing presence in the Caribbean, including a scheduled humanitarian deployment to the region.

National Guard Bureau Counter-drug Mission

The committee acknowledges the importance of the National Guard counter-drug mission as a part of ensuring the security of the U.S. homeland. The National Guard counter-drug mission is vital to successfully protecting the Nation's borders; however, the committee is aware of the budget constraints the National Guard Bureau faces in fully funding and operating its counter-drug mission.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2013, regarding the operational capabilities and future counter-drug mission set of the National Guard. The briefing should include information on the available resources and missions of the state partnership programs, border security initiatives, and counter-drug schools, including any anticipated gaps in resources. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the committee, by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the capabilities and policy issues associated with the counter-drug mission of the National Guard on the southwestern border of the United States.

Operation Martillo

The committee recognizes that the U.S. Southern Command mission Operation Martillo has been under way since January 2012. Initially a 6-month operation, Martillo has been extended indefinitely to combat illicit traffickers by focusing on the littoral waterways from South America to Central America as a way to transport narcotics. In the year since the operation began, confiscation of narcotics and prosecutions of criminals have risen.

The committee also recognizes the support and partnership of the 18 partner-nations in making Operation Martillo successful. As the operation moves forward, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2013, on Operation Martillo. The briefing should outline:

(1) The assets being used specifically for the mission by both U.S. Armed Forces and each partner nation;

(2) Each partner nation's contributions to the mission in the form of assets, capabilities, funding, and manpower;

(3) The mission's future goals in terms of manpower, funding, and focus and any challenges in meeting such goals; and

(4) The metrics in place to determine the effectiveness of the mission over the course of the next fiscal year.

The committee supports U.S. Southern Command's efforts and remains committed to the safety and security of the Nation and the Western Hemisphere.

Transition of Tethered Aerostat Radar System Program

The committee is aware of the transition of the Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) program from the U.S. Air Force to the Department of Homeland Security. This transition is under way only after the U.S. Air Force sent a statement of program cancellation to the contractor in January 2013. While the transition to the Department of Homeland Security has been delayed, the committee notes that the TARS program, which is in place along the southern border of the continental United States and the Caribbean, is an important tool in fighting illicit trafficking across the U.S. border.

The committee encourages both the U.S. Air Force and the Department of Homeland Security to continue to facilitate a smooth transition of the TARS program, with the goal of preventing any gaps in service or capability in the eight locations. Furthermore, the committee acknowledges the gaps in maintenance of several of the aerostats. As the Department of Homeland Security takes over the program by October 1, 2013, the committee encourages both the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security to mitigate these maintenance issues and ensure all eight aerostats are fully functional. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2013, on the status of the transition of the TARS program, including steps being taken by both departments to support continuation of coverage.

U.S. Southern Command Assets

The committee recognizes the ongoing budget crisis facing the Nation's military. As this crisis continues, U.S. Southern Command, along with all other combatant commands, must prioritize its missions. In light of the decision by the Department of the Navy to establish a zero-ship presence in the Caribbean, other military services will also have to consider realigning their assets. As U.S. Southern Command moves forward in its mission set, the committee acknowledges the possibility of current assets being insufficient to meet the needs of the mission.

Nevertheless, the committee believes that stability in the Western Hemisphere is a national security imperative. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to provide the House Committee on Armed Services with information on any resultant capability gaps for U.S. Southern Command against the full spectrum of the command's missions, including the allocation of forces and assets within the U.S. Southern Command area of responsibility for the past 5 years, and the projected availability of forces and assets for fiscal year 2014 within the region.

OTHER MATTERS

Assessment of Military Construction Project

The Department of the Air Force is the executive agent responsible for the design and construction of a $285.0 million development at the Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom. This development proposes to provide worldwide communications to the warfighter across a wide spectrum of operations. The initial phase of this development is a $12.0 million main gate complex that is designed to improve traffic congestion and support the segregation of large vehicles during their inspection process.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not completed an assessment of the wide range of options available to accommodate the mission proposed at the Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2013, with the following information:

(1) Analysis of alternatives, including the strategic imperative of intelligence functions being performed in the United Kingdom versus co-locating with the combatant command headquarters or in the United States;

(2) Analysis of the cost-benefits and efficiencies of co-locating the intelligence functions of U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) and European Command (USEUCOM);

(3) Description of direct, indirect, and burden-sharing contributions by the host nation in the construction of the new facilities at Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom;

(4) Description of the method in which the current requirement is presently being met; why the current facilities are not sufficient to meet the current requirement; and how the new proposed facilities will fully meet the current requirement without requiring an expansion of either the mission or the newly constructed facility;

(5) Description of the political, economic, military and legal requirements that require the functions to be completed in the current host-nation instead of the United States or the Federal Republic of Germany;

(6) Description of the current organizational structure of intelligence components of USAFRICOM and USEUCOM, including division of labor between United Kingdom-based staffs and the Germany-based headquarters and an evaluation of the current mission and staffing in order to better understand the needed requirements and resources to accomplish the mission; and

(7) Description of how USEUCOM and USAFRICOM are implementing and enforcing the appropriate U.S. Government policies and regulations, including identification of exceptions, to ensure Royal Air Force Molesworth-based Department of Defense civilians are not exceeding the 5-year overseas requirement and are in compliance with the Living Quarters Allowance regulations.

Furthermore, the committee recommends no funding, a reduction of $12 million, for the initial phase of development at the Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom.

Combatant Command Headquarters Personnel and Resources Requirements

The committee is concerned with the results of the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) recent report on five of the six geographic combatant commands. The results of the report show that the authorized military and civilian positions and mission support costs for the combatant commands and their subordinate commands have grown considerably over the last decade. The GAO report found that the authorized military and civilian positions increased by almost 50 percent between fiscal years 2001–12, to approximately 10,100 authorized positions. Additionally, the report found the mission and headquarters support costs more than doubled from fiscal years 2007–12, to over $1.1 billion. While the committee recognizes these figures include the establishment of two new geographic combatant commands (U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Africa Command), today's fiscal environment requires stronger oversight of the combatant commands' resources.

The committee is concerned about the four primary weaknesses that challenge the Department of Defense's ability to effectively manage and oversee these combatant commands. First, the committee is concerned that the Department does not thoroughly and periodically evaluate the commands' overall mission and personnel requirements to ensure the commands are effectively managing their personnel resources to meet their assigned missions. The committee believes the Department should conduct periodic evaluations of the combatant commands and supporting commands, including whether their existing size and structure is effectively positioned to meet current missions. Second, the committee is also concerned that the Department cannot track all the personnel assigned to the combatant commands and their subordinate commands. The committee believes the Department should integrate existing systems to identify, manage, and track all assigned personnel. Third, the committee is concerned about the lack of visibility and oversight of the Joint Staff and the combatant commands over the service component commands. This lack of visibility into personnel and resources makes it difficult for the Department to determine whether functions and tasks at the combatant commands are being duplicated or overlap with the component commands. The committee believes the Department should develop and implement a formal process to gather information on the service component commands to gain better transparency and oversight of these organizations. Fourth, the committee believes that the services and combatant commands should provide greater detailed information on authorized positions and mission funding totals in their annual operation and budget documents for submission to Congress.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2013, on any changes to processes and procedures to address each weakness identified above, including any suggested changes to law that they believe may be required.

Comptroller General Review of Functional Combatant Commands

The committee again notes that as the challenges to national security have expanded, the Department of Defense faces missions of increasing scope, variety, and complexity around the world. To support these missions, the Department of Defense has established three functional combatant commands, each with thousands of personnel, which provide unique capabilities in support of the Department's other components. These functional combatant commands are responsible for specific types of operational support, specifically: U.S. Transportation Command is responsible for air, land, and sea transport; U.S. Strategic Command is responsible for strategic nuclear, space, and other operations, to include cyberspace; and U.S. Special Operations Command is responsible for organizing, training, and equipping special operations forces. In May 2013, the Government Accountability Office reported that the authorized military and civilian positions and mission support costs devoted to five of the Department's geographic combatant commands had grown considerably and that there were weaknesses in its processes to size and oversee the combatant commands, to include the functional combatant commands. At a time of growing economic and fiscal constraints, the committee believes it is important that the Department of Defense ensure the functional combatant commands have the appropriate levels of personnel and resources to effectively meet mission requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the personnel and resources of the functional combatant commands, supporting military service component commands, and other assigned task forces, and to submit a report on the findings to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2014. The review should address the following:

(1) What are the trends in the resources (authorized positions and mission support costs) devoted to the functional combatant commands and their service component commands between fiscal years 2001–12?

(2) To what extent has the Department of Defense examined the size and structure of the functional combatant commands for efficiencies?

(3) What, if any, challenges does the Department of Defense face in appropriately sizing the functional combatant and their components given their unique capabilities and global responsibilities?

Comptroller General Review of Medical Countermeasures Against Genetically Engineered Bio-Terror Agents

The committee recognizes that development and deployment of safe, effective medical countermeasures against biological weapons and agents of concern remain an urgent priority for the U.S. Government. The National Institutes of Health (NIH), under the direction of the Department of Health and Human Services, is working with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense (DOD), as well as other agencies, to shape and execute an

aggressive research program to develop more effective medical countermeasures.

The committee notes that since 2007, the Department of Defense has initiated efforts to strengthen homeland defense and homeland security by developing broad-spectrum medical countermeasures against the threat of genetically engineered bio-terror agents. Additional initiatives that the Department of Defense is planning include the development of advanced detection and deterrent technologies and initiatives to facilitate full-scale civil-military exercises. While the Department of Defense planned to spend over $1.0 billion on these initiatives between fiscal years 2007–12, it remains unclear how it has coordinated its programs to complement those of the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Health and Human Services. The degree to which the Department of Defense has met program goals to improve interagency planning for complex homeland security contingencies also remains unclear.

The committee remains committed to a robust medical research and development program focused on military health issues, including medical, biological, and chemical defense. However, to assist the committee in conducting its oversight of DOD's initiatives to develop medical countermeasures, coordinate programs, and improve interagency contingency planning, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive review of medical countermeasures against genetically engineered bio-terror agents, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 3, 2014, on the findings and any recommendations. The report should include, but not be limited to:

(1) The status of DOD's initiatives to develop countermeasures for genetically engineered bio-terror agents and advanced detection and deterrent technologies;

(2) The extent to which the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense have coordinated their research programs to ensure efforts are complementary and not duplicative;

(3) The extent to which the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Homeland Security and other agencies have planned and executed full-scale civil-military exercises to improve interagency coordination;

(4) The cost basis for DOD's various programs and initiatives to develop countermeasures for genetically engineered bio-terror agents and related detection and deterrent technologies; and

(5) The nature and extent of potential program overlap and duplication with programs of other Federal agencies that could benefit from consolidations or improved coordination to achieve cost savings.

Comptroller General Review of Planning and Preparedness for Threats Posed by Non-Traditional Chemical Agents

The committee notes a growing awareness of the threat posed by novel chemical weapon agents or toxicants known as Non-Traditional Agents (NTAs). The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) states that the globalization of the world's chemical indus-

try, coupled with scientific breakthroughs, increases the possibility of NTAs being used against U.S. and allied forces. Furthermore, the QDR states that the Department of Defense (DOD) has increased its resources for research and development of technologies to meet and defeat these emerging threats. NTAs are allegedly binary nerve agents significantly more lethal than third-generation chemical weapons, such as VX nerve gas.

The current international agreements regarding chemical warfare do not adequately control the relatively simple formulas for NTAs that have been published. Consequently, the risk of illicit NTA production by various state and non-state actors is heightened compared to traditional chemical agents. NTAs could pose a significant threat to DOD personnel as they may be capable of defeating protective equipment, such as Mission Oriented Protective Posture masks and suits as well as evading chemical weapon detection tools. In the past, the Government Accountability Office has reported that most U.S. Army units tasked with providing chemical and biological defense support are not adequately staffed, equipped, or trained to perform their missions against traditional chemical agents. The Deparment's preparedness for NTAs may be even more important given the unique nature of this emerging threat.

To assist the committee in conducting its oversight of the Department of Defense's increased resources for research and development of technologies to meet and defeat emerging threats posed by NTAs, novel chemical weapon agents, or similar toxicants, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Department of Defense's planning and preparedness for threats posed by non-traditional chemical agents, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2014, with the findings and any recommendations. The report should include, but not be limited to:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Defense has conducted an analysis of the threat NTAs pose to DOD personnel, including the risk posed by bioregulators capable of inducing profound physiologic effects, and developed countermeasures, defenses, and mitigation strategies to address the threat posed by NTAs;

(2) The extent to which DOD's chemical and biological defense units that are tasked with chemical and biological defense support to combat units and commands are adequately staffed, equipped, and trained to deal with NTAs;

(3) The extent to which DOD's chemical and biological defense units that are tasked with a homeland defense mission, especially National Guard and Reserve units, are adequately staffed, equipped, and trained to deal with NTAs;

(4) How much the Department is planning to spend in fiscal year 2014 on research and development of technologies to address the threat of NTAs, and how much of an increase in resources this represents over fiscal year 2013 levels;

(5) The nature and extent of potential counter-NTA research and development program overlap and duplication between, for example, defense agencies, the military services, and national laboratories/federally funded research and development centers; and

(6) Which counter-NTA programs or efforts could benefit from consolidations, improved coordination, or other actions to achieve financial or other benefits, such as increased efficiencies.

Comptroller General Review of Role of the Army and the Marine Corps in Access-denied Areas

As U.S. forces draw down from operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Department of Defense is focusing on anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) challenges posed by potential adversaries elsewhere around the globe. The committee believes the Air Sea Battle concept and other recent publications highlight air, maritime, space, and cyberspace operations, and appear to rely heavily on Navy and Air Force assets and capabilities. However, the committee is concerned that less attention has been paid to the role of the Army and the Marine Corps in an A2/AD environment. The committee believes the Army and the Marine Corps, like each of the services, must be trained, manned, and equipped to respond to a full spectrum of challenges, consistent with the roles and missions of each service. However, given the uncertainty surrounding the role of the Army and the Marine Corps in an A2/AD environment, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an independent review that evaluates:

(1) Missions envisioned for the Army and the Marine Corps in an A2/AD environment;

(2) Alternatives being considered by the Department for meeting such missions;

(3) The operational, cost, and other assumptions underlying the Department's analyses; and

(4) Steps being taken to align Army and Marine Corps force structure with emerging A2/AD missions, the cost implications of the planned actions, and the extent to which such actions potentially duplicate the capabilities of other services or limit the ability of the Army and the Marine Corps to fulfill other missions.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit the results of the review to the congressional defense committees by April 15, 2014.

Comptroller General Review of U.S. Central Command Headquarters

The committee notes that since fiscal year 2001, the resources provided to U.S. Central Command and its supporting service components have grown dramatically to manage wars in both the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq, including directing U.S. operational forces, supporting counterinsurgency operations, and assisting host nation security forces in providing for their own defense. According to Department of Defense reports provided to Congress, military and civilian manpower at U.S. Central Command has more than doubled since fiscal year 2001, not including the contractors who support the headquarters.

With the drawdown of operational forces in Iraq and the impending drawdown in Afghanistan, the committee believes it is important to reexamine the levels of headquarters manpower and mission support costs needed by U.S. Central Command. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct as assessment of the following:

(1) The trends in manpower and mission support costs devoted to the headquarters of U.S. Central Command and its supporting service component commands since fiscal year 2001;

(2) The steps the Department of Defense has taken to date to reexamine the size and structure of the headquarters of U.S. Central Command and its service component commands in light of the drawdown of forces in its area of responsibility and changing U.S. military strategy; and

(3) The future plans for U.S. Central Command and its service component commands, including any plans to maintain headquarters in forward locations such as the State of Kuwait and the State of Qatar.

The Comptroller General may provide additional information deemed appropriate to provide the committee insight into the Department of Defense's plans for the headquarters functions of the U.S Central Command. The Comptroller General should provide the preliminary results of the study to the congressional defense committees by April 15, 2014, with the final report to follow as soon as practicable thereafter.

Defense Forensic Enterprise

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has used expeditionary forensics successfully to identify, target and disrupt terrorists and enemy combatants in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee is also aware that the Department has taken multiple steps towards establishing an enduring capability in this impactful area. The Department issued directive 5205.15E in 2011 to establish a policy regarding the Defense Forensic Enterprise (DFE), which assigned to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) a number of responsibilities including the development of a strategic plan to guide the activities of the DFE. However, given the important impact of the use of expeditionary forensics for U.S. counter-terrorism activities, the committee is concerned that two years after the issuance of directive 5205.15E, the required strategic plan is not yet finalized. The committee notes that the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently completed a study on defense forensics, in which it made several recommendations to facilitate the establishment of the DFE. Therefore, the committee directs the USD(AT&L) to set a date by August 30, 2013 to finalize and publish the strategic plan for the Defense Forensic Enterprise. Furthermore, the committee directs the USD(AT&L) to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2014 which describes the actions being taken to address the recommendations made within the GAO report on Defense Forensics.

Detailed Report on Defense Efficiencies

The committee notes that over the last 3 fiscal years, the previous Secretaries of the Department of Defense have developed budget submissions that contained directed efficiencies for the Department. However, the policies and procedures on the implementation of these efficiencies have not been detailed to Congress. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2013, on the following:

(1) A detailed accounting of how departmental fiscal policies, dating from fiscal year 2012 to the present, support compliance with the discretionary spending limit applied to the security category in fiscal year 2013 by section 251(c)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177); and

(2) A detailed accounting of how departmental fiscal policies will support compliance with the discretionary spending limit applied to the security category for each of fiscal years 2014–21 by section 251(c)(2) of Public Law 99–177.

Energy Security Assessments in the Quadrennial Defense Review

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense is required every four years to conduct a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code. The QDR is intended to provide a strategic defense review of plans necessary to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in the national defense strategy. The committee believes an essential element of any defense plan is the importance of energy security as a fundamental component of the Department of Defense's ability to project power and enable combat capability for operations. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), energy security was defined as "having assured access to reliable supplies of energy and the ability to protect and deliver sufficient energy to meet mission essential requirements." Noting that the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 urged the Secretary to conduct a more comprehensive QDR review, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the final assessment includes details regarding the importance of, and funding necessary to achieve, energy security.

Humanitarian Mine Action and Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Technologies

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) program is under-utilized and under-resourced, to include research, development, testing, and evaluation efforts. The committee notes that while the committee has authorized $10.0 million per fiscal year for this program in the past, the Department of Defense routinely commits less than $3.0 million per year towards global HMA requirements. Because of these shortfalls, the committee notes that HMA programs and projects are unable or unlikely to contribute to Geographic Combatant Commander theater security cooperation strategies in a sub-

stantive and enduring way, and that the efforts of the Department of Defense are potentially out of balance with larger U.S. Government HMA and security force assistance goals. Furthermore, the Department of Defense and commercial industry have invested heavily in improvised explosive device defeating technology over the past decade, and the committee believes that this technology should be better utilized within the HMA program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that outlines the strategic direction of the Department of Defense's HMA program, to include efforts to improve research, development, test, and evaluation, and ways to ensure coordination mechanisms exist to determine whether counter-improvised explosive technology could be applicable to HMA. In addition, the report should outline ways to improve interagency coordination with similar programs under way in the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Hybrid Airship Technology

The committee is aware that hybrid airship technology has the potential to provide much needed capability for the Department of Defense, particularly with regards to cargo lift and logistics. In the past, the committee has supported the development and demonstration of hybrid airship technology, and continues to monitor developments with interest. The committee is aware of recent developments that have demonstrated innovative capabilities in airship design and lift.

The committee is also aware, however, that airship technology still requires additional, more rigorous development and demonstration. As noted by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, "current conventional airships are capable of accommodating payloads of only a few thousand pounds. In order to achieve the massive payloads envisioned by air-logistic theorists, significant technical advances and resource investments must be made."

The committee continues to support efforts to transition from rudimentary technology demonstrators to operational prototypes in relevant environments. The committee encourages the Air Force and Transportation Command to work with industry to more fully develop the capability requirements and mission analysis needed to pursue such an operational prototype.

Nuclear Deterrence Education in the Armed Forces

The committee is aware that the military departments and the Joint Staff have invested considerable time and attention into overhauling and improving the instruction provided to officers and enlisted personnel concerning the U.S. nuclear deterrent mission.

Following the Minot and Taiwan incidents involving the improper and unauthorized handling by Air Force personnel of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapon components, and the termination by then-Defense Secretary Gates of the Chief of Staff of the

Air Force and the Secretary of the Air Force, former Secretary of Energy and Defense James Schlesinger undertook a comprehensive two-phase report on Nuclear Weapons Management in the Armed Forces.

In announcing the Phase I findings, Secretary Schlesinger stated that, "Over the years . . . what has been the long-time practice during the Cold War and subsequent years of developing the theory and doctrine of deterrence has more or less disappeared not only from the Air Force schools, more generally from military schools . . . the doctrine of deterrence has, to a large extent, been forgotten."

The committee has reviewed internal professional military education reviews of the status of improvements to instruction in the "doctrine of deterrence." The committee notes that the services, particularly the Navy, have determined that there are ongoing challenges and weaknesses in instruction in this subject matter. The committee also notes that challenges remain in educating airmen on their role in safeguarding national security. Educating the warfighters who execute the daily mission of nuclear deterrence remains a critical element to ensuring the level of excellence required for the mission.

The committee encourages the services and the Joint Staff to keep the same level of focus on this subject matter that was brought to bear by then-Secretary Gates in 2008.

Nuclear Weapons Council and Commonality in Nuclear Forces and Nuclear Warheads

The committee understands that the Nuclear Weapons Council has approved a long-term plan to increase the use of common components and systems across U.S. nuclear delivery systems and the nuclear stockpile. In the long-term, this approach is expected to yield significant cost savings, may enable novel approaches to mitigating risks through deployment of interoperable warheads that can be utilized on multiple delivery systems, and may facilitate reductions in the number of nuclear weapons held in reserve. However, the committee urges the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration to use caution in implementing this approach to ensure that commonality does not lead to unacceptable risk of widespread impacts to the deterrent force, should a technical risk cause a common component or subsystem to fail.

To better understand the Nuclear Weapons Council's long-term plan for interoperability and commonality, the committee directs the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, in coordination with appropriate Members of the Council, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 31, 2013, on the feasibility, cost savings, benefits, risks, timelines, impacts on the size of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and impacts to stockpile stewardship and any potential need for underground testing associated with the long-term plan for interoperability and commonality. Specifically, the briefing should describe:

(1) The Nuclear Weapons Council's approach for understanding and managing risks associated with commonality in

nuclear delivery systems, nuclear warheads, and their components;

(2) The Council's methods for evaluating trade-offs between the risk versus the cost savings of commonality;

(3) The potential for streamlining the maintenance of nuclear weapons through interoperability and commonality; and

(4) The long-term plan for interoperability and commonality across delivery systems and warheads, including impacts to workload and capacity in the nuclear security enterprise.

Personnel Growth at the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Staff, and the Service Secretariats

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense is supported by vast headquarters organizations that have grown over time, consisting of thousands of personnel in multiple layers of management. At a time of growing economic and fiscal constraints, the committee believes it is important that the Department of Defense ensures that its headquarters personnel are efficiently aligned with the missions. The committee believes that the Department must continue to reduce overhead and improve its business operations, particularly within its headquarters organizations. Moreover, the committee believes that this multi-layered structure breeds duplication and impedes timely decision-making at the Department as well as responsiveness to Congress.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) assists the Secretary in performing his duties and responsibilities for oversight, policy development, planning, resource management, and fiscal and program evaluation at the Department. OSD staff currently includes more than 2,600 military and civilian personnel, with an unknown number of supporting contractors, and these numbers appear to have grown nearly 40 percent since 2001. In addition, the Secretary is supported by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whose staff creates and distributes guidance for combatant forces' unified strategic direction, among other functions. The Joint Staff now includes more than 4,200 personnel and has nearly tripled since 2001. This growth is due, in part, to absorbing some functions from the now-defunct U.S. Joint Forces Command, but the "joint community" appears to be growing overall. In May 2013, the Government Accountability Office found that, even excluding U.S. Central Command, the geographic combatant commands have grown by nearly 50 percent since 2001. Outside the joint community, each of the Secretaries of the military departments has hundreds of military and civilian staff as well as numerous and proliferating offices supporting them and assisting the oversight of each of the military services. However, reliable information about the size of these service organizations is not readily available, limiting congressional oversight.

Given the need to minimize overhead at the Department of Defense, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the resources devoted to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military department's secretariats and military staffs. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed

Services by April 15, 2014, on the results of the review. The review should cover the following:

(1) What are the trends in the resources (authorized positions and mission support costs) devoted to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military department's secretariats and military staffs for fiscal years 2001–13?

(2) To what extent does the Department have processes in place to manage and oversee the resources of these headquarters organizations, including examining resources being devoted to contractor support staff?

(3) To what extent has the Department reviewed these organizations to determine whether overlap or duplication exists in the types of support being provided to the Secretary of Defense within or across these various headquarters organizations and whether there are opportunities for efficiencies?

Preventing Unfair Trade Practices in Military Equipment Sales

The committee notes that offsets are illegal under many international trade agreements and generally considered a violation of the principles of the European Union treaty, with the exception of certain defense procurements. The committee believes that any free trade agreement negotiations between the United States and the European Union should include the issue of prohibiting offset agreements with respect to the sale of defense equipment by U.S. companies to European Union member states that would require U.S. companies to reinvest a percentage of the value of any resulting contract in the importing country.

Replacement Plan for E–4B

The Air Force's fleet of E–4B aircraft serve as the National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC) for the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other senior leaders. According to a 2012 Air Force fact-sheet, "in case of national emergency or destruction of ground command control centers, the aircraft provides a highly survivable command, control, and communications center to direct U.S. forces, execute emergency war orders, and coordinate actions by civil authorities."

The E–4 fleet first entered service in 1974, and as the aircraft continues to age, sustainment efforts grow increasingly difficult and costly. Sustaining the fleet into the 2020s may become progressively difficult or unmanageable as commercial airlines continue to retire their fleet of 747–200 aircraft and spare parts and maintenance providers become unavailable. The committee is also aware of the significant potential cost of replacing the E–4B aircraft. The Air Force has not yet developed a plan to replace these critical command and control aircraft or a sustainable life-extension option. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 30, 2014, on the Air Force's plan to replace or sustainably extend the E–4B fleet and its associated capabilities. The report should contain an assessment of various potential options, costs, and a schedule for a replacement program.

Report on Implementation of Acquisition Strategy To Minimize Costs for Defense Base Act Insurance

Section 843 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) required that the Secretary of Defense adopt an acquisition strategy for Defense Base Act (DBA) insurance that minimizes the cost of such insurance for both the Department and its contractors. It also required the Department to submit a report to Congress, within 270 days of the law's enactment, on the acquisition strategy adopted. The committee is aware that the Department, after having submitted in September 2009 the report required by section 843, has been working through the steps to implement its acquisition strategy. The committee notes that several years have now passed since 2009, and therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2015 on its progress towards implementing the lower-cost acquisition strategy required by section 843.

Report on Security Exemptions and Waivers for U.S. Nuclear Forces

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its sustained commitment to ensuring the security of U.S. nuclear weapons. In particular, the committee recognizes the efforts undertaken by the Air Force and the Department of Defense to bring renewed focus, leadership, and resources to nuclear weapons security following the grave security incidents seen in the Air Force in 2006 and 2007. The committee encourages the Department to sustain continual efforts to improve nuclear weapons security (operational excellence and a culture of continual improvement are required). To better understand the Department's efforts to improve nuclear weapons security, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by November 15, 2013, on efforts to improve nuclear weapons security in the Department of Defense. In particular, the report should list any current exemptions or waivers to nuclear weapons security requirements or guidance, as well as the Department's plans and timelines for mitigating the risk from, and eventually eliminating the need for, such exemptions or waivers.

Reporting Pursuant to the War Powers Resolution

Elsewhere in this report, the committee addresses oversight of sensitive military operations. The committee notes that its oversight of military operations is in addition to all reporting pursuant to, or consistent with, section 4 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

Secure Internet Protocol Router Network for the Congressional Defense Committees

The Department of Defense maintains a classified Secure Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET) to provide secure networking among Department of Defense components, as well as with selected interagency partners. The committee is aware that access

to the network is available to much of the executive branch, but to virtually none of the legislative branch of the U.S. Government. The committee believes that having access to SIPRNET would improve its ability to conduct oversight of the Department of Defense, as well as help save funds by eliminating printing, travel, shipping, and courier costs of required communications. The committee notes that it is supplied with the means for secure telephony and believes this provides a suitable precedent to expand into other methods of secure collaboration between the Department and Congress.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2014, on extending SIPRNET access to the aforementioned committees by December 1, 2014. The briefing should include an assessment of the operational policies for implementing SIPRNET, as well as the costs, logistics, security considerations, and other matters the Secretary deems pertinent.

Sustainment of Sociocultural Understanding Capabilities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has invested in a number of programs over the past 10 years to provide increased sociocultural understanding at tactical, operational and strategic levels. The committee has been supportive of many of these capabilities, such as the Army's Human Terrain System, the Secretary of Defense's Minerva Initiative, and the cross-service Human, Social, Cultural, Behavioral Modeling program. Each program has served an important role in filling capability gaps for the Department, especially with regards to understanding the human dimensions of the counterinsurgency fights in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

However, the committee is concerned that with the drawdown of forces in Afghanistan and the refocus to the Asia-Pacific region, there may be a growing sense that some of the capabilities that proved so useful in the Middle East will be of little or no value in potential contingencies rooted in the Asia Pacific region. The committee firmly believes that sociocultural understanding will remain important in the Middle East as it grows in importance in Africa and Asia, though needs will be somewhat different and may require slightly different instantiations based on the differences in the operational environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the Department's plans for maintaining and adapting existing sociocultural capabilities, as well as development for new capabilities to meet the current strategic guidance. The report should identify the programs either in development or that have been deployed that support sociocultural understanding, and whether they will be sustained across the Future Years Defense Program. Elements of the report should also identify any capability gaps that exist based on the recent guidance shifting the Department's focus to the Asia-Pacific region.

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 2014 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—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.

Section 1003—Audit of Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2018 Financial Statements

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the Department of Defense's ongoing Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness process and support the goal of audit readiness across the Department by 2017. This section would also require that a full and complete audit takes place for fiscal year 2018.

Section 1004—Authority to Transfer Funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to Sustain Nuclear Weapons Modernization

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to transfer up to $150.0 million to the nuclear weapons program of the National Nuclear Security Administration if the amount authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for that program is less than $8.4 billion (the amount specified for fiscal year 2014 in the report required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84)).

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1011—Extension of Authority to Support Unified Counter-drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend, by 1 year, the unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia originally authorized by section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), and most recently amended by section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

Section 1012—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities

This section would extend, by 1 year, the support for joint task forces to support law enforcement agencies conducting counterterrorism activities, as originally authorized by section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), and most recently amended by section 1014 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

Section 1013—Two-Year Extension of Authority to Provide Additional Support for Counter-drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments

This section would extend, by 2 years, the authority to provide support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments, originally authorized by subsection (a)(2) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), and most recently amended by section 1006 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Section 1014—Sense of Congress Regarding the National Guard Counter-narcotic Program

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the importance of the National Guard Counter Narcotics Program as a tool in combating drug trafficking into the United States and the need for continued support and funding of such programs, especially along the Southwest border.

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1021—Clarification of Sole Ownership Resulting from Ship Donations at No Cost to the Navy

This section would clarify the current ship donation statute, section 7306 of title 10, United States Code, and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate any vessel stricken from the Naval Vessel Register.

Section 1022—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the retirement, inactivation, or storage of a cruiser or dock landing ship. This section would provide an exception for the retirement of the U.S.S. Denver (LPD 9).

This section would further provide for transfer authority for the purpose of providing sufficient appropriations to support the modernization of seven cruisers. If requested by the Secretary of Defense, the committee believes the following transfers should be included: OPN Line 0960, $662.7 million; OPN Line 2312, $1.8 million; OPN Line 2360, $6.6 million; OPN Line 2915, $13.7 million;

OPN Line 3050, $13.4 million; OPN Line 3216, $20.8 million; OPN Line 5530, $4.6 million; WPN Line 4223, $91.1 million; and RDTE Line 1447, $100.0 million. The total transfer authority is $914.7 million.

Section 1023—Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards

This section would amend subsection (a) of section 7310 of title 10, United States Code, to designate naval vessels that do not have a homeport to be treated as being homeported in the United States or Guam with regards to repair and maintenance of those vessels. Additionally, this section would define the term voyage repair.

Section 1024—Sense of Congress Regarding a Balanced Future Naval Force

This section would provide the Sense of Congress that additional funding should be prioritized toward shipbuilding efforts and that Department of Navy budget projections should realistically anticipate the true investment to meet force structure goals.

Section 1025—Authority for Short-term Extension or Renewal of Leases for Vessels Supporting the Transit Protection System Escort Program

This section would allow the Secretary of the Navy to extend or renew the lease of not more than four blocking vessels supporting the Transit Protection System Escort Program. This section would also require the Secretary, prior to extending or renewing such a lease, to submit to the congressional defense committees a notification of the proposed extension or renewal, along with a detailed description of the term of the proposed contract and a justification for extending or renewing the lease, as opposed to obtaining the capability through purchase of such vessels.

The committee notes that the requirement for the vessels appears to be an enduring requirement and is aware that the Secretary is conducting a business case analysis to determine the most cost-effective manner to obtain the capability provided by the vessels. The committee awaits the outcome of this analysis, and it encourages the Secretary to appropriately address funding for this requirement in the fiscal year 2015 President's budget request.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1030—Clarification of Procedures for Use of Alternate Members on Military Commissions

This section would clarify procedures for use of alternate members of military commissions.

Section 1031—Modification of Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program Reporting Requirement

This section would modify the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program to require additional annual reporting requirements.

Section 1032—Prohibition on Use of Funds To Construct or Modify 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 available to the Department of Defense during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2014, to modify or construct any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any detainee transferred from U.S. 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.

Section 1033—Requirements for Certifications Relating to the Transfer of Detainees 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 available to the Department of Defense (DOD) to transfer or release, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2014, individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within a foreign country or any other foreign entity. This prohibition would apply unless the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, provides a written certification to Congress addressing several requirements at least 30 days prior to the transfer of any such individual.

This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds for the transfer of any such individual 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 U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the same country or entity who engaged in terrorist activity subsequent to their transfer.

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the general prohibition against transfers to a foreign country where there has been a confirmed case of recidivism as well as two of the requirements for other transfers. In these instances, the Secretary of Defense must determine that alternative actions will be taken, that it is not possible to certify the risks have been completely eliminated, and that actions taken will substantially mitigate the risk of recidivism.

This section would require, in the event the Secretary of Defense uses the waiver, that he provide a report that includes a copy of the waiver, determination, a statement of the basis for the determination, a summary of the alternative actions to be taken, and information on the detainee's record of cooperation while in DOD custody and any agreements in place to provide for the detainee's continuing cooperation after transfer.

This section would also authorize the Secretary, for purposes of assessing the risk that a detainee will engage in terrorist activity if released for either a certification or national security waiver, to give favorable consideration to any detainee who has cooperated

with U.S. intelligence and law enforcement authorities pursuant to a pre-trial agreement while in DOD custody, and for whom appropriate agreements and mechanisms are in place to provide for continued cooperation with U.S. intelligence and law enforcement authorities following transfer.

Section 1034—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 use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2014, to transfer or release detainees at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions.

Section 1035—Unclassified Summary of Information Relating to Individuals Detained at Parwan, Afghanistan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to make publicly available an unclassified summary relating to individuals detained by the Department of Defense at the Detention Facility at Parwan, Afghanistan pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) at any time during the past 2 years who have been determined to represent an "enduring security threat" to the United States.

Section 1036—Assessment of Affiliates and Adherents of Al-Qaeda Outside the United States

This section would require an assessment to be conducted by the President, acting through the Secretary of Defense, of: any group operating outside the United States that is an affiliate or adherent of, or otherwise related to, Al Qaeda; a summary of relevant information relating to each such group; an assessment of whether each group is part of or substantially supporting Al Qaeda or the Taliban, or constitutes an associated force that is engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners; and the criteria used to determine the nature and extent of each group's relationship to Al Qaeda. The assessment would be required to be submitted to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1037—Designation of Department of Defense Senior Official for Facilitating the Transfer of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to designate a senior Department of Defense official as the official with principal responsibility for coordination and management of the transfer of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The Secretary of Defense would also set

forth the responsibilities of that senior official with respect to such transfers.

Section 1038—Rank of Chief Prosecutor and Chief Defense Counsel in Military Commissions Established to Try Individuals Detained at Guantanamo

This section would require the chief defense counsel and chief prosecutor of any military commission established to try an alien unprivileged enemy belligerent who is detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to have the same rank.

Section 1039—Report on Capability of Yemeni Government to Detain, Rehabilitate, and Prosecute Individuals Detained at Guantanamo who are Transferred to Yemen

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to jointly submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a report on the capability of the Republic of Yemen to detain, rehabilitate, and prosecute individuals transferred there from the Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility. This section would require such a report to be submitted not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1040—Report on Attachment of Rights to Individuals Detained at Guantanamo if Transferred to the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to jointly submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, a report on whether detainees, if transferred to the United States from the Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility, would become eligible for certain immigration-related relief or additional constitutional rights.

Section 1040A—Summary of Information Relating to Individuals Detained at Guantanamo who Became Leaders of Foreign Terrorist Groups

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, make publicly available a summary of information relating to individuals who were formerly detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who have, since being transferred or released from such detention, become leaders or involved in the leadership structure of a foreign terrorist group.

SUBTITLE E—SENSITIVE MILITARY OPERATIONS

Section 1041—Congressional Notification of Sensitive Military Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to promptly submit to the congressional defense committees notice in writing of any sensitive military operation following such operation. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for providing such notice in a manner consistent with the national security of the United States and the protection of operational integrity.

The term "sensitive military operation" would include lethal and capture operations conducted by the U.S. Armed Forces outside of the United States pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) or any other authority except a declaration of war or a specific statutory authorization for the use of force other than the 2001 authorization.

This section is not intended to create or alter reporting requirements of any other agency or department outside of the Department of Defense.

Section 1042—Report on Process for Determining Targets of Lethal Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act containing an explanation of the legal and policy considerations and approval processes used in determining whether an individual or group of individuals could be the target of a lethal operation or capture operation conducted by the Armed Forces of the United States outside the United States.

Section 1043—Counterterrorism Operational Briefings

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide quarterly briefings to the congressional defense committees outlining Department of Defense counterterrorism operations and related activities. Each briefing would include: a global update on activity within each geographic combatant command; an overview of authorities and legal issues including limitations; an outline of interagency activities and initiatives; and any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

SUBTITLE F—NUCLEAR FORCES

Section 1051—Prohibition on Elimination of the Nuclear Triad

This section would prohibit any of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Defense from being obligated or expended to reduce, convert, or decommission any strategic delivery system of the United States if such reduction, conversion, or decommissioning would eliminate a leg of the nuclear triad. This section defines "nuclear triad" to be composed of: (1) land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles; (2) submarine-launched ballistic mis-

siles and their associated ballistic missile submarines; and (3) nuclear-certified strategic bombers.

Section 1052—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Reduction of Nuclear Forces

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Defense or the National Nuclear Security Administration may be obligated or expended to carry out reductions to the nuclear forces of the United States required by the New START Treaty until the Secretary of Defense provides the plan required by section 1042(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) and the President certifies that any reductions to U.S. nuclear forces below the level required by the New START Treaty will be carried out only pursuant to a treaty or international agreement approved according to the Treaty Clause of the Constitution of the United States or an affirmative Act of Congress. This section would except those funds required to carry out inspections pursuant to the New START Treaty or reductions made to ensure the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of U.S. nuclear weapons and delivery systems.

Section 1053—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Reduction or Consolidation of Dual-Capable Aircraft Based in Europe

This section would provide that funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available may not be used to reduce or consolidate United States Dual-Capable Aircraft in Europe until 90 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Russian Federation has carried out similar actions; the Secretary has consulted with the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) about the proposed action with respect to United States Dual Capable Aircraft; and, there is a consensus among NATO member states in support of such action.

Section 1054—Statement of Policy on Implementation of Any Agreement for Further Arms Reduction Below the Levels of the New START Treaty; Limitation on Retirement or Dismantlement of Strategic Delivery Systems

This section would provide a Statement of Policy that reductions of United States nuclear forces that would rely on the verification regime of the New START Treaty can only be made pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President as set forth in the Treaty Clause of the Constitution of the United States or by Act of Congress.

This section would also provide that reductions below 800 strategic delivery vehicles, as defined by the New START Treaty, may not be made unless the President certifies a treaty has entered into force or an international agreement made pursuant to an affirmative Act of Congress has entered into force and such agreement includes significant and proportional reductions in non-strategic nuclear weapons of the Russian Federation; the President certifies the Russian Federation is in compliance with its nuclear arms control

obligations to the United States; and, the President has "high confidence" in intelligence community judgments on the nuclear forces of the People's Republic of China.

Section 1055—Sense of Congress on Compliance with Nuclear Arms Control Agreements

This section would state the sense of Congress that the President should consider not seeking to further limit or reduce the nuclear forces of the United States, including by negotiation, with a foreign country that remains in active noncompliance with existing nuclear arms control obligations, such as the Russian Federation.

This section would also require the President, if he determines that a foreign country is not in compliance with its nuclear arms control obligations, to immediately consult with the Congress on the implications of such noncompliance; to submit to Congress a plan concerning the diplomatic strategy of the President to engage such foreign country to bring it into full compliance with such obligations; and, at the earliest date, to submit a report to Congress detailing whether adherence to such agreement remains in the national security interest of the United States and how the United States will redress the effect of such noncompliance.

Section 1056—Retention of Capability to Redeploy Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to ensure that the Air Force is capable of deploying multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRV) to Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and any ground-based strategic deterrent follow-on to such missiles. This section would require the Secretary to ensure that the Air Force is capable of commencing such deployment not later than 270 days after the date on which the President determines such deployment is necessary.

This section would also require the Nuclear Weapons Council to ensure that the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile contains a sufficient number of warheads that are capable of being deployed as MIRVs on Minuteman III and any ground-based strategic deterrent follow on to such missiles and that such deployment is capable of being commenced not later than 270 days after the date on which the President determines such deployment is necessary.

The April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review concluded that, "the United States will 'deMIRV' all deployed ICBMs, so that each Minuteman III ICBM has only one nuclear warhead." The committee believes that the capability to "reMIRV" the Nation's ICBMs must be retained to mitigate the risk of a widespread technical failure in another leg of the nuclear triad or changes in the geopolitical environment that requires a more robust U.S. nuclear force posture.

The committee's intent is to mandate retention of the capability to reMIRV ICBMs, but it does not intend to impose undue costs by an unreasonable timeframe for initiating "reMIRVing." The committee is also aware that the commander, U.S. Strategic Command is assessing the requirements related to reMIRVing capabilities. The committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to provide a

briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2013, on the current and expected future requirements, costs, and timelines for beginning to reMIRV the Nation's ICBMs.

Section 1057—Assessment of Nuclear Weapons Program of the People's Republic of China

This section would amend section 1045(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to extend the date of the required assessment until August 15, 2014.

This section would also provide not more than 75 percent of the funds made available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for travel may be obligated or expended until 30 days after the Secretary notifies the appropriate congressional committees that the assessment has begun.

Section 1058—Cost Estimates for Nuclear Weapons

This section would amend section 1043(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to include in the annual report required by such section a detailed estimate of the personnel costs associated with sustaining and modernizing the nuclear deterrent and nuclear weapons stockpile of the United States. The report required by section 1043(a) of Public Law 112–81 would also be required to describe how and which locations were included with the cost estimate provided by the report.

Section 1059—Report on New START Treaty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff to jointly submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on whether the New START Treaty is in the national security interests of the United States.

SUBTITLE G—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1061—Enhancement of Capacity of the United States Government to Analyze Captured Records

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to establish a Conflict Records Research Center to facilitate research and analysis of records captured from countries, organizations, and individuals, now or once hostile, to the United States.

The committee recognizes that there are significant records available to the U.S. Government that could be useful for academic and policy research once immediate, tactical exploitation and dissemination has occurred. The committee believes that research and analysis of such captured records would increase the understanding of factors related to international relations, counterterrorism, conventional and unconventional warfare and, ultimately, enhance national security.

The committee notes that such a center currently exists, but additional statutory authorization would allow the Center to be fund-

ed collectively by the Department of Defense and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and other departments and agencies, rather than rely on discrete partner funding for each activity. This would also allow the Center to receive funding from other agencies, states, or other foreign and domestic entities.

The committee also understands that there exists procedures by which the intelligence community works with this Center to ensure that the intelligence value of specific documents is exhausted before releasing them to the academic community, as well as ensure the protection of classified information, sources and methods, and personally identifiable information. The committee expects the Center to ensure such procedures continue to be implemented in a manner to protect such information and encourages the Department to continue working with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to refine and improve those procedures.

Section 1062—Extension of Authority to Provide Military Transportation Services to Certain Other Agencies at the Department of Defense Reimbursement Rate

This section would amend section 2642 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to provide other Federal agencies transportation at the same rate the Department of Defense charges its own units for similar transportation. This section would also expand the authority to allow the use of the extra capacity on strategic transportation assets of the military for transportation provided in support of foreign military sales.

Section 1063—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Modification of Force Structure of the Army

This section would prevent the Department of the Army from spending any fiscal year 2014 funds to modify the force structure or basing strategy of the Army until the Secretary of the Army submits to Congress the report on force structure required by section 1066 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1943).

Section 1064—Limitation on Use of Funds for Public-Private Cooperation Activities

This section would prohibit the Department of Defense from obligating or expending any funds for public-private cooperation (PPC) activities undertaken by a combatant command until the Secretary of Defense submits the report on the conclusions of the Defense Business Board as directed in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

The committee is aware that the Defense Business Board completed its report on the Department's public-private cooperation activities in July 2012. The Defense Business Board report found "the single most frequently cited issue preventing the advancement of PPCs is the absence (actual or perceived) of legal authority." The committee is concerned about the lack of guidance for planning, supporting, or executing a PPC activity. The committee recognizes the value of PPC activities, particularly if they can effectively and

efficiently leverage the resources of civil society and private entities to maximize Department of Defense activities. However, the committee believes it is important that the Department work with Congress to provide supporting doctrine, clear policy, and the proper authorities for the successful planning and execution of PPC activities.

SUBTITLE H—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1071—Oversight of Combat Support Agencies

This section would require that assessments of combat support agencies undertaken pursuant to section 193(a) of title 10, United States Code, be submitted to the congressional defense committees.

Section 1072—Inclusion in Annual Report of Description of Interagency Coordination Relating to Humanitarian Demining Technology

This section would modify current reporting requirements for humanitarian demining as defined within section 407(d) of title 10, United States Code, to include interagency, research and development activities.

Section 1073—Extension of Deadline for Comptroller General Report on Assignment of Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense as Advisors to Foreign Ministries of Defense

This section would modify section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to extend the deadline for the required report of the Comptroller General of the United States from December 30, 2013, to December 30, 2014.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense will not deploy its first global Ministry of Defense Advisor (MODA) until June 2013. Therefore, the committee believes additional time is needed for the Government Accountability Office to thoroughly review and report on the effectiveness of the MODA program.

Section 1074—Repeal of Requirement for Comptroller General Assessment of Department of Defense Efficiencies

This section would repeal section 1054 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), relating to the implementation of the efficiencies undertaken in 2010 by then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates.

The committee notes that the Comptroller General of the United States recommended that Government Accountability Office resources might be better used to address other congressional priorities, as any future reports on 2011 and 2012 efficiencies implementation would provide little additive information to the data that has already been reported. Moreover, the committee believes that while there was merit in ensuring that the efficiencies identified in 2010 were actually generating the savings projected, the effort has been overtaken by events, including the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) and the implementation of sequestration starting in March 2013, which would make it difficult to ascertain

whether savings were the result of the 2010 effort or some other cause.

Section 1075—Matters for Inclusion in the Assessment of the 2013 Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would require the National Defense Panel (NDP) established pursuant to subsection 118(f) of title 10, United States Code, to review a recommendation of the Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel (QDRIP), which conducted an assessment of the 2009 quadrennial defense review. The members of the QDRIP found that there was insufficient top down guidance on priorities, roles, and missions to allow the Department of Defense to effectively plan its missions, structure, or resources, or to develop integration and coordination with other departments and agencies. Appendix 4 of the report of the QDRIP recommended the establishment of an independent strategic review panel to review the national security strategic environment of the next 20 years and provide prioritized goal and risk assessment guidance for use by the U.S. Government. The committee believes the concerns of the QDRIP are well founded, but seeks the advice of the current NDP regarding this recommendation, in light of the release of several strategic planning documents since the conclusion of the QDRIP.

In addition, this section would require the NDP to incorporate the assumptions and the findings of the Strategic Choices and Management Review (SCMR), directed by the Secretary of Defense during calendar year 2013, into its assessment of the Quadrennial Defense Review conducted during calendar year 2013. Furthermore, this section would require the Secretary to make information about both the 2013 quadrennial defense review and the SCMR available to the NDP in the conduct of its assessment.

Finally, although the committee commends the effort underway in the SCMR, elsewhere in this report, the committee notes that such an effort may be duplicative of reviews mandated within title 10, United States Code. The committee encourages the Secretary to ensure that the SCMR, or any other self-initiated, short-term review, does not replace the thorough, long-term strategic assessment that should be conducted as part of the 2013 quadrennial defense review. Likewise, the committee believes the Secretary of Defense would benefit from the independent counsel of the NDP. However, the committee is disappointed that the Secretary has not appointed the remaining members of the NDP, as required, by February 1, 2013, and encourages the Secretary to appoint the remaining members of the NDP.

Section 1076—Review and Assessment of United States Special Operations Forces and United States Special Operations Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense of the United States to review and assess the organization, missions, and authorities related to U.S. Special Operations Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees.

Section 1077—Reports on Unmanned Aircraft Systems

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, on behalf of the Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Executive Committee, to jointly submit a report on unmanned aircraft system collaboration, demonstration, use cases and data sharing to the appropriate committees of Congress within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the UAS Executive Committee, to submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress setting forth the resource requirements needed to meet the milestones for unmanned aircraft systems integration described in the 5-year roadmap under section 332(a)(5) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act (Public Law 112–95).

Section 1078—Online Availability of Reports Submitted to Congress

This section would amend section 122a of title 10, United States Code, to require certain unclassified reports be made available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Defense.

Section 1079—Provision of Defense Planning Guidance and Contingency Operation Plan Information to Congress

This section would amend section 113(g) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at the time of the budget submission by the President for each fiscal year thereafter, an annual report containing summaries of the guidance developed in accordance with the requirements of such section. Additionally, this section would provide a limitation on the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds, authorized to be appropriated by this Act for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the first report required by this section.

SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1081—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

Section 1082—Transportation of Supplies for the United States by Aircraft Operated by United States Air Carriers

This section would modify section 2631a, chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, to provide a preference for Civil Reserve Air Fleet aircraft for the transportation of Department of Defense supplies. This section would also require the Department of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees regarding outsize and oversize cargo. Finally, this section would amend chap-

ter 401 of title 49, United States Code, to direct at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of the equipment, materials, or commodities that are procured, contracted or subcontracted for by the U.S. Government, be transported by the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. An exception to the 50 percent requirement is provided for the use of military services of the United States or to respond to a humanitarian disaster. Additionally, a temporary waiver to the gross tonnage requirement is provided for the President, the Secretary of Transportation, or the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, under certain conditions.

Section 1083—Reduction in Costs to Report Critical Changes to Major Automated Information System Programs

This section would give Department of Defense senior officials responsible for major automated information system programs the option of submitting to the congressional defense committees either a critical change report when required, or a streamlined notification when the official further concludes that the critical change occurred primarily due to congressional action, such as a reduction in program funding.

Section 1084—Extension of Authority of Secretary of Transportation to Issue Non-Premium Aviation Insurance

This section would amend section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, relating to the expiration of non-premium insurance under chapter 443 of that title to extend the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide insurance and reinsurance.

Section 1085—Revision of Compensation of Members of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force

This section would enable parity for compensation and ethics workday computations by decreasing and making optional the annual compensation rate for commissioners appointed to the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force that was established in subtitle G of title III of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

Section 1086—Protection of Tier One Task Critical Assets from Electromagnetic Pulse and High-Powered Microwave Systems

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to certify to the congressional defense committees that defense critical assets designated as tier one task critical assets (TCAs) are protected from the adverse effects of electromagnetic pulses and high-powered microwave systems. For tier one TCAs not certified, the Department shall submit a plan on how to mitigate any risks to mission assurance, including any steps that may be needed for remediation.

Section 1087—Strategy for Future Military Information Operations Capabilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a strategy for developing and sustaining military

information operations capabilities for future contingencies. This strategy would be delivered to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2014.

Section 1088—Compliance of Military Departments with Minimum Safe Staffing Standards

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that all military departments comply with Department of Defense Fire and Emergency Services Program policy requirements on safe staffing.

Section 1089—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to disclose the transportation cost incurred by the Department of Defense for certain congressional travel.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

National Research Council Report on Chemical Biological Defense Programs Capabilities

The committee is aware that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Chemical Biological Defense (DASD (CBD)) requested a study from the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences to identify the core capabilities in science and technology that the Chemical Biological Defense Program must sustain for the successful completion of Chemical Biological Defense Program's mission. The committee notes that the NRC report contained multiple findings and recommendations for the DASD (CBD). The committee also notes recent efforts by the DASD (CBD) to implement programmatic changes to address these recommendations and is encouraged by the improvements being made to the program. The committee encourages the DASD (CBD) to continue these efforts, in particular in regards to finding ways to more effectively utilize academic and industrial facilities that focus on developing capabilities in basic science and technology research, including those facilities related to bioforensics and biosecurity.

Wage Grade Pay Parity at Joint Installations

The committee continues to be concerned about pay parity for Department of Defense employees at joint bases and is disappointed that it has not received the required follow up from the Office of Personnel Management regarding the actions being taken to address the Federal Prevailing Wage System area within the same General Schedule (GS) locality pay area, as directed in the committee report (H. Rpt. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. Since October 2010, the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee has consistently recommended consolidation of the Federal Wage System area with-

in the same GS locality pay area; however, no further action has been taken. As previously noted, an example of pay disparity is Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, New Jersey, where the former McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix are in the Philadelphia cost-of-living area, and the former Lakehurst Naval Air Engineering Station is in the New York cost-of-living area. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, to brief the committee not later than January 31, 2014, on actions planned or previously undertaken to correct the disparities between GS and Federal Wage System employees employed at joint military installations.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—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 1 year, the authority to waive the limitations on the amount of premium pay that may be paid to a Federal 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 response 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 1102—One-Year Extension of Discretionary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone

This section would authorize temporary discretionary authority to Federal agencies to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities comparable to those provided to members of the foreign service to an agency's civilian employees on official duty in a combat zone.

Section 1103—Extension of Voluntary Reduction-In-Force Authority for Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense

This section would amend 3502(f)(5) of title 5, United States Code, to extend existing reduction in force authority from September 30, 2014, to September 30, 2015.

Section 1104—Extension of Authority to Make Lump-Sum Severance Payments to Department of Defense Employees

This section would extend by 4 years the authority for the Secretary of Defense or a service secretary to allow eligible Department of Defense employees scheduled to be involuntarily separated from Federal service to request a lump sum severance payment in lieu of biweekly payments.

Section 1105—Revision to Amount of Financial Assistance under Department of Defense Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) Defense Education Program

This section would remove the specific items for which financial assistance may be provided under the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) program. Such revisions would increase the flexibility that the Secretary of Defense would have in exercising discretion in administration of the SMART Program and will lessen the administrative burden in SMART Program operations. It would also allow the Secretary to make SMART Program stipend costs more consistent with other Federal scholarship-for-service educational programs.

Section 1106—Extension of Program for Exchange of Information-Technology Personnel

This section would authorize the Information Technology Exchange Program (ITEP) for the Department of Defense until 2023.

The committee is aware that ITEP was established in order to allow employees from the private sector or academia to temporarily work for the Department of Defense, as well as Department of Defense employees to work in the private sector. The committee believes that this kind of technical exchange of ideas is helpful in fostering the sharing of industry, federal cultures, and technical expertise in ways that will help modernize the Department of Defense by exposing its employees to best practices from the constantly changing and evolving informational technology sector, especially in key areas like cloud computing, cyber security, information technology (IT) consolidation, network services, IT project and data management, and enterprise architecture. The committee also believes industry would benefit from learning how the Department of Defense operates and how it can better serve the Department's needs.

Section 1107—Defense Science Initiative for Personnel

This section would establish new authorities for personnel hiring and management of Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to conduct oversight of ongoing operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the war on terrorism, and those steps the Department of Defense must take to be prepared for an increasingly uncertain global security environment. In particular, the committee focuses on three core areas in this title directly connected to current U.S. national security interests and emerging threats facing our country. First, the committee resources the mission to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, while concurrently providing oversight of the transition in Afghanistan. Second, the committee strengthens its

oversight of security force assistance and military-to-military interactions throughout the world, including authorizing resources to combat transnational terrorism. Third, the committee works to enhance its oversight, and the resourcing, of efforts to deal with emerging and evolving threats around the world, including Al Qaeda and associated forces, the nuclear ambitions of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the conflict in Syria, and military developments in the Asia-Pacific.

The committee maintains its oversight of the campaign in Afghanistan, especially as the current mission concludes in 2014, as well as the capability and capacity of the Afghan National Security Forces who are moving into the lead for security in Afghanistan. The committee continues to resource key authorities to support the gains made in Afghanistan. However, the committee believes that a Bilateral Security Agreement (BSA) between the United States and the Government of Afghanistan remains a critical element of the ongoing transition in Afghanistan. Therefore, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the use of a significant portion of the funds for Afghanistan development and reconstruction until the Secretary of Defense certifies that a BSA is signed and includes critical protections for U.S. service members and U.S. interests. The committee also recognizes the strategic value of the United States' relationship with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, as well as the challenges that accompany it, especially as the U.S. continues to rely upon Pakistan to target al Qaeda and associated forces operating within its borders and to transship supplies and equipment to and from Afghanistan.

The committee also has taken several steps to resource key security assistance programs and activities which are critical to addressing other security challenges. The committee would expand the types of assistance that could be provided by the global train and equip authority originally provided by section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The committee will maintain close scrutiny of the use of this more flexible authority to ensure projects are executed consistent with congressional intent, other provisions of law, and policy. At the same time, the committee remains concerned about the progress of the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF), originally authorized by section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee believes that if the Department of Defense and the Department of State cannot successfully establish GSCF with full operational capability, including planning, executing, and assessing GSCF activities, then it may be necessary to terminate or allow this authority to expire.

The committee continues to applaud the success of the United States military in its global pursuit of al Qaeda. However, the committee remains concerned that al Qaeda and its affiliated and associated forces, though diminished in capacity in Afghanistan since 2001, would attack the United States if able and continue to threaten United States interests. Ungoverned spaces and the turmoil of the Arab Spring have enabled extremists to emerge in new countries within the greater Middle East, Africa, and throughout the world. Some of these groups have demonstrated the ability to

conduct lethal attacks—akin to that which occurred in Benghazi, Libya on September 11, 2012. Consequently, the committee believes that the Department of Defense must review its posture, alert status, and enabler support to deploy and respond to such attacks.

The committee also supports the efforts of the Department of Defense to prepare and position itself in preparation for other threats. Iran continues to defy the international community and appears to be committed to developing nuclear weapons. The committee believes the development of such weapons would destabilize the region as well as threaten U.S. national security interests. Thus, the committee believes that it is critical that the United States military is appropriately postured, and agreements are in place, to defend the Arabian Gulf or take military action, if necessary.

The committee continues its rigorous oversight of the conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic. The committee would express a sense of Congress that all courses of action should be fully considered to enforce the President's stated red lines concerning the use of weapons of mass destruction. Likewise, the committee believes the Department of Defense needs to develop and refine various military options to respond to the conflict in Syria to inform the President's decision making and to keep Congress informed of the risks of all courses of action or inaction. Finally, the committee would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to train and equip military and civilian partners in the region of Syria for Weapons of Mass Destruction consequence management in Syria and the region.

Finally, the committee has taken steps to ensure that the United States military is well positioned to address challenges in the Asia-Pacific region. The committee continues to monitor the modernization of the military of the People's Republic of China and their participation in regional, multinational exercises. The committee remains resolved that the rogue actions of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are unacceptable and contrary to international peace and stability. In order to maintain a clear understanding of the potential military threat posed by North Korea, the committee would extend the reporting requirement regarding North Korea's military capabilities through 2017. The committee also recommends other forms of partnership that could have a force-multiplying effect in the region, such as a Japanese and South Korean information sharing agreement, in addition to advocating for sufficient investments in modernization to respond to the challenges in the Asia-Pacific.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assistance to Civilians in Locations where U.S. Combat Operations Occur

The committee notes military commander support for providing recognition and assistance to civilians who suffer harm as a result of U.S. combat operations. This assistance can help address harm before it creates anger and resentment, and it can reduce local opposition to the presence or activities of U.S. military personnel. The committee encourages military commanders to utilize the authori-

ties available to provide assistance, as appropriate, to civilians who suffer harm in a combat zone. These include:

(1) The Foreign Claims Act (FCA), which authorizes the payment of claims in connection with non-combat activities of U.S. military forces outside the United States. The FCA does not authorize compensation for losses resulting directly or indirectly from combat activities;

(2) Solatia payments under section 2242 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes payments to a victim or a victim's family to express sympathy for an injury or loss suffered when such payments are consistent with the local custom. These payments are not claim payments and are not based on any acceptance of legal liability by the United States. However, for these payments to be made, the relevant combatant commander must approve them for a particular theater; and

(3) The Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP), which allows commanders in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to make ex gratia condolence or battle damage payments for harm caused by U.S. or coalition forces. Payments under CERP are provided as sympathy payments or to provide humanitarian relief to the victim or the victim's family. The committee notes that CERP will not endure as a tool for our commanders in future conflicts, as it is theater specific.

These authorities have contributed greatly to promoting goodwill with the local populace in combat zones. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consider adopting a standing policy so that commanders know how and when to make amends for the harm they may cause as a result of their lawful combat operations rather than create new ad hoc programs in each new theater. This policy should be included in the planning for future operations and should include, as appropriate, guidance on the authorities for, and utilization of, assistance to foreign civilians that are harmed incident to U.S. combat operations overseas.

Congressional Notifications Relating To Status of Forces Agreements

The committee believes that it must have a comprehensive understanding of forthcoming and on-going Status of Forces Agreement negotiations that the United States is preparing to enter into, or has entered into, with other countries. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees not later than 15 days after the date on which a Status of Forces Agreement between the United States and a foreign nation is signed, renewed, amended or otherwise revised, or terminated. However, this requirement does not ensure that the committee has a comprehensive understanding of forthcoming and on-going Status of Forces Agreement negotiations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, not later than September 30, 2013, to provide a briefing on the status of any Status of Forces Agreements that: (1) expire, which the United States intends to renew in the next calendar year; (2) the United States intends to enter into in the next calendar year; or

(3) contain amendments that the Secretary of Defense deems as substantial that are likely to be negotiated in the next calendar year.

The briefing should also include the status of on-going Status of Force Agreement negotiations.

Governance in Afghanistan and the Afghan Presidential Elections

The committee believes that credible governance and leadership that is perceived as legitimate by the Afghan people continues to be, and will remain, a critical condition for enduring, long-term stability of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the region. Therefore, the United States must help the Afghans achieve a democratic, transparent, and legitimate election for their next president in 2014, as such an election will be essential for Afghans to believe in the future of Afghanistan. Moreover, a credible election process and a legitimate election outcome will contribute to stability in the region, which is fundamental to the United States' enduring interests.

Importance of International Security Assistance Force Retrograde for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Role of U.S. European Command

The committee believes the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) retrograde from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan is important to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and its partners. The committee recognizes U.S. European Command's (USEUCOM) support role in coordinating with other U.S. combatant commands, military services, NATO allies, and NATO partners for the successful recovery of an estimated $28.0 billion in U.S. equipment and materiel, and billions more in allied and partner materiel, from the sustained operations in Afghanistan. Several important northern routes, which compliment the southern route through the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in U.S. Central Command's area, are within USEUCOM's area of operations. The committee recognizes the Northern Distribution Network provides multiple options to move tens of thousands of containers and vehicles and extends opportunities to work with key allies and partners in NATO. USEUCOM's assistance to, and collaboration with, these NATO allies and partners in recovering their assets while they, in turn, provide strategic access in their nations to conduct critical intermodal transportation access to move U.S. materiel home, provides a unique opportunity to enhance logistical interoperability and capabilities across the alliance.

Missile Defense Discussions between the United States and the Russian Federation

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and the Department of State have provided several briefings on U.S. Government discussions with the Russian Federation regarding missile defense. The committee commends both agencies for keeping it informed of the many developments in the U.S.-Russia dialogue on missile defense.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives by June 30, 2013, copies of all information, including presentations and documents, on U.S. missile defenses provided to the Russian Federation by the United States since January 1, 2007. This information should not be limited to "publicly releasable" information, as has been suggested by the Department of Defense.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to brief the aforementioned committees, every 6 months beginning June 30, 2013, and extending for 5 years, on discussions about missile defense between the United States and Russia; these briefings should include copies of any documents or presentations provided to Russia by the United States.

Missile Defense Programs of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China

In testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on April 18, 2013, the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency stated that, "China is also developing a tiered ballistic missile defense system and has successfully tested the upper-tier capability on two occasions." The committee is also aware that the Russian Federation announced late last year that it was reactivating a missile defense system around Moscow as part of its defense modernization program and that this defense system could include nuclear armed anti-missile defense warhead. Press reports indicate that Russia plans to test this system in 2013, and that Russia is pursuing the development of other missile defense systems, including the S–500 system.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command and the Director of National Intelligence, to assess the capability, intent, and drivers of the missile defense development and deployment activity by Russia and China. The assessment should address the following:

(1) Whether these missile defense deployments are intended to be used against U.S. nuclear and conventional capabilities and, if so, the attrition capable against U.S. nuclear and non-nuclear capabilities and the implications for U.S. deterrence and extended deterrence;

(2) A statement of the deterrence objectives of the United States against Russia and China; and

(3) The impact of U.S. missile defense plans on Russian and Chinese nuclear weapons acquisition plans, force posture, and policy; this information should be based on specific intelligence.

The committee further directs the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff to submit a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees on the findings of the assessment by November 30, 2013. The report should be in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Commitment to International Security Assistance Force Mission

The committee recognizes the important contribution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies and partners to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. NATO assumed command of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan beginning in 2003. ISAF is NATO's first-ever operational deployment outside Europe. The committee applauds all 28 NATO member nations that have provided troops to ISAF, and believes the NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan is a key provider of training and equipment to the Afghan National Security Forces. The committee also recognizes NATO allies and partners' commitment to Afghanistan after 2014. The committee believes that the ISAF mission has provided important lessons learned for the alliance's capabilities and capacity to conduct extended military operations. However, the committee remains concerned about the ongoing fiscal constraints to the military budgets of NATO allies. The committee encourages NATO allies to retain necessary military capabilities and capacity to conduct key missions and operations so that the combat and interoperability gains and lessons learned from ISAF are not lost once the combat mission ends.

Semi-Annual Reporting on Russian Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapon Deployments

The committee is aware that the Russian Federation is investing considerable resources to develop a new generation of long-range, sea-launched, land-attack cruise missiles capable of deploying nuclear or conventional warheads. Press reports indicate certain systems have ranges of as much as 2,500 kilometers. Press reports further indicate these systems may have already been deployed on attack and ballistic missile submarines of the Russian Federation. The committee is concerned that such cruise missiles may pose a threat to the United States, but are not limited under any arms control treaty. The committee believes there is little practical difference between so-called "strategic" and "non-strategic" nuclear weapons if used against the United States or its allies, yet one class is limited by treaty and the other class is completely unregulated.

The committee directs the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency to provide unclassified semi-annual reports, with a classified annex if necessary, detailing the status of the development and deployment by the Russian Federation of nuclear weapons and associated delivery systems not subject to strategic arms control treaties. Such reports shall include status of deployment, numbers of deployed systems, expected employment doctrine, and status of training in the employment of such systems by the military forces of the Russian Federation. The committee directs the first such report to be provided not later than September 15, 2013, and not later than every 90 days thereafter until September 2016.

Report and Briefings on Declassification of Certain Missile Defense Information

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to make available to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a summary of the deliberations of the National Disclosure Policy Committee related to the release of classified, Official Use Only, or For Official Use Only information on U.S. missile defenses to the Russian Federation since at least January 1, 2007, by not later than November 30, 2013. Such summary should include, at a minimum, the reason for the proposed release, the outcome of the deliberation of the National Disclosure Policy Committee, and a risk assessment of the potential use or misuse of the information, including whether the information could be transferred to another party, if the National Disclosure Policy Committee determined to release information to Russia on U.S. missile defenses.

The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, or a designee, to provide the aforementioned congressional committees with regular briefings, beginning November 30, 2013, and every 6 months thereafter until November 20, 2018, if there are additional disclosures, on additional releases and associated deliberations of the National Disclosure Policy Committee.

Report on Operation Observant Compass

The committee continues to support Operation Observant Compass, the U.S. Africa Command mission to provide advisory support to the Ugandan People's Defense Force's efforts to counter the Lord Resistance Army (LRA) and kill or apprehend Joseph Kony. However, the committee is concerned that this mission is open-ended in nature and that precise metrics have not been established to: (1) measure progress; and (2) determine if or when the mission has evolved toward a point of diminishing returns for the resources applied. This issue is particularly pressing since the requirements for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets remain high in other regions of the Continent of Africa, particularly in North and East Africa, due to Al Qaeda-affiliated and oriented terrorist groups. Yet, the requirements for ISR in these other locations are competing with the "Counter-LRA" campaign.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2013, that outlines, at a minimum, the following:

(1) The specific goals of the "Counter-LRA" campaign;

(2) The precise metrics used to measure progress in the campaign; and

(3) The required steps that will be taken to transition the "Counter-LRA" campaign if it is determined that it is no longer necessary for the United States to support the current mission.

Report on Terms and Agreements for Retrograde of U.S. Equipment and Supplies Through the Northern Distribution Network and Pakistan

As the United States executes its retrograde of equipment and supplies out of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in preparation for the end of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization mission on December 31, 2014, and the United States' post-2014 residual military presence to conduct counterterrorism and security assistance operations, the committee lacks a detailed understanding of the terms, conditions, or caveats on the movement of U.S. equipment and supplies through the Northern Distribution Network (NDN) and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 2, 2013, that includes the following:

(1) A description of the terms and agreements, including any conditions or caveats, between the United States and the Government of Pakistan relating to the use of the Ground Lines of Communication (GLOC) through Pakistan in support of U.S. forces in the Afghanistan or for the retrograde of U.S. equipment out of Afghanistan; and

(2) A description of the terms and agreements, including any conditions or caveats, between the United States and those countries associated with the NDN, for support of U.S. forces in Afghanistan or for the retrograde of U.S. equipment and supplies from Afghanistan through the NDN.

Report on U.S. Strategy in Afghanistan Post-2014

The long-term U.S. strategy and approach to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan remains critical to U.S. national security goals and interests. Afghanistan possesses a distinctive geographic and ethno-linguistic landscape that has unique importance and resonance to both the jihadist, whose narrative and ideology are bolstered by Afghanistan's history, but also the regional actors, whose national interests have driven them toward maintaining their influence within Afghanistan. The U.S. strategy and long-term commitment to Afghanistan is critical to setting the dynamics and the assumptions of the regional actors and the terrorist threats in the region.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, by January 15, 2014, on the U.S. strategy in Afghanistan following the end of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization mission on December 31, 2014. Specifically, the report should include, but is not limited to, a discussion of:

(1) The core U.S. interests in Afghanistan and the region;

(2) The U.S. goals post-2014 and how the United States will achieve these goals;

(3) The assumptions underpinning the strategy in Afghanistan and the length of the broader U.S. commitment to Afghanistan;

(4) The military mission sets that are required to support the strategy;

(5) The specific efforts, which are currently being conducted by the International Security and Assistance Force, that will be handed over to other U.S. Federal agencies or the Government of Afghanistan; and

(6) The long-term plan for sustainment of the infrastructure and equipment for the Afghan National Security Forces.

Report on U.S. Support to Advising Mission in Afghanistan

In June 2011, the President announced that the U.S. mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan would be moving from combat to support by December 31, 2014. A central element of the transfer of lead security responsibility to Afghanistan is the development of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF). To that end, the Department of Defense has used a variety of approaches to advise and assist the ANSF, such as the use of U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps Security Force Assistance Advisor Teams and, more recently, the U.S. Army's Security Force Assistance Brigades. The future of these efforts depends on the post-2014 U.S. presence in Afghanistan.

In February 2013, the President announced that U.S. troop presence in Afghanistan would be reduced by half to 34,000 U.S. troops by February 2014, with additional reductions to follow. At the same time, the President announced that beyond 2014, the U.S. commitment to a unified and sovereign Afghanistan will endure, but the nature of the commitment will focus on training and equipping Afghan forces as well as continued counterterrorism efforts. The committee understands that the specific nature of troop reductions and the mission of U.S. forces in Afghanistan will continue to be refined, but is concerned about the impact that these reductions may have on the Department's ability to support the remaining forces engaged in the advising mission. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by January 10, 2014, that reviews the Department of Defense's efforts to support the advising mission through December 2014, including:

(1) To what extent the Department has identified the composition and missions of U.S. forces as it makes its troop reductions over the next year;

(2) To what extent the Department has identified the support and security requirements for the remaining forces that will be engaged in the advising mission as force reductions occur;

(3) What challenges, if any, the Department faces in providing support and security for the advising mission, and what steps has it taken to mitigate any challenges; and

(4) To what extent the Department has defined the intended missions and related requirements for conducting the post-2014 training mission.

Resource Requirements For and Posture of Fleet Anti-Terrorism Security Teams and Commanders' In-Extremis Forces

Stemming from the terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, and the subsequent congressional oversight into the event, the committee is concerned that U.S. crisis response elements such as the Fleet Anti-Terrorism Security Teams (FAST) and the Commanders' In-Extremis Force (CIF) may not be sufficiently postured, fully capable, or adequately resourced to respond to future crises in the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) and U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) areas of responsibility.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by September 2, 2013, that outlines the following:

(1) The operational requirements for FAST and CIF in the USCENTCOM and USAFRICOM areas of responsibility;

(2) The assumptions underpinning such requirements;

(3) The intelligence threat picture and the risk assessment(s) that drive the planning for such requirements;

(4) The gap(s), if any, between such requirements and current resourcing; and

(5) The required posture of the enabling capabilities to support FAST and CIF within the USCENTCOM and USAFRICOM areas of responsibility.

Resource Requirements to Support U.S. Policy Objectives in Syria

The conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic continues to grow more lethal over time. The regime of President Bashar al-Assad is utilizing conventional and unconventional weapons, including chemical weapons, to defeat the opposition fighting against the regime. Events in Syria threaten the vital national security interests of the United States; however, the committee remains concerned that it does not have a comprehensive understanding of the resources required for certain courses of action that could shape the outcome of the conflict in Syria. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2013, that includes an assessment of the resources required for the following courses of actions:

(1) Conducting limited air strikes against runways and other infrastructure that would prevent the regime of President Bashar al-Assad from deploying fixed wing aircraft or resupply via the air;

(2) Establishing a no-fly zone over western Syria, enforced from the sea, that would prevent fixed or rotary wing aircraft from deploying or resupply via the air in that area;

(3) Creating safe zones sufficient to allow the Syrian opposition to change the military balance on the ground;

(4) Arming the Free Syrian Army with heavy military equipment to change the military balance on the ground; and

(5) Providing additional aid to Jordan and other regional allies to assist in securing all or some of the Syrian chemical weapons stockpile should it be required.

Additionally, the assessment should identify where U.S. capabilities likely would be required for each of these courses of action and the effects that such courses of action would have in supporting a range of U.S. policy objectives in Syria and the region.

RIMPAC 2014 Oversight

The committee recognizes the importance of the Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) Exercises, one of the world's largest international maritime warfare exercises. The committee is aware that the People's Republic of China's People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) has accepted an invitation by the United States to participate in the 2014 RIMPAC Exercise.

Because of the unique nature of the exercise and the diverse group of participants, the committee deems it important to better comprehend PLAN participation in RIMPAC 2014. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to brief the congressional defense committees, no less than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Act to the Committee on the Armed Services of the House, on the intended scope of PLAN participation in RIMPAC 2014 and the compliance of PLAN participation in RIPMAC 2014 with the 12 operational areas that were prohibited for mil-to-mil contact between the Department of Defense and PLA consistent with section 1201(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Security Assistance and the Leahy Law

The committee supports the intent of the Limitation on Assistance to Security Forces as set forth in section 2378d of title 22, United States Code, and section 8058 of the Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74) collectively and commonly known as the "Leahy Law." The committee notes that the Leahy Law, through its prohibition on security assistance to foreign forces that have been implicated in gross violations of human rights, promotes respect for human rights abroad. Further, the committee believes that the law can assist in professionalizing foreign military and security forces by linking the resumption of security assistance to action to correct human rights abuses.

The committee notes that the Department of State conducts the human rights vetting process on behalf of the Department of Defense. In keeping with these laws, current policies require the vetting of unit commanders and their units when full-unit training is requested, and the vetting of individual security force members and their respective units when individual training is requested.

While the committee supports the intent of the law and the coordination processes between the Department of Defense and the Department of State, the committee is concerned about the implementation of the law. Two recent committee hearings have highlighted a potential divergence between the intent of the law and its application to certain Department of Defense security assistance activities planned with full Chief of Mission concurrence. At those hearings, geographic combatant commanders testified before the committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities that the law, "is at times stopping us per-

haps more broadly than was the congressional intent," and that the law, "has restricted us in a number of countries across the globe in our ability to train units that we think need to be trained, that the U.S. Ambassador in many cases thinks needs to be trained, that those nations think need to be trained, and yet because of some of the restrictions of the Leahy amendment, we are prohibited from doing that."

The committee additionally notes a difference in language between section 2378d of title 22, United States Code, and section 8058 of Public Law 112–74 that may create a potential for misinterpretation. While section 2378d of title 22 notes that a prohibition shall remain in effect until "the Government of such country is taking effective steps to bring the responsible members of the security forces unit to justice," the concomitant section 8058 of Public Law 112–74 makes no funds available, "unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken." The committee believes that amended and clarifying language may be required to address any potential divergence between the intent of the law and its application.

The committee expects to remain engaged on this issue and to work with the Departments of Defense and State, the relevant congressional defense committees, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate to ensure that Department of Defense needs and requirements are fully addressed, while continually complying with the intent of the Leahy Law.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the implementation of the Leahy Law with respect to Department of Defense security assistance programs. The briefing should outline current implementation policies, limitations and recommendations for improvements.

Support for Military Information Sharing Agreement Between the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea and Related Initiatives

The committee continues to monitor the rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific region, as outlined in the defense strategic guidance released in January 2012. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee noted the importance of the Asia-Pacific region and the importance of the military having sufficient capability and capacity to effectively operate in the region. The committee seeks to ensure that investment and operation and maintenance accounts are adequately funded to conduct the rebalance, while meeting operational demands elsewhere around the globe. In addition, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to support initiatives that could increase cooperation and capabilities among allies. In particular, the committee notes that a military information sharing agreement has been a topic of negotiation between the Government of Japan and the Government of the Republic of Korea. The committee commends this effort, and recognizes that improved coordination and communication among allies could

conserve U.S. resources in responding to various theater security events and improve response outcomes.

U.S. Extended Deterrence in Asia

The committee notes the importance of on-going dialogues and assurances of a reliable and credible extended deterrent for U.S. allies in Asia, in the context of the nuclear weapons program and developing missile threat from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and other security threats. The committee is aware of ongoing dialogues regarding extended deterrence between the United States and Japan and the United States and the Republic of Korea. The committee is also aware of goals to create a unified trilateral extended deterrence dialogue between the United States, Japan, and South Korea, and the committee supports this goal and encourages the Nation's allies to take steps to make its creation a reality.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, to brief the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives by October 1, 2013, on bilateral and multilateral dialogues with U.S. allies in Asia, including Japan and South Korea, to maintain credible and reliable extended deterrence assurances. The briefing should include transmission to the aforementioned committees of the terms of reference agreed to between the United States and South Korea in its discussions concerning the counter-provocation plan and tailored extended deterrence through the Extended Deterrence Policy Committee, as well as a detailed discussion of the United States and South Korea agreements and disagreements through that entity. The briefing should also provide an update on U.S. efforts to create the trilateral extended deterrence dialogue between the United States, Japan, and South Korea.

U.S. Military Engagement with Burma

The committee encourages advancement of democracy and respect for human rights in Southeast Asia, including the development of democratic institutions within the Union of Burma. The committee believes that the United States can play a constructive role in supporting democratic progress in Burma, even as the United States continues to verify and monitor the extent of recent reforms. As the President noted following the first visit by a president of Burma to the United States in 50 years, "his is a long journey and there is still much work to be done."

As cornerstones of further reform, the committee supports efforts to enhance military professionalism, accountability, civilian control, and transparency in Burma, to improve governmental responsiveness to the people of Burma, and to reduce the risk of human rights violations. The committee intends to closely oversee any proposals regarding military-to-military engagements between the United States and Burma. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to thoroughly evaluate the potential for developing military-to-military relations between the United States and

Burma and to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2013, on the findings and recommendations.

U.S. Policy and Interagency Strategy in Iraq

The committee remains concerned that the United States has not established a comprehensive policy that preserves U.S. interests in the Republic of Iraq. Moreover, the ambiguity and disjointedness associated with the U.S. policy and approach in Iraq has been evident through the bureaucratic infighting and the often disparate activities being conducted by the Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq (OSC–I) and the U.S. Embassy. The implications of the United States' ambiguous policy and approach is that the Government of Iraq has hedged its interests and future towards regional actors at the expense of U.S. interests.

The committee believes that the U.S. interagency should devise and implement a comprehensive policy and strategy in Iraq. Given the investment that the United States has made in Iraq and the importance of Iraq within an increasingly unstable region, it is imperative that the interagency conducts a fulsome policy analysis and applies the required resources to ensuring that Iraq sufficiently contemplates U.S. interests in Iraq and the region.

Moreover, the Department of Defense must work in concert with the Department of State to both normalize OSC–I within the U.S. Embassy in Iraq and to devise a long-term, sustainable structure and approach for OSC–I that supports the U.S. Embassy efforts and broader U.S. policy.

U.S. Strategic Partnership with Pakistan

The committee continues to be concerned about the direction of the United States' strategic partnership with the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan continues to allow the Haqqani Network to operate in Pakistan and attack U.S. troops in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Al Qaeda continues to enjoy sanctuary in, and operate from, the territory of Pakistan. Moreover, the Government of Pakistan has not allowed U.S. trainers to work with Pakistan's Frontier Corps, which has led the committee, in consultation with the Department of Defense, to not renew the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund in this Act. The committee does acknowledge that the Government of Pakistan has reversed its antagonistic course in some areas, including re-opening the Ground Lines of Communication, and has constructively worked with the International Security and Assistance Force on critical cross-border issues. However, more must be done in order for the committee to be confident that the Government of Pakistan is willing to engage in a comprehensive strategic partnership with the United States. The committee urges the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the Department of State, to continue to take prudent steps in fostering a constructive strategic relationship with the Government of Pakistan. Additionally, the committee cautions that it will remain skeptical of furthering pre-existing programs, and creating new programs, to engage with the military of the Government of Pakistan until there are meaningful steps by the Government of Pakistan to fully support U.S. goals and interests in the region.

U.S. Security Sector Assistance

The committee commends the new Presidential Policy Directive (PPD) on Security Sector Assistance as a positive step to establish an overarching strategy and implementation plan for U.S. Government security sector assistance (SSA). SSA is necessary to help partner nations build a sustainable capacity to address common defense and security threats. Furthermore, the committee believes that this interagency collaboration is an important step in recognizing that many national security functions reside across a broad spectrum of U.S. Government activity. The committee recommends that the interagency, in executing the effort outlined in the PPD, prioritize security sector assistance and also review current authorities to identify potential ineffective, duplicative, and/or overlapping authorities. Additionally, the committee recognizes the essential role stability and good governance play in regional security development and therefore expects that an annual review of the impact of this assistance on human rights standards, rule of law, and good governance for each recipient country will be included as part of the implementation plan for this PPD. While the committee recognizes the implementation plan is still in development, the committee urges the executive branch to keep the appropriate congressional committees informed on the progress of the implementation plan. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by October 1, 2013, on the status of the implementation plan.

Use of Missile Defense Declassification Authority by Director, Missile Defense Agency

The committee is aware that, pursuant to the Ballistic Missile Defense System Security Classification Guide, the Director, Missile Defense Agency (MDA) is given the authority by the Secretary of Defense to exercise Original Classification Authority and Foreign Disclosure Authority to establish security classification policy and guidance over MDA funded technology, development, and acquisition programs. This authority is delegated to the Director because of his expertise of MDA technology and the risks of its disclosure.

The committee continues to be concerned about the potential risks of disclosure of sensitive missile defense technologies to foreign parties. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives by August 16, 2013, that lists each example of a request for an exception made by the Director, or submitted to the Director, for use of the Foreign Disclosure Authority related to the Russian Federation covering the period between January 1, 2007 through April 1, 2013. The report should include a brief summary of each example, including the Russian entity receiving the information and the specific information or MDA technology involved.

The committee directs the Director to provide an interim briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House

of Representatives by July 15, 2013, regarding the expected scale of this report.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

This section would modify subsection 1206(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as most recently amended by section 1206 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), regarding the program to build the capacity of foreign military forces. This section would broaden the authority to include support of the theater security priorities of a geographic combatant commander. The committee expects that the additional activities under this new authority will be directly tied to a combatant command's Theater Security Cooperation Plan and should be narrowly defined to key theater security priorities that are directly linked to U.S. national security interests. The committee will closely consider the strength of this linkage during the congressional notification process.

This section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to build the capacity of a foreign country's security forces to conduct counterterrorism operations. The committee recognizes that in certain countries, the counterterrorism unit is not located with the Ministry of Defense. However, the committee expects this authority to be used sparingly when it is clear that these forces are the most suitable for the task.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit as part of the budget justification materials, beginning with the fiscal year 2016 budget submission, a detailed description of how the Department of Defense intends to spend not less than 50 percent of the funds authorized for that fiscal year. This description may take the form of the current congressional notification for individual projects. The committee believes that this would provide improved congressional oversight and public notice of the combatant command proposed programs, insight into how the programs support the combatant commanders' theater security plans, and balance both predictability for the combatant commands and flexibility for the Secretary of Defense to respond to emerging requirements.

This section would raise the limit of funds available from operation and maintenance accounts from $350.0 million per fiscal year to $425.0 million per fiscal year, and extend the termination of the program from September 30, 2014, to September 30, 2016.

The committee believes the expansion of this authority meets the current and emerging needs of the combatant commanders. As stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee remains "concerned that the proliferation of similar, overlapping and/or competing building partner capacity authorities creates unnecessary confusion and friction." Therefore, this section

would also repeal section 1203 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

Section 1202—Three-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would authorize the Department of Defense a 3-year extension to continue to develop, manage, and execute a Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery personnel recovery program for isolated Department of Defense, U.S. Government, and other designated personnel supporting U.S. national interests globally. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use funds through fiscal year 2017.

Section 1203—Global Security Contingency Fund

This section would modify the notification requirements of the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF), including the required process and guidance notification.

The committee is aware of a legislative proposal submitted by the Department of Defense requesting that "professional guidance and advice" be added as an authorized type of assistance. The committee believes that "professional guidance and advice" are logical supporting components of the provision of equipment, supplies, and training, and therefore covered under current authorized types of assistance.

The committee remains concerned about the progress of the GSCF, including the development of what appears to be a burdensome bureaucratic process. The committee notes the GSCF authority expires on September 30, 2015. The committee believes that if the Department of Defense and the Department of State cannot successfully establish GSCF with full operational capability, including planning, executing, and assessing GSCF activities, then it may be necessary to terminate or allow this authority to expire.

Section 1204—Codification of National Guard State Partnership Program

This section would codify the National Guard State Partnership Program in chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code.

Section 1205—Authority to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Certain Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction in Syria and the Region

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide assistance to the military and civilian response organizations of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the State of Kuwait, the Kingdom of Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, the Republic of Iraq, the Republic of Turkey, and other countries in the region of the Syrian Arab Republic in order for such countries to respond effectively to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction in Syria and the region. The Secretary may use up to $4.0 million of the funds made available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance to carry out this program.

This section would also require, not later than 60 days after the date on which this authority is first exercised and annually thereafter through December 31, 2015, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit:

(1) A detailed description by country of assistance provided.

(2) An overview of how such assistance fits into, and is coordinated with, other United States efforts to build the capability and capacity of countries in the region of Syria to counter the threat of weapons of mass destruction in Syria and the region.

(3) A listing of equipment and supplies provided to countries in the region of Syria.

(4) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State determine appropriate.

The authority provided by this section would expire on September 30, 2015.

Section 1206—One-Year Extension of Authority to Support Foreign Forces Participating in Operations to Disarm the Lord's Resistance Army

This section would modify section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to extend the Counter Lord's Resistance Army authority and funding, which supports Operation Observant Compass, for 1 year through the end of fiscal year 2014.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on metrics and objectives associated with Operation Observant Compass, and recommends $50.0 million in intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance (ISR) support for the operation. In addition, the committee includes a provision in title XV of this Act that would limit the obligation or expenditure of amounts authorized to be appropriated for the ISR support for Operation Observant Compass until the committee receives the specified report.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND PAKISTAN

Section 1211—One-Year Extension and Modification of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would amend section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by extending the authority for reimbursement of coalition nations for support provided to the United States for military operations through fiscal year 2014, and making certain technical amendments. This section would limit the amounts available for fiscal year 2014 to $1.5 billion.

Additionally, this section would prohibit the reimbursement of support provided by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan until such time as the Secretary of Defense certifies to

the congressional defense committees that Pakistan is maintaining security and is not, through its actions or inaction at any level of government, limiting or otherwise restricting the movement of U.S. equipment and supplies along the Ground Lines of Communication through Pakistan, and that Pakistan is taking demonstrable steps to (1) support counterterrorism operations against Al Qaeda, Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan, and other militant groups such as the Haqqani Network and the Quetta Shura Taliban; (2) disrupt the conduct of cross-border attacks against U.S., coalition, and Afghan security forces; (3) counter the threat of improvised explosive device networks; and (4) conduct cross-border coordination and communication with Afghan security forces and U.S. Armed Forces.

Section 1212—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Funds for Reintegration Activities in Afghanistan

This section would amend section 1216 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), as most recently amended by section 1218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by extending the authority to use funds for reintegration activities in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and authorizing $25.0 million for fiscal year 2014.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this section can be obligated or expended until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the United States and the Government of Afghanistan have signed a bilateral security agreement and that such agreement includes certain specified requirements.

Section 1213—Extension of Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan

This section would amend section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as amended by section 1221 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by extending for 1 year the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and authorizing $60.0 million for fiscal year 2014.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of $45.0 million of CERP funding until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the United States and the Government of Afghanistan have signed a bilateral security agreement and that such agreement includes certain specified requirements.

Section 1214—Extension of Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq

This section would amend section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as amended by section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by specifying that the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of State, may use funds provided to the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC–I) to conduct non-operational training of Iraqi Ministry of Defense personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps and integrate certain processes within the Iraqi security forces. This section would preclude training of Counter Terrorism Service personnel. This section would also limit the total funding authorized for operations and activities for OSC–I to $209.0 million in fiscal year 2014.

Section 1215—One-Year Extension and Modification of Authority for Program to Develop and Carry Out Infrastructure Projects in Afghanistan

This section would amend subsection (f) of section 1217 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), as most recently amended by section 1219 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by extending the authority for a program to develop and carry out infrastructure projects in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for 1 year and authorizing $279.0 million for fiscal year 2014. This section also includes an additional element which would require an assessment of the capability of the Afghan National Security Forces to provide security for projects funded by this authority after January 1, 2015.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this section can be obligated or expended until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the United States and the Government of Afghanistan have signed a bilateral security agreement and that such agreement includes certain specified requirements.

Section 1216—Special Immigrant Visas for Certain Iraqi and Afghan Allies

This section would amend section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) by requiring that a principal alien seeking special immigrant status must apply for approval from the appropriate Chief of Mission, or the designee of the appropriate Chief of Mission, by not later than September 30, 2015. Also, the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section may not exceed 435 for each of fiscal years 2014–18.

Additionally, this section would amend section 1244(a)(1) of the Refugee Crisis in Iraq Act of 2007 (8 U.S.C. 1157 note) by authorizing the Secretary of Homeland Security, or, notwithstanding any

other provision of law, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide an alien described in section 1244(b) with the status of a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)), if the alien or an agent acting on behalf of the alien submits a petition for classification under section 203(b)(4) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4)) on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1217—Requirement to Withhold Department of Defense Assistance to Afghanistan in Amount Equivalent to 100 Percent of All Taxes Assessed By Afghanistan to Extent Such Taxes Are Not Reimbursed By Afghanistan

This section would require that an amount equivalent to 100 percent of the total taxes assessed during fiscal year 2013 by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan on all Department of Defense assistance must be withheld by the Secretary of Defense for such assistance for fiscal year 2014 to the extent that the Secretary of Defense certifies and reports in writing to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that such taxes have not been reimbursed by the Government of Afghanistan to the Department of Defense or the grantee, contractor, or subcontractor that are affected. The Secretary of Defense would be able to waive this requirement if the Secretary determines that such waiver is necessary to achieve U.S. goals in Afghanistan. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the total taxes assessed during fiscal year 2013 by the Government of Afghanistan on all Department of Defense assistance.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO AFGHANISTAN POST 2014

Section 1221—Modification of Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan

This section would amend the report required by section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1214 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), to require the Secretary of Defense, in all future reports, to provide information on the redeployment of U.S. personnel, redeployment of U.S. military vehicles and equipment, and the closure of U.S. bases in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Additionally, this section would require a summary of tasks and functions conducted by the U.S. Armed Forces or the Department of Defense that have been transferred to other U.S. Government departments and agencies, Afghan Government ministries and agencies, other foreign governments, or nongovernmental organizations; or tasks that have been discontinued during the reporting period. The summary shall include a discussion of the formal and informal arrangements and working groups that have been estab-

lished to coordinate and execute the transfer of such tasks and functions.

Section 1222—Sense of Congress on United States Military Support in Afghanistan

This section would express the sense of Congress on U.S. military support in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, including that a stable and secure Afghanistan is in the long-term interests of the United States; the United States should continue to assist the Afghan National Security Forces; the United States should continue to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al Qaeda following the duration of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's mission on December 31, 2014; the United States should provide assistance for the operational requirements of the Afghan Security Forces to maintain the security of Afghanistan; the transition to counterterrorism and advise and assist missions should occur consistent with agreements between the United States, Afghanistan, and international partners; and the bilateral security agreement between the United States and the Government of Afghanistan is critical to the long-term stability of Afghanistan as well as U.S. interests. Additionally, this section would express the sense of Congress that the President, consistent with U.S. interests, should:

(1) Publicly support a residual U.S. military presence in Afghanistan;

(2) Publicly define the mission sets and support the United States will provide to the Afghan National Security Forces; and

(3) Publicly support sufficient funding for the Afghan National Security Forces.

Section 1223—Defense Intelligence Plan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees a Department of Defense plan regarding covered defense intelligence assets in relation to the drawdown of U.S. forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would require the plan to include:

(1) A description of the covered defense intelligence assets;

(2) A description of any such assets to remain in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014;

(3) A description of any such assets that will be, or have been, reallocated to other locations outside of the United States;

(4) The defense intelligence priorities that will be, or have been, addressed with the reallocation of such assets;

(5) The necessary logistics, operations, and maintenance plans to operate in the locations where such assets, including personnel, basing, and any host country agreements, will be, or have been, reallocated; and

(6) A description of any such assets that will be, or have been, returned to the United States.

Further discussion is contained in the classified annex accompanying this report.

Section 1224—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Authorities for Afghanistan

This section would require that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Authority for the Program to Develop and Carry Out Infrastructure Projects in Afghanistan and the Authority to Use Funds for Reintegration Activities in Afghanistan be obligated or expended until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, transmits to the specified committees a certification regarding the Bilateral Security Agreement (BSA) between the United States and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Additionally, this section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of $45.0 million of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan and $2.6 billion of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, respectively, until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, transmits to the specified committees the certification regarding the BSA between the United States and Afghanistan.

This section would require that such certification include a confirmation that the United States and Afghanistan have signed a BSA that:

(1) Protects the Department of Defense, its military and civilian personnel, and contractors from liability to pay any tax, or similar charge, associated with efforts to carry out missions in the territory of Afghanistan that have been agreed to by both the Government of the United States and the Government of Afghanistan;

(2) Ensures exclusive jurisdiction for the United States over U.S. Armed Forces located in Afghanistan;

(3) Ensures that there is no infringement on the right of self-defense of the U.S. military mission or U.S. military personnel in Afghanistan;

(4) Ensures that the U.S. military in Afghanistan is permitted to take the efforts deemed necessary to protect other U.S. Government offices and personnel in Afghanistan as may be required;

(5) Ensures that the U.S. military mission in Afghanistan has sufficient access to bases and basing rights as may be necessary to carry out the activities in Afghanistan that the President has assigned to the military; and

(6) Ensures that the United States has the freedom of movement to carry out those military missions as may be required to continue the effort to defeat Al Qaeda and its associated forces.

The committee reiterates its concerns about illegal taxation of U.S. assistance in Afghanistan, as reflected in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, and notes that U.S. law forbids the taxing of U.S. Government assistance.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAN

Section 1231—Report on United States Military Partnership with Gulf Cooperation Council Countries

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the United States military partnership with the Gulf Cooperation Council countries.

Section 1232—Additional Elements in Annual Report on Military Power of Iran

This section would amend section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as amended by section 1231 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by requiring the Secretary of Defense to provide information on the global Iranian Threat Network and how the Iranian Threat Network reinforces the grand strategy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a list of gaps in intelligence and to prioritize those gaps by operational need.

Section 1233—Sense of Congress on the Defense of the Arabian Gulf

This section would express the sense of Congress with respect to the United States' operational posture and capacity to defend the Arabian Gulf, including the risk of maintaining only 1 aircraft carrier battle group in the Arabian Gulf to deter the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the limitations on maintaining a 2 aircraft carrier battle group presence in the Arabian Gulf, stemming in part from not constructing and sustaining a fleet of at least 11 aircraft carriers. Additionally, this section would express the sense of Congress that the United States should finalize bilateral security agreements with key Gulf Cooperation Council countries that support the Defense of the Arabian Gulf requirements at the earliest possible date.

SUBTITLE E—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1241—Report on Posture and Readiness of United States Armed Forces to Respond to Future Terrorist Attacks in Africa and the Middle East

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the terrorist attack that occurred in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, and the alert status, readiness, and posture of the U.S. Armed Forces to respond to future terrorist attacks in Africa and the Middle East.

This section also would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Relations, that as-

sesses the terrorist groups that threaten the United States in Africa and a description of the readiness, posture, and alert status of relevant U.S. Armed Forces in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and the United States; and any changes implemented since the terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to include in this report a description of any new or modified requirements of the Department of State for U.S. Marine Security Guard Detachments, any other Department of Defense assets to provide enhanced security at Department of State facilities, and an explanation of how any new requirements for U.S. Marine Security Detachments or other Department of Defense assets affect the capacity of the U.S. Armed Forces to fulfill Department of Defense operational requirements.

Section 1242—Role of the Government of Egypt to United States National Security

This section would express the sense of Congress on the role of the Government of Egypt to U.S. national security. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report, not later than 180 days after the date of the 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, that contains a comprehensive plan for U.S. military assistance and cooperation with the Government of Egypt.

Section 1243—Sense of Congress on Military Developments on the Korean Peninsula

This section would express certain findings and the sense of the Congress regarding the military developments on the Korean peninsula.

Section 1244—Sense of Congress on Defense Cooperation with Georgia

This section would express the sense of Congress that the United States should enhance its defense cooperation efforts with the country of Georgia and support the efforts of the Government of Georgia to provide for the defense of its government, people, and sovereign territory.

Section 1245—Limitation on Establishment of Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers

This section would limit the expenditure of funds for the establishment of "Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers" or similar regional entities. This section would also require a joint report by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to be submitted to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Section 1246—Additional Reports on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

This section would amend the report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as originally required by section 1236 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to require the Secretary of Defense to submit the report every 2 years beginning on November 1, 2013, through November 1, 2017. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit an update to the report if, in the Secretary of Defense's estimation, interim events or developments occurring during the 2-year period between reports require an update.

Section 1247—Amendments to Annual Report Under Arms Control and Disarmament Act

This section would amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2593a) to add as recipients of the annual report on Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments, also known as the "Compliance Report", the following congressional committees: the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the congressional intelligence committees, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

This section would also add a requirement that if the annual report is not provided by the statutory deadline of April 15, the Administration shall provide a briefing on the draft report to the appropriate committees not later than May 15 of each year.

Section 1248—Limitation On Funds to Provide the Russian Federation with Access to Certain Missile Defense Technology

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized for fiscal years 2014 through 2018 for the Department of Defense to provide the Russian Federation with access to hit-to-kill missile defense technology of the United States or its telemetry data.

The committee is aware that in a December 13, 2011 letter, Assistant to the President Rob Nabors wrote that, "hit-to-kill technology and interceptor telemetry will under no circumstances be provided to Russia." Further Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Brad Roberts testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces during its March 6, 2012, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense that, "hit-to-kill is our technology, and it serves our interests well to keep it in our hands."

Section 1249—Reports On Actions to Reduce Support of Ballistic Missile Programs of China, Syria, Iran, and North Korea

This section would require the President to encourage the Russian Federation to disclose past support by it or Russian entities for the ballistic missile programs of certain states. This section would also require the President to submit a semi-annual report to the congressional defense committees on any disclosure by the Government of the Russian Federation. This section would require an

initial report to cover disclosures made for the period preceding the date of enactment by 10 years.

This section would also require the development of a plan by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to seek and secure the cooperation of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China to verifiably reduce the spread of technology and expertise that supports the ballistic missile programs of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Section 1250—Congressional Notifications Relating to Status of Forces Agreements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to notify the congressional defense committees, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, not later than 15 days after the date on which a Status of Forces Agreement between the United States and a foreign nation is signed, renewed, amended or otherwise revised, or terminated. This section would apply to such agreements that are signed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, not later than September 30, 2013, to provide a briefing on the status of any forthcoming or on-going Status of Forces Agreement negotiations.

Section 1251—Sense of Congress on the Conflict in Syria

This section would set forth certain findings and express the sense of Congress on the conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic, including that President Obama should have a comprehensive policy and should ensure robust contingency planning to secure United States' interests in Syria; the President of the United States should fully consider all courses of action to remove President Bashar al-Assad from power; the conflict in Syria threatens the vital national security interests of Israel, which should be sufficiently weighed by the President when considering policy approaches towards the conflict in Syria; the President of the United States should fully consider all courses of action to reinforce his stated "redline" regarding the use of chemical weapons; the United States should continue to conduct rigorous planning and operational preparation to secure the chemical stockpiles and associated weapons in Syria; the United States should continue to support the opposition as necessary; and the United States should have a policy that supports the stability of countries in the region of Syria.

Section 1252—Revision of Statutory References to Former NATO Support Organizations and Related NATO Agreements

This section would revise two statutes to reflect the new North Atlantic Treaty Organization organizational structure, which became effective in July 2012.

Section 1253—Limitation on Funds to Implement Executive Agreements Relating to United States Missile Defense Capabilities

This section includes a Statement of Policy that executive agreements related to U.S. missile defense capabilities have no legally binding effect if not made pursuant to the Treaty Clause of the Constitution of the United States or an affirmative Act of Congress.

This section would also limit funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2014 or any fiscal year thereafter to implement an executive agreement with respect to U.S. missile defense capabilities or to implement Guidance for Employment of Force relating to such agreements. This section includes a statutory Rule of Construction that the limitation does not apply to executive agreements made with a U.S. ally or a state with which the U.S. maintains a security guarantee.

Section 1254—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Threat Reduction Engagement Activities and United States Contributions to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty Organization

This section would provide that none of the funds made available for fiscal year 2014 for Threat Reduction Engagement activities may be obligated or expended until the President certifies to Congress that no state party to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) has undertaken nuclear weapons test activities in fiscal year 2013 that are inconsistent with United States interpretations regarding obligations under such Treaty.

This section would also provide that none of the funds made available for fiscal year 2014 for contributions to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization may be used for lobbying or advocacy in the United States relating to the CTBT.

Section 1255—Sense of Congress on Military-to-Military Cooperation Between the United States and Burma

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding military-to-military cooperation between the United States and the Union of Burma.

Section 1256—Sense of Congress on the Stationing of United States Forces in Europe

This section would express certain findings and the sense of the Congress regarding the stationing of United States Forces in Europe.

Section 1257—Sense of Congress on Military Capabilities of the People's Republic of China

This section would express certain findings and the sense of the Congress regarding the military developments of the People's Republic of China.

Section 1258—Rule of Construction

This section would set forth that nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against the Syrian Arab Republic.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $528.5 million for fiscal year 2014, representing an increase of $9.3 million from the amount requested and authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2013. Following the initial submission of the budget request, the Department of Defense proposed to alter the allocation of funding within the CTR program, requesting that the following amounts be authorized to be appropriated for the CTR program: $5.7 million for Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination, $13.0 million for Chemical Weapons Destruction, $32.8 million for Global Nuclear Security, $293.1 million for Cooperative Biological Engagement, $149.3 million for Proliferation Prevention, $6.4 million for Threat Reduction Engagement, and $28.2 million for Other Assessments/Administrative support.

The committee continues to support the goals of the CTR program and believes that the program is important to United States national security. In past years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, has sometimes limited progress of the CTR program. The committee notes, however, that the CTR program has made significant achievements, and that much work remains to be done as new threats emerge.

Congress has addressed these concerns by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the former Soviet Union; 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 metrics; requiring a report by the Secretary of Defense regarding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project in the Russian Federation at Schuch'ye; 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 ensuring that the CTR program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee notes that the CTR Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP) now encompasses two-thirds of the CTR budget request. The committee reaffirms its view, stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and reaffirmed in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, that biological threat reduction and engagement 'should be guided by a com-

prehensive long-term 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 further reaffirms its view that the CTR program as a whole should 'maintain a strong focus' on the full range of threat reduction challenges. Lastly, the committee continues to believe that concrete metrics remain important for measuring the impact and effectiveness of CBEP activities. The committee welcomes efforts by the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and keep the committee fully informed of efforts and developments in these areas.

The committee authorizes $528.5 million, the amount of the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Focus

The committee recognizes that one of the Department of Defense's primary missions is to counter weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee believes the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program has been one of the Department's most effective activities in strengthening non-proliferation regimes and building partner capacity to counter WMD and increase U.S. and international security. However, the committee recognizes the threat of WMD has shifted since the CTR program was initially established more than 20 years ago with the purpose of securing and dismantling WMD and the supporting infrastructure in the former Soviet Union states. The committee believes the CTR program must be flexible and adaptable to the evolving nature, location, and threat of WMD. The changing security situation in the Middle East and North Africa requires the Department to shift its resources and attention to the WMD threat in these regions, including building partner capacity with regional allies and partners to prevent the spread of WMD to terrorist regimes and organizations. The committee believes that in an era of fiscal austerity resources must be directed toward the most significant threats in order to maximize the Department's ability to counter the proliferation of WMD.

Cooperative Biological Engagement Program

The committee notes the growth of the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program's fiscal year 2014 President's budget request. The committee finds that the CBEP budget has grown as a percentage of the CTR budget from 40 percent in fiscal year 2011 to more than 60 percent of the fiscal year 2014 budget request. The committee is concerned about the infrastructure projects the CBEP is funding, with approximately $180.0 million of the requested budget projected to be spent on laboratory construction and renovation in the former Soviet Union republics. The committee is aware of the program's plan to phase out funding for these infrastructure projects in the next few years as these projects are completed. The committee will continue to exercise its oversight of these projects to en-

sure the CBEP is properly positioned to meet the evolving biological threats, both in the region and around the world. While the committee is supportive of the CBEP's mission to build the capabilities and capacities of key partners to rapidly detect, investigate, report, and secure dangerous biological pathogens, the committee is concerned about the CBEP's current activities in building and renovating laboratories. The committee believes the current fiscal environment requires the Department of Defense to focus on more efficient and effective means of building partnership capacities to counter biological weapons of mass destruction.

U.S.-Russia Umbrella Agreement Negotiations

The committee is aware the current U.S.-Russia Umbrella Agreement expires in June 2013, and that there are ongoing negotiations for a new agreement to continue the bilateral work with the Russian Federation to secure and eliminate weapons of mass destruction. The committee recognizes the significant progress made in securing nuclear weapons since the establishment of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program more than 20 years ago. The committee also believes a new agreement should reflect the progress made, including consideration of an equal partnership and burden-sharing arrangement, and opportunities for further cooperation to strengthen security. However, the committee believes privileges and immunities, and liability protections, must be required components of any new agreement. The committee encourages the Department of State and the Department of Defense to continue to inform the appropriate congressional committees of the progress of negotiations.

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 3 fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program from within the overall $528.5 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 2014. This section would also require notifications to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2014 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.

Section 1303—Extension for Use of Contributions to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

This section would extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to accept contributions from any person, including any foreign government or entity, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, through December 30, 2018.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Working Capital Fund Cash Balance Concerns

The committee remains concerned about the failure of the Department of Defense to address the levels of cash necessary within working capital funds to maintain both solvency and an adequate reserve. Further, the committee notes that the Department has been unable to hold rates at a single level throughout a fiscal year without reprogramming funds. While the lower level of the working capital fund cash corpus (7 days) might be sufficient to satisfy fiscal liability concerns, the artificially constrained size of the cash corpus (from 7 to 10 days) cannot absorb the market fluctuations associated with commodities related to fuel and transportation. As such, managers of the Defense Working Capital Fund (DWCF) and the Transportation Working Capital Fund (TWCF) continue to struggle to maintain a steady rate throughout a single fiscal year. Since 2005, the standard composite fuel price charged to Department customers has changed at least once every year during the year of execution, with up to five price changes in 2009. These continuously changing prices destabilize budget execution throughout the Department, most notably within the operation and maintenance accounts. The working capital funds were created and designed to absorb market fluctuations and maintain stability in appropriated accounts, but the committee observes that has not been the case.

Therefore, for working capital funds subject to significant market fluctuations, namely the DWCF and the TWCF, the committee recommends expanding the cash corpus metric required from 7–10 days to 7–20 days. This new metric should be the basis for the development of the fiscal year 2015 budget request for these working capital funds. The committee believes that this adjustment, along with revised budget practices related to fuel rate determination addressed elsewhere in this report, should improve the Department's ability to stabilize working capital fund rates during the year of execution.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1405—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1406—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Use of National Defense Stockpile for the Conservation of a Strategic and Critical Materials Supply

This section would modify certain provisions of the President's authority to maintain and manage a national defense stockpile to allow the Defense Logistics Agency to more proactively engage in the market. These changes would grant the President the authority to conserve strategic and critical materials.

Section 1412—Authority to Acquire Additional Materials for the National Defense Stockpile

This section would provide authority to acquire certain additional strategic and critical materials for the National Defense Stockpile. The materials anticipated to be acquired have been identified to

meet the military, industrial, and essential civilian needs of the United States.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1421—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds from the Defense Health Program 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 1422—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $67.8 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2014.

Section 1423—Cemeterial Expenses

This section would authorize $45.8 million to be appropriated for the Army for cemeterial expenses for Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia.

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 appropriations to be available upon enactment of this Act to support overseas contingency operations principally associated with Operation Enduring Freedom.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained no funding for National Guard and Reserve Component

equipment. Elsewhere in this Act, the budget request contained $4.2 billion for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment.

The specific amount of resources, including equipment, needed to adequately sustain the National Guard and Reserve Component's operational reserve status remains a concern because of the fiscal environment, especially given the dual mission responsibility of the National Guard and Reserve Components, particularly the National Guard. The committee recognizes the National Guard and Reserve Components continue to report significant equipment shortages in modernized equipment, specifically in rotorcraft and tactical wheeled vehicles. Over the past 8 years, annual National Guard and Reserve Component equipment procurement averaged $7.0 billion. The committee is concerned that modernization funding across the Future Years Defense Program is only expected to average $3.8 billion annually, a significant reduction from prior year requests. The committee also notes that National Guard and Reserve Component equipment modernization is not funded to 100 percent of what the National Guard and Reserve Components believe their requirements to be and that they are expected to have unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2014.

The committee believes additional funds would help eliminate identified shortfalls in the areas of critical dual-use equipment. The committee expects these funds to be used for the purposes of, but not limited to, the procurement of: aircraft, missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, non-system training devices, logistics automation systems, remote weapon stations, chemical/biological protective shelters, internal and external fuel tanks for CH–47 and AH–64 rotorcraft, F–15 F100 engines, special mission propellers for C–130 aircraft, and other critical dual-use procurement items for the National Guard and Reserve Components. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to make every effort to identify the most critical National Guard and Reserve Component modernization programs and expedite funding for those programs.

The committee recommends $400.0 million for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends $4.2 billion, full funding of the request, for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Support for U.S. Special Operations Forces and Partner Nation Forces

The committee is aware of a $163.0 million operational requirement to provide additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities in support of U.S. and partner nation Special Operations Forces (SOF) within U.S. Central Command, U.S. Africa Command, and U.S. Southern Command. The requirement calls for the deployment of Buckeye Arrow Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and distributed command nodes to assist with mission support, mission planning, and terrain mapping, and to more effectively enable U.S. and partner nation special operations elements with collection management and ISR training. Buckeye UAV systems have successfully deployed to the Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and U.S. Africa Command. These systems

have provided more than 400,000 square kilometers of unclassified high-resolution and high-accuracy color imagery and elevation data in support of U.S. Special Operations Forces and partner nation forces. Given the importance of the U.S. government's partnership strategies, the committee believes that this validated ISR requirement for U.S. and partner nation SOF should be rapidly addressed by U.S. Army Geospatial Center and other supporting commands out of funds made available to Army, Operation and Maintenance, Overseas Contingency Operations funding. Therefore the committee encourages the immediate and full resourcing of this $163.0 million operational ISR requirement to enable U.S. Special Operations Forces and partner nation forces.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

Section 1502—Procurement

This section would authorize additional appropriations for procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize additional appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act.

Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance programs at the levels identified in section 4302 of division D of this Act.

Section 1505—Military Personnel

This section would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

Section 1506—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1507—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the level identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1508—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1509—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

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 $3.0 billion of additional war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would amend section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by subsection 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), as most recently amended by section 1531 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), by extending the existing limitations on the availability of funds for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) through fiscal year 2014. This section also would require the Secretary of Defense to revise the plan required by section 1531(e) of Public Law 112–239 to ensure that an office or official of the Department of Defense is identified as responsible for each program or activity supported by ASFF, using funds available to the Department of Defense. Additionally, this section would require that of the funds available to the Department of Defense for ASFF for fiscal year 2014, at least $47.3 million shall be used for the recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces within planned ASFF programs and activities.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would require that of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, $2.61 billion may not be obligated or expended until

15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the United States and the Government of Afghanistan have signed a bilateral security agreement and that such agreement includes certain specified requirements.

Section 1532—Future Role of Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for the future role of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) and to provide this plan to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1533—Limitation on Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Support for Operation Observant Compass

This section would require that none of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for operation and maintenance by section 1504, as specified in the funding table in section 4302 of this Act, may be obligated or expended for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support for Operation Observant Compass until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report, required elsewhere in this Act, on Operation Observant Compass, including the specific goals of the campaign to counter the Lord's Resistance Army, the precise metrics used to measure progress in such campaign, and the required steps that will be taken to transition such campaign if it is determined that it is no longer necessary for the United States to support the mission of such campaign.

Section 1534—Report on United States Force Levels and Costs of Military Operations in Afghanistan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, not later than January 15, 2014, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on:

(1) The estimated United States force levels in Afghanistan for each of the years 2015 through 2020.

(2) The estimated costs of United States military operations in Afghanistan for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.

TITLE XVI—INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Apportionment of Small Business Funds under Continuing Resolutions

The committee is concerned that the majority of Department of Defense programs receiving Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) or Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) funding are yet to receive fiscal year 2013 funding. The committee understands

that the delay may be due to a continuing budget resolution (CR), even though it is now more than half-way through the fiscal year. Under such a CR, Federal agencies remain responsible for assessing the SBIR and STTR set-asides, and executing program support for small business technology innovation. The committee believes that SBIR/STTR awardees should not be deprived of funds legitimately competed and vitally needed for business stability, especially during this period of extreme economic uncertainty. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that future SBIR/STTR funding availability may also be delayed, causing significant hardships for these small businesses. The committee also believes that it is imperative that Department of Defense comptrollers move expeditiously to calculate the SBIR/STTR assessments and make those funds available to military service and agency SBIR/STTR programs commensurate with those assessments, as well as to those small businesses who have been deprived of SBIR/STTR awards and related funds. The committee encourages the Department, in circumstances when a CR extends past three months, to release 75 percent of CR funding for SBIR/STTR by the beginning of the fourth month of that CR.

Carbon Nanotube Devices

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is pursuing carbon nanotube based technologies to support the development of microelectronics to enhance the processing and radiation-hardening capabilities of satellite electronic systems. The committee supports development of carbon nanotube applications for random access memory and electronically erasable read only memory, including the development of domestic, commercial manufacturing sources for such microelectronics. The committee believes that these applications will provide substantially greater capability for radiation-hardened microelectronics, and the domestic commercial capability will ensure both trusted sources, as well as economies of scale that can potentially drive down unit costs. The committee encourages the Department to examine ways to support the development and expansion of this industrial base sector through means such as, but not limited to, the Industrial Base Innovation Fund or Defense Production Act Title III.

Communication between the Department of Defense and Industry

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DoD) must collaborate and contract with various information technology vendors to help ensure that the Department has the most effective and innovative technologies available to achieve its mission. The committee recognizes that these contracts are only as effective as the collaboration, information sharing, open dialogue, and unfettered access between the government customer and the commercial vendor. These companies regularly communicate with the Department on planning, certification, deployment of products and services, resolution of service issues, product innovation, resource planning and utilization, and maintenance of the product and service security. However, the committee is concerned that the Department has curtailed communication between technology providers and

their customers throughout the Army, Air Force, and the Defense Information Systems Agency. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that these restrictions of access would appear to violate the implied term of good faith cooperation that is contained within every government contract. The committee understands that communication restrictions are in place on both the Department and potential business partners during the contracting process, and are appropriate at that stage of the acquisition process. However, the committee believes that open dialogue outside that direct acquisition process should be regularly maintained and encouraged by the Department in order for the Government to realize the full value of information technology products and services and best support the warfighter. The committee believes that both the Department and the commercial vendors need timely and consistent access in order to:

(1) Answer questions quickly about the scope and capabilities of the software to solve problems quickly and efficiently;

(2) Provide mission support to the end-user operational forces;

(3) Disseminate information on the features and upgrades purchased in order to fully utilize available contracts and avoid procuring duplicative solutions; and

(4) Work with the Department on designs and requirements that can be incorporated into ongoing research and development efforts so that the Department receives the most innovative, efficient, and effective products and services.

Contracting for Textiles and Clothing

The committee supports maintaining the integrity of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, commonly referred to as the "Berry Amendment," which requires 100 percent U.S. content for certain products sourced for the Armed Forces. The committee is concerned with protecting the supply chain and domestic production base for components and weapon systems that are vital to the Armed Forces. In addition, the practice of sourcing certain products and materials from foreign entities in violation of the Berry Amendment may harm the domestic industrial base, as well as result in U.S. job losses. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to periodically review the Department's compliance with established restrictions.

Defense Security Service Access to Information in Conducting the National Industrial Security Program

The committee is aware that the Defense Security Service (DSS) supports national security by securing the Nation's technology base and overseeing the protection of sensitive and classified information and technology in the hands of industry. According to its mission statement, DSS is "responsible for clearing industrial facilities, personnel, and associated information systems; collecting, analyzing, and providing threat information to industry and government partners; managing foreign ownership control and influence in cleared industry; providing advice and oversight to industry; de-

livering security education and training; and, providing information technology services that support the industrial security mission of the Department of Defense and its partner agencies."

According to the 2012 DSS report, "Targeting Technology: A Trend Analysis of Reporting from Defense Industry", aggressive cyber collection activities increasingly target cleared contractor networks in attempts to obtain sensitive U.S. information and technologies. Although the Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 5220.22–M, National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual, dated February 28, 2006, requires information systems that are used to process or distribute classified information to be properly managed to protect against unauthorized disclosure of classified information and requires cleared contractors to remain vigilant and to report suspicious contacts, there is insufficient governance, monitoring, and reporting of cyber attacks on the unclassified networks of the cleared contractors.

The committee believes that intrusions on the unclassified networks of cleared contractors may be the very first indicator that a foreign entity is attempting to compromise or exploit cleared personnel, or to obtain illegal or unauthorized access to sensitive information and technology resident in the cleared industrial base. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that such attacks could garner sensitive, but unclassified, information and data that when aggregated could provide the foreign entity with much of the information that is being sought.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to review DODI 5220.22M and all other relevant guidance to ensure that the ability of DSS to support protection of sensitive and classified information and technology is not being hampered by a lack of access to information regarding intrusions on the unclassified networks of cleared contractors. Following the review, the Secretary is further directed to brief the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by February 1, 2014, on the findings of the review, along with any recommendations to strengthen the ability of DSS to secure the Nation's technology base.

Furthermore, as noted elsewhere in this report, the committee remains concerned about the potential presence of specific information technology equipment manufactured by firms with known links to the government and military of the People's Republic of China, namely, Huawei and ZTE Corporation, in networks that are critical to the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that some of this equipment could potentially be resident in the networks of cleared defense contractors. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Defense Security Service to develop a plan by February 1, 2014, to enhance awareness of the threat posed by such technology, to aid cleared contractors in identifying and reporting the presence of such technology in their classified and unclassified networks, and to reduce the likelihood of such technology being incorporated into these networks in the future.

Export Control Reform

The committee remains strongly supportive of reform of our nation's export control system. While export controls play a critical role in protecting critical technology for our defense systems, a system that makes no distinction between a fighter aircraft or a simple and widely available non-critical component used on that aircraft is not only unwieldy, but threatens the competitiveness of American companies.

On March 8, 2013, in an Executive Order signed by the President, authorities related to the administration of certain export and import controls were updated in a significant and far-reaching way. The committee looks forward to the completion of this phase of the reform and additional efforts to comprehensively modernize and update the system.

The committee supports continued progress towards export control reform that will protect our nation's security while ensuring our nation's economic competitiveness, including timely and responsive processes for designating control protocols, enhanced information technology systems to aid in accountability, and coordinated enforcement. The committee notes that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs have primary legislative oversight of export control reform efforts and the appropriate expertise. The committee believes that in order for further export control reform to succeed, the Administration must work hand-in-hand with these committees of jurisdiction.

Foreign Commercial Satellite Services Review

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense relies on many commercial companies to provide satellite services of national security importance, including commercial satellite communications. For instance, on January 24, 2013, the Defense Business Board reported that commercial satellite communications account for 40 percent of the Department's satellite communications.

Over the past year, the committee has conducted oversight of the Department's leases of commercial satellite services, particularly relating to satellites owned, operated, or launched by states subject to sanctions and laws, such as section 1261(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) and the Iran, North Korea, Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106–178). Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision regarding its concerns with what it has learned about several of these leases.

While the committee has received some information from the Department regarding several leases of satellite services of certain foreign providers, the responses to many straight-forward questions have changed over time. The committee is disappointed by the Department's lack of clarity on this issue, and the committee is concerned that the Department has not established effective management controls over commercial satellite leases, and in particular, ones regarding certain foreign providers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to provide a

briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2013, on any Department of Defense commercial services over satellites owned, operated, or launched by states subject to sanctions and laws, such as section 1261(c)(2) of Public Law 112–239, and the Iran, North Korea, Syria Nonproliferation Act. The briefing should include:

(1) The projected period of performance (including any period covered by options to extend the contract), the financial terms, and a description of the services to be provided under each contract;

(2) Identification of the satellites that will be used to provide the necessary services, including a description of where they were launched from and currently operate from;

(3) Identification, to the extent practical, of foreign government ownership of the foreign providers;

(4) Identification of risks, and a description of any applicable policies and procedures to mitigate the risks, of using certain foreign commercial satellite services; and

(5) A description of why other commercial or U.S. Government providers, including the Operationally Responsive Space office, were not available or tasked to fill the requirement.

Germanium Wafer Defense Industrial Base

The committee endorses the Department of Defense's commitment to promote domestic germanium substrate manufacturing capabilities for national security space, as reflected in the Department's 2012 report, "Annual Industrial Capabilities Report to Congress." The committee also notes that in the report, the Department modified its germanium upgrade program to emphasize full and open competition as a key program for securing materials. The committee believes that focusing its efforts on competition, specifically domestic competition, will help the Department accomplish two critical objectives: (1) providing best value in contracting for germanium substrates; and (2) fostering continued development of the germanium substrates manufacturing base. The committee encourages the Department to continue using full and open competition and other competitive best practices in developing domestic germanium substrate manufacturing capabilities and capacities.

Improving Information Technology Acquisition Outcomes

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense continues to face challenges in its efforts to effectively acquire information technology (IT) resources. Even as the importance of such IT systems increases, from providing mission critical systems for intelligence analysis and fusion to time and cost-savings capabilities for electronic health records and financial auditability, the Department's success rate in developing, acquiring and implementing these systems remains mediocre, at best. This point is underscored by the failure of recent IT initiatives by the Department, such as the Expeditionary Combat Support System, the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System, or the Net-Enabled Command Capability.

The committee believes that part of the challenge that the Department faces is in its reliance on processes that are too heavily focused on the acquisition of militarily-unique hardware systems. The committee recognizes that the paradigm for IT acquisition is rooted more firmly in the commercial marketplace. As a consumer of commercially-developed solutions, rather than a generator of unique requirements, the Department follows commercial trends more often than it leads them.

Unfortunately, the committee believes that the Department has not done enough to come to terms with this trend, choosing instead to act as though it has the same power to influence computing and electronics markets as it did for most of the 20th century. Though numerous studies have indicated a need to change acquisition processes within the Department to adjust to the reality of 21st century commercial IT markets, the Department has made little progress. Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 111–84) authorized the Department to implement a new acquisition process for IT systems, but to date, there has been little tangible action to take advantage of those new authorities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the progress of implementing an IT-specific acquisition process, as well as how lessons are being learned from recent IT failures in order to improve the outcomes for current and future efforts.

Monitoring and Enforcement of Mitigation Agreements Related to Foreign Investment in the United States

The committee is aware that the Foreign Investment and National Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 100–49) requires the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) to designate a lead agency to negotiate, modify, monitor and enforce agreements to mitigate any threat to national security that could result from foreign investment in the U.S. economy. The committee notes that during fiscal year 2012, the Department of Defense was named lead or co-lead of approximately 50 percent of the 121 CFUIS filings. Furthermore, the committee notes that the Defense Security Service (DSS) reviews and responds to every CFUIS filing to identity implications of the proposed investment on the National Industrial Security Program, and also executes and provides oversight of Foreign Ownership Control or Influence (FOCI) mitigation requirements. However, DSS is not currently charged with monitoring implementation of, and compliance with, CFIUS mitigation agreements for those cases in which the Department of Defense was a lead or co-lead. Instead, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy is performing that function.

The committee is concerned that the monitoring of CFIUS mitigation agreements is being performed by a policy organization that currently lacks the resources, technical expertise, facilities, and relationships with other oversight and investigative agencies to provide reasonable oversight of implementation of, and compliance

with, these mitigation agreements. While it is appropriate for the Deputy Assistant Secretary to be charged with responsibility for recommending actions related to enforcement of such mitigation agreements, the Department may benefit from leveraging the capabilities of DSS for monitoring implementation and compliance. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the role of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy in monitoring CFIUS mitigation agreements in which the Department of Defense was the lead or co-lead, and to determine if DSS is suited to perform these functions. The committee further directs the Secretary to report the findings of the review to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2013.

National Defense Stockpile Beryllium Upgrade

The committee is aware the Administrator of Defense Logistics Agency Strategic Materials tested a process for upgrading hot-pressed beryllium billets in the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) to high-purity beryllium powders capable of near-net shape processing. Initial results lead the committee to believe the high-purity beryllium powder resulting from upgrading hot-pressed billets can reduce the amount of time required to integrate stockpiled beryllium into national security programs and can result in more efficient processing with less waste. The committee also notes that vacuum cast ingots in the NDS are held for the National Nuclear Security Administration and should be retained in that form.

The committee recognizes that adequate supplies of beryllium for both conventional and strategic programs are vital to the defense industrial base, and encourages the Administrator to take such steps as necessary to ensure the stockpile of hot-pressed beryllium billets is upgraded to meet demands without undue lead times and in a manner that protects against obsolescence.

Next Generation Global Positioning System Receiver Equipment

The committee notes the current schedule for Global Positioning System (GPS) III spacecraft, Next Generation Operational Control System, and the user equipment is not aligned. The user equipment is scheduled to be fielded at least one year later than the other elements of the program.

The committee recommends the Department of Defense accelerate the fielding of user equipment capable of receiving the legacy and modernized military codes from the GPS. Further, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to establish approved security evaluation and certification processes and procedures, as well as to support and ensure sufficient redundancy of the GPS user equipment industrial base.

Regional Commercialization Activities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense continues to be challenged in commercializing and transitioning technology developed through federally funded research and development. The Department has a number of tools at its disposal to support these activities, such as the Commercialization Readiness Pro-

gram, the Manufacturing Technology Program and the Mentor-Protege program, but few are focused on tapping into the regional innovation centers across the Nation.

The committee understands that the Office of Naval Research has funded some initiatives that support the regional technology commercialization ecosystem. For example, the Pacific International Center for High Technology Research provides some administrative support and subject matter expertise for small and emerging businesses in diverse fields such as agriculture, renewable energy and health information systems. Also, the Hawaii Technology Development Venture is a project supporting Hawaii-based technology businesses, as well as current and future Department of Navy and Department of Defense programs.

In addition, the committee notes that section 252 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) allowed the Secretary of Defense to use the research and engineering network of the Department of Defense to support the regional advanced technology clusters established by the Secretary of Commerce to encourage the development of technologies for national security and homeland defense challenges. The committee sees such activities as useful means to leverage state and local technology investments, and encourages the Department to find similar mechanisms for supporting the nation's industrial base for emerging technologies.

Report on Diversification of Supply Activities Related to Rare Earth Elements

The committee is aware that in response to the report required by section 843 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) and based on forecasting demand for fiscal year 2013 only, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics concluded that domestic production of rare earth elements could satisfy the level of consumption required to meet defense procurement needs by fiscal year 2013, with the exception of yttrium. However, the committee observes that the Future Years Defense Program indicates that consumption of rare earth elements is expected to increase after 2013. Specifically, the report on the feasibility and desirability of recycling, recovery, and reprocessing of rare earth elements required by the conference report (H. Rept. 112–329) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, states that each SSN–774 *Virginia*-class submarine would require approximately 9,200 pounds of rare earth materials, each DDG–51 Aegis destroyer would require approximately 5,200 pounds of these materials, and each F–35 Lightning II aircraft would require approximately 920 pounds of these materials.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense intends to pursue a three-pronged strategy to secure supplies of rare earth elements, which consists of diversification of supply, pursuit of substitutes, and a focus on reclamation of waste, as part of a larger U.S. Government recycling effort. The committee believes that diversification of supply activities related to rare earth elements is necessary in order to meet the growing demand for these materials, but the committee is concerned that some of these processes may

prove to be technically difficult or so expensive that they are deemed cost-prohibitive.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2014, on the Department's risk mitigation strategy for rare earth elements, which should include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) A list and description of the programs initiated or planned to reclaim rare earth elements by the Department, along with a description of the materials reclaimed or expected to be reclaimed from such programs;

(2) An assessment of the cost of materials produced by these reclamation efforts compared to the cost of newly-mined materials;

(3) An assessment of availability of reliable suppliers in the National Defense Industrial Base for the reclamation and reprocessing of rare earth elements;

(4) A list of alternative sources of supply, such as mine tailings, recycled components, and consumer waste, that the Department has investigated or plans to investigate;

(5) A physical description of alternative sources of supply with corresponding geologic characteristics, such as grade, resource size, and the amenability of that feedstock to metallurgical processing;

(6) A description of the materials that the Department plans to obtain via the Defense Priorities and Allocations System; and

(7) Other diversification of supply activities deemed relevant by the Under Secretary.

Report on Export of Night Vision Devices

The committee is concerned that restrictions on the export of night vision devices do not reflect the current state of the global marketplace and, as a result, domestic producers of the devices are prohibited from marketing products overseas that are commonly available from foreign competitors. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the export regulations and specifications related to the sale or transfer of night vision devices and to inform the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2014, of any recommendations for statutory or regulatory changes to ensure a robust domestic manufacturing capability of these devices.

Report on the Integrity of the Supply Chain for Nuclear Command and Control and Critical Defense Capabilities

The committee is aware that critical infrastructure is not just physical, but also encompasses information and information systems, as well as supports infrastructure. According to the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program documents, there is "no single solution to ensure the protection of information and the associated information infrastructure," and to address these mission assurance needs, the Department of Defense (DOD) has developed a "defense-

in-depth" strategy which includes a variety of tools to assess the robustness and security-readiness of DOD networks.

The committee is aware of the many threats facing the mission assurance of critical aspects of the Department, and in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee included a requirement for the Secretary of Energy to report on the supply chain security and integrity of the nuclear weapons complex. In responding to that reporting requirement, the Secretary of Energy found the presence of specific information technology equipment manufactured by the firm Huawei, which has known links to the Government and military of the People's Republic of China, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). The Secretary of Energy informed the committee that, once technology linked to Huawei was found within the LANL network, steps were promptly taken to remove it from that network. The committee commends this action, but is concerned that such technology was incorporated into the LANL networks in the first place.

The committee is also aware of the bipartisan investigative report of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, "[t]he U.S. National Security Issues Posed by Chinese Telecommunications Companies Huawei and ZTE." The committee notes that the bipartisan recommendations of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence included:

> "(1) The United States should view with suspicion the continued penetration of the U.S. telecommunications market by Chinese telecommunications companies;
>
> (2) Private Sector entities in the United States are strongly encouraged to consider the long-term security risks associated with doing business with either ZTE or Huawei for equipment or services; and,
>
> (3) Committees of jurisdiction in the U.S. Congress should consider potential legislation to better address the risk posed by telecommunications companies with nation-state ties or otherwise not clearly trusted to build critical infrastructure."

In addition, the Defense Security Service reported in its 2012 report, "Targeting U.S. Technologies" that, "[t]he stakes are high in the battle against foreign collection efforts and espionage that target U.S. technology, intellectual property, trade secrets, and proprietary information." The report went on to state that East Asia and the Pacific accounted for 43 percent of the reported foreign attempts to obtain illegal or unauthorized access to sensitive (including proprietary information) and or classified information and technology residing in the cleared industrial base.

These findings only heighten the committee's concerns about the security risks associated with the presence of information technology manufactured by firms with known affiliation to the military and Government of China. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the telecommunications and information technology supply chain of select components of the Department of Defense, including the nuclear command and control infrastructure. Such a review should include an inspection of the critical assets, infrastructure, and key resources identified by the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program for pres-

ence of Huawei and ZTE telecommunications and information technology equipment. The Secretary should submit a report on the findings of the review, along with any recommendations for improving the mission assurance of the Department's critical information and the associated information infrastructure, to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 1, 2014, with an interim report due by February 15, 2014.

Report on the Implementation of Rare Earth Elements Strategy in the Joint Strike Fighter Program

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense intends to pursue a three-pronged strategy to secure supplies of rare earth elements, which consists of diversification of supply, pursuit of substitutes, and a focus on reclamation of waste as part of a larger U.S. Government recycling effort. However, it remains unclear how this strategy will be implemented in the Department's major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs). Several high-profile MDAPs, including the F–35 Lightening II program, may use significant amounts of rare earth elements in full-rate production. The committee is concerned that the introduction of substitute materials and components may increase acquisition and sustainment costs through the qualification of manufacturers for substitutes, implementation of engineering changes to accommodate substitutes, and the long-term costs associated with supplier networks.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, in coordination with the Program Executive Officer for the F–35, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2014, on the potential for substitution of components and materials into F–35 aircraft to reduce consumption of rare earth materials. The report, which may include a classified annex, should include the following:

(1) A list and description of subsystems that contain rare earth elements and the approximate quantities of each rare earth element by subsystem;

(2) An assessment of the potential to incorporate substitute components or materials in each subsystem based on technical acceptability, to include consideration of performance requirements, and engineering changes that may be necessary for integration of the substitute; and

(3) An assessment of the potential to incorporate substitute components or materials in each subsystem based on cost acceptability to include consideration of material costs, qualification and testing costs, and engineering change costs.

Risks to the Cruise Missile Industrial Base

The committee is aware that, in the August 2012 "Annual Industrial Capabilities Base Report to Congress," the Department of Defense noted that the lack of new missile program development, along with decreases in Tactical Tomahawk procurement quantities and delays to the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile-Extended Range low-rate initial production programs, are combining to threaten the viability of the long-range cruise missile propulsion

sector. The report states that these factors may lead to the disbandment of highly specialized engineering design teams associated with developing and sustaining cruise missile systems. The committee notes that the development of cruise missiles by foreign nations has led to higher-speed, longer-range weapons, and advanced air defense capabilities abroad.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not developed a plan to address the sustainment of the cruise missile industrial base in light of emerging threats abroad, and that, without sustainment of the existing cruise missile propulsion capabilities, future development of needed advancements may be significantly delayed and will likely come at a much higher cost. The committee believes that preserving the existing national cruise missile propulsion capability, with an emphasis on sustaining design engineering teams, is of utmost importance. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue to closely monitor this portion of the industrial base and to take such steps as necessary to ensure risks to the viability of this sector are appropriately mitigated.

Small Business Size Standards

The committee understands the importance of the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) to ensure fair and competitive economic activity between Government buying authorities and the small and large businesses that compose the U.S. defense industrial base. The committee is aware that at 5-year intervals U.S. authorities, in conjunction with their counterparts in Mexico and Canada, confer on necessary adjustments and realignments to the NAICS codes. The committee also recognizes that the Small Business Administration (SBA) has the authority to determine the appropriate size standards associated with each NAICS code based on factors concerning business revenue or number of employees. However, when the periodic realignment of the NAICS codes causes what was previously coded as one industry to now be recognized as multiple industries, or what were previously considered separate industries to be consolidated into a single code, it inadvertently affects the assignment of size standards which, in turn, has consequences for important segments of the defense industrial base.

For example, under the 2007 iteration of the NAICS code determination, footwear manufacturing was broken into five discrete categories with their own individual codes and size standards: Rubber and Plastics Footwear Manufacturing, code 316211, 1,000 employee size standard; House Slipper Manufacturing, code 316212, 500 employee size standard; Men's Footwear (except Athletic) Manufacturing, code 361213, 500 employee size standard, Women's Footwear (except Athletic) Manufacturing, code 361214, 500 employee size standard; and Other Footwear Manufacturing, code 361219, 500 employee size standard. However, under the 2012 NAICS code determination, these were consolidated into one code with one size standard: Footwear Manufacturing, code 361210, 1000 employees. The result is that businesses that were previously considered large are now considered small without SBA having made an affirmative decision that the larger size standard is appro-

priate. As a consequence, in at least one of these NAICS codes, all but one company doing business with the Federal Government is now considered small, which may distort the market and disproportionately harm those businesses with fewer than 500 employees.

The committee recognizes the effort of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) to comply with recent realignment of NAICS codes and subsequent adjustments to small business size standards related to footwear as it applies Federal Acquisition Regulation, Part 19. However, the committee in concerned that SBA failed to observe the normal rulemaking and public comment process that governs changes to the size standards, thereby not allowing industry the ability to register comments. The committee believes that SBA's decision to update size standards without adherence to the normal rulemaking process has undermined the sustainability of the industrial base, discouraged competitive procurement, creates negative effects throughout industrial sectors needed to support warfighter, and harmed true small businesses. Although DLA did initially respond to the changes to the small business size standards as they relate to footwear and began setting aside contracts that were previously available for full and open competition, the committee recognizes that DLA has the purchasing authority to appropriately scope procurement requirements and contracting processes in order to ensure appropriate pricing, product quality and equipment suitability are achieved from available vendors, and protect the diversity of the industry necessary to meet surge requirements. The committee encourages DLA to exercise this flexibility and authority to maximize the buying power for military footwear, particularly in light of the fact that the SBA made the changes without adherence to standard protocols.

Furthermore, the committee remains concerned about the harm this type of action could cause to legitimate small businesses. When the size standards are over-inflated to include large businesses, true small businesses lose the protections normally afforded to them in the procurement system, which may harm the industrial base. The committee looks forward to working with the House Committee on Small Business to address these policy concerns.

Solid Rocket Motor Industrial Base

The committee has long been concerned about the health and long-term viability of the large solid rocket motor (SRM) industrial base. A number of studies and assessments in the past several years have reinforced these concerns. Demand for large SRMs has decreased dramatically in recent years, particularly with the decision by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to retire, terminate, or delay certain launch programs, including the Constellation program. The Air Force Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) program and Navy Trident II/D5 submarine-launched ballistic missile program rely on this industrial base and now bear the increasing cost of SRMs. The committee believes the industrial base has been diligent in reducing overhead costs and excess capacity, and the committee believes that significant further cuts may result in the permanent loss of key capabilities and skills.

The committee notes that while the Navy continues low-rate production of D5 solid rocket motors, the Air Force ceased acquisition of new SRMs for the Minuteman III ICBM program at the conclusion of the Propulsion Replacement Program in 2009. The committee recognizes that the Air Force will need to acquire additional Minuteman III SRMs to extend the life of this system to 2030, as currently planned, or potentially beyond. The committee encourages the Air Force to consider the health of the SRM industrial base when considering when and how to resume production and, as with all major acquisition programs, encourages whenever possible the use of full and open competition in executing such an acquisition.

Finally, the committee notes the potential for greater commonality between Air Force and Navy SRM systems. Initiatives to increase commonality between the Services may lead to significant cost savings and a more robust industrial base through a smaller but more consistently utilized supply chain. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to explore commonality across their respective SRM-based strategic weapon systems to increase efficiencies and save costs, but cautions that such commonality should be carefully considered so that it does not unacceptably increase technical risks from the failure of common components.

Space Surveillance Telescope

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has developed a Space Surveillance Telescope (SST) program in order to demonstrate an advanced ground-based optical system to detect and track faint objects in space. The committee understands that DARPA has signed a memorandum of agreement with the Air Force to transition SST to Air Force Space Command for operational use. Furthermore, the committee understands that SST will be moved to the Commonwealth of Australia for further operational demonstrations in a relevant environment with a richer and more interesting population of SSA targets in geosynchronous orbit.

However, the committee believes this move presents numerous challenges, including logistical and technical communications obstacles resulting from a site that is significantly more remote than the current SST location. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the logistical and sustainment strategy for SST. The briefing should address the plans for providing the maintenance and spare parts for SST after it is moved to Australia.

Specialty Metals Clause Waiver Processes and Notification

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) issued national security waivers to the specialty metals clause under section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) for certain samarium-

cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies in the F–35 Lightning II aircraft. The committee is aware that at least two qualified suppliers in the domestic defense industrial base currently hold contracts directly with the Department for similar magnets and magnet assemblies. Moreover, a third qualifying supplier indirectly provides these materials to the Department through other prime contractors. These qualifying suppliers continue to manufacture samarium-cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies for fixed wing, missile, and radar programs. The committee is increasingly concerned that this use of national security waivers contravenes the congressional intent of Public Law 110–181, which, among other purposes, is to facilitate competition and guarantee a secure supply chain of certain materials.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to investigate the issuance of these national security waivers for samarium-cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, that includes, at minimum, a description of the following:

(1) The extent to which distributor-fabricators who supplied non-compliant samarium-cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies to DOD prime or subcontractors knowingly and/or willfully supplied samarium-cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies manufactured by foreign suppliers to subcontractors for inclusion in the F–35 program;

(2) The extent to which distributor-fabricators who supplied non-compliant samarium-cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies to DOD prime or subcontractors were aware of, or engaged with, qualified sources for samarium-cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies on other commercial or defense contracts;

(3) The extent to which acquisition officials within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the F–35 Joint Program Office were aware of, or engaged with, qualified sources for samarium-cobalt magnets and magnet assemblies on other subcontracts;

(4) The criteria, method, or process utilized by OSD acquisition officials to define and determine "knowing and willful" as it pertains to noncompliance with the specialty metals clause;

(5) Recommendations to improve the criteria, method, or process utilized by OSD acquisition officials to define and determine "knowing and willful" as it pertains to noncompliance with the specialty metals clause;

(6) Recommendations for DOD acquisition policy changes, such as consideration of previous noncompliance on future contracts, fines by non-compliant lower-tier suppliers, or suspension and debarment, that may adequately deter or dissuade lower-tier suppliers from knowingly and/or willingly violating acquisition regulations and other rules promulgated in accordance with section 2533b of title 10, United States Code; and

(7) Recommendations to improve the Department's supply chain management procedures and actions necessary to prevent such lapses in the future.

Transfer of International Traffic in Arms Regulations Controlled Missile Defense Technology to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

The committee received allegations that certain Missile Defense Agency technology was involved in the transfer of International Traffic in Arms (ITAR) controlled missile defense technology to unauthorized foreign nationals. The committee further understands that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), upon investigation of this alleged transfer, referred the case to the U.S. Department of Justice for prosecution.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the FBI and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees, the Science, Space and Technology Committee of the House, and the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee of the Senate, not later than August 1, 2013, on the following:

(1) What U.S. missile defense technology or information, classified or export-controlled, NASA had access to prior to June 1, 2013, and what was the purpose of NASA's access to such technology or information? What protective measures were imposed to insure proper handling of this information and technology by NASA?

(2) The status of any FBI investigation into whether U.S. missile defense technology to which NASA had access was allowed to be transferred to persons without lawful authority to access said technology.

(3) If an FBI investigation has determined that missile defense technology was in fact transferred; provide a damage assessment of the consequence of the loss of this technology; and how a state, such as the People's Republic of China, could exploit such technology to improve its offensive or defensive military capabilities or to counter U.S. offensive or defensive military capabilities.

Trusted Sources of Microelectronics

The committee remains concerned about the state of defense microelectronics, with regards to both the availability of a trusted supply chain, as well as the long-term health and vitality of the industrial base. The committee fully recognizes the critical importance to the Department of Defense of sustaining and improving the supply of trusted semiconductors, supply chain components and inspection tools manufactured in the United States.

The committee is also concerned that the Department's recent microelectronics strategy lacked depth of detail to comprehensively address the areas of sustained investment, as well as new areas of emphasis in the future, such as photonics and optoelectronic components. The committee is aware that the Department is revising this strategy, but until such time, the Department will be challenged in supporting decisions regarding what course of action may be most beneficial to the industrial base. The committee recognizes the health of the microelectronics industrial base is a significant concern for our national security. The changing nature of the

microelectronics industrial base, influenced heavily by the significant cost pressures associated with recapitalization and retooling, could be determined before the U.S. Government understands the changes taking place, or can act swiftly enough to respond effectively.

The committee is aware that industry is potentially facing a major transition to larger sized, 450 mm wafers that will allow the manufacture of more advanced semiconductor devices at a lower cost. The committee believes that to get there will likely require the development of the next generation of manufacturing tools. The committee recognizes the value of pursuing technology research for other technologies that support fabless and maskless semiconductor development as a way to change the paradigm for the microelectronics industrial sector. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to expeditiously reexamine its defense microelectronics strategy, which should examine ways of supporting further technology development for fabless and maskless semiconductor production, as well as manufacturing tools for 450 mm wafers. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy to examine the challenges to the microelectronics industrial base during its Sector-by-Sector, Tier-by-Tier analyses.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1601—Periodic Audits of Contracting Compliance by Inspector General of Department of Defense

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct an audit of the Department's compliance with contracting practices and policies related to procurement under section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, which pertains to the requirement to buy certain articles from American sources and is frequently referred to as the "Berry Amendment." This section would also require the Inspector General to include the findings of such periodic audits as part of the semiannual report transmitted to congressional committees as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–452).

Section 1602—Expansion of the Procurement Technical Assistance Program to Advance Small Business Growth

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to publish, and update annually, a list of capabilities and characteristics recommended to enable a qualified small business concern to become competitive as an other-than-small business for future contracts awarded by the Department of Defense. This section would also require any contract awarded to a qualified small business concern that would exceed the applicable receipt-based small business size standard (or if the contract would exceed $70.0 million in an industry with an employee based size standard) to include a contract clause that would encourage the small business to develop the capabilities and characteristics identified by the Under Secretary if they desire to remain competitive as other-than-small business in that industry. In

addition, this section would amend chapter 142 of title 10, United States Code, to enable Procurement Technical Assistance Centers (PTAC) to provide additional support to these businesses without the funding and cost-share limitations that are otherwise applicable to PTAC support. Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit three annual reports to the congressional defense committees beginning on March 1, 2015, on the implementation of the amendments made by this section, along with any recommendations for improving the Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program.

Section 1603—Amendments Relating to Procurement Technical Assistance Cooperative Agreement Program

This section would amend section 2413 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to defray up to 65 percent of the eligible entity's cost of furnishing assistance under the program and would also amend section 2414 of title 10, United States Code, to increase limitations on the value of assistance that may be provided under the program.

Section 1604—Strategic Plan for Requirements for War Reserve Stocks of Meals Ready-To-Eat

This section would limit the authority of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) to alter stockage level requirements for meals ready-to-eat (MRE) war reserves until a strategic plan is developed and is briefed to the congressional defense committees.

The committee is concerned that the Defense Logistics Agency's potential reduction of its MRE war reserve stockage requirements may adversely impact military readiness. The committee commends DLA for initiating action to study the MRE war reserve but has concerns over potential reductions that could harm the industrial base and threaten military readiness for possible contingencies.

Section 1605—Foreign Commercial Satellite Services

This section would prevent the Secretary of Defense from entering into contracts for satellite services with a foreign entity that a covered foreign country has ownership interest or the foreign entity plans to or is expected to provide launch or other satellite services, including satellite operation, under the contract from a covered foreign country. A covered foreign country is defined as a country described in section 1261(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the prohibition for a particular contract if the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, submits a national security assessment for such contract to the congressional defense committees in an unclassified form, including a classified annex if necessary.

The assessment shall include:

(1) The projected period of performance (including any period covered by options to extend the contract), the financial terms,

and a description of the services to be provided under the contract;

(2) To the extent practicable, a description of the ownership interest that a covered foreign country has in the foreign entity providing satellite services to the Department of Defense under the contract and the launch or other satellite services (including satellite operation) that will be provided in a covered foreign country under the contract;

(3) A justification for entering into a contract with such covered foreign entity and a description of the actions necessary to eliminate the need to enter into such a contract with such covered foreign entity in the future; and

(4) A risk assessment of entering into a contract with such covered foreign entity, including an assessment of mission assurance and security of information and a description of any measures necessary to mitigate risks found by such risk assessment.

The Secretary of Defense may delegate the waiver authority to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, or the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Section 1606—Proof of Concept Commercialization Pilot Program

This section would allow the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to establish a 5-year pilot program to accelerate the commercialization of basic research innovations from qualifying institutions.

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 2014. As recommended by the committee, division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $10,055,086,000 for construction in support of the Active Forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2014.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $9,017,563,000 for military construction, $451,357,000 for Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities, and $1,542,713,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends authorization of $8,645,906,000 for military construction, $451,357,000 for BRAC activities, and $1,542,713,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2014.

Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014."

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 XXVII and XXIX shall expire on October 1, 2016, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, 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, 2013, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,119,875,000 for Army military construction and $556,879,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends authorization of $1,099,875,000 for military construction and $556,879,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustment

The committee recommends reduction of funding for a project contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. This reduction includes:

(1) $10.0 million for Command and Control Facility Administrative Areas at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. The budget request included $75.0 million to support the command and control requirements of the Army in the Pacific. While the committee supports the requirement for this facility, the committee is concerned that the unit cost for this facility is high compared to a standard design even when accounting for Area Cost Factors. Accordingly, the committee recommends $65.0 million, a reduction of $10.0 million, for this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2014.

Section 2103—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize appropriations for Army military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2104—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Project

This section would reauthorize a project initially provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, for construction of a Loading Facility. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2101 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,700,269,000 for Navy military construction and $463,251,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends authorization of $1,700,269,000 for military construction and $463,251,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2014.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2014.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize appropriations for Navy military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2205—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would limit the Secretary of the Navy from expending any funds authorized in this title that are associated with the land acquisition associated with the Townsend Bombing Range near Savannah, Georgia, until the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that an agreement with the local communities has been concluded that mitigates the loss of the real estate tax base.

Section 2206—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2207—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2208—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,156,573,000 for Air Force military construction and $464,958,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends authorization of $1,138,843,000 for military construction and $464,959,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2014.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2014.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize appropriations for Air Force military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2305—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project

This section would increase the construction scope associated with a Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar authorization, provided in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112—239), to $128.0 million. The hangar is to be constructed of cast-in-place reinforced concrete and will be adequately sized to provide repairs, functionality checks, and aircraft inspections in support of the Pacific Airpower Resiliency (PAR) mission.

The committee notes that the Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar is required to support a Continuous Bomber Presence, Tanker Task Force, Theater Security Packages, and the Global Hawk beddown. The lack of this hardened facility would significantly reduce readiness and could result in degradation of operational capabilities. The committee supports PAR's balance of dispersal and hardening, and this project is a critical component of that program.

Section 2306—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would limit the Secretary of the Air Force from expending any funds authorized by this title that are associated with the construction of a maintenance facility, a hazardous cargo pad, or an airport storage facility at Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, until the Secretary certifies that the Secretary will purchase the requisite real estate necessary to support these projects.

Section 2307—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,985,000,000 for defense agency military construction and $57,625,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends authorization of $3,708,373,000 for military construction and $57,625,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2014.

The budget request also contained $122,536,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of $122,536,000 for chemical demilitarization construction for fiscal year 2014.

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) $3.6 million for the SOF Boat Docks at Naval Air Station Key West, Florida. The budget request included $3.6 million to repair and expand the existing boat dock facilities to support specialized training conducted by the Special Forces Underwater Operations School. While the committee supports the requirement for this capability, the committee believes the requirement can be met through the use of operation and maintenance funds. Accordingly, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $3.6 million for this project.

(2) $13.0 million for the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID) Replacement Stage I, Increment 8 at Fort Detrick, Maryland. The budget request included $13.0 million to construct a replacement high-containment research laboratory and support space for USAMRIID. The committee notes that the Department of Defense could use bid savings to complete this increment of the project. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $13.0 million for this project.

(3) $12.4 million for the Ambulatory Care Center, Increment 2 at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. The budget request included $76.2 million for the second increment of an ambulatory care center to support the delivery of care in the National Capital Region. The committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year or 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 2014. As such, the committee recommends $63.8 million, a reduction of $12.4 million for this project.

(4) $100.0 million for the Public Health Command Lab Replacement at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. The budget request included $210.0 million for a multistory replacement laboratory to support the expanding requirements for Public Health Command Lab services. The committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year or 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 2014. As such, the committee recommends $110.0 million, a reduction of $100.0 million for this project.

(5) $14.4 million for the SOF Performance Resiliency Center at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. The budget request included $14.4 million to support the Human Performance Initiative for East Coast based units assigned to U.S. Marine Corps Forces Special Operations Command (MARSOC). The committee is concerned that the purpose of this facility is duplicative to ex-

isting physical fitness facilities and in conflict with medical care provided by the TRICARE Management Activity. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $14.4 million for this project.

(6) $100.0 million for the Hospital Replacement Increment 5 at Fort Bliss, Texas. The budget request included $252.1 million for the fifth increment of the Fort Bliss hospital replacement project to provide inpatient and outpatient care to the Ft. Bliss beneficiary population. The committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year or 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 2014. As such, the committee recommends $152.1 million, a reduction of $100.0 million for this project.

(7) $11.147 million for the SOF Human Performance Center at Naval Air Station Oceana (Dam Neck Annex), Virginia. The budget request included $11.147 million to support the Naval Special Warfare Development Group's High Performance Program. The committee is concerned that the purpose of this facility is duplicative to existing physical fitness facilities and in conflict with medical care provided by the TRICARE Management Activity. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $11.147 million for this project.

(8) $5.0 million for the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex, Increment 2, at Deveselu, Romania. The budget request included $85.0 million for the second increment of a project to enhance regional ballistic missile defense against short- and medium- range ballistic missile threats. The committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year or 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 2014. As such, the committee recommends $80.0 million, a reduction of $5.0 million for this project.

(9) $7.83 million for the SOF Facility Augmentation at Torri Station, Japan. The budget request included $71.451 million to construct a company operations and support facilities necessary to support the growth of Special Operations Forces. While the committee is supportive of the majority of this project, the committee is concerned with an element of the project to support the tactical human optimization rapid rehabilitation and reconditioning and the resiliency programs. The committee is concerned that the purpose of this facility is in conflict with medical care provided by the TRICARE Management Activity. As such, the committee recommends $63.621 million, a reduction of $7.83 million for this project.

(10) $10.0 million for Contingency Construction. The budget request included $10.0 million to support contingency construction requirements in support of projects not previously authorized by law. The committee notes that significant unobligated balances remain in this account and other authorities exist to

construct projects that are in keeping with a national security interest. Accordingly, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $10.0 million for this program.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects at the amounts authorized by each project at a specific location valued at a cost greater than $2.0 million. This section would also authorize the sum total of projects across various locations, each project of which is less than $2.0 million.

Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize appropriations for defense agencies military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for chemical demilitarization construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $239,700,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends authorization of $199,700,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2014.

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 appropriations for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $693,310,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends authorization of $676,310,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2014.

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) $4.0 million for the 175th Network Warfare Squadron Facility at Fort Meade, Maryland. The budget request included $4.0 million to support operations and training of an Air National Guard Network Warfare Squadron. The committee is concerned that the Commander, Cyber Command has not adequately established the requirements to support the National Guard and Reserves and is concerned that this project is early-to-need. The committee discuses this issue further in title IX. Accordingly, recommends no funds, a reduction of $4.0 million for this project.

(2) $8.0 million for the CYBER/ISR Facility at Martin State Airport, Maryland. The budget request included $8.0 million to support a Network Warfare Group. The committee is concerned that the Commander, Cyber Command has not adequately established the requirements to support the National Guard and Reserve and therefore believes that this project is early-to-need. The committee discusses this issue further in title IX. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the budget request does not fully support the scope of the military construction project. Accordingly, recommends no funds, a reduction of $8.0 million for this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2611—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2603 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2612—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $451,357,000 for activities related to Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities. The committee recommends authorization of $451,357,000 for BRAC activities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account

This section would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of Base Realignment and Closure activities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2711—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round

This section would prohibit funds, appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations contained in this Act, to be use to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Closure and Realignment round.

Section 2712—Elimination of Quarterly Certification Requirement Regarding Availabilty of Military Health Care in National Capital Region

This section would repeal a quarterly reporting requirement regarding the capacity of the military health care system in the Na-

tional Capital Region. The committee notes that sufficient capacity has been obtained in the National Capital Region to replace the loss of the former Walter Reed Army Military Medical Center, District of Columbia.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Air Education and Training Command

The committee recognizes the important role that Air Education and Training Command (AETC) plays in recruiting, training, and educating Airmen for the United States Air Force. A key mission set filled by AETC is the initial and follow-on flight training for pilots and aircrews. This includes Initial Flight Screening, Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training, Euro-NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) Joint Jet Pilot Training, Undergraduate Remotely-Piloted Aircraft (RPA) Training, and Undergraduate Combat Systems Officer Training among other programs. The committee has been made aware of adverse impacts to aircraft, facilities, equipment, and operations due to flooding and deficiencies in infrastructure at AETC installations. The committee encourages the Air Force to consider the impact these infrastructure deficiencies have had on AETC's ability to train Airmen due to damaged aircraft, facilities and equipment when prioritizing investments in the military construction and Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Maintenance programs.

Air Force Institute of Technology Laboratory Recapitalization

The committee is aware that a recapitalized research laboratory for the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) is required to support their mission. The laboratory is used for graduate engineering students to conduct original, defense-directed scientific research in cutting-edge national security topics such as stealth technology, nuclear engineering, unmanned aerial vehicles, cyberspace, and directed energy. Currently, most of AFIT's laboratory space is housed in three buildings that lack utility support and stable physical conditions for scientific experiments. As an alternative to traditional military construction, the committee encourages AFIT to pursue leasing arrangements, particularly those that would offer the Air Force cost savings through public partnerships.

Analysis of Type I and Type III Retro-Reflective Glass Beads

The committee notes that the Department of Defense supports the inclusion of both Type I and Type III retro-reflective glass beads in the Department of Defense construction specifications for airport construction and airport marking standards. However, the committee also notes that the index of refraction is higher for the Type III beads. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report by April 1, 2014 to the congressional defense committees that provides a business case analysis that

compares the efficacy of continuing to specify both Type I and Type III retroreflective glass beads in the Department of Defense Unified Facilities Guide Specification Standards.

Blast Protection for Forward Military Locations in Contingency Operations

The committee is aware that establishing forward operating bases and outposts is required to support military operations, especially during stability or counterinsurgency operations. Such locations allow forces to conduct operations or logistic support activities. Due to the threat environment around these locations, greater security measures must be deployed, such as increasing standoff distances, hardening access of facilities, and installing blast protection measures where necessary to ensure the safety and security of personnel operating from such a location. In continuing to evaluate force protection requirements and procedures in contingency locations, the committee encourages the Department to assess current policies, procedures, and capabilities for blast protection of facilities in forward locations, to include current and appropriate standoff requirements, and new and available technology that could help reduce standoff distance requirements and improve force protection and building security.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the requirements and procedures in such contingency locations and to provide a briefing on the assessment to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2014. The briefing should include: a review of the current design basis threat; changes to security policies that would better protect personnel; and an assessment of current facility methods, to include standoff distances and physical barriers to address the design basis threat. The briefing should also address the availability of new technologies or procedures that provide a significant improvement against the design basis threat.

Foreign Materiel Exploitation

Consistent with the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee notes the importance of the foreign materiel exploitation of the Department of Defense. According to Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General Report Number 98–005, foreign materiel exploitation involves analysis, testing, and evaluation of foreign materiel to include testing against U.S. equipment. Foreign materiel exploitation supports Department of Defense acquisition programs, testing, threat simulator and target development, modeling and simulation, and training and tactics. The committee encourages the Department to ensure the military services have the necessary facilities and resources to perform this critical mission.

Dayton Peace Accord Exhibit

The General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, also known as the Dayton Accords, negotiated at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio, in November 1995, ended the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina and stands as

one of the great contributions in our generation to ending armed conflict. Moreover, it is a testament to the value Americans place on promoting world peace. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to work with the Director of the National Park Services to develop appropriate permanent commemorative exhibits at or in the vicinity of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base to tell the story to the American people as well as international visitors of America's contribution to peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina through the negotiation of the Dayton Accords.

Department of Defense Joint Bases

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to realize efficiencies through joint basing, but it is concerned that the intent of joint basing, including a consolidation of common services across the entirety of the joint base enterprise, has not realized its full potential. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, on the extent to which the Department of Defense has achieved joint operations and efficiencies at joint bases. Specifically, the report should address the following elements:

(1) The common elements that are included in the individual joint base memoranda of agreements, differences that are unique to joint bases, and how the memoranda of agreements reflect best practices identified on joint bases on how the services interact and provide for support services;

(2) The extent to which joint bases have implemented the terms of their memoranda of agreement, including adopting the joint standards to provide a single source for support services;

(3) The extent to which the joint bases have reduced duplication of management and similar support services, achieved greater efficiencies through economies of scale, and consolidated and optimized existing and future service contract requirements; and

(4) How the Department of Defense measures the improvement in joint operations from the joint bases and what the Department of Defense has found in measuring joint operations.

Distributed Generation and Energy Security

The committee is aware of the dependency of military facilities and installations across the globe on outside inputs, such as the electrical grid. The committee is also aware of myriad threats arrayed against such utilities in the cyber domain. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to evaluate available technologies for distributed power generation, including but not limited to fuel cells, microgrids, solar generation, wind turbines, other renewables and trigeneration, as part of its ongoing efforts for installation energy management to increase energy reliability and energy security, as defined in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), with consideration for lifecycle cost savings and return-on-investment associated with such projects.

European Consolidation Initiative

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is conducting an analysis of infrastructure capacity in Europe to provide the basis for reducing expenses through consolidations. The committee is supportive of the Department of Defense's effort to eliminate excess capacity overseas while ensuring that our infrastructure properly supports the operational and strategic requirements of the national security interests of the United States. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2014. The briefing shall address the results of the European Infrastructure Consolidation assessment and include an assessment of military force structure and infrastructure requirements overseas, to include an assessment of excess infrastructure and infrastructure capacity overseas and consideration of the consolidation of overseas infrastructure.

Industrial Control Systems integration into the Department of Defense Networks

In the development of an energy monitoring and utility control system specification for military construction and military family housing activities as required by section 2841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) and energy metering requirements directed by section 2827 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), the committee understands that the commercially developed control systems are required to seek compliance certifications to enable them to operate on Department of Defense networks. These compliance certifications are essential for national security, but due to the lengthy and cumbersome process to gain certification to operate on defense networks, the Department of Defense is unable to integrate the latest control energy monitoring and utility control systems into its overall physical plant and networking architecture. The committee believes that it is essential to expedite the compliance process that will allow for integration of needed, next-generation control systems while still ensuring adherence to network security protocols.

Therefore, the committee directs the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration/DOD Chief Information Officer, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014 on steps to improve the Defense Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process to more rapidly ensure compliance for energy monitoring and utility control systems and to capture and track energy usage. Specifically, this briefing should address any updates to the Unified Facilities Guide Specification that are required to implement this direction.

KC–46A Air National Guard Basing Strategy

The committee understands that the Air Force plans to accept delivery of 179 KC–46A aircraft between 2016–28. The current strategic basing strategy, as briefed to the committee, proposed to

base KC–46A aircraft at up to 10 Main Operating Bases (MOB). Of these, up to two will be Active Duty-led within the continental United States, up to four will be Air National Guard-led, up to two will be Air Force Reserve-led, and up to two will be located outside the continental United States. While the first Active Duty-led MOB will have a primary aircraft authorization (PAA) of 36 aircraft and the first Air National Guard-led MOB will have a PAA of 12 aircraft, the committee is aware that the Air Force is currently working to determine the most efficient basing construct for future Air National Guard-led MOBs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, or a designee, to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the basing strategy, to include PAA construct and basing criteria, for future Air National Guard-led MOBs, no later than 30 days before a final basing decision is made.

Leased Space Assessment

The committee notes that several of the Department of Defense's base closure and realignment (BRAC) recommendations were designed to relocate certain activities from leased space to Government-owned space. In the justification for some of these recommendations, the Secretary of Defense noted that implementation would reduce the Department's reliance on leased space, which historically has overall higher costs than Government-owned space and generally does not meet anti-terrorism/force protection standards. In a June 2012 report (GAO–12–709R), the Government Accountability Office noted that 2 of the recommendations to consolidate from leased space to Government-owned space were among the 14 recommendations for increasing the most in one-time costs. However, since the conclusion of the BRAC round, the committee has become aware that Department is continuing to rely on leased space.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committee by March 1, 2014, on the Department's reliance on leased space to meet its mission requirements and address the following:

(1) How much space does the Department lease, specifically in the National Capital Region?

(2) To what extent has the Department reduced its reliance on leased space since the beginning of BRAC 2005, particularly in the National Capital Region?

(3) How much is the Department spending on such leases?

(4) To what extent do facilities currently being leased by Department of Defense activities comply with current anti-terrorism/force protection standards?

(5) To what extent do opportunities exist to further reduce the extent to which the Department leases space, particularly in the National Capital Region?

Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization

As a federally funded research and development center sponsored by the Department of Defense, Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Lincoln Laboratory conducts research and develops technologies that address critical national security challenges. The com-

mittee notes that Lincoln Laboratory's facilities at Hanscom Air Force Base are in need of improvement and modernization in order to carry out their mission. The committee believe that the Secretary of the Air Force has existing authorities under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to carry out improvements and modernization of the Lincoln Laboratory complex at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts.

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into discussions with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to carry out such improvements and modernizations as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

Military Heritage Sites

The committee is aware of a number of military heritage sites, such as museums and exhibits that are dedicated to preserving and promoting the history of the United States Armed Forces. In many instances, such sites are operated by non-profit organizations and may be located on real estate leased from the Department of Defense or the Military Departments. The committee is further aware that section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, provides authority for the Secretary concerned to lease real property for a term of more than 5 years, and for an amount that is less than the fair market value of the lease interest, if the Secretary concerned determines that a public interest will be served as a result of the lease. The committee believes that the public interest can be well served by the operation of military heritage sites that preserve and promote the history of the United States Armed Forces. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the military departments, when in the public interest and when such activity does not conflict with military operational requirements, to work with military heritage sites under existing real estate authorities to allow for the continued operation of such sites.

Plan for Replacement of MQ–1 Aircraft of the National Guard

The committee notes that the Air Force is considering a transition strategy for the Predator MQ–1 to the Reaper MQ–9. The committee supports this transition strategy and believes that the Air Force should prioritize the replacement of MQ–1s with MQ–9s at locations with an existing Formal Training Units schoolhouses, which would allow the Air Force to capitalize on existing infrastructure, trained personnel, instructor expertise, and minimize overall life cycle costs.

Therefore, not later than March 1, 2014, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a recapitalization plan for the replacement of MQ–1 aircraft with MQ–9 aircraft. The plan shall include the criteria for beddown, including both the weight and scoring of such criteria that will be given to MQ–1 wings and squadrons with co-located formal training unit schoolhouse missions.

Report on Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment

The committee recognizes the Army's need to responsibly decrease Active Duty end strength from 562,000 at the end of Fiscal

Year 2012 to 490,000 by Fiscal Year 2020. The committee notes that as the Army considers stationing actions that will involve the inactivation of at least eight Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs), the Army has undertaken a Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) to examine the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of potential stationing decisions. In addition, the Army process will involve a qualitative analysis to consider factors such as training, power projection, Soldier well-being, mission expansion, and geographic distribution. In making final stationing recommendations, the committee fully expects the Army to demonstrate a business case analysis in support of each recommendation. Prior to issuing formal stationing announcements related to the Army 2020 force structure realignment, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the business case to support the stationing recommendations proposed by the Army.

Space Management

The committee believes that significant savings may be available in better space management on military installations. The Government Accountability Office continues to designate the Department of Defense's management of its support infrastructure as a high-risk area, in part because of issues in disposing of excess facilities. In order to identify excess or underutilized facilities, the Department needs accurate facility utilization information in its real property inventory database. This information is ultimately reported to the Federal Real Property Profile and is used by decision-makers to make asset management decisions, including disposing of unneeded federal properties or identifying opportunities for consolidation.

As the Government Accountability Office recently reported, the Department does not maintain complete and accurate data concerning the utilization of its facilities. For example, the Government Accountability Office found that the Department's real property inventory database showed utilization data for less than half of the Department's total inventory and that this data was often incomplete or did not reflect the true usage rate of the facilities. Further, the Government Accountability Office recommended that the Department calculate and record complete and accurate utilization data for all facilities. The Department concurred with this recommendation and stated that it recognizes the need for further improvements in the collection and reporting of utilization data. The Department of Defense's ability to identify excess or underutilized facilities and potential opportunities for consolidation of space relies on collecting and maintaining accurate facility utilization data. The committee encourages the Department to take action to correct its collection and reporting of facility utilization data to ensure that opportunities for disposal or consolidation are identified and not lost.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, on the Department's efforts to improve the accuracy of its real property inventory database and the impact

on consolidation activities. At a minimum, the report should address the following:

(1) To what extent has the Department improved collecting and accurately maintaining facility utilization data in its real property inventory database;

(2) To what extent does the Department use the data contained in its real property inventory database to identify excess facilities or potential consolidation opportunities; and

(3) To what extent the Department has consolidated facilities where the Department identified consolidation opportunities.

Study on Treating Defense Nuclear Facilities as Military Construction

Section 2804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, as passed by the House of Representatives, would have mandated that certain defense nuclear facility construction projects of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) be deemed military construction projects and be carried out as such. The committee continues to be concerned about NNSA's inability to successfully execute large defense nuclear facility construction projects. Last year, NNSA informed the committee that its largest defense nuclear facility construction project, the Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project (UCRP) at the Y–12 National Security Complex, Tennessee, had encountered major problems because the process equipment would not fit within the structure of the planned building. NNSA also now intends to reduce the scope of UCRP such that only capabilities currently contained in Building 9212 at Y–12 National Security Complex will be replaced in the first phase of the project; however, the project cost is likely to increase despite the reduced scope. NNSA has indicated that the redesign required by this problem will result in a schedule delay of at least 9 months and require a new baseline cost estimate.

As only the most recent example of NNSA's history of problems in designing and constructing large defense nuclear facilities on-time and on-budget, the committee continues to believe that facilities, like UCRP, can be constructed in a more cost effective and timely manner. To better understand the option and implications of designating these facilities as military construction, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 30, 2014, containing an analysis of the feasibility, costs, benefits, and risks regarding moving design and construction of defense nuclear facilities to military construction. In addition an assessment of costs, benefits, and risks, the report should also include:

(1) A comparative analysis of the similarities and differences between the military construction process and NNSA's defense nuclear facility construction process, including for one-of-a-kind facilities;

(2) A description of the Navy's history and experience in designing and constructing nuclear facilities, including one-of-a-kind facilities and facilities that process and store nuclear materials; and

(3) One or more case studies describing the costs, benefits, and risks of carrying out a specific defense nuclear facility construction project through military construction.

Update to Master Plan for Camp Lemonnier, Djibouti

The committee acknowledges the strategic importance of Camp Lemonnier, Djibouti, which currently supports four combatant commands as well as other government agencies. The committee believes that the national security interests of the United States are supported by the enduring presence at Camp Lemonnier and recognizes the need to make prudent investments in the infrastructure and facilities at Camp Lemonnier that are necessary to support the enduring mission.

On August 31, 2012, the committee received the Camp Lemonnier, Djibouti Master Plan which outlined a $1.4 billion investment to provide infrastructure to support operational requirements and support functions at Camp Lemonnier. The committee received an update to this master plan on April 12, 2013, which reduced the total cost to $880 million. However, the committee is aware that the Government of Djibouti mandated that operations of remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) cease from Camp Lemonnier, while allowing such operations to relocate to Chabelley Airfield, Djibouti. To date, the committee has received notification of approximately $13.0 million in investments made to ensure that appropriate infrastructure and equipment is in place to support the relocation of RPA operations to Chabelley Airfield. While the committee is supportive of the investments necessary to allow continuity of operations from Djibouti, the committee is concerned about the lack of clarity on the long-term plan to sustain operations and the infrastructure at this leased location and subsequent investments required to support such operations.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to keep the committee informed as alternative locations are considered to host RPA operations that were previously hosted at Camp Lemonnier and as changes are made to the short- and long-term master plans for infrastructure requirements to support operations from Djibouti. Additionally, the committee also encourages the Department of Defense to ensure that the master plan addresses energy security requirements to include energy reductions and surety of supply, in addition to steps taken to minimize exposures to toxic fumes from host-nation waste disposal sites.

U.S. Air Force Space Command Infrastructure

The committee recognizes the national importance of having a safe, secure, reliable, and modern space launch range infrastructure to support the national security space mission. The committee is aware that there are a number of aging facilities, with structural and technological deficiencies, that are indispensable hubs for command, telemetry, and radar support for U.S. space launch capabilities as well as warfighters down-range. The committee notes that the Air Force included military construction projects in the Future Years Defense Program, submitted as part of the Fiscal Year 2014 budget request, that would support the U.S. Air Force Space Com-

mand. However, the committee is concerned about the current condition of the aging facilities and the impact such conditions may have on the ability of U.S. Air Force Space Command to meet its mission and operational requirements until such facilities are recapitalized. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Air Force Space Command to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, on the modernization and sustainment of space launch range infrastructure that supports its mission. In addition, the briefing should address what steps are planned to mitigate potential adverse impacts to the mission readiness of U.S. Air Force Space Command until such time as the infrastructure is recapitalized.

Utilization of Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative

The committee believes the Army's government-owned ammunition plants are critical to the nation's readiness and to equipping the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee recognizes that the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) Initiative has allowed Army ammunition plants to utilize commercial firms to reduce overhead costs, resulting in cost savings and lower production costs for the Department of Defense. The committee encourages continued utilization of the ARMS Initiative to promote use of ammunition plant facilities by private firms, foster private investment in the facilities, and generate further cost savings. The committee also encourages cooperation and coordination among the Army, property managers, commercial interests, local and state agencies, and local economic development organizations to promote effective utilization of ARMS.

To further promote its use, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology as well as Joint Munitions Command, to report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2014, on potential improvements to the ARMS Initiative. The report should include proposals to foster greater participation by commercial interests and local and state agencies and should consider longer lease terms in order to foster greater commercial interest in the program.

Vulnerability of Defense Infrastructure to Seismic Hazards

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has existing infrastructure on installations located in seismic hazard zones and that some of this infrastructure is vulnerable to seismic hazards. The committee acknowledges that there is a need for the Department of Defense to balance investments in infrastructure that supports new missions while also recapitalizing existing infrastructure that supports current missions. When prioritizing recapitalization projects, the committee encourages the Department to address seismic vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure that supports the national security of the United States. Particular consideration should be given to buildings, depots, and other infrastructure located in seismic hazard zones that are in need of seismic up-

grades to ensure the life, safety, and health of personnel as well as the continuity of operations following a seismic event.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Military Construction

The section would modify section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, and allow the threshold of the unspecified minor construction project to be adjusted based on area cost factors. This section would also increase the threshold of application associated with operation and maintenance funding for construction purposes from $750,000 to $1.0 million.

Section 2802—Repeal of Requirements for Local Comparability of Room Patterns and Floor Areas for Military Family Housing and Submission of Net Floor Area Information

This section would repeal section 2826 of title 10, Untied States Code, that required the Secretary concerned to acquire military family housing that is comparable in structure to family housing available in the local community. While the committee notes that the Administration has generally adopted this practice, the committee also notes that the Department should be provided latitude in the design and construction of family housing.

Section 2803—Repeal of Separate Authority to Enter into Limited Partnerships with Private Developers of Housing

This section would repeal the limited authority of the Department of Defense to enter into partnerships with private developers for the purpose of providing family housing construction. The committee notes that subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, provides the Department of Defense broad authority to implement an extremely successful privatization family housing program which is not being abridged by this section.

Section 2804—Military Construction Standards to Reduce Vulnerability of Structures to Terrorist Attack

This section would provide additional latitude to the Department of Defense (DOD) to apply local threat criteria into the design of DOD facilities.

Currently, the Department of Defense uses a universal design basis threat to develop facilities criteria. Unfortunately, the universal application of a design basis threat drives increased facility costs when no credible threat exists. The committee continues to be concerned about institutional cost additions that only serve to increase the Federal cost premium.

Section 2805—Treatment of Payments Received for Providing Utilities and Services in Connection with Use of Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing

This provision would modify section 2872a of title 10, United States Code, and eliminate the fiscal year reimbursement loss that occurs on late fiscal year reimbursements to the military family housing account. Specifically, payments made for utilities and services would be credited to the appropriation or working capital account that is current at the time the reimbursements are received, instead of the appropriation account from which the services were originally funded.

Section 2806—Repeal of Advance Notification Requirement for Use of Military Family Housing Investment Authority

This section would repeal a family housing notification requirement required in section 2875 of title 10, United States Code, that has been previously assessed in the President's request.

Section 2807—Additional Element for Annual Report on Military Housing Privatization Projects

This section would provide additional oversight and accountability in the pursuit of military family housing privatization projects to include an assessment of litigation costs that are being pursued by the privatization partners.

Section 2808—Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects in Certain Areas Outside the United States

This section would amend section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) and extend the Department of Defense's ability to use operation and maintenance appropriations for military construction purposes for the U.S. Central Command and Horn of Africa area until September 30, 2014.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Codification of Policies and Requirements Regarding Closure and Realignment of United States Military Installations in Foreign Countries

This section would repeal section 2921 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510) and consolidate the requirements of overseas basing notification process in section 2687a of title 10, Untied States Code. This section would also remove a redundant reporting requirement associated with the proposed residual value of foreign military closure determinations.

SUBTITLE C—ENERGY SECURITY

Section 2821—Continuation of Limitation on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold or Platinum Certification

This section would continue the prohibition on the use of funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design gold or platinum certifications for fiscal year 2014, set forth in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as amended by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has met two of the three requirements to include submission of a report regarding the different design standards and a new high performance and sustainable building unified facilities criteria. The committee looks forward to receiving the updated policy guidance that prescribes building design and certification standards that specifically address energy- and water-efficient standards and sustainable design attributes for military construction based on the cost-benefit analysis, return on investment, total ownership costs, and demonstrated payback applied by specific geographic location and local circumstances to ensure maximum savings.

SUBTITLE D—PROVISIONS RELATED TO GUAM REALIGNMENT

Section 2831—Change From Previous Calendar Year to Previous Fiscal Year for Period Covered by Annual Report of Interagency Coordination Group of Inspectors General for Guam Realignment

This section would change the annual inspectors general reporting requirement from the end of each calendar year to the end of the fiscal year.

Section 2832—Repeal of Certain Restrictions on Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region

This section would repeal section 2832 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239).

SUBTITLE E—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2841—Real Property Acquisition, Naval Base Ventura County, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to terminate the outlease and acquire certain family housing improvements at Naval Base Ventura County, California. This section would also authorize the continued use of the housing as authorized by section 2835 and section 2835a of title 10, United States Code, pending funding and execution of a Navy project to permanently convert the housing to an alternative use.

Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Former Oxnard Air Force Base, Ventura County, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, the Oxnard Air Force Base at Ventura, California, to Ventura County for public purposes.

Section 2843—Land Conveyance, Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain properties and improvements at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pennsylvania, for fair market value.

Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Camp Williams, Utah

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 420 acres to the State of Utah for the purpose of permitting the Utah National Guard to use the conveyed land for military use.

Section 2845—Conveyance, Air National Guard Radar Site, Francis Peak, Wasatch Mountains, Utah

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, certain Air National Guard facilities at Francis Peak, Utah, for purposes of permitting the State to use the structures to support emergency public safety communications. This authority shall expire on September 30, 2014, or enactment of an act authorizing military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

Section 2846—Land Conveyance, Former Fort Monroe, Hampton, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain properties at Fort Monroe, Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Section 2847—Land Conveyance, Mifflin County United States Army Reserve Center, Lewistown, Pennsylvania

This section would convey, without consideration, to Derry Township, Pennsylvania, certain properties for the purpose of permitting the Township to use these properties for public purposes.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Repeal of Annual Economic Adjustment Committee Reporting Requirement

This section would repeal an annual economic adjustment committee report required by section 4004 of the Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, and Stabilization Act of 1990 (division D of Public Law 101–510).

Section 2862—Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies

This section would name the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies at Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies", and would make other conforming changes.

Section 2863—Redesignation of the Graduate School of Nursing at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences as the Daniel K. Inouye Graduate School of Nursing

This section would rename the Graduate School of Nursing at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, as the "Daniel K. Inouye Graduate School of Nursing", and would make other conforming changes.

Section 2864—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio

This section would modify the name of the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers Aviation Center to the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers National Museum, Dayton, Ohio.

Section 2865—Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in Riverside, California

This section would authorize a memorial to members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross The memorial is located at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, and would hereby be designated as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained no funds for Overseas Contingency Activity military construction related activities. The committee recommends authorization of $247,400,000 for Overseas Contingency Activity military construction activities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Project

This section would contain the list of certain authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts include: Seaside Galley, $12.0 million; High Value Detainee Facility, $52.0 million; Medical Support Facilities, $11.8 million; Communications Network Facility, $11.6 million; Barracks (496 Persons), $94.0 million; and Barracks (352 Persons), $66.0 million. These projects represent a binding list of the specific projects authorized at this location.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide a brief to the congressional defense committees on infrastructure costs associated with continued detention operations at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and would require the President to provide a plan relating to detainees at Guantanamo Bay, future terrorist captures, and detainees held at the Detention Facility at Parwan, Afghanistan.

TITLE XXX—MILITARY LAND TRANSFERS AND WITHDRAWALS TO SUPPORT READINESS AND SECURITY

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—LIMESTONE HILLS TRAINING AREA, MONTANA

Section 3001—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Lands for Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana

This section would withdraw the lands described at Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana, for use by the Department of the Army.

Section 3002—Management of Withdrawn and Reserved Lands

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to manage the lands withdrawn in section 3001 in accordance with the limitations and restrictions of section.

Section 3003—Special Rules Governing Minerals Management

This section would establish additional rules governing mineral management at Limestone Hills Training Area, Montana.

Section 3004—Grazing

This section would require the Secretary of the Interior to continue and manage grazing permits and leases. The Secretary of the Interior, with the agreement of the Secretary of the Army, may delegate such authority to the Secretary of the Army.

Section 3005—Duration of Withdrawal and Reservation

This section would terminate the land withdrawal authorized in this subtitle on March 31, 2039.

Section 3006—Payments in Lieu of Taxes

This section would authorize the lands withdrawn in section 3001 to remain entitlement land under section 6901 of title 31, United States Code.

Section 3007—Hunting, Fishing and Trapping

This section would require hunting, fishing and trapping on the lands withdrawn in section 3001 to be conducted in accordance with section 2671 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 3008—Water Rights

This section would retain water rights in existence prior to the withdrawal authorized in section 3001.

Section 3009—Brush and Range Fire Prevention and Suppression

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to take necessary precautions to prevent, and actions to suppress, brush and range fires occurring as a result of military activities on the lands withdrawn by section 3001.

Section 3010—On-Going Decontamination

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to maintain a program of decontamination on the withdrawn land provided by section 3001.

Section 3011—Application for Renewal of a Withdrawal and Reservation

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to notify the Secretary of the Interior 5 years before the termination of the withdrawal. The Secretary of the Army shall provide to the Secretary of the Interior notice as to the Army's intent to continue defense related functions after the term of the withdrawal.

Section 3012—Limitation on Subsequent Availability of Lands for Appropriation

This section would withdraw the lands transferred in section 3001 from all forms of appropriation under public land laws.

Section 3013—Relinquishment

This section would provide authority and procedures for the Secretary of the Army to relinquish any or all of the lands withdrawn or reserved authorized in section 3001.

SUBTITLE B—WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, NEW MEXICO

Section 3021—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

This section would transfer the administrative jurisdiction of certain lands located in Dona Ana County, New Mexico, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Army.

Section 3022—Water Rights

This section would retain water rights in existence prior to the transfer of administrative jurisdiction authorized in section 3021.

Section 3023—Withdrawal

This section would withdraw the lands transferred in section 3021 from all forms of appropriation under public land laws so long as the lands remain under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army.

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL AIR WEAPONS STATION CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA

Section 3031—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California

This section would transfer the administrative jurisdiction of certain lands located in Inyo, Kern and San Bernardino Counties, California, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Navy.

Section 3032—Water Rights

This section would retain water rights in existence prior to the transfer of administrative jurisdiction authorized in section 3031.

Section 3033—Withdrawal

This section would withdraw the lands transferred in section 3031 from all forms of appropriation under public land laws so long as the lands remain under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

SUBTITLE D—CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE, CALIFORNIA

Section 3041—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, California

This section would transfer the administrative jurisdiction of certain lands located in Imperial and Riverside Counties, California, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Navy.

Section 3042—Management and Use of Transferred Land

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to use the lands transferred in section 3041 for military purposes. This section would also limit any diminution of these lands as critical habitat for the desert tortoise. Finally, this section would withdraw the lands transferred in section 3041 from all forms of appropriation under public land laws so long as the lands remain under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

Section 3043—Realignment of Range Boundary and Related Transfer of Title

This section would authorize the realignment of the range boundary to ensure that the northwestern boundary of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range shall be realigned to the edge of the Bradshaw trail so that the trail remains entirely under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to any transfer provided by this section.

Section 3044—Effect of Termination of Military Use

This section would require that if the Secretary of the Navy determines that there is no longer a military need for the lands

transferred by section 3041, the Secretary of the Navy shall assess the level of contamination and determine, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, whether decontamination is practical and economically feasible. If the Secretary of the Navy determines that decontamination is practical, the Secretary of the Navy shall provide funds for such decontamination.

Section 3045—Temporary Extension of Existing Withdrawal Period

This section would find that notwithstanding subsection (a) of section 806 of the California Military Lands Withdrawal and Overflight Act of 1994 (title VIII of Public Law 103–433), the withdrawal and reservation of land transferred under section 3041 shall not terminate until the date on which the land transfer required by section 3041 is executed.

Section 3046—Water Rights

This section would retain water rights in existence prior to the transfer of administrative jurisdiction authorized in section 3041.

SUBTITLE E—MARINE CORPS AIR GROUND COMBAT CENTER TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA

Section 3051—Designation of Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area

This section would designate certain lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior in San Bernardino County, California, as the "Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area". This section would further withdraw the lands designated in this section from all forms of appropriation under public land laws.

Section 3052—Limited Biannual Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms Use of Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the Secretary of the Navy's use of the Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area twice in each calendar year for up to a total of 60 days per year for certain purposes. Any agreement for the military use of the Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area shall terminate not later than March 31, 2039.

Section 3053—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Southern Study Area, Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms, California

This section would transfer certain lands in San Bernardino County, California, as generally depicted as the "Southern Study Area" to be transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Navy for military purposes.

Section 3054—Water Rights

This section would retain water rights in existence prior to the transfer of administrative jurisdiction authorized in section 3051.

SUBTITLE F—NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON, NEVADA

Section 3061—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada

This section would transfer certain lands in Churchill County, Nevada, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Navy for military purposes.

Section 3062—Water Rights

This section would retain water rights in existence prior to the transfer of administrative jurisdiction authorized in section 3061.

Section 3063—Withdrawal

This section would withdraw the lands transferred in section 3031 from all forms of appropriation under public land laws so long as the lands remain under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2014 contained $17.8 billion for atomic energy defense activities. The committee recommends $17.6 billion, a decrease of $146.0 million to the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request contained $11.7 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends $11.9 billion, an increase of $212.0 million to the budget request.

Weapons Activities

Advanced manufacturing within the nuclear security enterprise

The committee notes the recent progress in advanced manufacturing technologies in the commercial sector and the potential to adapt these methods for use by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). These technologies have the potential to reduce the cost, schedule, and risk for NNSA's warhead life extension programs and other national security programs. Technologies such as additive manufacturing may improve the manufacturability of components, reduce time required between design and production

of components, and reduce waste and production footprint. However, the committee is aware that new manufacturing technologies may face significant hurdles before their products can be certified for use in the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee also is concerned that advanced manufacturing technologies could create proliferation challenges.

The committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to develop a roadmap for developing the opportunities and addressing the challenges of advanced manufacturing technologies, and to provide a briefing on the roadmap to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2014. The plan should include identification of the following:

(1) Near-term and long-term advanced manufacturing processes that could be further developed and adapted for NNSA's mission;

(2) Steps that must be taken to scale-up advanced manufacturing technologies to support NNSA production requirements;

(3) Potential cost savings and reductions in waste, including toxic waste, floor space requirements, and production time that may be possible from the use of advanced manufacturing technologies;

(4) Timelines associated with developing and scaling up advanced manufacturing technologies;

(5) Challenges related to certification for use in the stockpile of products made through advanced manufacturing technologies, including timelines for when such certification may be possible; and

(6) Collaboration opportunities related to advanced manufacturing among the production plants and laboratories of the nuclear security enterprise, as well as private industry and other Government agencies.

Finally, the briefing should also provide an assessment of the security and proliferation implications of these new technologies, including implications for detection of illicit uses and steps that should be taken to protect or limit access to sensitive technologies.

Budget tables for NNSA Production Office

As is traditional practice, the fiscal year 2014 budget request submission for the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) contained "Laboratory Tables" and "State Tables" that are intended to describe, respectively, the funding each DOE facility would receive and the funding each State would receive under the budget request. Due to the recent creation of the NNSA Production Office (NPO), which oversees both the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, and the Y–12 National Security Complex in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, these budget tables are unclear. The Laboratory Tables combine the amounts for Pantex and Y–12 under the NPO and do not provide any information regarding how much funding would be provided to each of these facilities. Furthermore, the State Tables combine the nearly $1.8 billion in total funding for Pantex and Y–12 into a single entry called "Undesignated State."

This lack of clarity hinders the committee's ability to understand the budget request in detail. The committee encourages the Sec-

retary of Energy to include facility-specific detail for Pantex and Y–12 in future budget submissions.

Cyber security

The budget request contained $148.4 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration's Chief Information Officer (NCIO) Activities.

The NCIO program includes cyber security efforts at NNSA Headquarters, field offices, and the facilities of the nuclear security enterprise. Like other agencies of the federal government, NNSA has been striving to defend against cyber security threats of increasing quantity and sophistication. The committee is concerned that the request for NCIO Activities does not reflect the severity of this threat, and the committee is concerned that NNSA is actually decreasing the cyber security funds provided to the management and operating contractors who run its facilities and have operational responsibility for protecting their computer networks.

Therefore, the committee recommends $170.9 million for NCIO Activities, an increase of $22.5 million. The committee expects this funding would be distributed in a risk-based manner across all NNSA elements and the facilities of the nuclear security enterprise.

Clarification of congressional intent regarding national security laboratories

The committee believes that national security relies upon a diverse science and technology base that is then leveraged and applied to a wide range of problems. This includes weapons development, but also signature detection and analysis, forensics and attribution, data analysis, nonproliferation, infrastructure protection, cyber security, and many others. In the United States, many of these capabilities are stewarded and provided by a broad range of national laboratories in a way that leverages the investments of many federal agencies responsible for security, energy, and fundamental science missions.

The committee notes that section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) created a statutory definition for "national security laboratory" in section 4002 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501). The definition includes the three laboratories of the National Nuclear Security Administration. However, the committee clarifies that the intent of this definition was not to exclude other national laboratories or defense laboratories from pursuing or engaging in national security work. The committee believes the capabilities of all Federal laboratories should be leveraged to support national security wherever appropriate, with particular focus on leveraging unique capabilities while avoiding unnecessary duplication and loss of critical capabilities.

Deferred maintenance in the nuclear security enterprise

The budget request contained $1.7 billion for Site Stewardship, which includes $433.8 million for Enterprise Infrastructure-Sustainment. These funds provide for maintenance activities at

mission essential facilities, recapitalization of aging and obsolete infrastructure, and efforts to address deferred maintenance.

The Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) was established in fiscal year 2002 to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance that had accumulated across the facilities of the nuclear security enterprise. In February 2013, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) announced the completion of the FIRP and highlighted that, during the course of the program, over 800 separate projects had been executed and a total of $900 million in deferred maintenance had been eliminated.

With the termination of FIRP and the numerous high-priority programs at the NNSA, the committee is concerned that the backlog of deferred maintenance will again accumulate. The committee encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security to remain vigilant and request resources as needed to ensure NNSA's facilities and infrastructure are modern and well-maintained. To ensure full transparency, the committee also encourages the Administrator to include, as part of future budget requests, an estimate of the deferred maintenance backlog across the enterprise.

The committee recommends $498.9 million for Enterprise Infrastructure-Sustainment, an increase of $65.1 million to the budget request, to support continued reduction of deferred maintenance across the enterprise.

Directed Stockpile Work

The budget request contained $2.4 billion for Directed Stockpile Work (DSW). DSW encompasses a variety of activities related to the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) core mission of nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship and management, including life extension programs and major alterations, stockpile surveillance and sustainment, testing and experiments, manufacturing and delivery of limited life components, and weapons dismantlement and disposition.

Within DSW, the budget request contained $1.0 billion for life extension programs and major alterations to nuclear weapons in the enduring stockpile. The committee notes that the Acting Administrator for Nuclear Security has testified that the continuing effects of budget cuts, including those resulting from the Budget Control Act, may result in delays to schedules for several critical DSW programs, including the B61 Life Extension Program (LEP) and the W78/88–1 LEP. The committee also notes that NNSA has budgeted for $106.8 million in "efficiencies" within DSW. If these efficiencies are not achieved, significant impacts to critical DSW programs will likely result.

The committee recommends $2.6 billion for DSW, an increase of $125.9 million to the budget request. This includes $581.0 million for the B61 LEP, an increase of $44.0 million, and $78.3 million, an increase of $5.6 million, to the W78/88–1 LEP to reduce risk and prevent schedule slips in these critical programs. This also includes $245.1 million for the W76 LEP, an increase of $9.7 million, to ensure NNSA delivers the full, previously-agreed quantity of W76–1 warheads to the Navy in fiscal year 2014. Finally, this also includes $970.8 million for Stockpile Services, an increase of $60.6 million, to improve capabilities that support the entire stockpile,

particularly research and development in support of certification and safety and plutonium sustainment activities. Within Stockpile Services, $351.0 million is provided to Production Support, an increase of $29.6 million, to ensure sufficient production capacity is available to support the B61 and W76 LEPs.

Exascale computing

To maintain our economic and national security, the committee believes that the United States must continue to be at the forefront of high-performance computing technology. The committee believes that the U.S. must continue public and private efforts to develop exascale computing systems that would represent a dramatic leap-forward in high performance computing technology. Such computers would not only help ensure the long-term viability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing, but would also support important technology innovation for the broader economy.

A robust research and development program coordinated among the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Department of Energy's Office of Science, and key industry partners is critical to successfully fielding exascale computers. Recent progress towards exascale computing is encouraging, but significant technical challenges remain. The committee encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Secretary of Energy to prioritize exascale computing development efforts within its high performance computing portfolio.

Ignition and budget prioritization

The committee understands that the National Ignition Campaign concluded in September 2012 without having achieved its primary goal of creating fusion ignition in a laboratory environment. The committee continues to support efforts to achieve ignition, but believes such efforts must become a lower priority when the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is faced with such large budget needs in core Directed Stockpile Work and Nuclear Programs. The committee is therefore supportive of NNSA's efforts in fiscal year 2013 and the budget request for fiscal year 2014 to reorient funding for ignition experiments towards experiments and activities more directly supporting the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee believes NNSA must set priorities within its budget and continues to believe that the top priority of the Administrator must be sustaining and modernizing the nuclear weapons stockpile, delivering life extension programs on schedules that meet military requirements, and modernizing the supporting infrastructure.

Livermore valley open campus

The committee understands that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has endorsed the development of the Livermore Valley Open Campus (LVOC), which utilizes adjoining portions of the California site of Sandia National Laboratories and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to enable mission-driven research and development collaboration with public and private sector partners. The LVOC research activities, first initiated in fiscal year 2011, enhance core laboratory science and engineering ca-

pabilities by advancing programs in high performance computing, energy security, and cyber security. The committee encourages the NNSA to consider facilitating continued development of the LVOC by utilizing its existing authorities to lease land within the LVOC to enable public/private partnerships to construct new facilities. However, the committee cautions that the LVOC should complement, and not distract from, NNSA's core mission, that limited NNSA resources must be applied judiciously to any public/private partnerships, and that appropriate steps be taken to ensure security of sensitive information.

Trilateral cooperation

The committee notes that there may be opportunities to strengthen trilateral cooperation between the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the French Republic on nuclear stockpile stewardship and nuclear nonproliferation goals. These efforts could increase scientific collaboration and lead to cost-savings and efficiencies in a budget-constrained environment. The committee therefore encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to consider specific technical, scientific, and policy areas that could benefit from further cooperation; assess regulatory constraints that relate to such cooperation; and identify areas in which cooperation should be limited to protect sensitive information. The committee encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security to keep the congressional defense committees informed of these considerations.

Risks within long-term schedule for life extension programs

The committee notes the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) ambitious schedule for performance of nuclear weapons Life Extension Programs (LEP), including plans to conduct development or production of up to five LEPs concurrently during fiscal year 2023 and plans to conduct at least three LEPs concurrently during the late-2020s. Such LEPs would be conducted while NNSA continues efforts to meet military requirements for limited lifetime component exchanges and while also managing several very large defense nuclear facility construction projects.

The committee also notes the track record of significant technical challenges, cost increases, and schedule delays that have plagued NNSA's major programs. In 2012, NNSA's estimated cost of the B61 LEP increased to $7.9 billion. In a September 2012 report, the Department of Energy Inspector General found that the W76 LEP had "experienced significant delays in startup and in achieving production goals," and "NNSA may be unable to complete the W76 LEP within established scope, cost and schedule parameters, unless it adopts a more effective approach to reducing unit costs."

The committee is therefore concerned about the potential risks within the long-term schedule for LEPs. In particular, the committee is concerned regarding how potential delays or cost increases within the B61 LEP may affect other LEPs planned for the 2020s and 2030s.

The committee directs the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council and the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide a

joint briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than January 15, 2014, on the risks within the long-term schedule for LEPs, including the impacts to the long-term plan of potential unforeseen technical challenges, schedule delays, and cost increases in near-term LEPs.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

Follow-on to Global Threat Reduction Initiative

The committee recognizes the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Global Threat Reduction Initiative's (GTRI) progress to secure and remove nuclear weapons-usable material in both foreign countries and the United States. The committee notes the central role this program has played in the President's plan to secure all vulnerable nuclear weapons-usable material worldwide and commends the commitments made by foreign leaders at the 2010 and 2012 Nuclear Security Summits to reduce the risk of nuclear terrorism. The committee notes that calendar year 2013 marks the end of this 4-year plan and the beginning of the phasing out of the program. However, the committee understands that significant quantities of highly-enriched uranium (HEU) remain in foreign countries and potentially at risk of theft or diversion.

The committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide a plan to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2014, to complete efforts to remove and secure vulnerable HEU worldwide. This plan should include:

(1) Analysis detailing the quantity and status of HEU that has not been secured or removed;

(2) An assessment of the threat or risks of this HEU being stolen or diverted;

(3) An assessment of the level of vulnerability of such material;

(4) Potential follow-on efforts to the GTRI's efforts to secure or remove this material; a cost-benefit analysis for such potential follow-on efforts;

(5) An estimation of the costs of such efforts that would be borne by the United States, allied countries, and partner countries;

(6) An assessment of the priority of such efforts as compared to other NNSA missions, including a description of the opportunity costs on other NNSA missions inherent with pursuing such efforts; and

(7) An assessment of material that cannot be accessed, removed, or secured and the threats to such material.

Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility analysis

While the Committee is concerned with the continuing escalating costs associated the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication (MOX) Facility, the budget request may not actually reduce costs to the taxpayer and will likely delay the disposition of 34 metric tons of weapons grade plutonium.

Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to study ways to achieve cost savings within the MOX program. This study should analyze potential additional international

partners and the potential for achieving greater economic efficiencies by designating additional supplies of surplus plutonium for disposition through the MOX facility. The completed study should be submitted to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2014.

Nonproliferation and arms control verification technology research and development

The committee notes the importance of continuing sound investments in technology research and development (R&D) to support detection and verification efforts for nonproliferation and arms control regimes. The committee is concerned that the level of investment and a clear strategic plan to sustain and develop national capabilities to support current and long-term nonproliferation goals may not be sufficient to effectively address future threats and opportunities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator of Nuclear Security, in consultation with the relevant national laboratories and the Director of National Intelligence, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, on the national research agenda to develop technologies, responsive to near- and long-term requirements, including technologies applicable to safeguards, to detect state and non-state efforts to develop or acquire nuclear devices or weapons-usable nuclear materials. The report should also include verification technologies, including non-traditional technologies, that need to be developed, across the near- and long-term, to support future arms control efforts including nuclear reductions to lower force levels, reductions of strategic or non-strategic nuclear forces, or of deployed or non-deployed warhead limitations.

Naval Reactors

Fissile material stockpiles

The committee is mindful that the Director, Naval Reactors has an enduring requirement for highly enriched uranium for their mission to provide nuclear reactors to the U.S. Navy. The committee also notes that a key argument for maintaining a domestic enrichment capability is to ensure a sustainable stockpile of highly enriched uranium for the nuclear Navy mission. The Department of Energy is undertaking a program to provide such a domestic enrichment capability at the present time.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Naval Reactors to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by August 31, 2013, on the projected availability of highly enriched uranium and very highly enriched uranium for naval nuclear reactors and the date at which new production or enrichment of highly and very highly enriched uranium is required to support naval nuclear reactors for the long-term future.

Naval Reactors

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion efforts, including reactor plant technology design and development, reactor plant operation and maintenance,

and reactor retirement and disposal. The program ensures the safe and reliable operation of reactor plants in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers that represent over 40 percent of the Navy's major combatants.

The budget request contained $1.2 billion for Naval Reactors for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends $1.2 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Office of the Administrator

Office of Infrastructure and Operations

In March 2012, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) created the Office of Infrastructure and Operations, headed by a new Associate Administrator, and realigned all NNSA site offices to report to this new entity rather than the Office of Defense Programs. This realignment was intended to provide Defense Programs the ability to focus more directly on its mission while Infrastructure and Operations provides the basic management and functions required to keep NNSA facilities open and operating. The realignment also provides a more direct link between the site offices (now renamed "field offices") and the NNSA Administrator. With the fiscal year 2014 budget request, NNSA also proposes to divide the former Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities account into two new accounts: (1) Nuclear Programs, and (2) Site Stewardship. NNSA has proposed the new Site Stewardship funding to be managed by the Office of Infrastructure and Operations, while Nuclear Programs remains with the Office of Defense Programs.

The committee understands the intent of this realignment, but is concerned about NNSA's ability to execute it efficiently and effectively. Based on past experiences at the Department of Energy and NNSA, creation of a new office can lead to increased bureaucracy, confused roles and responsibilities, and poor coordination on priorities and programs. The committee expects the Associate Administrator for Infrastructure and Operations to work closely with all elements of NNSA to ensure appropriate priorities are set, timely and efficient decisionmaking occurs, roles and responsibilities are clear, and processes are streamlined. The committee will continue its oversight of this new structure.

Plan and roadmap to address security problems

In response to the security incident that occurred at the Y–12 National Security Complex on July 28, 2012, the committee conducted several briefings and hearings to examine the management, governance, oversight, and cultural failures within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Energy (DOE) that enabled the incident to take place.

Over the past several decades, many independent and objective studies have been conducted that have highlighted the longstanding problems at NNSA and DOE that led directly to the Y–12 incident and other security failures before it. Many of these studies have found the same problems and recommended strikingly similar solutions. The Independent NNSA Security Review (known as the "Mies Panel") highlighted this fact in 2005, stating that, ". . . past studies and reviews of DOE/NNSA security have reached

similar findings regarding the cultural, personnel, organizational, policy and procedural challenges that exist within DOE and NNSA. Many of these issues are not new; many continue to exist because of a lack of clear accountability, excessive bureaucracy, organizational stovepipes, lack of collaboration, and unwieldy, cumbersome processes. Robust, formal mechanisms to evaluate findings, assess underlying root causes, analyze alternative courses of action, formulate appropriate corrective action, gain approval, and effectively implement change are weak to non-existent within DOE/NNSA."

The committee continues to be concerned with the failure to implement meaningful and effective changes when the problems and possible solutions have been so thoroughly studied. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to prepare and submit a report to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, by September 30, 2013, on the Department's plan to address the longstanding, well-documented problems that contributed to the Y–12 security failure. The report should contain at least three major components:

(1) An explicit examination of studies conducted in the past 15 years, including the reviews performed following the Y–12 intrusion, that have assessed security problems within the nuclear enterprise and a summary of their findings and recommendations as well as the actions the Department has taken or will take to resolve them. This should take the form of a security roadmap, as recommended in the Task Force Report on the Assessment of NNSA Federal Organization and Oversight of Security Operations, that, "consolidates recommendations, articulates a clear vision of where the security program is going, . . . charts a path forward," and provides evidence that, "the solutions [are] enduring so that they are not again written up in the next report."

(2) A clear statement of the authorities, roles, responsibilities, budget authority, and chain of command regarding security within all NNSA organizations with security responsibilities and any DOE organizations that affect NNSA security.

(3) Measures to improve oversight and increase accountability of both contractors and Federal officials.

Reprogramming Procedure and Funding Control Levels

The committee requests that the Department of Energy follow the same procedures for reprogramming requests and approvals as the Department of Defense. Requesting prior approval for reprogramming requests rather than adhering to a notice and wait procedure can streamline the process for approval and execution. The committee would like to work with and support the emergent execution year requirements of the Department of Energy, and will work to respond to reprogramming requests in an efficient manner.

In the justification books accompanying the fiscal year 2014 budget request, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) proposes funding control levels at the subprogram level, rather than the activity level. The committee understands NNSA executes a wide range of nuclear security programs, and that the proposed control levels may provide greater flexibility, agility, and

efficiency for program management. However, the committee is concerned that NNSA has not yet demonstrated sufficient program management effectiveness to warrant such leeway from Congress. Furthermore, the scope of work NNSA must accomplish in the next decade is significantly larger than in the past. In addition, the committee believes it is important to separate the maintenance, support, and operations funding lines and maintain those as separate control levels to reduce the risk of maintenance funds being diverted to operations, particularly as many facilities across the nuclear enterprise are decades-old.

The committee is concerned that this proposal for higher-level control levels was made without prior discussion with the committee and without sufficient justification and transparency. Therefore, the committee clarifies that the control levels for the NNSA authorization are those authorized by section 3101 of this Act. The committee encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in coordination with the White House Office of Management and Budget, to consult closely with Congress before any future changes to control levels are proposed.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $6.1 billion for environmental and other defense activities for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends $5.7 billion, a decrease of $358.0 million to the budget request.

Defense Environmental Cleanup

Environmental Management Technology Development Program

The budget request contained $24.1 million for the technology development program of the Office of Environmental Management.

This program is focused on resolving technical challenges and developing transformational technology solutions to address the highest priority needs of the environmental remediation program. Applied engineering and research to create and demonstrate high-risk, high-payoff technologies are included in this program. Technologies developed by this program have already been shown to significantly reduce long-term costs, improve waste processing throughput, and improve schedules for cleanup activities. Because the environmental cleanup program as a whole is expected to require at least an additional $200.0 billion and continue into the 2060s, small amounts of money invested now on technology and process improvements can lead to major savings in the future.

The committee supports this program and encourages the Office of Environmental Management to develop and communicate potential return on investment figures for each subprogram.

The committee recommends $34.1 million, an increase of $10.0 million, for the technology development program.

Transuranic Wastes at Hanford Tank Farms

The committee is aware that on March 11, 2013, the Department of Energy announced its preferred alternative to characterize and

certify appropriate mixed transuranic (TRU) waste at the Hanford Site's Tank Farms and ultimately dispose of such waste at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico. The Department has identified up to 3.1 million gallons of potential mixed TRU waste in the Tank Farms, equivalent to approximately 5.6 percent of the total waste volume in the tanks, that would be assessed for possible disposal at WIPP. Currently, all Tank Farm waste is managed as high-level waste.

The committee is aware that although the amount of waste that may potentially be classified as mixed TRU is a small fraction of the total 56 million gallons of waste in the Tank Farms, efforts to dispose of this small fraction at WIPP may result in significant cost savings in the long-term. Such disposal may also enable the Department of Energy to demonstrate small but appreciable progress on cleaning up a major Cold War legacy site and removing waste from the State of Washington.

However, the committee notes stakeholder concerns about the process of classifying tank waste as TRU waste, as well as the technical and legal obstacles to doing so. Such disposal, if viable and cost-effective, must adhere to a rigorous and transparent process based on sound science in determining and certifying potential mixed TRU waste, be based on a rigorous cost-benefit analysis of the investments needed to certify and dispose of TRU waste versus immobilization through vitrification, and be adequately coordinated with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and appropriate agencies in the State of Washington and the State of New Mexico. The committee encourages the Department of Energy to fully investigate this possible approach to disposal and ensure that all regulatory requirements are met and appropriate permits are in place before retrieval of tank waste is initiated. Throughout this process, the committee expects the Department to keep the appropriate congressional committees fully informed of its plans.

Other Defense Activities

Idaho Sitewide Safeguards and Security Program

The Department of Energy budget request proposes to move funding for the Idaho Sitewide Safeguards and Security from Other Defense Activities to Nuclear Energy programs. This move is intended to provide the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy more direct control over the safeguards and security program at a facility for which the Assistant Secretary has responsibility. The committee is supportive of this realignment, and views it as a sensible management practice. However, the committee cautions the Department that this move should not be viewed as a precedent for transferring defense funding to energy programs.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act. This section would also authorize several new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2014, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize appropriations for other defense activities for fiscal year 2014, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance

This section would authorize appropriations for energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2014, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Clarification of Principles of National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would amend section 3211 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401) to clarify the set of principles with which the National Nuclear Security Administration must carry out its operations and activities. Specifically, this section would add the requirement that all operations and activities of the Administration be conducted consistent with the principle of "ensuring the security of the nuclear weapons, nuclear material, and classified information in the custody of the Administration."

Section 3112—Termination of Department of Energy Employees to Protect National Security

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to terminate an employee of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) or any element of the Department of Energy that involves nuclear security if the Secretary determines the employee acted in a manner that endangers the security of special nuclear material or classified information. To exercise such authority, the Secretary

would have to consider the termination to be in the interests of the United States and determine that the termination procedures prescribed by other provisions of law cannot be invoked in a manner that the Secretary considers consistent with national security.

This section would also require the Secretary, to the extent the interests of national security permit, to notify an employee whose employment is terminated under this section of the reasons for the termination. The terminated employee would then be allowed 30 days to submit statements or affidavits to the Secretary to show why the employee should be restored to duty. If such statements and affidavits are submitted, the Secretary would be required to provide a written response to the employee and may, if the Secretary chooses, restore the employment of the employee. A decision by the Secretary to terminate employment of an employee under this section would be final and would not be able to be appealed, though such termination would not affect the right of the employee to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States if that employee is declared eligible for such employment by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. The authority under this section would reside only with the Secretary, without delegation.

The committee understands that several Federal employees have been reassigned or allowed to retire in response to the July 2012, security breach at the Y–12 National Security Complex. However, no Federal employees have been terminated. Senior officials from the Department of Energy have indicated to the committee that Federal employment rules did not enable terminations in this case. The committee believes that strong accountability actions are required in response to egregious security problems; this section would provide the Secretary of Energy the authority needed to ensure strong accountability actions are possible. The committee notes that this authority would reside only with the Secretary (without delegation) and encourages the Secretary to make use of the authority only in instances where the most robust accountability is needed. The committee notes the similar existing statutory authority contained in section 1609 of title 10, United States Code, which enables the Secretary of Defense to terminate defense intelligence employees.

Section 3113—Modification of Independent Cost Estimates on Life Extension Programs and New Nuclear Facilities

This section would amend section 4217 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2537) to require that any independent cost estimate carried out pursuant to section 4217 be conducted by the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE). The Director would be authorized to delegate carrying out such cost estimates to other elements of the Department of Defense. This section would also provide the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator for Nuclear Security and acting through the Director of CAPE, the authority to conduct an independent cost assessment of any initiative or program of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) that is estimated to cost more than $500.0 million.

This section would also require the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator, to request an independent review of each guidance issued for the analysis of alternatives for each nuclear weapon system undergoing life extension and each new nuclear facility of the nuclear security enterprise as well as the results of such analysis of alternatives. The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator, would be required to submit the results of any such analysis to the Nuclear Weapons Council and the congressional defense committees. The independent review would be required to be conducted by either the Director of CAPE, an organization selected by the Director of CAPE, or the JASON Defense Advisory Panel. The requirement for independent reviews would expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Finally, this section would express the sense of Congress that Congress encourages the Administrator and the Nuclear Weapons Council to follow the results of the analysis of alternatives of a life extension program or a defense nuclear facility construction project when selecting a final option.

Section 3114—Plan for Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposition of Tank Farm Waste at Hanford Nuclear Reservation

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to submit a comprehensive plan through 2025 to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014, for the safe and effective retrieval, treatment, and disposition of nuclear waste contained in the Tank Farms of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Richland, Washington. The plan would be required to include: (1) a list of all requirements, assumptions, and criteria needed to design, construct, and operate the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) and any required infrastructure or facilities at the Hanford Tank Farms; (2) a schedule of activities, construction, and operations at the Tank Farms and the WTP through 2025 in order to carry out the safe and effective retrieval, treatment, and disposition of nuclear waste in the Tank Farms; (3) actions required to accelerate, to the extent possible, retrieval and treatment of lower-risk, low-activity waste while continuing efforts to accelerate resolution of technical challenges associated with higher-risk, high-activity waste; and (4) a description of how adequate protection will be provided to workers and the public under the plan and how any new science and technical information, not available prior to development of the plan or available prior to March 2014, will be incorporated into the plan.

This section would also require that the Secretary make a determination whether each requirement, assumption, and criterion identified in the plan is finalized and will be used to inform planning, design, construction, and operations. For each requirement, assumption, or criterion that the Secretary cannot make a finalized determination, the Secretary would be required to include in the plan: (1) a description of the requirement, assumption, or criterion; (2) a list of activities required for the Secretary to make a finalized determination; and (3) the date on which the Secretary anticipates making a finalized determination. Once a finalized determination

is made, the Secretary would be required to notify the congressional defense committees.

This section would authorize the Secretary (without delegation) to change a finalized determination made pursuant to this section. If such a change will have a material effect on any aspect of the schedule or cost of the WTP project, the Secretary would be required to promptly notify the congressional defense committees. Finally, the Secretary would be required to make changes to a requirement, assumption, or criterion if adequate protection cannot be provided without such change.

In carrying out this section, the committee expects the Secretary to leverage the national laboratories to help resolve outstanding technical challenges.

Section 3115—Enhanced Procurement Authority to Manage Supply Chain Risk

This section would provide the Secretary of Energy with the authority to take certain actions with regard to the protection of the supply chain of the Department of Energy. This authority would replicate the authority provided to the Department of Defense in section 806 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) and to the intelligence community in section 309 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–87).

Section 3116—Limitation on Availability of Funds for National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would limit the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) such that $139.5 million may not be obligated or expended until the Administrator for Nuclear Security submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed plan to achieve certain planned efficiencies and written certification that the planned efficiencies will be achieved. If the Administrator does not submit the plan or is unable to certify within 60 days of the date of the enactment of this Act that the efficiencies will be achieved, the Administrator would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the amount of planned efficiencies that will not be realized and any effects caused by planned but unrealized efficiencies in the Directed Stockpile Work and Nuclear Programs accounts. The limitation of funds for NNSA would not apply to funds authorized to be appropriated for Directed Stockpile Work, Nuclear Programs, or Naval Reactors. Finally, the limitation on obligation of funds would not affect the authority of the Secretary of Energy to reprogram or transfer funding under sections 4702, 4705, and 4711 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2742, 2745, and 2751).

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2014 budget request justification materials for NNSA assume $106.8 million in Directed Stockpile Work and $32.7 million in Nuclear Programs will be saved through, "management efficiency and workforce restructuring reductions." The NNSA anticipates utilizing the savings from these efficiencies to support nuclear modernization work in

these programs. However, the committee is concerned that NNSA does not have a clear plan for achieving these efficiencies. Furthermore, if these efficiencies are not achieved, critical nuclear modernization programs will be forced to reduce scope or slip schedules. Therefore, the committee recommends this section to ensure a detailed plan is submitted to Congress and that nuclear modernization programs remain on track should the expected efficiencies not be realized. If the efficiencies are not realized, the committee encourages the Secretary to propose a transfer of funds from lower priority programs to support the nuclear modernization efforts at the core of Directed Stockpile Work and Nuclear Programs.

Section 3117—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Administrator

This section would limit the availability of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's Office of the Administrator to not more than 75 percent until several statutorily required reports are submitted to Congress in 2013 and 2014. These include:

(1) The report on stockpile assessments required under section 4205(f)(2) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2525(f)(2));

(2) The Secretary of Energy's portion of the report required by section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81);

(3) The annual assessment required under section 3122 of Public Law 112–81; and,

(4) The detailed report (in 2013) and summary (in 2014) on the stockpile stewardship, management, and infrastructure plan required by section 4203(b) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523(b)).

The committee notes that in the past year, it did not receive many statutorily required reports that are key to conducting effective oversight of the nuclear weapons stockpile and nuclear security enterprise. In particular, the four reports identified in this section are a critical means by which the committee is informed of the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile as well as the Administration's plans for the stockpile and enterprise. In 2012, the committee received the report on stockpile assessments from the President 3-months late and never received the "Section 1043 Report" or Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan (SSMP). Regarding the Section 1043 Report and SSMP, it was not until December 7, 2012, that the committee was officially informed that the Administration would not be submitting the reports as required by law. The committee finds this to be unacceptable and has a direct and negative impact on the committee's oversight activities. Therefore, the committee recommends this section to ensure the reports are submitted, as required, in 2013 and 2014.

Section 3118—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Global Threat Reduction Initiative

This section would express the sense of Congress that, particularly in a constrained budget environment, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) should prioritize its primary mission of sustaining and modernizing the nuclear weapons stockpile and, if required, shift funding from secondary missions to ensure critical nuclear weapons modernization programs stay on schedule and deliver nuclear warheads needed to support military requirements.

This section would also require that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative of the NNSA, not more than 80 percent may be obligated or expended unless, by not later than 60 days after the date of enactment, the NNSA Administrator certifies to the congressional defense committees that the B61 Life Extension Program (LEP) will deliver a first production unit in fiscal year 2019.

Finally, this section includes an exception that the limitation on funds described above does not affect the authority of the Secretary of Energy to reprogram or transfer such limited funds under section 4702 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2742).

Section 3119—Establishment of Center for Security Technology, Analysis, Testing, and Response

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish a Center for Security Technology, Analysis, Testing, and Response within the nuclear security enterprise. The Center would be responsible for a range of activities, but would primarily serve to provide the Administrator, the Chief of Defense Nuclear Security, and the management and operating contractors of the nuclear security enterprise a wide-range of objective expertise on security technologies, systems, analysis, testing, and response forces. The Center would also:

(1) Assist the Administrator in developing standards, requirements, analysis methods, and testing criteria;

(2) Collect, analyze, and distribute lessons learned;

(3) Support inspections and oversight activities;

(4) Promote professional development and training for security professionals;

(5) Provide for advance and bulk procurement for security-related acquisitions that impact multiple facilities of the nuclear security enterprise; and

(6) Advocate continual improvement and security excellence across the nuclear security enterprise.

The committee notes that the Center established by this section would serve an advisory, support, and coordination function across the nuclear security enterprise, and would not replace the role of the Administrator or the Secretary of Energy in deciding final security requirements and policies or conducting oversight. The committee believes the Center would serve to advance a strong security culture and enable consistency, effectiveness, and coordination in security matters across the nuclear security enterprise.

Section 3120—Cost-Benefit Analyses for Competition of Management and Operating Contracts

This section would amend section 3121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to clarify that, if a management and operating contract awarded by the Administrator for Nuclear Security is protested, the report required by such section to be submitted to Congress shall be submitted not later than 30 days after such protest is resolved. This section would also require any report under section 3121 to include a description of the assumptions used and analysis conducted to determine cost savings expected from the competition of the contract and exempt contracts for managing and operating facilities of the Naval Reactors Program from the requirements of section 3121.

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) recent award of the contract for consolidated management and operations of the Y–12 National Security Complex and the Pantex Plant was protested by several bidders. On April 29, 2013, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) sustained this protest. GAO stated that it, "sustained these protests on the basis that NNSA failed to follow the publicly-stated solicitation criteria, which provided that the agency would evaluate the feasibility and size of each offeror's proposed cost savings resulting from the consolidation of the management and operation of these sites. Specifically, GAO concluded that NNSA failed to meaningfully assess the majority of each offeror's proposed cost savings, and based its source selection decision on the unsupported assumption that all cost savings proposed by every offeror would be achieved."

The committee believes NNSA's failure to meaningfully assess each offeror's proposed cost savings is unacceptable for a contract whose total value will likely exceed $22.8 billion. To ensure robust oversight of this issue, the committee recommends this section to ensure NNSA reports to Congress about the assumptions and analysis utilized to estimate anticipated cost savings. Finally, to protect proprietary information and the integrity of contract competitions, the committee believes submission of the report required by section 3121 of Public Law 112–239 is appropriate after any protest is resolved.

Section 3121—W88–1 Warhead and W78–1 Warhead Life Extension Options

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Nuclear Weapons Council, to include several warhead life extension options through all of Phase 6.2 and all of Phase 6.2A of the Joint W78/88–1 Warhead Life Extension Program. The options would include:

(1) A separate life extension option to produce a W78–1 warhead;

(2) A separate life extension option to produce a W88–1 warhead;

(3) A W78/88–1 life extension option that would produce an interoperable warhead for both intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles; and

(4) Any other option that the Nuclear Weapons Council considers appropriate.

During Phase 6.2 and Phase 6.2A, each such option would be required to receive a full analysis of feasibility, design definition, and cost estimation.

The committee understands that the Nuclear Weapons Council has endorsed a long-term plan for U.S. nuclear weapons that would, through life extension programs, produce several interoperable nuclear warheads that contain components that may be deployed on either submarine-launched ballistic missiles or land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. The committee believes that while this conceptual approach has merit, caution is required. In particular, the committee is concerned about the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) ability to execute a W78/88–1 program that contains significant technical and programmatic risk. Close coordination between the Air Force, the Navy, and NNSA will be required throughout the program. In addition, the Nuclear Weapons Council must have full information on the various options for the life extension before entering Phase 6.3 (Development Engineering) of the program. Therefore, the committee believes this section is a prudent means of ensuring that full feasibility, design definition, and cost estimates are developed to enable a fully informed decision by the Nuclear Weapons Council on a final option. The committee discusses its views on commonality elsewhere in this report.

Section 3122—Extension of Principles of Pilot Program to Additional Facilities of the Nuclear Security Enterprise

This section would make a series of findings related to a pilot program conducted by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) at the Kansas City Plant (KCP) starting in April 2006, and would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to extend the principles of such pilot program. The Administrator would be required to implement the principles of the pilot program permanently at the Kansas City Plant and extend the principles of the pilot program, with modifications as the Administrator determines appropriate, to not less than two additional facilities of the nuclear security enterprise within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

In carrying out the principles of the pilot program, the Administrator would be allowed to exempt high-hazard or high-risk activities from such extension, would be required to exempt nuclear operations from such extension, and would be required to focus initial extension of such principles on low-risk, high-reward initiatives. In extending the principles of the pilot program, the Administrator would be required to certify to the appropriate congressional committees that: (1) the management and operating contractor for a selected facility has sufficiently mature processes and high-performance to enable the extension without undue risk; and (2) Federal oversight mechanisms are in place and mature enough to enable the extension without undue risk. If the Administrator cannot make such a certification, the Administrator would be required to delay the extension until they can make such a certification and submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees re-

garding: what improvements to processes, procedures, and performance are required to make such certification; the Administrator's plan for what activities will be carried out to make such improvements; and the date by which the Administrator expects to make a certification.

Based upon its continuing oversight of this issue, the committee continues to believe that reform of the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy's (DOE) approach to governance, management, and oversight of the nuclear security enterprise are required. In addition, the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy must streamline and clarify roles, responsibilities, and authorities and ensure robust accountability of both contractors and Federal officials when failures occur.

The committee expects the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise established by section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to provide concrete and actionable recommendations for fixing the longstanding and well-documented problems with the current system. However, the committee is concerned that fiscal challenges and the large scope of work facing the National Nuclear Security Administration necessitate more immediate action as well. Therefore, the committee recommends this section to extend the principles of a previously successful pilot program to additional facilities of the enterprise. Such extension was recommended in 2009 by the bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States.

The committee notes that while an independent assessment of the Kansas City Plant pilot program found significant cost savings and said, "the lessons learned at KCP can and should be applied at other NNSA and DOE sites," the assessment also cautioned that application of the, "elements [of the pilot] will be limited in other locations, primarily by the presence of high risk, high hazard activities and materials." The assessment went on to highlight several features of the pilot that should be considered for other sites within these limitations. The committee encourages the Administrator to carefully consider the advice of the independent assessment, as well as the recommendations in recent reports by the Government Accountability Office on this topic, in determining where and how to extend the principles of the pilot program. Finally, to ensure the committee is fully informed, the committee expects the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 30, 2013, on the benefits, risks, opportunities, and challenges associated with extension of the principles of the pilot program to additional sites.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS

Section 3131—Annual Report and Certification on Status of the Security of the Nuclear Security Enterprise

This section would amend section 4506 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act to require that, not later than September 30 of each year, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the Secretary of Energy and to the congressional defense committees a re-

port detailing the status of the security of the nuclear security enterprise, including the status of the security of special nuclear material, nuclear weapons, and classified information at each nuclear weapons production facility and national security laboratory. This section would also require that, as part of this annual report to the Secretary and to Congress, the Administrator certify that the special nuclear material, nuclear weapons, and classified information in the custody of the National Nuclear Security Administration are secure.

Section 3132—Modifications to Annual Reports Regarding the Condition of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile

This section would amend section 4205 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2525) to clarify requirements related to the statutorily required annual assessments regarding the condition of the nuclear weapons stockpile. Specifically, the assessments submitted by the head of each national security laboratory would be required to include a concise summary of any significant finding investigations initiated or active during the previous year. Furthermore, the assessment submitted by the commander, U.S. Strategic Command would be required to include a summary of major assembly releases in place as of the date of the assessment. This section would also require that, if the President does not forward the annual assessments to Congress by March 15 as required by statute, the appropriate officials submit their assessments directly to the congressional defense committees.

The committee believes these annual stockpile assessments to be a critical means by which Congress stays apprised of the safety, reliability, performance, and military effectiveness of our nuclear weapons. In recent years, the committee has received these assessments after the statutory deadline of March 15. For instance, in 2012 the assessments were not submitted by the President until June 25. These delays have a direct and detrimental impact on the committee's ability to conduct oversight and carry out its responsibility to provide for the common defense. Review of past assessment letters indicate that the nuclear security laboratory directors and the commander, U.S. Strategic Command have been diligent in submitting their reports to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy on time. Therefore, the committee recommends this section that would require the laboratory directors and commander to submit their assessments directly to Congress should the President fail to submit the annual assessment report to Congress by March 15.

Section 3133—Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements

This section would repeal two statutes requiring submission of annual, recurring reports: (1) a report on Counterintelligence and Security Practices at National Laboratories required by section 4507 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2658); and (2) a report on Advanced Supercomputer Sales to Certain Foreign Nations contained in section 3157 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85).

Repeal of these recurring report requirements was requested by the Secretary of Energy. The committee appreciates the Secretary's desire to reduce the number of recurring reports, but believes continued vigilance on the issues covered by these reports is warranted. The committee expects the Secretary of Energy to continue providing regular, annual briefings to the appropriate congressional committees on the matters covered by these reports to ensure continued leadership attention and robust congressional oversight.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 3141—Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise

This section would amend section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to modify statutory deadlines regarding the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise. The advisory panel's interim report would be due by October 1, 2013, instead of 180 days after enactment of Public Law 112–239. Also, the advisory panel's full report would be due March 1, 2014, instead of February 1, 2014. Finally, the advisory panel would terminate not later than September 30, 2014, instead of June 1, 2014. This section would also enable the advisory panel to submit a final report on its activities and recommendations prior to termination. Given the late start of the panel's work resulting from the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6), the committee believes these adjustments are prudent to enable the advisory panel to carry out its mandate.

The committee reaffirms its belief, based on the findings of dozens of reports and the committee's own oversight activities, that the current system for governance, management, and oversight of the nuclear security enterprise is broken. The committee encourages the advisory panel to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the system and its problems, meet with all stakeholders, and consider a wide range of potential solutions. Ultimately, however, the committee expects the advisory panel to deliver a concrete, actionable, and bipartisan recommendation for how to fix the system.

Section 3142—Study of Potential Reuse of Nuclear Weapon Secondaries

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to conduct a study of the potential reuse of nuclear weapon secondaries that includes: an assessment of the potential for reusing secondaries in future life extension programs; a description of such secondaries that could be reused; the number of such secondaries available as of the date of the study; and the number of such secondaries that are planned to be available as a result of the dismantlement of nuclear weapons.

The study required under this section would be required to include a variety of other matters, including: an assessment of the feasibility and practicability of potential full or partial reuse op-

tions with respect to nuclear weapon secondaries; the benefits and risks of reusing such secondaries; a list of technical challenges that must be resolved to certify aged materials under dynamic loading conditions and the full stockpile-to-target sequence of weapons, including a program plan and timeline for resolving such technical challenges and an assessment of the importance of resolving outstanding materials issues on certifying aged secondaries; the potential costs and cost savings of such reuse; the effects of such reuse on the requirements for secondary manufacturing; and an assessment of how such reuse affects plans to build a responsive nuclear weapons infrastructure.

This section would require the Administrator to submit the study carried out pursuant to this section to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2014.

Section 3143—Clarification of Role of Secretary of Energy

This section would clarify that the amendment made by section 3113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112—239) to section 4102 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2512) may not be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of Energy, in carrying out national security programs, with respect to the management, planning, and oversight of the National Nuclear Security Administration or as affecting the delegation by the Secretary of Energy of authority to carry out such activities, as set forth under subsection (a) of section 4102 as it existed before the amendment made by section 3113.

Section 3144—Technical Amendment to Atomic Energy Act of 1954

This section would make a technical amendment to chapter 10 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.).

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $29.9 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends $29.9 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 2014.

Section 3202—Improvements to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

This section would amend section 315 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286d) to enable the Secretary of Energy to request an analysis regarding the costs and benefits of any draft or final recommendation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. If the Secretary requests such an analysis, the Board would

be required to transmit such an analysis to the Department of Energy within 30 days and make such analysis public when the associated recommendation is made available to the public. Additionally, if the Secretary requests such an analysis from the Board, the Secretary would be required to conduct a similar analysis of the costs and benefits of the recommendation and make such analysis available to the public.

This section would also amend section 312 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (U.S.C. 2286a) to clarify that, in making recommendations to the Secretary of Energy, the Board must use rigorous, quantitative analysis and specifically assess the use of various administrative, passive, and engineered controls for implementing the recommended measures.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $20.0 million for fiscal year 2014 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Title XI Ship Loan Guarantee

The budget request contained $2.65 million to support expenses associated with administering the Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program.

The committee notes that the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program is designed to promote the growth and modernization of the U.S. merchant marine and U.S. shipyards by enabling owners of eligible vessels and shipyards to obtain long-term financing on terms and conditions that might not otherwise be available for projects that are technically, financially, and economically sound.

The committee supports an increase of $70.0 million for the Maritime Administration Title XI Ship loan guarantee program to expand the loan capacity of the Maritime Administration. This program is essential to modernize and sustain our U.S.-flagged Merchant Marine and United States shipbuilding industry, both of which are critical to national security preparedness.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2014

This section would authorize appropriations for the national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal year 2014.

Section 3502—5-Year Reauthorization of Vessel War Risk Insurance Program

This section would amend section 53912 of title 46, United States Code, relating to the expiration of chapter 539, War Risk Insurance Program. Under this program, the Secretary of Transportation, with the approval of the President, may provide insurance and reinsurance to American and foreign vessels that provide service to the U.S. Government. The insurance covers loss or damage caused by war risks. Whenever it appears to the Secretary that the insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from the commercial insurance market, then such war risk insurance for vessels may be provided by the Secretary only on the condition that such vessels are available for the U.S. Government in time of war or national emergency.

Section 3503—Sense of Congress

This section would provide a sense of Congress on the importance of the United States shipbuilding industry and specifically the Ready Reserve Force of the Maritime Administration to the national security needs of the United States. This section also encourages the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the Department of the Navy, to pursue the most cost effective means for recapitalizing the Ready Reserve Force.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables

This section would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, this section would also require that a decision by an Agency Head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and section 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I—Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,024,387	135,100	5,159,487
Missile Procurement, Army	1,334,083		1,334,083
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,597,267	191,000	1,788,267
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,540,437	–74,500	1,465,937
Other Procurement, Army	6,465,218	–54,300	6,410,918
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	17,927,651	30,000	17,957,651
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,122,193	–14,100	3,108,093
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	589,267		589,267
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	14,077,804	934,300	15,012,104
Other Procurement, Navy	6,310,257	–26,194	6,284,063
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,343,511		1,343,511
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,398,901	310,200	11,709,101
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,343,286	–703	5,342,583
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	759,442		759,442
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,760,581		16,760,581
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,534,083	107,000	4,641,083
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	98,800	–98,800	0
Subtotal, Title I—Procurement	**98,227,168**	**1,439,003**	**99,666,171**
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	7,989,102	–47,000	7,942,102
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	15,974,780	58,100	16,032,880
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	25,702,946	76,000	25,778,946
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	17,667,108	472,124	18,139,232
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	186,300		186,300
Subtotal, Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**67,520,236**	**559,224**	**68,079,460**
Title III—Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	35,073,077	232,476	34,840,601
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	3,095,036	29,100	3,124,136
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	7,054,196	74,200	7,128,396
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	39,945,237	–26,994	39,918,243
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	6,254,650	24,100	6,278,750
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,197,752	5,000	1,202,752
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	263,317	1,800	265,117
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	37,270,842	166,830	37,437,672
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,164,607	9,100	3,173,707
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,566,004	26,900	6,592,904
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	32,997,693	–497,062	32,500,631

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—
Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense	13,606	–980	12,626
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	109,500		109,500
Cooperative Threat Reduction	528,455		528,455
Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund	256,031		256,031
Environmental Restoration, Army	298,815		298,815
Environmental Restoration, Navy	316,103		316,103
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	439,820		439,820
Environmental Restoration, Defense	10,757		10,757
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites	237,443		237,443
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	5,000	–5,000	0
Subtotal, Title III—Operation and Maintenance	**175,097,941**	**–425,482**	**174,672,459**
Title IV—Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	130,399,881	–180,600	130,219,281
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,676,750		6,676,750
Subtotal, Title IV—Military Personnel	**137,076,631**	**–180,600**	**136,896,031**
Title XIV—Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	25,158		25,158
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	61,731		61,731
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	46,428		46,428
Working Capital Fund, DECA	1,412,510		1,412,510
National Defense Sealift Fund	730,700		730,700
Defense Health Program	33,054,528	–276,800	32,777,728
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	1,057,123		1,057,123
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	938,545		938,545
Office of the Inspector General	312,131		312,131
Subtotal, Title XIV—Other Authorizations	**37,638,854**	**–276,800**	**37,362,054**
Total, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	**515,560,830**	**1,115,345**	**516,676,175**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Army	1,119,875	–20,000	1,099,875
Navy	1,700,269		1,700,269
Air Force	1,156,573	–17,730	1,138,843
Defense-Wide	3,985,300	–276,927	3,708,373
Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense	122,536		122,536
NATO Security Investment Program	239,700	–40,000	199,700
Army National Guard	320,815	–5,000	315,815
Army Reserve	174,060		174,060
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	32,976		32,976
Air National Guard	119,800	–12,000	107,800
Air Force Reserve	45,659		45,659
Subtotal, Military Construction	**9,017,563**	**–371,657**	**8,645,906**
Family Housing			

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—
Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Construction, Army	44,008		44,008
Operation & Maintenance, Army	512,871		512,871
Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	73,407		73,407
Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	389,844		389,844
Construction, Air Force	76,360		76,360
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	388,598		388,598
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	55,845		55,845
Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,780		1,780
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,542,713**		**1,542,713**
Base Realignment and Closure			
Base Realignment and Closure—Army	180,401		180,401
Base Realignment and Closure—Navy	144,580		144,580
Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force	126,376		126,376
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	**451,357**		**451,357**
Undistributed Adjustments			
Prior Year Savings	0	–584,413	–584,413
Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments	**0**	**–584,413**	**–584,413**
Total, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	**11,011,633**	**–956,070**	**10,055,563**
Total, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**526,572,463**	**159,275**	**526,731,738**
Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations			
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	16,000	–16,000	0
Nuclear Energy	94,000		94,000
Weapons Activities	7,868,409	220,000	8,088,409
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,140,142		2,140,142
Naval Reactors	1,246,134		1,246,134
Office of the Administrator	397,784	–8,000	389,784
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,316,909	–358,000	4,958,909
Other Defense Activities	749,080		749,080
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**17,828,458**	**–162,000**	**17,666,458**
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	29,915		29,915
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**29,915**		**29,915**
Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations	**17,858,373**	**–162,000**	**17,696,373**
Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,858,373**	**–162,000**	**17,696,373**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request	**544,430,836**	**–2,725**	**544,428,111**
National Defense Funding, OCO Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	771,788		771,788
Missile Procurement, Army	128,645	25,887	154,532
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	0	15,422	15,422
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	180,900	34,482	215,382
Other Procurement, Army	603,123	340,937	944,060
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	1,000,000		1,000,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	240,696		240,696
Weapons Procurement, Navy	86,500		86,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	206,821		206,821
Other Procurement, Navy	17,968		17,968
Procurement, Marine Corps	129,584		129,584
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	115,668		115,668
Missile Procurement, Air Force	24,200		24,200
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	159,965		159,965
Other Procurement, Air Force	2,574,846		2,574,846
Procurement, Defense-Wide	111,275		111,275
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	15,000	–15,000	0
National Guard & Reserve Equipment	0	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, Procurement	**6,366,979**	**801,728**	**7,168,707**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	7,000		7,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	34,426		34,426
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	9,000		9,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	66,208		66,208
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**116,634**		**116,634**
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	29,279,633	2,116,100	31,395,733
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	42,935	75,800	118,735
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	199,371		199,371
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	7,726,720		7,726,720
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund	279,000		279,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	6,067,993	949,800	7,017,793
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,669,815	61,400	2,731,215
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	55,700		55,700
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	12,534		12,534
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	10,005,224	1,004,000	11,009,224
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	32,849		32,849
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	22,200		22,200
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	6,435,078	35,000	6,470,078

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**62,829,052**	**4,242,100**	**67,071,152**
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	9,689,307		9,689,307
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	164,033		164,033
Subtotal, Military Personnel	**9,853,340**		**9,853,340**
Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	44,732		44,732
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	88,500		88,500
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	131,678		131,678
Defense Health Program	904,201		904,201
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	376,305		376,305
Office of the Inspector General	10,766		10,766
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**1,556,182**		**1,556,182**
Total, National Defense Funding, OCO Budget Request	**80,722,187**	**5,043,828**	**85,766,015**
Total, National Defense	**625,153,023**	**5,041,103**	**630,194,126**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	67,800		67,800
Title XIV—Cemeterial Expenses, Army (Function 700)	45,800	25,000	70,800
Title XXXIV—Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270)	20,000		20,000
Title XXXV—Maritime Administration (Function 400)	152,168	45,000	197,168
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)			
Title X—General Transfer Authority	[4,000,000]		[3,500,000]
Title XV—Special Transfer Authority	[4,000,000]		[3,000,000]
MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)			
Defense Production Act	[25,135]		[25,135]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	**526,572,463**	**159,275**	**526,731,738**
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	**17,858,373**	**–162,000**	**17,696,373**
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)—BASE BILL	**544,430,836**	**–2,725**	**544,428,111**
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	**80,722,187**	**5,043,828**	**85,766,015**
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**625,153,023**	**5,041,103**	**630,194,126**

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
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	25,135		25,135
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	10,000		10,000
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	30,000		30,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**65,135**		**65,135**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	104,000		104,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**104,000**		**104,000**
Other Discretionary Programs	7,407,000		7,407,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**7,407,000**		**7,407,000**
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	**7,576,135**		**7,576,135**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary			
Department of Defense—Military (051)	607,359,785	5,203,103	612,562,888
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,962,373	–162,000	17,800,373
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,407,000		7,407,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary	**632,729,158**	**5,041,103**	**637,770,261**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (OMB Estimates)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	6,970,000		6,970,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,156,000		1,156,000
Offsetting receipts	–1,752,000		–1,752,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**6,374,000**		**6,374,000**
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,281,000		1,281,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**1,281,000**		**1,281,000**
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	76,000		76,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**590,000**		**590,000**
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	**8,245,000**		**8,245,000**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory			
Department of Defense—Military (051)	613,733,785	5,203,103	618,936,888
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,243,373	–162,000	19,081,373
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,997,000		7,997,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory	**640,974,158**	**5,041,103**	**646,015,261**

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
001	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	1	19,730			1	19,730
002	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	4	142,050			4	142,050
003	MQ–1 UAV	15	518,460	4		19	518,460
004	RQ–11 (RAVEN)		10,772				10,772
	ROTARY						
005	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	10	96,227	21	135,100	31	231,327
	Program increase for additional aircraft			[21]	[115,100]		
	Program increase for fielding				[20,000]		
006	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	42	608,469			42	608,469
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		150,931				150,931
011	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	65	1,046,976			65	1,046,976
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		116,001				116,001
013	CH–47 HELICOPTER	28	801,650			28	801,650
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		98,376				98,376
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
015	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS		97,781				97,781
016	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		10,262				10,262
017	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		12,467				12,467

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
018	AH–64 MODS		53,559				53,559
019	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		149,764				149,764
020	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		17,500				17,500
021	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	167	74,095			167	74,095
022	KIOWA MODS WARRIOR	3	184,044			3	184,044
023	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		152,569				152,569
024	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		92,779				92,779
025	GATM ROLLUP		65,613				65,613
026	RQ–7 UAV MODS		121,902				121,902
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
027	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		47,610				47,610
028	SURVIVABILITY CM		5,700				5,700
029	CMWS		126,869				126,869
	OTHER SUPPORT						
030	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	705	6,809			705	6,809
031	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		65,397				65,397
032	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		45,841				45,841
033	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		79,692				79,692
034	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,615				1,615
035	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,877				2,877
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,040**	**5,024,387**	**25**	**135,100**	**1,065**	**5,159,487**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
002	MSE MISSILE	56	540,401			56	540,401
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						

003	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		4,464			4,464
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS					
004	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	449	110,510		449	110,510
005	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	988	49,354		988	49,354
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,965			19,965
007	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,788	237,216		1,788	237,216
008	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,412	19,022		2,412	19,022
	MODIFICATIONS					
010	PATRIOT MODS		256,438			256,438
011	STINGER MODS		37,252			37,252
012	ITAS/TOW MODS		20,000			20,000
013	MLRS MODS		11,571			11,571
014	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		6,105			6,105
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
015	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		11,222			11,222
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
016	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,530			3,530
017	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		1,748			1,748
018	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		5,285			5,285
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**5,693**	**1,334,083**		**5,693**	**1,334,083**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY					
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES					
001	STRYKER VEHICLE		374,100			374,100
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES					
002	STRYKER (MOD)		20,522			20,522
003	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		29,965			29,965
004	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		158,000			158,000
005	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		4,769			4,769
006	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	18	260,177		18	260,177
007	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)		111,031	75,000		186,031
	Program increase			[75,000]		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
008	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)		2,500				2,500
009	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	14	62,951	7	31,000	21	93,951
	Program increase			[7]	[31,000]		
010	M88 FOV MODS		28,469				28,469
011	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE		2,002				2,002
012	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		178,100				178,100
013	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM				168,000		168,000
	Program increase				[168,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
014	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		1,544				1,544
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
015	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY	1,424	69,147	–1424	–61,000		8,147
	Funding ahead of need			[–1,424]	[–50,000]		
	Transfer to PE 64601A per Army's request				[–11,000]		
018	MORTAR SYSTEMS		5,310				5,310
019	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	5,061	24,049			5,061	24,049
021	CARBINE	41,897	70,846		–22,000	41,897	48,846
	Funding ahead of need				[–22,000]		
023	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	242	56,580			242	56,580
024	HANDGUN		300				300
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
026	M777 MODS		39,300				39,300
027	M4 CARBINE MODS		10,300				10,300
028	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		33,691				33,691
029	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		7,608				7,608
030	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		2,719				2,719

031	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		7,017				7,017
032	M119 MODIFICATIONS		18,707				18,707
033	M16 RIFLE MODS		2,136				2,136
034	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		1,569				1,569
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
035	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,024				2,024
036	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		10,108				10,108
037	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		459				459
038	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		1,267				1,267
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**48,656**	**1,597,267**	**–1,417**	**191,000**	**47,239**	**1,788,267**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
002	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		112,167		–25,000		87,167
	Unit cost efficiencies—Army requested reduction				[–25,000]		
003	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		58,571		–5,000		53,571
	Unit cost efficiencies—Army requested reduction				[–5,000]		
004	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		9,858				9,858
005	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		80,037		–25,000		55,037
	Unit cost efficiencies—Army requested reduction				[–25,000]		
007	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		16,496				16,496
008	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		69,533		–19,500		50,033
	Unit cost efficiencies—Army requested reduction				[–19,500]		
009	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		55,781				55,781
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
010	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		38,029				38,029
011	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		24,656				24,656
012	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		60,781				60,781
	TANK AMMUNITION						
013	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES		121,551				121,551
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
014	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		39,825				39,825

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
015	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		37,902				37,902
016	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	802	67,896			802	67,896
017	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		71,205				71,205
	ROCKETS						
020	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		1,012				1,012
021	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		108,476				108,476
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
022	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		24,074				24,074
023	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		33,242				33,242
024	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		7,609				7,609
025	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		5,228				5,228
	MISCELLANEOUS						
026	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		16,700				16,700
027	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		7,366				7,366
028	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		3,614				3,614
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (AMMO)		12,423				12,423
030	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		16,604				16,604
031	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		14,328				14,328
032	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		108				108
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
033	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		242,324				242,324
034	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION		179,605				179,605
035	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,436				3,436
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**802**	**1,540,437**		**–74,500**	**802**	**1,465,937**

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

	TACTICAL VEHICLES					
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	25	4,000		25	4,000
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	40	6,841		40	6,841
003	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	837	223,910		837	223,910
004	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		11,880			11,880
005	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	220	14,731		220	14,731
006	PLS ESP	74	44,252		74	44,252
009	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	77	39,525		77	39,525
011	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	746	51,258	–25,300	746	25,958
	Funding ahead of need			[–25,300]		
012	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	34	49,904		34	49,904
013	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		2,200			2,200
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES					
014	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		400			400
015	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		716			716
016	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		5,619			5,619
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS					
018	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	2,139	973,477		2,139	973,477
019	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		14,120			14,120
020	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY		7,869			7,869
021	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,296			5,296
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS					
022	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	31	147,212		31	147,212
023	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		7,998			7,998
024	SHF TERM		7,232			7,232
025	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		3,308			3,308
026	SMART-T (SPACE)		13,992			13,992
028	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS	94	28,206		94	28,206
029	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	15	2,778		15	2,778
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM					
031	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		17,590			17,590
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
032	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		786				786
033	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	10,523	382,930			10,523	382,930
034	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	130	19,200			130	19,200
035	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		1,438				1,438
036	SINCGARS FAMILY		9,856				9,856
037	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	2,066	14,184			2,066	14,184
038	TRACTOR DESK		6,271				6,271
040	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		1,030				1,030
041	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM	15,967	31,868			15,967	31,868
042	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE		18,000				18,000
044	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		1,166				1,166
045	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE		22,867				22,867
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM						
048	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,512				1,512
049	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	323	61,096			323	61,096
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
050	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		13,890				13,890
051	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	1,133	23,245			1,133	23,245
052	BIOMETRICS ENTERPRISE		3,800				3,800
053	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	877	24,711			877	24,711
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
055	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		43,395				43,395
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
057	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		104,577				104,577
058	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		612				612
059	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		39,000				39,000

060	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		248,477		248,477
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)				
064	JTT/CIBS-M		824		824
065	PROPHET GROUND	10	59,198	10	59,198
067	DCGS-A (MIP)	2,717	267,214	2,717	267,214
068	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	5	9,899	5	9,899
069	TROJAN (MIP)		24,598		24,598
070	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		1,927		1,927
071	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		6,169		6,169
072	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M		2,924		2,924
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)				
074	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	18	40,735	18	40,735
075	EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT)		13		13
076	ENEMY UAS		2,800		2,800
079	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		1,237		1,237
080	CI MODERNIZATION		1,399		1,399
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)				
082	SENTINEL MODS	86	47,983	86	47,983
083	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)		142		142
084	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	6,879	202,428	6,879	202,428
085	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		5,183		5,183
086	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		14,074		14,074
087	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	1,491	22,300	1,491	22,300
089	GREEN LASER INTERDICTION SYSTEM (GLIS)		1,016		1,016
090	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	5	55,354	5	55,354
091	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		800		800
092	PROFILER		3,027		3,027
093	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		1,185		1,185
094	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	3,866	103,214	3,866	103,214
096	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	167	26,037	167	26,037
097	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	120	23,100	120	23,100
098	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	19	312,727	19	312,727

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
101	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	574	43,228			574	43,228
102	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM	167	14,446			167	14,446
103	FAAD C2		4,607				4,607
104	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	8	33,090			8	33,090
105	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM		21,200				21,200
107	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,795				1,795
109	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		54,327				54,327
110	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	2,959	59,171			2,959	59,171
111	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)		83,936				83,936
113	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION		25,476				25,476
114	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	212	19,341			212	19,341
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION						
115	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		11,865				11,865
116	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		219,431				219,431
117	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM		6,414				6,414
118	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)		62,683				62,683
120	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		34,951				34,951
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
121	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		7,440				7,440
122	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	16	1,615			16	1,615
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT						
123	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		554				554
124	BCT EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES		20,000				20,000
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
124A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,558				3,558

	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT					
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		762			762
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	3,759	20,630		3,759	20,630
128	CBRN DEFENSE	24,530	22,151		24,530	22,151
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT					
130	TACTICAL BRIDGING	2	14,188		2	14,188
131	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	34	23,101		34	23,101
132	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP		15,416			15,416
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT					
134	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	311	50,465		311	50,465
135	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		6,490			6,490
136	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION		1,563			1,563
137	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	6,774	20,921		6,774	20,921
138	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS		100			100
139	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	70	2,271		70	2,271
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
140	HEATERS AND ECU'S	464	7,269		464	7,269
141	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES		200			200
142	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		1,468			1,468
143	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	31,530	26,526		31,530	26,526
144	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	5,547	81,680	–10,000	5,547	71,680
	Unjustified unit cost growth			[–10,000]		
147	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	217	28,096		217	28,096
148	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	6,904	56,150		6,904	56,150
149	MORTUARY AFFAIRS SYSTEMS	248	3,242		248	3,242
150	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	289	38,141		289	38,141
151	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)	210	5,859		210	5,859
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT					
152	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	508	60,612		508	60,612
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT					
153	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	3,258	22,042		3,258	22,042
154	MEDEVAC MISSON EQUIPMENT PACKAGE (MEP)	88	35,318		88	35,318

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
155	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	25	19,427			25	19,427
156	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	347	3,860			347	3,860
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
157	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,000				2,000
159	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	52	36,078			52	36,078
160	MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING	13	9,721			13	9,721
162	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	109	50,122			109	50,122
163	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	84	28,828			84	28,828
164	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	19	19,863			19	19,863
166	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	34	23,465			34	23,465
168	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP	109	13,590			109	13,590
169	CONST EQUIP ESP	80	16,088			80	16,088
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	66	6,850			66	6,850
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
171	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP		38,007		–19,000		19,007
	Funding ahead of need				[–19,000]		
172	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		10,605				10,605
	GENERATORS						
173	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	5,239	129,437			5,239	129,437
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
174	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)		1,250				1,250
175	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	60	8,260			60	8,260
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
176	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	309	121,710			309	121,710
177	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	8,181	225,200			8,181	225,200

178	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	15	30,063		15	30,063
179	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	2	34,913		2	34,913
180	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		9,955			9,955
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)					
181	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	3	8,241		3	8,241
182	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	1,810	67,506		1,810	67,506
183	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	2,105	18,755		2,105	18,755
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
184	M25 STABILIZED BINOCULAR	647	5,110		647	5,110
185	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,110			5,110
186	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		62,904			62,904
187	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,427			1,427
188	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	1,936	96,661		1,936	96,661
189	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,450			2,450
190	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	69	11,593		69	11,593
191	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	1,597	8,948		1,597	8,948
192	TRACTOR YARD		8,000			8,000
	OPA2					
195	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	15	59,700		15	59,700
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**162,339**	**6,465,218**	**–54,300**	**162,339**	**6,410,918**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT					
001	EA–18G	21	2,001,787	–45,000	21	1,956,787
	Program adjustment			[–45,000]		
003	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET		206,551			206,551
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			75,000		75,000
	Program increase			[75,000]		
005	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	4	1,135,444		4	1,135,444
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		94,766			94,766
007	JSF STOVL	6	1,267,260		6	1,267,260
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		103,195			103,195

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
009	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	18	1,432,573			18	1,432,573
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		55,196				55,196
011	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	25	749,962			25	749,962
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		71,000				71,000
013	MH–60S (MYP)	18	383,831			18	383,831
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		37,278				37,278
015	MH–60R (MYP)	19	599,237	1		20	599,237
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		231,834				231,834
017	P–8A POSEIDON	16	3,189,989			16	3,189,989
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		313,160				313,160
019	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	5	997,107		–35,000	5	962,107
	Unjustified CRI Funding				[–35,000]		
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		266,542				266,542
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
021	JPATS	29	249,080			29	249,080
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
022	KC–130J	2	134,358			2	134,358
023	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		32,288				32,288
025	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		52,002				52,002
026	MQ–8 UAV	1	60,980			1	60,980
028	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	1	14,958			1	14,958
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
029	EA–6 SERIES		18,577				18,577
030	AEA SYSTEMS		48,502				48,502
031	AV–8 SERIES		41,575				41,575
032	ADVERSARY		2,992				2,992

033	F–18 SERIES	875,371				875,371
034	H–46 SERIES	2,127				2,127
036	H–53 SERIES	67,675				67,675
037	SH–60 SERIES	135,054				135,054
038	H–1 SERIES	41,706				41,706
039	EP–3 SERIES	55,903	12	22,000	12	77,903
	12th Aircraft Spiral 3 Upgrade			[8,000]		
	Multi-INT Sensor Kits & Installation		[12]	[14,000]		
040	P–3 SERIES	37,436				37,436
041	E–2 SERIES	31,044				31,044
042	TRAINER A/C SERIES	43,720				43,720
043	C–2A	902				902
044	C–130 SERIES	47,587				47,587
045	FEWSG	665				665
046	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	14,587				14,587
047	E–6 SERIES	189,312				189,312
048	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	85,537				85,537
049	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	3,684	4	13,000	4	16,684
	Engineering and Technical Services Support			[8,000]		
	Multi-INT Sensor Kits & Installation		[4]	[5,000]		
050	T–45 SERIES	98,128				98,128
051	POWER PLANT CHANGES	22,999				22,999
052	JPATS SERIES	1,576				1,576
053	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS	6,267				6,267
054	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	141,685				141,685
055	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	120,660				120,660
056	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	3,554				3,554
057	ID SYSTEMS	41,800				41,800
058	P–8 SERIES	9,485				9,485
059	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION	14,431				14,431
060	MQ–8 SERIES	1,001				1,001
061	RQ–7 SERIES	26,433				26,433

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
062	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		160,834				160,834
063	F–35 STOVL SERIES		147,130				147,130
064	F–35 CV SERIES		31,100				31,100
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
065	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,142,461				1,142,461
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
066	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		410,044				410,044
067	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		27,450				27,450
068	WAR CONSUMABLES		28,930				28,930
069	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		5,268				5,268
070	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		60,306				60,306
071	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,775				1,775
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**165**	**17,927,651**	**17**	**30,000**	**182**	**17,957,651**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II MODS		1,140,865		–14,100		1,126,765
	Equipment related to New START treaty implementation				[–14,100]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		7,617				7,617
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	196	312,456			196	312,456
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
004	AMRAAM	54	95,413			54	95,413
005	SIDEWINDER	225	117,208			225	117,208
006	JSOW	328	136,794			328	136,794

007	STANDARD MISSILE	81	367,985	81	367,985
008	RAM	66	67,596	66	67,596
009	HELLFIRE	363	33,916	363	33,916
010	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	50	6,278	50	6,278
011	AERIAL TARGETS		41,799		41,799
012	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,538		3,538
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES				
013	ESSM	53	76,749	53	76,749
014	HARM MODS	143	111,902	143	111,902
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES				
015	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,138		1,138
016	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		23,014		23,014
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
017	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		84,318		84,318
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP				
018	SSTD		3,978		3,978
019	ASW TARGETS		8,031		8,031
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP				
020	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	150	125,898	150	125,898
021	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	108	53,203	108	53,203
022	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		7,800		7,800
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
023	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		59,730		59,730
024	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		4,222		4,222
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION				
025	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,963		3,963
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS				
026	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		12,513		12,513
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS				
027	CIWS MODS		56,308		56,308
028	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		10,727		10,727
029	GUN MOUNT MODS		72,901		72,901

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
030	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		1,943	1		1	1,943
031	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		19,758				19,758
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
033	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		52,632				52,632
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**1,817**	**3,122,193**	**1**	**–14,100**	**1,818**	**3,108,093**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		37,703				37,703
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		65,411				65,411
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		20,284				20,284
004	PRACTICE BOMBS		37,870				37,870
005	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		53,764				53,764
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		67,194				67,194
007	JATOS		2,749				2,749
008	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE		3,906				3,906
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		24,151				24,151
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		33,080				33,080
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		40,398				40,398
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		61,219				61,219
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		10,637				10,637
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,578				4,578
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		26,297				26,297
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		6,088				6,088
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES		7,644				7,644

018	60MM, ALL TYPES		3,349			3,349
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		13,361			13,361
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		2,149			2,149
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		27,465			27,465
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES		26,366			26,366
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION		8,403			8,403
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,201			5,201
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**589,267**			**589,267**
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY					
	OTHER WARSHIPS					
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		944,866			944,866
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	2,930,704	492,000	2	3,422,704
	Increase to Virginia class			[492,000]		
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		2,354,612			2,354,612
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		1,705,424			1,705,424
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		245,793			245,793
007	DDG 1000		231,694	79,300		310,994
	Increase to DDG 1000			[79,300]		
008	DDG–51	1	1,615,564		1	1,615,564
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		388,551			388,551
010	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	4	1,793,014		4	1,793,014
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS					
012	AFLOAT FORWARD STAGING BASE	1	524,000		1	524,000
014	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL		2,732			2,732
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST					
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		183,900			183,900
017	OUTFITTING		450,163			450,163
019	LCAC SLEP	4	80,987		4	80,987
020	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		625,800	363,000		988,800
	DDG–51			[332,000]		
	Joint High Speed Vessel			[7,600]		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MTS				[23,400]		
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	**12**	**14,077,804**		**934,300**	**12**	**15,012,104**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
001	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE		10,180				10,180
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		5,536				5,536
003	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)		16,956				16,956
	GENERATORS						
004	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E		19,782				19,782
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
005	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		39,509				39,509
	PERISCOPES						
006	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		52,515				52,515
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
007	DDG MOD		285,994				285,994
008	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,389				14,389
009	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		2,436				2,436
010	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE		12,700				12,700
011	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM		40,329				40,329
012	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		19,603				19,603
013	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,678				8,678
014	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		74,209				74,209
015	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		47,078				47,078
016	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		37,000				37,000
017	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25,053				25,053

018	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	12,986			12,986
019	DSSP EQUIPMENT	2,455			2,455
020	CG MODERNIZATION	10,539	1	1	10,539
021	LCAC	14,431			14,431
022	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	36,700			36,700
023	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	119,902			119,902
024	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	3,678			3,678
025	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	8,292			8,292
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT				
027	REACTOR COMPONENTS	286,744			286,744
	OCEAN ENGINEERING				
028	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	8,780			8,780
	SMALL BOATS				
029	STANDARD BOATS	36,452			36,452
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
030	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	36,145			36,145
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT				
031	OPERATING FORCES IPE	69,368			69,368
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT				
032	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	106,328			106,328
033	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT	45,966			45,966
034	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES	59,885			59,885
035	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES	37,168			37,168
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT				
036	LSD MIDLIFE	77,974	1	1	77,974
	SHIP SONARS				
038	SPQ–9B RADAR	27,934			27,934
039	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	83,231			83,231
040	SSN ACOUSTICS	199,438			199,438
041	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	9,394			9,394
042	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	12,953			12,953
043	ELECTRONIC WARFARE MILDEC	8,958			8,958

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
044	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		24,077				24,077
045	SSTD		11,925				11,925
046	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		94,338				94,338
047	SURTASS		9,680				9,680
048	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNSAISANCE FORCE		18,130				18,130
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
049	AN/SLQ–32		203,375	1		1	203,375
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
050	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		123,656	1		1	123,656
051	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)		896				896
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
052	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		49,475				49,475
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
053	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		34,692				34,692
054	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)		396				396
055	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		15,703				15,703
056	ATDLS		3,836				3,836
057	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)		7,201				7,201
058	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		54,400				54,400
059	SHALLOW WATER MCM		8,548				8,548
060	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		11,765				11,765
061	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE		6,483				6,483
062	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		7,631				7,631
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
063	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		53,644				53,644

	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
064	MATCALS	7,461			7,461
065	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,140			9,140
066	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	20,798			20,798
067	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	19,754			19,754
068	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,909			8,909
069	LANDING SYSTEMS	13,554			13,554
070	ID SYSTEMS	38,934			38,934
071	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	14,131			14,131
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
072	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL	3,249			3,249
073	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	11,646			11,646
074	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	18,189			18,189
075	DCGS-N	17,350			17,350
076	CANES	340,567	1	1	340,567
077	RADIAC	9,835			9,835
078	CANES-INTELL	59,652			59,652
079	GPETE	6,253			6,253
080	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,963			4,963
081	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,664			4,664
082	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	66,889			66,889
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS				
084	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	23,877	1	1	23,877
086	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	28,001			28,001
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS				
087	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	7,856			7,856
088	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	74,376			74,376
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS				
089	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	27,381			27,381
090	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	215,952	1	1	215,952
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS				
091	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	4,463			4,463

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
092	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		778				778
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
094	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		133,530				133,530
095	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM		1,000				1,000
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
096	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		12,251				12,251
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
097	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		2,893				2,893
	SONOBUOYS						
099	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES		179,927				179,927
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
100	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		55,279				55,279
101	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		8,792				8,792
102	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		11,364				11,364
103	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		59,502				59,502
104	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		19,118				19,118
105	DCRS/DPL		1,425				1,425
106	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		29,670				29,670
107	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		101,554				101,554
108	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		18,293				18,293
109	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS		7,969				7,969
110	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,215				5,215
111	AUTONOMIC LOGISTICS INFORMATION SYSTEM (ALIS)		4,827				4,827
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
112	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		1,188				1,188
113	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		4,447				4,447

	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT					
114	NATO SEASPARROW	58,368				58,368
115	RAM GMLS	491				491
116	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	51,858				51,858
117	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	59,757				59,757
118	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	71,559				71,559
119	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	626				626
120	MARITIME INTEGRATED PLANNING SYSTEM-MIPS	2,779				2,779
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
121	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	224,484		–25,919		198,565
	New START treaty implementation			[–25,919]		
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
122	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	85,678				85,678
123	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,913				3,913
124	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,909				3,909
125	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	28,694				28,694
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
126	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	46,586				46,586
127	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	11,933				11,933
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE					
128	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	62,361	1		1	62,361
129	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	41,813				41,813
130	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	26,672				26,672
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
131	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	5,600				5,600
132	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	3,717				3,717
133	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	10,881				10,881
134	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,748				14,748
135	TACTICAL VEHICLES	5,540				5,540
136	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	5,741				5,741
137	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	3,852				3,852
138	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	25,757				25,757

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
139	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,182				1,182
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
140	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		14,250				14,250
141	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,401				6,401
142	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,718				5,718
143	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		22,597				22,597
	TRAINING DEVICES						
144	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		22,527				22,527
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
145	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		50,428				50,428
146	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,292				2,292
147	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,925				4,925
149	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,202				3,202
151	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,294				24,294
152	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		4,287				4,287
153	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		18,276				18,276
154	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		134,495				134,495
155	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		324,327				324,327
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
156A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		12,140				12,140
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
157	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		317,234		–275		316,959
	New START treaty implementation				[–275]		
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**6,310,257**	**8**	**–26,194**	**8**	**6,284,063**

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
001	AAV7A1 PIP		32,360		32,360
002	LAV PIP		6,003		6,003
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS				
003	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		589		589
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		3,655		3,655
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		5,467		5,467
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		20,354		20,354
	OTHER SUPPORT				
007	MODIFICATION KITS		38,446		38,446
008	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		4,734		4,734
	GUIDED MISSILES				
009	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		15,713		15,713
010	JAVELIN	219	36,175	219	36,175
012	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		1,136		1,136
	OTHER SUPPORT				
013	MODIFICATION KITS		33,976		33,976
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS				
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		16,273		16,273
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
015	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		41,063		41,063
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)				
016	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,930		2,930
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)				
018	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		1,637		1,637
019	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		18,394		18,394
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
020	RADAR SYSTEMS		114,051		114,051
021	RQ–21 UAS	25	66,612	25	66,612
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
022	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,749		3,749
023	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		75,979		75,979

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
026	RQ–11 UAV		1,653				1,653
027	DCGS-MC		9,494				9,494
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
028	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		6,171				6,171
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
029	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		121,955				121,955
030	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		83,294				83,294
031	RADIO SYSTEMS		74,718				74,718
032	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		47,613				47,613
033	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		19,573				19,573
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
033A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		5,659				5,659
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
034	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		1,039				1,039
035	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		31,050				31,050
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
036	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)		36,333				36,333
037	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		3,137				3,137
040	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		27,385				27,385
	OTHER SUPPORT						
041	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,016				7,016
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
042	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		14,377				14,377
043	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		24,864				24,864
044	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		21,592				21,592
045	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		61,353				61,353

046	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,827		4,827
047	EOD SYSTEMS		40,011		40,011
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
048	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		16,809		16,809
049	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		3,408		3,408
050	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		48,549		48,549
051	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		190		190
	GENERAL PROPERTY				
052	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		23,129		23,129
053	TRAINING DEVICES		8,346		8,346
054	CONTAINER FAMILY		1,857		1,857
055	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		36,198		36,198
056	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		2,390		2,390
	OTHER SUPPORT				
057	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,525		6,525
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
058	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		13,700		13,700
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**244**	**1,343,511**	**244**	**1,343,511**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	TACTICAL FORCES				
001	F–35	19	3,060,770	19	3,060,770
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		363,783		363,783
	OTHER AIRLIFT				
005	C–130J	6	537,517	6	537,517
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		162,000		162,000
007	HC–130J	1	132,121	1	132,121
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		88,000		88,000
009	MC–130J	4	389,434	4	389,434
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		104,000		104,000
	HELICOPTERS				
015	CV–22 (MYP)	3	230,798	3	230,798

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
017	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	6	2,541			6	2,541
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
020	TARGET DRONES	41	138,669			41	138,669
022	AC–130J	5	470,019			5	470,019
024	RQ–4		27,000				27,000
027	MQ–9	12	272,217	6	80,000	18	352,217
	Program increase			[6]	[80,000]		
028	RQ–4 BLOCK 40 PROC		1,747				1,747
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
029	B–2A		20,019				20,019
030	B–1B		132,222				132,222
031	B–52		111,002		–500		110,502
	B–52 conversions related to New START treaty implementation				[–500]		
032	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		27,197				27,197
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
033	A–10		47,598				47,598
034	F–15		354,624				354,624
035	F–16		11,794				11,794
036	F–22A		285,830				285,830
037	F–35 MODIFICATIONS		157,777				157,777
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
038	C–5		2,456				2,456
039	C–5M		1,021,967				1,021,967
042	C–17A		143,197				143,197
043	C–21		103				103

044	C–32A	9,780				9,780
045	C–37A	452				452
046	C–130 AMP		8	47,300	8	47,300
	LRIP Kit Procurement		[8]	[47,300]		
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT					
047	GLIDER MODS	128				128
048	T–6	6,427				6,427
049	T–1	277				277
050	T–38	28,686				28,686
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
052	U–2 MODS	45,591				45,591
053	KC–10A (ATCA)	70,918				70,918
054	C–12	1,876				1,876
055	MC–12W	5,000				5,000
056	C–20 MODS	192				192
057	VC–25A MOD	263				263
058	C–40	6,119				6,119
059	C–130	58,577		15,700		74,277
	C–130H Propulsion System Engine Upgrades			[15,700]		
061	C–130J MODS	10,475				10,475
062	C–135	46,556				46,556
063	COMPASS CALL MODS	34,494				34,494
064	RC–135	171,813				171,813
065	E–3	197,087				197,087
066	E–4	14,304				14,304
067	E–8	57,472				57,472
068	H–1	6,627				6,627
069	H–60	27,654				27,654
070	RQ–4 MODS	9,313				9,313
071	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS	16,300				16,300
072	OTHER AIRCRAFT	6,948				6,948
073	MQ–1 MODS	9,734				9,734

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
074	MQ–9 MODS		102,970				102,970
076	RQ–4 GSRA/CSRA MODS		30,000				30,000
077	CV–22 MODS		23,310				23,310
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
078	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		463,285	25	176,000	25	639,285
	F100–229 spare engine shortfall			[25]	[165,000]		
	MQ–9 spares				[11,000]		
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
079	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		49,140				49,140
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
081	B–1		3,683				3,683
083	B–2A		43,786				43,786
084	B–52		7,000				7,000
087	C–17A		81,952				81,952
089	C–135		8,597				8,597
090	F–15		2,403				2,403
091	F–16		3,455				3,455
092	F–22A		5,911				5,911
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
094	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		21,148				21,148
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
095	WAR CONSUMABLES		94,947				94,947
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
096	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		1,242,004				1,242,004
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
101A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		75,845		–8,300		67,545

	Program Decrease				[–8,300]		
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**97**	**11,398,901**	**39**	**310,200**	**136**	**11,709,101**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		39,104				39,104
	TACTICAL						
002	JASSM	183	291,151			183	291,151
003	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	225	119,904			225	119,904
004	AMRAAM	199	340,015			199	340,015
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	413	48,548			413	48,548
006	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	144	42,347			144	42,347
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
007	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		752				752
	CLASS IV						
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS		21,635				21,635
010	AGM–65D MAVERICK		276				276
011	AGM–88A HARM		580				580
012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		6,888				6,888
013	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		5,000				5,000
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		72,080		–703		71,377
	Spares and repair parts related to New START treaty implementation				[–703]		
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
015	ADVANCED EHF		379,586				379,586
016	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		38,398				38,398
017	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	2	403,431			2	403,431
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		74,167				74,167
019	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		5,244				5,244
020	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		55,997				55,997
021	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		95,673				95,673
022	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	5	1,852,900			5	1,852,900

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
023	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)		583,192				583,192
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
029	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		36,716				36,716
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
029A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		829,702				829,702
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**1,171**	**5,343,286**		**–703**	**1,171**	**5,342,583**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS		15,735				15,735
	CARTRIDGES						
002	CARTRIDGES		129,921				129,921
	BOMBS						
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		30,840				30,840
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		187,397				187,397
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	6,965	188,510			6,965	188,510
	OTHER ITEMS						
006	CAD/PAD		35,837				35,837
007	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		7,531				7,531
008	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		499				499
009	MODIFICATIONS		480				480
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,765				9,765
	FLARES						
011	FLARES		55,864				55,864
	FUZES						
013	FUZES		76,037				76,037

	SMALL ARMS				
014	SMALL ARMS		21,026		21,026
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**6,965**	**759,442**	**6,965**	**759,442**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES				
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,048		2,048
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES				
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		8,019		8,019
003	CAP VEHICLES		946		946
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,138		7,138
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES				
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		13,093		13,093
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		13,983		13,983
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT				
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		23,794		23,794
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		8,669		8,669
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT				
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP		6,144		6,144
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,580		1,580
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)				
012	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		149,661		149,661
013	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		726		726
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS				
014	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,789		2,789
015	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		31,875		31,875
016	ADVANCE TECH SENSORS		452		452
017	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		14,203		14,203
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS				
018	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		46,232		46,232
019	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		11,685		11,685

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
020	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED		19,248				19,248
021	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS		19,292				19,292
022	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		17,166				17,166
023	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		22,723				22,723
024	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		27,930				27,930
025	TAC SIGNIT SPT		217				217
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		49,627				49,627
028	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		13,559				13,559
029	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		11,186				11,186
030	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		43,238				43,238
031	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		10,431				10,431
032	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		13,769				13,769
033	GCSS-AF FOS		19,138				19,138
034	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		8,809				8,809
035	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		26,935				26,935
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
036	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS		80,558				80,558
038	AFNET		97,588				97,588
039	VOICE SYSTEMS		8,419				8,419
040	USCENTCOM		34,276				34,276
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
041	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		28,235				28,235
042	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		2,061				2,061
043	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		4,415				4,415
044	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE		30,237				30,237

045	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	98,062	98,062
046	MILSATCOM SPACE	105,935	105,935
047	SPACE MODS SPACE	37,861	37,861
048	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	7,171	7,171
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
049	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	83,537	83,537
050	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER	11,884	11,884
051	RADIO EQUIPMENT	14,711	14,711
052	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	10,275	10,275
053	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	50,907	50,907
	MODIFICATIONS		
054	COMM ELECT MODS	55,701	55,701
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
055	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	14,524	14,524
056	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	28,655	28,655
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ		
057	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	9,332	9,332
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
058	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	16,762	16,762
059	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	33,768	33,768
060	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	2,495	2,495
061	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	12,859	12,859
062	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,954	1,954
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
064	DARP RC135	24,528	24,528
065	DCGS-AF	137,819	137,819
067	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	479,586	479,586
068	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	45,159	45,159
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
068A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,519,256	14,519,256
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
069	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	25,746	25,746

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**16,760,581**				**16,760,581**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD						
038	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		37,345				37,345
039	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		16,678				16,678
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
037	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		14,363				14,363
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
041	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		35,259				35,259
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
008	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		16,189				16,189
011	TELEPORT PROGRAM		66,075				66,075
012	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		83,881				83,881
013	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		2,572				2,572
014	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		125,557				125,557
016	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		16,941				16,941
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
017	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		13,137				13,137
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
021	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,020				5,020
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
001	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,291				1,291
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
040	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		14,792				14,792
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						

025	THAAD	36	581,005		36	581,005
026	AEGIS BMD	52	580,814		52	580,814
027	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS		62,000			62,000
028	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III	1	131,400		1	131,400
030	IRON DOME	1	220,309		1	220,309
032	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			107,000		107,000
	Advanced Procurement of 14 GBIs, beginning with booster motor sets			[107,000]		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA					
003	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		47,201			47,201
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY					
022	VEHICLES	2	100		2	100
023	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	13,395		3	13,395
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY					
020	EQUIPMENT		978			978
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA					
019	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,454			1,454
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA					
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,711			5,711
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT					
018	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	5	15,414		5	15,414
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
041A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		544,272			544,272
	AVIATION PROGRAMS					
043	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		112,456			112,456
044	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		81,457			81,457
045	NON-STANDARD AVIATION		2,650			2,650
046	U–28		56,208			56,208
047	MH–47 CHINOOK		19,766			19,766
048	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		850			850
049	CV–22 MODIFICATION	3	98,927		3	98,927
050	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		20,576			20,576
051	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		1,893			1,893

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
053	STUASL0		13,166				13,166
054	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE		107,687				107,687
055	AC/MC–130J		51,870				51,870
057	C–130 MODIFICATIONS		71,940				71,940
	SHIPBUILDING						
059	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		37,439				37,439
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
061	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M		159,029				159,029
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
064	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		79,819				79,819
066	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		14,906				14,906
068	OTHER ITEMS <$5M		81,711				81,711
069	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		35,053				35,053
072	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		41,526				41,526
073	TACTICAL VEHICLES		43,353				43,353
074	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M		210,540				210,540
076	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		20,000				20,000
080	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		6,645				6,645
081	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		25,581				25,581
087	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		191,061				191,061
	CBDP						
089	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		14,271				14,271
090	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		101,667				101,667
092	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)		13,447				13,447
093	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		20,896				20,896
094	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		144,540				144,540

	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**103**	**4,534,083**		**107,000**	**103**	**4,641,083**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		98,800		–98,800		0
	Program reduction				[–98,800]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**98,800**		**–98,800**		**0**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**229,104**	**98,227,168**	**–1,327**	**1,439,003**	**227,777**	**99,666,171**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
001A	SATURN ARCH (MIP)	4	48,000			4	48,000
003	MQ–1 UAV	4	31,988			4	31,988
	ROTARY						
008	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	4	142,000			4	142,000
010	KIOWA WARRIOR WRA	14	163,800			14	163,800
013	CH–47 HELICOPTER	10	386,000			10	386,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**36**	**771,788**			**36**	**771,788**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
002	MSE MISSILE				25,887		25,887
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.				[25,887]		
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
003	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	550	54,000			550	54,000
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
007	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	383	39,045			383	39,045
009A	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS)—SYS SUM	38	35,600			38	35,600
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**971**	**128,645**		**25,887**	**971**	**154,532**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						

033	M16 RIFLE MODS			15,422		15,422
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[15,422]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY			**15,422**		**15,422**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY					
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION					
002	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		4,400			4,400
004	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		1,500			1,500
005	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		5,000	5,000		10,000
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[5,000]		
008	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		60,000			60,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION					
010	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		5,000			5,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION					
014	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		10,000	20,000		30,000
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[20,000]		
015	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		10,000			10,000
016	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	120	11,000		120	11,000
	MINES					
018	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES			9,482		9,482
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[9,482]		
	ROCKETS					
021	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		57,000			57,000
	OTHER AMMUNITION					
022	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		4,000			4,000
023	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		3,000			3,000
024	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		8,000			8,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
028	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,000				2,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**120**	**180,900**		**34,482**	**120**	**215,382**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
003	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)				2,500		2,500
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.				[2,500]		
005	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)				2,050		2,050
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.				[2,050]		
013	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		321,040		241,556		562,596
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.				[241,556]		
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
060	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		25,000				25,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
067	DCGS-A (MIP)		7,200				7,200
071	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		5,980				5,980
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
074	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	67	57,800		25,455	67	83,255
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.				[25,455]		
078	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE		15,300				15,300
079	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		4,221				4,221
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						

091	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	34	1,834		34	1,834
093	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)			8,400		8,400
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[8,400]		
096	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	137	21,000		137	21,000
098	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	4	85,830		4	85,830
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS					
110	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)			3,200		3,200
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[3,200]		
112	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)			5,160		5,160
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[5,160]		
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT					
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)			15,000		15,000
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[15,000]		
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)			24,932		24,932
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[24,932]		
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT					
137	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)			3,565		3,565
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[3,565]		
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
146	FORCE PROVIDER	3	51,654		3	51,654
147	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	18	6,264		18	6,264
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT					
152	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER			2,119		2,119
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.			[2,119]		
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
176	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT				7,000		7,000
	Restoral of funds based on offsets used for April 2013 reprogramming.				[7,000]		
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**263**	**603,123**		**340,937**	**263**	**944,060**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK		417,700				417,700
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		248,886				248,886
	FORCE TRAINING						
003	TRAIN THE FORCE		106,000				106,000
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
004	OPERATIONS		227,414				227,414
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**1,000,000**				**1,000,000**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
011	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	1	29,520			1	29,520
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
026	MQ–8 UAV	1	13,100			1	13,100
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
031	AV–8 SERIES		57,652				57,652
033	F–18 SERIES		35,500				35,500
039	EP–3 SERIES		2,700				2,700
049	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		3,375				3,375

054	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		49,183		49,183
055	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		4,190		4,190
059	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		20,700		20,700
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
065	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		24,776		24,776
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**2**	**240,696**	**2**	**240,696**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
	TACTICAL MISSILES				
009	HELLFIRE	270	27,000	270	27,000
009A	LASER MAVERICK	500	58,000	500	58,000
010	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	9	1,500	9	1,500
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**779**	**86,500**	**779**	**86,500**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC				
	NAVY AMMUNITION				
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		11,424		11,424
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		30,332		30,332
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		8,282		8,282
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		31,884		31,884
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		409		409
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		11,976		11,976
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		2,447		2,447
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,692		7,692
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION				
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		13,461		13,461
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		3,310		3,310
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES		6,244		6,244
018	60MM, ALL TYPES		3,368		3,368
019	81MM, ALL TYPES		9,162		9,162
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		10,266		10,266
021	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		1,887		1,887

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		1,611				1,611
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		37,459				37,459
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		970				970
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		418				418
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES		14,219				14,219
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**206,821**				**206,821**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
135	TACTICAL VEHICLES		17,968				17,968
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**17,968**				**17,968**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
010	JAVELIN	180	29,334			180	29,334
011	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		105				105
	OTHER SUPPORT						
013	MODIFICATION KITS		16,081				16,081
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
015	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		16,081				16,081
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
017	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831				2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
018	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		8,170				8,170
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
023	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,700				2,700

026	RQ–11 UAV		2,830		2,830
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
029	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		4,866		4,866
030	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		265		265
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
042	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		114		114
043	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		523		523
044	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		365		365
045	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		2,004		2,004
047	EOD SYSTEMS		42,930		42,930
	GENERAL PROPERTY				
055	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		385		385
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**180**	**129,584**	**180**	**129,584**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT				
032	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		94,050		94,050
	OTHER AIRCRAFT				
052	U–2 MODS		11,300		11,300
059	C–130		1,618		1,618
064	RC–135		2,700		2,700
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
079	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		6,000		6,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**115,668**		**115,668**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	TACTICAL				
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	211	24,200	211	24,200
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**211**	**24,200**	**211**	**24,200**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE				
	ROCKETS				

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
001	ROCKETS		326				326
	CARTRIDGES						
002	CARTRIDGES		17,634				17,634
	BOMBS						
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		37,514				37,514
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,879	84,459			2,879	84,459
	FLARES						
011	FLARES		14,973				14,973
012	FUZES		3,859				3,859
	SMALL ARMS						
014	SMALL ARMS		1,200				1,200
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**2,879**	**159,965**			**2,879**	**159,965**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
022	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		1,800				1,800
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
046	MILSATCOM SPACE		5,695				5,695
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
059	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		60,600				60,600
061	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		68,000				68,000
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
068	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		58,250				58,250
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
068A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,380,501				2,380,501
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**2,574,846**				**2,574,846**

	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE					
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA					
011	TELEPORT PROGRAM		4,760			4,760
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
041A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		78,986			78,986
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS					
060	ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	25	2,841		25	2,841
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
064	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	1	13,300		1	13,300
082	SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	53	8,034		53	8,034
087	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	126	3,354		126	3,354
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**205**	**111,275**		**205**	**111,275**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		15,000	–15,000		0
	Program reduction			[–15,000]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**15,000**	**–15,000**		**0**
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT					
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
999	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT			400,000		400,000
	Program increase			[400,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT			**400,000**		**400,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**5,646**	**6,366,979**	**801,728**	**5,646**	**7,168,707**

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	21,803		21,803
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	221,901		221,901
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	79,359		79,359
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	113,662		113,662
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**436,725**		**436,725**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	26,585		26,585
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	43,170		43,170
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	36,293		36,293
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	55,615		55,615
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,585		17,585
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	51,528		51,528
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	26,162		26,162
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	24,063		24,063
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	64,589		64,589

014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	68,300	68,300
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	4,490	4,490
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,818	7,818
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	37,798	37,798
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	59,021	59,021
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	43,426	43,426
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	20,574	20,574
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	21,339	21,339
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,316	20,316
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	34,209	34,209
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	10,439	10,439
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	70,064	70,064
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	17,654	17,654
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	31,546	31,546
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	93,340	93,340
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**885,924**	**885,924**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	56,056	56,056
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	62,032	62,032
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	81,080	81,080
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	63,919	63,919
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	97,043	97,043
034	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,866	5,866
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	7,800	7,800
036	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	40,416	40,416
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	9,166	9,166
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	13,627	13,627
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	10,667	10,667
041	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,054	15,054
042	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	3,194	3,194
043	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,367	2,367

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
044	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	25,348		25,348
045	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,009		64,009
046	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	11,083		11,083
047	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	180,662		180,662
048	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	22,806		22,806
049	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,030		5,030
050	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	36,407		36,407
051	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	11,745		11,745
052	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,717		23,717
053	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	33,012		33,012
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**882,106**		**882,106**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
054	0603305A	ARMY MISSLE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	15,301		15,301
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	13,592		13,592
056	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	10,625		10,625
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,612		30,612
059	0603653A	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	49,989		49,989
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	6,703		6,703
061	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	6,894		6,894
062	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	9,066		9,066
063	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	2,633		2,633
064	0603782A	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL—DEM/VAL	272,384		272,384
065	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,874		3,874
066	0603801A	AVIATION—ADV DEV	5,018		5,018
067	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	11,556		11,556
069	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	15,603		15,603

070	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	14,159		14,159
071	0603850A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	79		79
072	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	55,605		55,605
074	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2–INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	79,232		79,232
075	0604785A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE (BUDGET ACTIVITY 4)	4,476		4,476
076	0305205A	ENDURANCE UAVS	28,991	–28,000	991
		LEMV program reduction		[–28,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**636,392**	**–28,000**	**608,392**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
077	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	76,588		76,588
078	0604220A	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS	73,309		73,309
079	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	154,621		154,621
080	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	31,826		31,826
081	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	23,341		23,341
082	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	4,839		4,839
083	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	23,841		23,841
084	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	79,855	11,000	90,855
		Transfer from WTCV line 15—XM25 development		[11,000]	
085	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,140		2,140
086	0604611A	JAVELIN	5,002		5,002
087	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	21,321		21,321
088	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	514		514
093	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	43,405		43,405
094	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,939		1,939
095	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	18,980		18,980
097	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	18,294		18,294
098	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,013		17,013
099	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	6,701		6,701
100	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	14,575		14,575
101	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	27,634		27,634
102	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	193,748		193,748

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
103	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	15,721		15,721
104	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	41,703		41,703
105	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	7,379		7,379
106	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	39,468		39,468
107	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	92,285		92,285
108	0604814A	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS—EMD	8,209		8,209
109	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	22,958		22,958
110	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	1,549		1,549
111	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	17,342		17,342
112	0604823A	FIREFINDER	47,221		47,221
113	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	48,477		48,477
114	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	80,613		80,613
117	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	68,814		68,814
118	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	137,290		137,290
119	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	116,298		116,298
120	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	68,148		68,148
121	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	33,219		33,219
122	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	15,127		15,127
124	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	68,843		68,843
125	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	364,649		364,649
126	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	592,201		592,201
127	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	10,382		10,382
128	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	21,143		21,143
129	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	84,230		84,230
130	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	3,465		3,465
131	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	10,806		10,806
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**2,857,026**	**11,000**	**2,868,026**

		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
132	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	16,934		16,934
133	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,488		13,488
134	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	46,672		46,672
135	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	11,919		11,919
136	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	193,658		193,658
137	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	37,158		37,158
139	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	340,659		340,659
140	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	66,061		66,061
141	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	43,280		43,280
143	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	6,025		6,025
144	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,349		7,349
145	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	19,809		19,809
146	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	5,941		5,941
147	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	55,504		55,504
148	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	65,274		65,274
149	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	1,283		1,283
150	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	82,035		82,035
151	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	33,853		33,853
152	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	53,340		53,340
153	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	5,193		5,193
154	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	54,175		54,175
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,159,610**		**1,159,610**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
156	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	110,576		110,576
157	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	3,717		3,717
159	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	70,053		70,053
160	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	98,450	–30,000	68,450
		JLENS program reduction		[–30,000]	
161	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	30,940		30,940

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
162	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	177,532		177,532
163	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	36,495		36,495
164	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	257,187		257,187
165	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	315		315
166	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	6,186		6,186
167	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,578		1,578
168	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	62,100		62,100
169	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	18,778		18,778
170	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	7,108		7,108
173	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	7,600		7,600
174	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	9,357		9,357
175	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	41,225		41,225
176	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	18,197		18,197
177	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	14,215		14,215
179	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	33,533		33,533
180	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	27,622		27,622
181	0305219A	MQ–1C GRAY EAGLE UAS	10,901		10,901
182	0305232A	RQ–11 UAV	2,321		2,321
183	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	12,031		12,031
185	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	12,449		12,449
186	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	56,136		56,136
186A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,717		4,717
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,131,319**	**–30,000**	**1,101,319**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**7,989,102**	**–47,000**	**7,942,102**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			

		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	112,617	10,000	122,617
		Program increase		[10,000]	
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,230		18,230
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	484,459		484,459
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**615,306**	**10,000**	**625,306**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	104,513		104,513
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	145,307		145,307
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	47,334		47,334
007	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	34,163		34,163
008	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	49,689		49,689
009	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	97,701		97,701
010	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,685	18,000	63,685
		AGOR mid life refit		[18,000]	
011	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,060		6,060
012	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	103,050		103,050
013	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	169,710		169,710
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	31,326		31,326
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**834,538**	**18,000**	**852,538**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,201		48,201
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,328		28,328
019	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	56,179		56,179
020	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	132,400		132,400
021	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,854		11,854
022	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	247,931		247,931
023	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,760		4,760
025	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	51,463		51,463
026	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,000		2,000

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**583,116**		**583,116**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
027	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	42,246		42,246
028	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,591		5,591
029	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,262		3,262
030	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	74		74
031	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,964		7,964
032	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,257		5,257
033	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,570		1,570
034	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	168,040		168,040
035	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	88,649		88,649
036	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	83,902		83,902
037	0603525N	PILOT FISH	108,713		108,713
038	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	9,316		9,316
039	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	77,108		77,108
040	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	762		762
041	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	2,349		2,349
042	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	852,977	22,000	874,977
		Unmanned Underwater Vehicle Development		[22,000]	
043	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	8,764		8,764
044	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	20,501		20,501
045	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	27,052		27,052
046	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	428,933		428,933
047	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	27,154		27,154
048	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	519,140		519,140
049	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	406,389		406,389

050	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	36,570		36,570
051	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	8,404		8,404
052	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	136,967		136,967
053	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,489		1,489
054	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	38,422		38,422
055	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	69,312		69,312
056	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	9,196		9,196
057	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	18,850		18,850
058	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	45,618		45,618
059	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	3,019		3,019
060	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	144,951		144,951
061	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	5,797		5,797
062	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	308,131		308,131
063	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	195,189		195,189
064	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	56,358		56,358
065	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	55,378		55,378
066	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	48,842		48,842
067	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	7,509		7,509
068	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	5,075		5,075
069	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	51,178		51,178
070	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	205,615		205,615
072	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	37,227		37,227
073	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	169		169
074	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	20,874	–10,000	10,874
		Schedule delay		[–10,000]	
075	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	2,257		2,257
076	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	38,327		38,327
077	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	135,985		135,985
078	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	50,362		50,362
079	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	8,448		8,448
080	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	153		153
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,641,385**	**12,000**	**4,653,385**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
081	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	40,558		40,558
082	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	35,825		35,825
083	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	99,891		99,891
084	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	17,565		17,565
085	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,026		4,026
086	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,791		1,791
087	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	11,725		11,725
088	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	68,463		68,463
089	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	152,041		152,041
090	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	47,123		47,123
091	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	30,208		30,208
092	0604262N	V–22A	43,084		43,084
093	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	11,401		11,401
094	0604269N	EA–18	11,138		11,138
095	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	34,964		34,964
096	0604273N	VH–71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	94,238		94,238
097	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	257,796		257,796
098	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	3,302		3,302
099	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	240,298		240,298
100	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	1,214		1,214
101	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	46,007		46,007
102	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	75,592		75,592
103	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	117,854		117,854
104	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	10,080		10,080
105	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	21,413		21,413

106	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM	146,683	146,683
107	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	275,871	275,871
108	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	89,672	89,672
109	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	13,754	13,754
110	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	69,615	69,615
112	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	121,566	121,566
113	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	49,143	49,143
114	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	155,254	155,254
115	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,689	3,689
116	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	5,041	5,041
117	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	26,444	26,444
118	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,897	8,897
119	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	6,233	6,233
120	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	442	442
121	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	130,360	130,360
122	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	50,209	50,209
123	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	164,799	164,799
124	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	1,984	1,984
125	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	9,458	9,458
126	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	51,430	51,430
127	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	512,631	512,631
128	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	534,187	534,187
129	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	5,564	5,564
130	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	69,659	69,659
132	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	503,180	503,180
133	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	5,500	5,500
134	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	317,358	317,358
135	0204202N	DDG–1000	187,910	187,910
136	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	2,140	2,140
137	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	9,406	9,406
138	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	22,800	22,800
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,028,476**	**5,028,476**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
139	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	43,261		43,261
140	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	71,872		71,872
141	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	38,033		38,033
142	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	1,352		1,352
143	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	5,566		5,566
144	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	48,345		48,345
146	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	637		637
147	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	76,585		76,585
148	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,221		3,221
149	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	72,725		72,725
150	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	141,778		141,778
151	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	331,219		331,219
152	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,565		16,565
153	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,265		3,265
154	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	7,134		7,134
155	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	24,082		24,082
156	0305885N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	497		497
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**886,137**		**886,137**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
159	0604227N	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	699		699
160	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT	20,961	20,000	40,961
		X–47B Aerial Refueling Test & Evaluation		[20,000]	
162	0604766M	MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS	35		35
163	0605525N	CARRIER ONBOARD DELIVERY (COD) FOLLOW ON	2,460		2,460

164	0605555N	STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT	9,757		9,757
165	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	98,057	23,900	121,957
		Reentry System Applications and Strategic Guidance Applications		[23,900]	
166	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	31,768		31,768
167	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,464		1,464
168	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	21,729		21,729
169	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	13,561		13,561
170	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	131,118		131,118
171	0204152N	E–2 SQUADRONS	1,971		1,971
172	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	46,155		46,155
173	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	2,374		2,374
174	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	12,407		12,407
175	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	41,609		41,609
176	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	7,240		7,240
177	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	78,208		78,208
178	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	45,124		45,124
179	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	2,703		2,703
180	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	19,563		19,563
181	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	13,586		13,586
182	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	197,538		197,538
183	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	31,863		31,863
184	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	12,806		12,806
185	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	88,607		88,607
187	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	116,928		116,928
188	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	178,753		178,753
189	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	139,594	–25,800	113,794
		Marine personnel carrier—funding ahead of need		[–20,800]	
		Precision extended range munition program reduction		[–5,000]	
190	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	42,647		42,647
191	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	34,394		34,394
192	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	39,159		39,159
193	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,613		2,613

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
194	0208058N	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	986		986
199	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	66,231		66,231
200	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	24,476		24,476
201	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,531		23,531
206	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	742		742
207	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	4,804		4,804
208	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,381		8,381
211	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,535		5,535
212	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	19,718		19,718
213	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	375,235		375,235
214	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	48,713		48,713
215	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	102		102
216	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	710		710
217	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	5,013		5,013
219	0305239M	RQ–21A	11,122		11,122
220	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	28,851		28,851
221	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	5,116		5,116
222	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	28,042		28,042
223	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	50,933		50,933
224	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,998		4,998
224A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,185,132		1,185,132
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,385,822**	**18,100**	**3,403,922**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**15,974,780**	**58,100**	**16,032,880**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			

001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	373,151		373,151
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	138,333		138,333
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,286		13,286
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**524,770**		**524,770**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	116,846		116,846
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	119,672		119,672
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	89,483		89,483
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	197,546		197,546
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	127,539		127,539
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	104,063		104,063
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	81,521		81,521
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	112,845		112,845
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	138,161		138,161
013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	40,217		40,217
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,127,893**		**1,127,893**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	39,572	10,000	49,572
		Program increase		[10,000]	
015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	12,800		12,800
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	30,579		30,579
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	77,347		77,347
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	149,321		149,321
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	49,128		49,128
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	68,071		68,071
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	26,299		26,299
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	20,967		20,967
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	33,996		33,996
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,000		19,000
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	41,353		41,353

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	49,093		49,093
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**617,526**	**10,000**	**627,526**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
028	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,983		3,983
029	0603287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,874		3,874
032	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	27,024		27,024
033	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	15,899		15,899
034	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,568		4,568
035	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	379		379
036	0603830F	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP)	28,764		28,764
038	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	86,737		86,737
040	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL	953		953
042	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	379,437		379,437
044	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,606		2,606
045	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	103		103
047	0604337F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,018		16,018
049	0604458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER	58,861		58,861
050	0604618F	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,500		2,500
051	0604635F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	21,175		21,175
053	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	13,636		13,636
054	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	2,799		2,799
055	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	70,160		70,160
056	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	137,233		137,233
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**876,709**		**876,709**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			

058	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	977		977
061	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	3,601		3,601
062	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,971		1,971
064	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	51,456		51,456
065	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	50		50
066	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	115,000		115,000
067	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	23,930		23,930
068	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	400,258		400,258
069	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	4,575		4,575
070	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	352,532	20,000	372,532
		Space Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS) Data Exploitation		[20,000]	
071	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	16,284		16,284
072	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,564		2,564
073	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	17,036		17,036
074	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	7,273		7,273
075	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	33,200		33,200
078	0604800F	F–35—EMD	816,335		816,335
079	0604851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—EMD	145,442		145,442
080	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	27,963		27,963
081	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	5,000		5,000
082	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	129,411		129,411
083	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	131,100		131,100
084	0605221F	KC–46	1,558,590		1,558,590
085	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	393,558		393,558
086	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	6,242		6,242
087	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	272,872		272,872
088	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	124,805		124,805
089	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	13,948		13,948
090	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	303,500		303,500
091	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	67,874		67,874
094	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	4,663		4,663
097	0401318F	CV–22	46,705		46,705

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,078,715**	**20,000**	**5,098,715**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
099	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	17,690		17,690
100	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	34,841		34,841
101	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	32,956		32,956
103	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	13,610		13,610
104	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	742,658		742,658
105	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	14,203		14,203
106	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	13,000		13,000
107	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	44,160		44,160
108	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,643		27,643
109	0606323F	MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE	13,935		13,935
110	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	192,348		192,348
111	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	28,647		28,647
112	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	315		315
114	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,785		3,785
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,179,791**		**1,179,791**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
115	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	383,500		383,500
117	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	5,000		5,000
118	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	90,097		90,097
119	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	32,086		32,086
121	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	24,007		24,007
122	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	450		450
123	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	19,589		19,589

124	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	100,194	100,194
125	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	37,448	37,448
128	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,700	1,700
130	0203761F	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND	3,844	3,844
131	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	128,328	128,328
133	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS	9,614	9,614
134	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	177,298	177,298
135	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	244,289	244,289
136	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	13,138	13,138
137	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	328,542	328,542
138	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	33,000	33,000
139	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	15,460	15,460
140	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	84,172	84,172
142	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	2,582	2,582
143	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	542	542
144	0207247F	AF TENCAP	89,816	89,816
145	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,075	1,075
146	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	10,782	10,782
147	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	139,369	139,369
149	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	6,373	6,373
150	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	22,820	22,820
151	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	7,029	7,029
152	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	186,256	186,256
153	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	743	743
156	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	4,471	4,471
158	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	10,250	10,250
159	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,431	1,431
160	0207449F	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	7,329	7,329
161	0207452F	DCAPES	15,081	15,081
162	0207581F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	13,248	13,248
163	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	24,342	24,342
164	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	10,448	10,448

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
165	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,512		5,512
166	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	3,301		3,301
167	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	62,605		62,605
169	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	68,099		68,099
170	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	14,047		14,047
171	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	5,853		5,853
179	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	12,197		12,197
180	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	18,267		18,267
181	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	36,288		36,288
182	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	90,231		90,231
183	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	725		725
185	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	140,170		140,170
187	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	117,110		117,110
190	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,430		4,430
191	0305103F	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,048		2,048
192	0305105F	DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER	288		288
193	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	35,698		35,698
194	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	24,667		24,667
195	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	35,674		35,674
196	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	21,186		21,186
199	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	195		195
200	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	1,430		1,430
201	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	330		330
206	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,696		3,696
207	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,469		2,469
208	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	8,289		8,289
209	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	13,345		13,345

211	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	18,700		18,700
212	0305205F	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	3,000		3,000
213	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	37,828		37,828
214	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,491		13,491
215	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	7,498		7,498
216	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	3,326		3,326
217	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	134,406		134,406
218	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	7,413		7,413
219	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)	40,503		40,503
220	0305238F	NATO AGS	264,134		264,134
221	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	23,016		23,016
222	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	221,276		221,276
223	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	58,523		58,523
224	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	2,218		2,218
226	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	50,547		50,547
227	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	18,807		18,807
229	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,079		1,079
230	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	400	26,000	26,400
		C–130H Propulsion System Propeller Upgrades		[26,000]	
231	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	61,492		61,492
232	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	109,134		109,134
233	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	22,443		22,443
234	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	4,116		4,116
238	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	44,553		44,553
239	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	6,213		6,213
240	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,605		1,605
242	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	95,238		95,238
243	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,925		10,925
244	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	1,347		1,347
245	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	65		65
246	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	1,083		1,083
247	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,577		1,577

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
248	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	5,990		5,990
249	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	786		786
250	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	654		654
251	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	135,735		135,735
252A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,874,528	20,000	11,894,528
		Program Increase		[20,000]	
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**16,297,542**	**46,000**	**16,343,542**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**25,702,946**	**76,000**	**25,778,946**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	45,837		45,837
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	315,033		315,033
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	11,171		11,171
004	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	49,500		49,500
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	84,271	5,000	89,271
		Restore PK–12 funding		[5,000]	
006	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	30,895	5,000	35,895
		Program increase		[5,000]	
007	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	51,426		51,426
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**588,133**	**10,000**	**598,133**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
008	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	20,065	–6,500	13,565
		Decrease to insensitive munitions program		[–6,500]	
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	114,790		114,790

011	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	46,875		46,875
013	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	45,000		45,000
014	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	413,260		413,260
015	0602304E	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	16,330		16,330
017	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	24,537		24,537
018	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	227,065	–10,000	217,065
		Program decrease		[–10,000]	
020	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	18,908		18,908
022	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	225,977		225,977
023	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	166,654		166,654
024	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	243,469		243,469
025	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	175,282		175,282
026	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	11,107		11,107
027	1160401BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	29,246		29,246
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,778,565**	**–16,500**	**1,762,065**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
028	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	26,646		26,646
029	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,420	500	19,920
		Program increase for future information operations strategy		[500]	
030	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	77,792		77,792
031	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	274,033		274,033
032	0603175C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	309,203	–70,000	239,203
		Decrease in funding of Common Kill Vehicle Technology Program		[–70,000]	
034	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	19,305		19,305
035	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	7,565		7,565
036	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	40,426		40,426
037	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	149,804		149,804
038	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	172,546		172,546
039	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	170,847		170,847
040	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,009		9,009
041	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	174,428	–7,000	167,428

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Decrease to Strategic Capabilities Office efforts		[–7,000]	
042	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	20,000		20,000
045	0603668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH	19,668		19,668
047	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,041		34,041
048	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	61,971	–8,000	53,971
		Decrease to Strategic Capabilities Office efforts		[–8,000]	
050	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	20,000		20,000
051	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	30,256		30,256
052	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	72,324		72,324
053	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	82,700		82,700
054	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	8,431		8,431
055	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	117,080		117,080
057	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	239,078		239,078
059	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	259,006		259,006
060	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	286,364		286,364
061	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,116		12,116
062	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	19,008		19,008
063	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	78,532		78,532
065	0603828J	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	12,667		12,667
066	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	41,370		41,370
069	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	92,508		92,508
070	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	52,001	8,000	60,001
		Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund		[8,000]	
071	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	52,053		52,053
072	1160402BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	46,809		46,809
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**3,109,007**	**–76,500**	**3,032,507**

		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES			
075	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	63,641		63,641
076	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	19,152		19,152
077	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	70,763		70,763
079	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	17,230		17,230
080	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	71,453		71,453
081	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	268,990		268,990
082	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,033,903	140,400	1,174,303
		Planning and Design (35% to 100% design)		[50,000]	
		RDT&E Ground Systems Development		[70,000]	
		RDT&E Site Activities, including EIS		[20,400]	
082A	0603XXXC	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY AND CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM		70,000	70,000
		Common Kill Vehicle Technology Program		[70,000]	
083	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	196,237		196,237
084	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	315,183		315,183
086	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	377,605		377,605
087	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	286,613		286,613
088	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	937,056		937,056
089	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	44,947		44,947
090	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	6,515		6,515
091	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI	418,355		418,355
092	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	47,419		47,419
093	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	52,131		52,131
094	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	13,864		13,864
095	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	44,478		44,478
096	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	95,782	188,000	283,782
		Development of increased capabilities for Iron Dome		[15,000]	
		Increase Israeli Cooperative Programs		[173,000]	
097	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	375,866		375,866
098	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	495,257		495,257
099	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	11,704		11,704
100	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	9,842		9,842

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
101	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	3,312	10,000	13,312
		Corrosion Prevention, Control, and Mitigation		[10,000]	
102	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	130,000	–105,000	25,000
		Decrease to SCO efforts		[–105,000]	
103	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	8,300		8,300
104	0604445J	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	30,000		30,000
106	0604775D8Z	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM		250,000	250,000
		Rapid Innovation Program		[250,000]	
108	0604787J	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	7,402		7,402
110	0604828J	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	7,506		7,506
111	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	129,374		129,374
112	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	308,522		308,522
115	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,169		3,169
116	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	946		946
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES	**5,902,517**	**553,400**	**6,455,917**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION			
118	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	8,155		8,155
119	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	65,440		65,440
120	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	451,306		451,306
122	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	29,138		29,138
123	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	19,475		19,475
124	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	12,901		12,901
125	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,812		13,812
126	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	386		386
127	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,763		3,763
128	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	6,788		6,788

129	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	27,917		27,917
130	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	22,297		22,297
131	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INTIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	51,689		51,689
132	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	6,184		6,184
133	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	12,083		12,083
134	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	3,302		3,302
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	**734,636**		**734,636**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
135	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	6,393		6,393
136	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	2,479		2,479
137	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	240,213		240,213
138	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	2,127		2,127
139	0604943D8Z	THERMAL VICAR	8,287		8,287
140	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	31,000		31,000
141	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,379		24,379
143	0605117D8Z	FOREIGN MATERIEL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	54,311		54,311
144	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	47,462		47,462
146	0605130D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	12,134		12,134
147	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	44,237		44,237
148	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	5,871		5,871
149	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	5,028		5,028
150	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	6,301		6,301
151	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	6,504		6,504
152	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	92,046		92,046
158	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (S	1,868		1,868
159	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	8,362		8,362
160	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	56,024		56,024
161	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	6,908		6,908
162	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,451	4,000	19,451
		Program increase		[4,000]	
164	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,659		71,659

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
165	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,083		4,083
167	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	5,306		5,306
168	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	2,097		2,097
172	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	8,394		8,394
175	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	7,624		7,624
178	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	43,247		43,247
179	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	37,712		37,712
180	0901598D8W	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS	607		607
181A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	54,914		54,914
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**913,028**	**4,000**	**917,028**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
182	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	7,552		7,552
183	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA	3,270		3,270
184	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	287		287
185	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	14,000		14,000
186	0607310D8Z	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,955		1,955
187	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS)	13,250		13,250
188	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	13,026		13,026
190	0607828J	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	12,652		12,652
191	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,061		3,061
192	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	72,726		72,726
194	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	6,524		6,524
201	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	512		512
202	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	12,867		12,867
203	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	36,565		36,565
204	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	13,144		13,144

205	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	1,060		1,060
206	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	33,279		33,279
207	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	10,673		10,673
208	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	181,567	–2,276	179,291
		Excess to need		[–2,276]	
210	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	34,288		34,288
211	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	7,741		7,741
212	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	3,325		3,325
213	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	1,246		1,246
214	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	5,147		5,147
216	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	17,352		17,352
220	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	3,658		3,658
221	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	9,752		9,752
225	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	3,210		3,210
227	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	21,602		21,602
230	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,195		5,195
233	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,348		3,348
235	0305219BB	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	641		641
238	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,338		2,338
239	0305600D8Z	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES	4,372		4,372
247	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	24,691		24,691
248	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	4,659		4,659
249	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	3,533		3,533
250	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	1,314		1,314
254	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	156,561		156,561
256	1160405BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,705		7,705
257	1160408BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	42,620		42,620
261	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	17,970		17,970
262	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	7,424		7,424
268	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,206		2,206
271	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	18,325		18,325
274	1160489BB	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,304		3,304

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
275	1160490BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	16,021		16,021
275A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,773,704		3,773,704
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**4,641,222**	**–2,276**	**4,638,946**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**17,667,108**	**472,124**	**18,139,232**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	75,720		75,720
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	48,423		48,423
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	62,157		62,157
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**186,300**		**186,300**
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**186,300**		**186,300**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**67,520,236**	**559,224**	**68,079,460**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
087	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	7,000		7,000
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**7,000**		**7,000**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**7,000**		**7,000**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
224A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	34,426		34,426
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**34,426**		**34,426**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**34,426**		**34,426**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
252A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	9,000		9,000
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**9,000**		**9,000**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**9,000**		**9,000**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
275A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	66,208		66,208
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**66,208**		**66,208**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**66,208**		**66,208**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		TOTAL RDT&E	116,634		116,634

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	888,114	208,600	1,096,714
	Missile Defense Deployment to Guam		[13,100]	
	Restore Army OPTEMPO to 90%		[195,500]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	72,624		72,624
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	617,402		617,402
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	602,262		602,262
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,032,484		1,032,484
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,287,462	15,800	1,303,262
	Restore Army Flying Hour Program to 90%		[15,800]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,559,656		3,559,656
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	454,477		454,477
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,481,156		1,481,156
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,278,154		7,278,154
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,754,712	257,000	3,011,712
	Realignment of Arlington National Cemetary operations		[–25,000]	
	Sustainment to 90%		[282,000]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	425,271		425,271
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	185,064		185,064
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	463,270	–6,676	456,594

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Realignment of SOUTHCOM Information Operations		[3,100]	
	Unjustified EUCOM Growth		[–9,776]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**21,102,108**	**474,724**	**21,576,832**
	MOBILIZATION			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	360,240		360,240
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	192,105		192,105
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	7,101		7,101
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**559,446**		**559,446**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	115,992		115,992
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	52,323		52,323
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	43,589		43,589
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	453,745		453,745
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	1,034,495		1,034,495
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,016,876		1,016,876
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	186,565		186,565
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	652,514		652,514
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	485,500		485,500
300	EXAMINING	170,912		170,912
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	251,523		251,523
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	184,422		184,422
330	JUNIOR ROTC	181,105		181,105
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**4,829,561**		**4,829,561**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			

350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	690,089		690,089
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	774,120	5,000	779,120
	Corrosion Prevention, Control, and Mitigation		[5,000]	
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	651,765		651,765
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	453,051		453,051
390	ADMINISTRATION	487,737		487,737
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,563,115		1,563,115
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	326,853		326,853
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	234,364		234,364
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,212,091		1,212,091
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	243,540		243,540
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	241,101		241,101
460	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	226,291		226,291
470	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	426,651	31,200	457,851
	Realignment of NATO Special Operations Headquarters from O&M Defense-wide		[31,200]	
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	27,248	–3,100	24,148
	Realignment of SOUTHCOM Information Operations		[–3,100]	
525	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,023,946		1,023,946
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**8,581,962**	**33,100**	**8,615,062**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
530	UNDISTRIBUTED		–740,300	–740,300
	Average civilian end strength above projection		[–284,300]	
	Unobligated balances		[–456,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–740,300**	**–740,300**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**35,073,077**	**–232,476**	**34,840,601**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,621		1,621
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	24,429		24,429

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	657,099		657,099
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	122,485		122,485
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	584,058		584,058
060	AVIATION ASSETS	79,380		79,380
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	471,616		471,616
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	74,243		74,243
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	70,894		70,894
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	569,801		569,801
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	294,145	29,100	323,245
	Sustainment to 90%		[29,100]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	51,853		51,853
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,001,624**	**29,100**	**3,030,724**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,735		10,735
140	ADMINISTRATION	24,197		24,197
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	10,304		10,304
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	10,319		10,319
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	37,857		37,857
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**93,412**		**93,412**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**3,095,036**	**29,100**	**3,124,136**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	800,880		800,880
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	178,650		178,650

030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	771,503		771,503
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	98,699		98,699
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	38,779		38,779
060	AVIATION ASSETS	922,503		922,503
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	761,056		761,056
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	62,971		62,971
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	233,105		233,105
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,019,059		1,019,059
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	712,139	74,200	786,339
	Sustainment to 90%		[74,200]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	1,013,715		1,013,715
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,613,059**	**74,200**	**6,687,259**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,812		10,812
140	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	1,551		1,551
150	ADMINISTRATION	78,284		78,284
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	46,995		46,995
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	6,390		6,390
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	297,105		297,105
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**441,137**		**441,137**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**7,054,196**	**74,200**	**7,128,396**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,952,522		4,952,522
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,826,404		1,826,404
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	38,639		38,639
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	90,030		90,030
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	362,700		362,700
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	915,881		915,881

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	35,838		35,838
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	379,914	68,500	448,414
	CLS for AVN Logistics		[68,500]	
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,884,836		3,884,836
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	734,852		734,852
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,191,511		5,191,511
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,351,274		1,351,274
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	701,316	–9,594	691,722
	New START treaty implementation, excluding verification and inspection activities		[–9,594]	
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	97,710		97,710
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	172,330		172,330
160	WARFARE TACTICS	454,682		454,682
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	328,406		328,406
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	946,429		946,429
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	142,249	6,000	148,249
	Corrosion Prevention, Control, and Mitigation		[6,000]	
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,603		2,603
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	102,970		102,970
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	199,128		199,128
230	CRUISE MISSILE	92,671		92,671
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,193,188		1,193,188
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	105,985		105,985
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	532,627		532,627
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	304,160		304,160
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	1,011,528		1,011,528
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,996,821	185,200	2,182,021
	Sustainment to 90%		[185,200]	

300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,460,918		4,460,918
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**32,610,122**	**250,106**	**32,860,228**
	MOBILIZATION			
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	331,576		331,576
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,638		6,638
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	222,752		222,752
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	73,310		73,310
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,675		2,675
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	23,794		23,794
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**660,745**		**660,745**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	148,516		148,516
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	9,384		9,384
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	139,876		139,876
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	630,069		630,069
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	9,294		9,294
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	169,082		169,082
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	164,368		164,368
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	241,733	1,100	242,833
	Naval Sea Cadets		[1,100]	
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	139,815		139,815
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	94,632		94,632
470	JUNIOR ROTC	51,373		51,373
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,798,142**	**1,100**	**1,799,242**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	886,088		886,088
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	13,131		13,131
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	115,742		115,742
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	382,150		382,150

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	268,403		268,403
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	317,293		317,293
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	207,128		207,128
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	295,855		295,855
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,140,484		1,140,484
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	52,873		52,873
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	27,587		27,587
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	75,728		75,728
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	543,026		543,026
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,965		4,965
705	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	545,775		545,775
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**4,876,228**		**4,876,228**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
710	UNDISTRIBUTED		–278,200	–278,200
	Average civilian end strength above projection		[–38,500]	
	Unobligated balances		[–239,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–278,200**	**–278,200**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**39,945,237**	**–26,994**	**39,918,243**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	837,012	65,000	902,012
	Crisis Response Force		[30,000]	
	Marine Security Guard		[35,000]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	894,555	4,000	898,555

	Corrosion Prevention, Control, and Mitigation		[4,000]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	223,337	–2,000	221,337
	Unjustified Growth HUMVEE Modifications		[–2,000]	
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	97,878		97,878
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	774,619	7,100	781,719
	Sustainment to 90%		[7,100]	
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,166,661		2,166,661
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,994,062**	**74,100**	**5,068,162**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	17,693		17,693
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	896		896
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	100,806		100,806
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	46,928		46,928
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	356,426		356,426
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	179,747		179,747
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	52,255		52,255
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,138		23,138
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**777,889**		**777,889**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	43,816		43,816
160	ADMINISTRATION	305,107		305,107
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	87,500		87,500
185	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	46,276		46,276
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**482,699**		**482,699**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		–50,000	–50,000
	Unobligated balances		[–50,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–50,000**	**–50,000**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**6,254,650**	**24,100**	**6,278,750**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	586,620		586,620
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	7,008		7,008
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	100,657		100,657
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	305		305
060	AVIATION LOGISTICS	3,927		3,927
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	75,933		75,933
080	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	601		601
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	44,364		44,364
100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,477		15,477
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	115,608		115,608
120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	1,967		1,967
130	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	43,726		43,726
140	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	69,011	5,000	74,011
	Sustainment to 90%		[5,000]	
150	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	109,604		109,604
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,174,808**	**5,000**	**1,179,808**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
160	ADMINISTRATION	2,905		2,905
170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	14,425		14,425
180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,485		2,485
190	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,129		3,129
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**22,944**		**22,944**

	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**1,197,752**	**5,000**	**1,202,752**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	96,244		96,244
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	17,581	1,500	19,081
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[1,500]	
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	32,438	300	32,738
	Sustainment to 90%		[300]	
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	95,259		95,259
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**241,522**	**1,800**	**243,322**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	894		894
060	ADMINISTRATION	11,743		11,743
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,158		9,158
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**21,795**		**21,795**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**263,317**	**1,800**	**265,117**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,295,814		3,295,814
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,875,095		1,875,095
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,559,109		1,559,109
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,956,304	5,000	5,961,304
	Corrosion Prevention, Control, and Mitigation		[5,000]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,834,424	390,030	2,224,454
	Restoration, Modernization, and Demolition project shortfalls		[170,530]	
	Sustainment to 90%		[219,500]	
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,779,811		2,779,811

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	913,841		913,841
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	916,837		916,837
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	720,349		720,349
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	305,275		305,275
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	433,658		433,658
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	1,146,016	1,100	1,147,116
	NORTHCOM VOICE program		[1,100]	
140	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	231,830		231,830
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**21,968,363**	**396,130**	**22,364,493**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,015,902		2,015,902
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	147,216		147,216
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,556,232		1,556,232
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	167,402		167,402
190	BASE SUPPORT	707,040		707,040
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**4,593,792**		**4,593,792**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	102,334		102,334
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	17,733		17,733
220	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	94,600		94,600
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	217,011		217,011
240	BASE SUPPORT	800,327		800,327
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	399,364		399,364
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	792,275		792,275
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	248,958		248,958

280	TRAINING SUPPORT	106,741		106,741
290	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	319,331		319,331
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	122,736		122,736
310	EXAMINING	3,679		3,679
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	137,255		137,255
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	176,153		176,153
340	JUNIOR ROTC	67,018		67,018
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,605,515**		**3,605,515**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,103,684		1,103,684
360	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	919,923		919,923
370	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	56,601	–4,000	52,601
	Heavy bomber eliminations related to New START treaty implementation		[–400]	
	ICBM reductions related to New START implementation		[–3,600]	
380	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	281,061		281,061
390	BASE SUPPORT	1,203,305		1,203,305
400	ADMINISTRATION	593,865		593,865
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	574,609		574,609
420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,028,600	–15,400	1,013,200
	De-MIRVing ICBMs related to New START treaty implementation		[–700]	
	ICBM eliminations and Environmental Impact Study related to New START treaty implementation		[–14,700]	
430	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,720		24,720
460	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	89,008		89,008
465	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,227,796	–4,800	1,222,996
	Classified Adjustment		[–4,800]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**7,103,172**	**–24,200**	**7,078,972**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
470	UNDISTRIBUTED		–205,100	–205,100
	Average civilian end strength above projection		[–18,700]	
	Unobligated balances		[–186,400]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–205,100**	**–205,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**37,270,842**	**166,830**	**37,437,672**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,857,951		1,857,951
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	224,462		224,462
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	521,182		521,182
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	89,704	9,100	98,804
	Sustainment to 90%		[9,100]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	360,836		360,836
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,054,135**	**9,100**	**3,063,235**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	64,362		64,362
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	15,056		15,056
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	23,617		23,617
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,618		6,618
100	AUDIOVISUAL	819		819
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**110,472**		**110,472**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**3,164,607**	**9,100**	**3,173,707**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,371,871		3,371,871

020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	720,305		720,305
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,514,870		1,514,870
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	296,953	26,900	323,853
	Sustainment to 90%		[26,900]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	597,303		597,303
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,501,302**	**26,900**	**6,528,202**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	32,117		32,117
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	32,585		32,585
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	**64,702**		**64,702**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,566,004**	**26,900**	**6,592,904**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	472,239		472,239
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	5,261,463	–30,752	5,230,711
	AFSOC Flying Hour Program		[70,100]	
	International SOF Information Sharing System		[–7,017]	
	Ongoing baseline contingency operations		[–35,519]	
	Pilot program for SOF family members		[5,000]	
	Preserve the force and families—human performance program		[–16,605]	
	Preserve the force and families—resiliency		[–8,786]	
	Realignment of NATO Special Operations Headquarters to O&M, Army		[–31,200]	
	Regional SOF Coordination Centers		[–14,725]	
	SOCOM National Capitol Region		[–10,000]	
	USASOC Flying Hour Program		[18,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,733,702**	**–30,752**	**5,702,950**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
040	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	157,397		157,397

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
050	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	84,899		84,899
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**242,296**		**242,296**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	144,443	21,000	165,443
	STARBASE		[21,000]	
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	612,207		612,207
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,378,606		1,378,606
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	763,091		763,091
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,326,243		1,326,243
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	29,933		29,933
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	462,545		462,545
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	222,979		222,979
170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	21,594		21,594
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	788,389		788,389
190	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	546,603		546,603
210	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	35,151		35,151
220	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	438,033		438,033
240	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,713,756		2,713,756
250	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	256,201		256,201
270	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	371,615	–153,900	217,715
	Program reduction		[–153,900]	
280	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	2,010,176	–17,500	1,992,676
	BRAC 2015 Initiative		[–8,000]	
	Combatant Commanders Exercise Engagement Training Transformation		[90,500]	
	Procurement Technical Assistance Program—Enhanced Business Support		[10,000]	
	Realignment to Building Partnership Capacity authories		[–35,000]	

	Reduction to Building Partnership Capacity authories		[–75,000]	
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	616,572		616,572
295	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,283,558	4,090	14,287,648
	Classified adjustment		[4,090]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**27,021,695**	**–146,310**	**26,875,385**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
305	UNDISTRIBUTED		–320,000	–320,000
	Section 514. Study of Reserve Component General and Flag Officers		[3,000]	
	Section 551. Department of Defense Recognition of Spouses of Members of Armed Forces who Serve in Combat Zones		[5,000]	
	Section 571 .DOD Supplementary Impact Aid		[25,000]	
	Section 621. Expand the victims transitional compensation benefit		[10,000]	
	Unobligated balances		[–363,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–320,000**	**–320,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**32,997,693**	**–497,062**	**32,500,631**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
050	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	109,500		109,500
060	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	528,455		528,455
080	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	256,031		256,031
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	298,815		298,815
160	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000	–5,000	
	Program reduction		[–5,000]	
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,197,801**	**–5,000**	**1,192,801**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
100	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	316,103		316,103
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**316,103**		**316,103**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
110	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	439,820		439,820
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**439,820**		**439,820**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
040	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,606	–980	12,626
	Unjustified Growth		[–980]	
120	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	10,757		10,757
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**24,363**	**–980**	**23,383**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
130	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	237,443		237,443
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**237,443**		**237,443**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,215,530**	**–5,980**	**2,209,550**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**175,097,941**	**–425,482**	**174,672,459**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	217,571	30,000	247,571
	Missile Defense Deployment—Other		[15,000]	
	Missile Defense Deployment to Turkey		[15,000]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	8,266		8,266
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	56,626		56,626
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	4,209,942		4,209,942
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	950,567		950,567
060	AVIATION ASSETS	474,288		474,288
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,349,152		1,349,152
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	655,000		655,000
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	301,563	495,000	796,563
	Restore High Priority Depot Maintenance		[495,000]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	706,214		706,214
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	11,519,498		11,519,498
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	60,000		60,000
160	RESET	2,240,358	1,500,000	3,740,358
	Restore Critical Army Reset		[1,500,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**22,749,045**	**2,025,000**	**24,774,045**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	4,601,356		4,601,356
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	17,418		17,418

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	110,000		110,000
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	94,820		94,820
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	54,000		54,000
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	250,000		250,000
525	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,402,994		1,402,994
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**6,530,588**		**6,530,588**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
530	UNDISTRIBUTED		91,100	91,100
	Increase to support higher fuel rates		[91,100]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**91,100**	**91,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**29,279,633**	**2,116,100**	**31,395,733**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	6,995		6,995
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,332		2,332
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	608		608
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE		75,800	75,800
	Restore High Priority Depot Maintenance		[75,800]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,000		33,000
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**42,935**	**75,800**	**118,735**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**42,935**	**75,800**	**118,735**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			

	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	29,314	29,314
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	1,494	1,494
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	15,343	15,343
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,549	1,549
060	AVIATION ASSETS	64,504	64,504
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	31,512	31,512
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	42,179	42,179
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	11,996	11,996
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**197,891**	**197,891**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,480	1,480
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**1,480**	**1,480**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**199,371**	**199,371**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND		
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE		
010	SUSTAINMENT	2,735,603	2,735,603
020	INFRASTRUCTURE	278,650	278,650
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	2,180,382	2,180,382
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	626,550	626,550
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**5,821,185**	**5,821,185**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR		
060	SUSTAINMENT	1,214,995	1,214,995
080	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	54,696	54,696
090	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	626,119	626,119
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**1,895,810**	**1,895,810**
	DETAINEE OPS		

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
110	SUSTAINMENT	7,225		7,225
140	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	2,500		2,500
	SUBTOTAL DETAINEE OPS	**9,725**		**9,725**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**7,726,720**		**7,726,720**
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
010	POWER	279,000		279,000
	SUBTOTAL AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND	**279,000**		**279,000**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND	**279,000**		**279,000**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	845,169		845,169
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	600		600
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	17,489		17,489
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	78,491		78,491
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	162,420	40,000	202,420
	Restore critical depot maintenance		[40,000]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,700		2,700
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	50,130		50,130
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	949,539	11,400	960,939
	Spares		[11,400]	
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	20,226		20,226
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,679,660	164,000	1,843,660

	Program increase		[164,000]	
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT		126,000	126,000
	Program increase		[126,000]	
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	37,760		37,760
160	WARFARE TACTICS	25,351		25,351
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	20,045		20,045
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,212,296	453,000	1,665,296
	Combat forces equipment		[148,000]	
	Combat forces shortfall		[305,000]	
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	10,203		10,203
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	127,972		127,972
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	221,427		221,427
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	13,386		13,386
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	110,940		110,940
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,585,804**	**794,400**	**6,380,204**
	MOBILIZATION			
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	18,460		18,460
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	227,033		227,033
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**245,493**		**245,493**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	50,269		50,269
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	5,400		5,400
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**55,669**		**55,669**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	2,418		2,418
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	516		516
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,107		5,107
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,411		1,411
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,545		2,545

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	153,427		153,427
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8,570		8,570
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,425		1,425
705	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	5,608		5,608
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**181,027**		**181,027**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
710	UNDISTRIBUTED		155,400	155,400
	Increase to support higher fuel rates		[155,400]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**155,400**	**155,400**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**6,067,993**	**949,800**	**7,017,793**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	992,190		992,190
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	559,574		559,574
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	570,000	56,000	626,000
	Restore High Priority Depot Maintenance		[56,000]	
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	69,726		69,726
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,191,490**	**56,000**	**2,247,490**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	108,270		108,270
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**108,270**		**108,270**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			

150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	365,555		365,555
160	ADMINISTRATION	3,675		3,675
185	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	825		825
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**370,055**		**370,055**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		5,400	5,400
	Increase to support higher fuel rates		[5,400]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**5,400**	**5,400**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**2,669,815**	**61,400**	**2,731,215**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	17,196		17,196
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	200		200
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,000		6,000
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	12,304		12,304
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,790		6,790
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	13,210		13,210
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**55,700**		**55,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**55,700**		**55,700**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	11,124		11,124
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,410		1,410
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**12,534**		**12,534**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**12,534**		**12,534**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,712,393	70,000	1,782,393
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[70,000]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	836,104		836,104
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	14,118		14,118
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,373,480	100,000	1,473,480
	Program increase		[100,000]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	122,712		122,712
060	BASE SUPPORT	1,520,333		1,520,333
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	31,582		31,582
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	147,524		147,524
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	857		857
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,353		8,353
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	50,495		50,495
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,817,951**	**170,000**	**5,987,951**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,091,133	50,000	3,141,133
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[50,000]	
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	47,897		47,897
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	387,179	500,000	887,179
	Program increase		[500,000]	
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	7,043		7,043
190	BASE SUPPORT	68,382		68,382
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**3,601,634**	**550,000**	**4,151,634**

	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	100		100
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	478		478
240	BASE SUPPORT	19,256		19,256
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	12,845		12,845
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	731		731
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	607		607
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	720		720
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	152		152
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**34,889**		**34,889**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	86,273		86,273
360	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,511		2,511
390	BASE SUPPORT	19,887		19,887
400	ADMINISTRATION	3,493		3,493
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	152,086		152,086
420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	269,825		269,825
460	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	117		117
465	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	16,558		16,558
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**550,750**		**550,750**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
470	UNDISTRIBUTED		284,000	284,000
	Increase to support higher fuel rates		[284,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**284,000**	**284,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**10,005,224**	**1,004,000**	**11,009,224**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	26,599		26,599

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
050	BASE SUPPORT	6,250		6,250
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**32,849**		**32,849**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**32,849**		**32,849**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	22,200		22,200
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**22,200**		**22,200**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**22,200**		**22,200**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,222,868		2,222,868
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,222,868**		**2,222,868**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	27,781		27,781
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	45,746		45,746
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	76,348		76,348
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	99,538		99,538
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	9,620		9,620
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,950,000		1,950,000
240	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	100,100		100,100
280	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	38,227	35,000	73,227
	Realignment to Building Partnership Capacity authories		[35,000]	

290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	2,784		2,784
295	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,862,066		1,862,066
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**4,212,210**	**35,000**	**4,247,210**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**6,435,078**	**35,000**	**6,470,078**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**62,829,052**	**4,242,100**	**67,071,152**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	**130,399,881**	**–180,600**	**130,219,281**
Flight Paramedic Training Pay and Allowances—Army Guard		[4,500]	
Flight Paramedic Training Pay and Allowances—Army Reserve		[900]	
Military Personnel unobligated balances		[–186,000]	
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	**6,676,750**		**6,676,750**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	9,689,307		9,689,307
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	164,033		164,033

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	25,158		25,158
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**25,158**		**25,158**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (MEDICAL/DENTAL)	61,731		61,731
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**61,731**		**61,731**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	46,428		46,428
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**46,428**		**46,428**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,412,510		1,412,510
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,412,510**		**1,412,510**
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
MPF MLP	134,917		134,917
POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	43,404		43,404
LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	116,784		116,784
DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	60,703		60,703

TAH MAINTENANCE	19,809		19,809
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	56,058		56,058
READY RESERVE FORCE	299,025		299,025
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	**730,700**		**730,700**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
IN-HOUSE CARE	8,880,738		8,880,738
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	15,842,732		15,842,732
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,505,640		2,505,640
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,450,619		1,450,619
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	368,248		368,248
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	733,097		733,097
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,872,660		1,872,660
R&D RESEARCH	9,162		9,162
R&D EXPLORATRY DEVELOPMENT	47,977		47,977
R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	291,156		291,156
R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	132,430		132,430
R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	161,674		161,674
R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	72,568		72,568
R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	14,646		14,646
PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING	89,404		89,404
PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	377,577		377,577
PROC IEHR	204,200		204,200
UNDISTRIBUTED		–276,800	–276,800
DHP Unobligated		[–440,800]	
Section 711. Future Availability of TRICARE Prime for Certain Beneficiaries Enrolled in TRICARE Prime		[164,000]	
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**33,054,528**	**–276,800**	**32,777,728**
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	451,572		451,572
RDT&E	604,183		604,183
PROCUREMENT	1,368		1,368

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**1,057,123**		**1,057,123**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
OPERATING FORCES	815,965		815,965
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	122,580		122,580
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**938,545**		**938,545**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	311,131		311,131
PROCUREMENT	1,000		1,000
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**312,131**		**312,131**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**37,638,854**	**–276,800**	**37,362,054**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	44,732		44,732
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**44,732**		**44,732**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
C–17 CLS ENGINE REPAIR	78,500		78,500
TRANSPORTATION FALLEN HEROES	10,000		10,000
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**88,500**		**88,500**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	131,678		131,678
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**131,678**		**131,678**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
IN-HOUSE CARE	375,958		375,958
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	382,560		382,560
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	132,749		132,749
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	2,238		2,238
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	460		460
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	10,236		10,236
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**904,201**		**904,201**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
OPERATING FORCES	376,305		376,305
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**376,305**		**376,305**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	10,766		10,766
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**10,766**		**10,766**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**1,556,182**		**1,556,182**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	ALASKA	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Battalion Complex	45,000		45,000
Army	ALASKA	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Storage Hangar	58,000		58,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	66,000		66,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	73,000		73,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Central Energy Plant	34,000		34,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Fire Station	12,000		12,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Headquarters Building	33,000		33,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Runway	12,000		12,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Simulator Building	12,200		12,200
Army	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	Automated Sniper Field Fire Range	4,700		4,700
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph2	61,000		61,000
Army	HAWAII	Fort Shafter	Command and Control Facility—Admin	75,000	–10,000	65,000
Army	KANSAS	Fort Leavenworth	Simulations Center	17,000		17,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Battlefield Weather Support Facility	4,800		4,800
Army	MARYLAND	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Operations and Maintenance Facilities	21,000		21,000
Army	MARYLAND	Fort Detrick	Entry Control Point	2,500		2,500
Army	MARYLAND	Fort Detrick	Hazardous Material Storage Building	4,600		4,600
Army	MISSOURI	Fort Leonard Wood	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph1	86,000		86,000
Army	MISSOURI	Fort Leonard Wood	Simulator Building	4,700		4,700
Army	NEW YORK	U.S. Military Academy	Cadet Barracks, Incr 2	42,000		42,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Command and Control Facility	5,900		5,900

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Control Tower	10,800		10,800
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	36,000		36,000
Army	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph3	50,000		50,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis-Mcchord	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	79,000		79,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis-Mcchord	Airfield Operations Complex	37,000		37,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis-Mcchord	Aviation Battalion Complex	28,000		28,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Yakima	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	9,100		9,100
Army	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	Company Operations Complex	33,000		33,000
Army	KWAJALEIN	Kwajalein Atoll	Pier	63,000		63,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Host Nation Support FY14	33,000	–10,000	23,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction FY14	25,000		25,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design FY14	41,575		41,575
Total Military Construction, Army				**1,119,875**	**–20,000**	**1,099,875**
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Barstow	Engine Dynamometer Facility	14,998		14,998
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade	13,124		13,124
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	H–60 Trainer Facility	8,910		8,910
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Point Mugu	Aircraft Engine Test Pads	7,198		7,198
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Point Mugu	BAMS Consolidated Maintenance Hangar	17,469		17,469
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Port Hueneme	Unaccompanied Housing Conversion	33,600		33,600
Navy	CALIFORNIA	San Diego	Steam Plant Decentralization	34,331		34,331
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Twentynine Palms	Camp Wilson Infrastructure Upgrades	33,437		33,437
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	P–8A Training & Parking Apron Expansion	20,752		20,752

Navy	FLORIDA	Key West	Aircraft Crash/Rescue & Fire Headquarters	14,001	14,001
Navy	FLORIDA	Mayport	LCS Logistics Support Facility	16,093	16,093
Navy	GEORGIA	Albany	CERS Dispatch Facility	1,010	1,010
Navy	GEORGIA	Albany	Weapons Storage and Inspection Facility	15,600	15,600
Navy	GEORGIA	Savannah	Townsend Bombing Range Land Acq—Phase 1	61,717	61,717
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar—North Ramp	85,673	85,673
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	BAMS Forward Operational & Maintenance Hangar	61,702	61,702
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Dehumidified Supply Storage Facility	17,170	17,170
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Emergent Repair Facility Expansion	35,860	35,860
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Modular Storage Magazines	63,382	63,382
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Sierra Wharf Improvements	1,170	1,170
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	X-Ray Wharf Improvements	53,420	53,420
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	3rd Radio Bn Maintenance/Operations Complex	25,336	25,336
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Aircraft Maintenance Expansion	16,968	16,968
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar Upgrades	31,820	31,820
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Armory Addition and Renovation	12,952	12,952
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Aviation Simulator Modernization/Addition	17,724	17,724
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	MV–22 Hangar	57,517	57,517
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	MV–22 Parking Apron and Infrastructure	74,665	74,665
Navy	HAWAII	Pearl City	Water Transmission Line	30,100	30,100
Navy	HAWAII	Pearl Harbor	Drydock Waterfront Facility	22,721	22,721
Navy	HAWAII	Pearl Harbor	Submarine Production Support Facility	35,277	35,277
Navy	ILLINOIS	Great Lakes	Unaccompanied Housing	35,851	35,851
Navy	MAINE	Bangor	NCTAMS VLF Commercial Power Connection	13,800	13,800
Navy	MAINE	Kittery	Structural Shops Consolidation	11,522	11,522
Navy	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	MARFORCYBERCOM HQ-OPS Building	83,988	83,988
Navy	NEVADA	Fallon	Wastewater Treatment Plant	11,334	11,334
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Landfill—Phase 4	20,795	20,795
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Operations Training Complex	22,515	22,515
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Steam Decentralization—BEQ Nodes	18,679	18,679
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Steam Decentralization—Camp Johnson	2,620	2,620
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Steam Decentralization—Hadnot Point	13,390	13,390

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	CH–53K Maintenance Training Facility	13,218		13,218
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	Corrosion Control Hangar	12,547		12,547
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	Regional Communication Station	20,098		20,098
Navy	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	TACAMO E–6B Hangar	14,144		14,144
Navy	RHODE ISLAND	Newport	Hewitt Hall Research Center	12,422		12,422
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	Charleston	Nuclear Power Operational Training Facility	73,932		73,932
Navy	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	Aerial Target Operation Consolidation	10,587		10,587
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	Pier 11 Power Upgrades for CVN–78	3,380		3,380
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Academic Instruction Facility TECOM Schools	25,731		25,731
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	ATC Transmitter/Receiver Relocation	3,630		3,630
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Fuller Road Improvements	9,013		9,013
Navy	VIRGINIA	Yorktown	Small Arms Ranges	18,700		18,700
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bremerton	Integrated Water Treatment Sys Dry Docks 3&4	18,189		18,189
Navy	WASHINGTON	Kitsap	Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (INC)	24,880		24,880
Navy	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	EA–18G Facility Improvements	32,482		32,482
Navy	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	P–8A Hangar and Training Facilities	85,167		85,167
Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier	Armory	6,420		6,420
Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier	Unaccompanied Housing	22,580		22,580
Navy	JAPAN	Camp Butler	Airfield Security Upgrades	5,820		5,820
Navy	JAPAN	Yokosuka	Communication System Upgrade	7,568		7,568
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCON Design Funds	89,830		89,830
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	19,740		19,740
Total Military Construction, Navy				**1,700,269**	**0**	**1,700,269**
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35 Field Training Detachment	5,500		5,500

AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35 Sq Ops/Aircraft Maintenance Unit #3	21,400		21,400
AF	CALIFORNIA	Beale AFB	Distributed Common Ground Station Ops Bldg	62,000		62,000
AF	FLORIDA	Tyndall AFB	F–22 Munitions Storage Complex	9,100		9,100
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PAR—Fuel Sys Hardened Bldgs	20,000		20,000
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PAR—Strike Tactical Missile Mxs Facility	10,530		10,530
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PAR—Tanker GP Mx Hangar/AMU/Sqd Ops	132,600		132,600
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC RED HORSE Airfield Operations Facility	8,500		8,500
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC SF Fire Rescue & Emergency Mgt	4,600		4,600
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A 2–Bay Corrosion Control/Fuel Cell Hangar	0	82,000	82,000
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A 3–Bay General Purpose Maintenance Hangar	0	80,000	80,000
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A Aircraft Parking Apron Alteration	0	2,200	2,200
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A Aprons Fuels Distribution System	0	12,800	12,800
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A Flight Simulator Facility Phase 1	0	2,150	2,150
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A General Maintenance Hangar	0	32,000	32,000
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A Miscellaneous Facilities Alteration	0	970	970
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A Pipeline Student Dormatory	0	7,000	7,000
AF	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	C–17 Modernize Hgr 35, Docks 1&2	4,800		4,800
AF	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	19th Air Support Operations Sqdrn Expansion	8,000		8,000
AF	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center, Increment 1	85,000		85,000
AF	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	Helicopter Operations Facility	30,000		30,000
AF	MISSOURI	Whiteman AFB	WSA MOP Igloos and Assembly Facility	5,900		5,900
AF	NEBRASKA	Offutt AFB	USSTRATCOM Replacement Facility, Incr 3	136,000		136,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	Add RPA Weapons School Facility	20,000		20,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	Dormitory (240 RM)	35,000		35,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35 Alt Mission Equip (AME) Storage	5,000		5,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35 Fuel Cell Hangar	9,400		9,400
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35 Parts Store	9,100		9,100
AF	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	Airmen and Family Readiness Center	5,500		5,500
AF	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	22,000		22,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	Satellite Dining Facility	6,600		6,600
AF	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	F–16 Aircraft Covered Washrack and Pad	2,250		2,250
AF	NEW MEXICO	Kirtland AFB	Nuclear Systems Wing & Sustainment Center (Ph	30,500		30,500

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	Minot AFB	B–52 ADAL Aircraft Maintenance Unit	15,530		15,530
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	Minot AFB	B–52 Munitions Storage Igloos	8,300		8,300
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU ADAL Fuel Systems Maintenance Dock	0	3,350	3,350
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU ADAL Squad Ops/AMU	0	7,400	7,400
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU Flight Training Center Simulators Facility Phase 1.	0	12,600	12,600
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU Fuselage Trainer Phase 1	0	6,300	6,300
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU Renovate Facility	0	1,200	1,200
AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC–46A Land Acquisition	8,600		8,600
AF	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	F–16 BAK 12/14 Aircraft Arresting System	3,350		3,350
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	F–35 Aircraft Mx Unit Hangar 45E Ops #1	13,500		13,500
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	Fire Crash Rescue Station	18,500		18,500
AF	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	4–Bay Conventional Munitions Inspection Bldg	4,800		4,800
AF	GREENLAND	Thule AB	Thule Consolidation, Phase 2	43,904		43,904
AF	MARIANA ISLANDS	Saipan	PAR—Airport POL/Bulk Storage AST	18,500		18,500
AF	MARIANA ISLANDS	Saipan	PAR—Hazardous Cargo Pad	8,000		8,000
AF	MARIANA ISLANDS	Saipan	PAR—Maintenance Facility	2,800		2,800
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	Croughton RAF	Main Gate Complex	12,000	–12,000	0
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	Guardian Angel Operations Facility	22,047		22,047
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	KC–46A FTU Facility Projects	63,000	–63,000	0
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	KC–46A MOB #1 Facility Projects	192,700	–192,700	0
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	11,314		11,314
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,448		20,448

Total Military Construction, Air Force				**1,156,573**	**–17,730**	**1,138,843**
Def-Wide	ALASKA	Clear AFS	BMDS Upgrade Early Warning Radar	17,204		17,204
Def-Wide	ALASKA	Fort Greely	Mechanical-Electrical Bldg Missile Field #1	82,000		82,000
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Brawley	SOF Desert Warfare Training Center	23,095		23,095
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Defense Distribution Depot-Tracy	General Purpose Warehouse	37,554		37,554
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Miramar	Replace Fuel Pipeline	6,000		6,000
Def-Wide	COLORADO	Fort Carson	SOF Group Support Battalion	22,282		22,282
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Hurlburt Field	SOF ADD/ALTER Operations Facility	7,900		7,900
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	Replace Fuel Pipeline	7,500		7,500
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Key West	SOF Boat Docks	3,600	–3,600	0
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Panama City	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	2,600		2,600
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Tyndall AFB	Replace Fuel Pipeline	9,500		9,500
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	Faith Middle School Addition	6,031		6,031
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	White Elemtary School Replacement	37,304		37,304
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Stewart	Diamond Elementary School Replacement	44,504		44,504
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Hunter Army Airfield	Replace Fuel Island	13,500		13,500
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Moody AFB	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	3,800		3,800
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Ford Island	DISA Pacific Facility Upgrades	2,615		2,615
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Alter Warehouse Space	2,800		2,800
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Fort Campbell High School Replacement	59,278		59,278
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Marshall Elementary School Replacement	38,591		38,591
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	SOF Group Special Troops Battalion	26,342		26,342
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Knox	Ambulatory Health Center	265,000		265,000
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Knox	Consolidate/Replace Van Voorhis-Mudge ES	38,023		38,023
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Public Health Command Lab Replacement	210,000	–100,000	110,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Bethesda Naval Hospital	Mech & Electrical Improvements	46,800		46,800
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Bethesda Naval Hospital	Parking Garage	20,000		20,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Detrick	USAMRIID Replacement Stage 1, Incr 8	13,000	–13,000	0
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	High Performance Computing Capacity Inc 3	431,000		431,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW Recapitalize Building #1/Site M Inc 2	58,000		58,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	Ambulatory Care Center Inc 2	76,200	–12,400	63,800

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	MASSACHUSETTS	Hanscom AFB	Hanscom Primary School Replacement	36,213		36,213
Def-Wide	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base Mcguire-Dix-Lakehurst	Replace Fuel Distribution Components	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	Medical Clinic Replacement	60,000		60,000
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	21,400		21,400
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	SOF Performance Resiliency Center	14,400	–14,400	0
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	SOF Sustainment Training Complex	28,977		28,977
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Consolidate/Replace Pope Holbrook Elementary	37,032		37,032
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Civil Affairs Battalion Annex	37,689		37,689
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Combat Medic Skills Sustain. Course Bldg	7,600		7,600
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Engineer Training Facility	10,419		10,419
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Language and Cultural Center	64,606		64,606
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Upgrade Training Facility	14,719		14,719
Def-Wide	NORTH DAKOTA	Minot AFB	Replace Fuel Pipeline	6,400		6,400
Def-Wide	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	Replace Refueler Parking	2,100		2,100
Def-Wide	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	Replace Fuel Distribution Facilities	36,000		36,000
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	Def Distribution Depot New Cumberland	Upgrade Hazardous Material Warehouse	3,100		3,100
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	Def Distribution Depot New Cumberland	Upgrade Public Safety Facility	5,900		5,900
Def-Wide	SOUTH CAROLINA	Beaufort	Bolden Elementary/Middle School Replacement	41,324		41,324
Def-Wide	TENNESSEE	Arnold Air Force Base	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	2,200		2,200
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement Incr 5	252,100	–100,000	152,100
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	SAMMC Hyperbaric Facility Addition	12,600		12,600
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	SOF Human Performance Center	11,147	–11,147	0
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Def Distribution Depot Richmond	Operations Center Phase 1	87,000		87,000
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story	SOF LOGSU Two Operations Facility	30,404		30,404

Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Boundary Channel Access Control Point	6,700		6,700
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Pentagon South Pedestrian Safety Project	1,850		1,850
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	PFPA Support Operations Center	14,800		14,800
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Raven Rock Administrative Facility Upgrade	32,000		32,000
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Raven Rock Exterior Cooling Tower	4,100		4,100
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Quantico Middle/High School Replacement	40,586		40,586
Def-Wide	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	Replace Fuel Pier Breakwater	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	AN/TPY–2 Radar Site	15,000		15,000
Def-Wide	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	45,400		45,400
Def-Wide	BELGIUM	Brussels	NATO Headquarters Facility	38,513		38,513
Def-Wide	BELGIUM	Brussels	NATO Headquarters Fit-Out	29,100		29,100
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Kaiserlautern AB	Kaiserslautern Elementary School Replacement	49,907		49,907
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Ramstein AB	Ramstein High School Replacement	98,762		98,762
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement, Incr 3	151,545		151,545
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Weisbaden	Hainerberg Elementary School Replacement	58,899		58,899
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Weisbaden	Wiesbaden Middle School Replacement	50,756		50,756
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Atsugi	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	4,100		4,100
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Iwakuni	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	34,000		34,000
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Kadena Middle School Addition/Renovation	38,792		38,792
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Torri Commo Station	SOF Facility Augmentation	71,451	–7,380	64,071
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Yokosuka	Upgrade Fuel Pumps	10,600		10,600
Def-Wide	KOREA	Camp Walker	Daegu Middle/High School Replacement	52,164		52,164
Def-Wide	ROMANIA	Deveselu	Aegis Ashore Missile Def Sys Cmplx, Increm. 2	85,000	–5,000	80,000
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Raf Mildenhall	Replace Fuel Storage	17,732		17,732
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Raf Mildenhall	SOF Airfield Pavements and Hangar/AMU	0	48,448	48,448
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Raf Mildenhall	SOF Airfiled Pavements	24,077	–24,077	0
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Raf Mildenhall	SOF Hangar/AMU	24,371	–24,371	0
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Raf Mildenhall	SOF MRSP and Parts Storage	6,797		6,797
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Raf Mildenhall	SOF Squadron Operations Facility	11,652		11,652
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	Lakenheath High School Replacement	69,638		69,638

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Contingency Construction	10,000	–10,000	0
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Energy Conservation Investment Program	150,000		150,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Exercise Related Minor Construction	9,730		9,730
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	10,891		10,891
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	75,905		75,905
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	36,866		36,866
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	6,931		6,931
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	50,192		50,192
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	57,053		57,053
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000		2,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,430		7,430
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,170		5,170
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,409		5,409

Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500		1,500
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	9,578		9,578
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
Total Military Construction, Defense-Wide				**3,985,300**	**–276,927**	**3,708,373**
Chem Demil	KENTUCKY	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph XIV	122,536		122,536
Total Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense				**122,536**	**0**	**122,536**
NATO	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Nato Security Investment Program	Nato Security Investment Program	239,700	–40,000	199,700
Total NATO Security Investment Program				**239,700**	**–40,000**	**199,700**
Army NG	ALABAMA	Decatur	National Guard Readiness Center Add/Alt	4,000		4,000
Army NG	ARKANSAS	Fort Chaffee	Scout/RECCE Gunnery Complex	21,000		21,000
Army NG	FLORIDA	Pinellas Park	Ready Building	5,700		5,700
Army NG	ILLINOIS	Kankakee	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	28,000		28,000
Army NG	ILLINOIS	Kankakee	Readiness Center	14,000		14,000
Army NG	MASSACHUSETTS	Camp Edwards	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training Add	19,000		19,000
Army NG	MICHIGAN	Camp Grayling	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training	17,000		17,000
Army NG	MINNESOTA	Stillwater	Readiness Center	17,000		17,000
Army NG	MISSISSIPPI	Camp Shelby	Water Supply/Treatment Building, Potable	3,000		3,000
Army NG	MISSISSIPPI	Pascagoula	Readiness Center	4,500		4,500
Army NG	MISSOURI	Macon	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	9,100		9,100
Army NG	MISSOURI	Whiteman AFB	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	5,000		5,000
Army NG	NEW YORK	New York	Readiness Center Add/Alt	31,000		31,000
Army NG	OHIO	Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant	Sanitary Sewer	5,200		5,200
Army NG	PENNSYLVANIA	Fort Indiantown Gap	Aircraft Maintenance Instructional Building	40,000		40,000
Army NG	PUERTO RICO	Camp Santiago	Maneuver Area Training & Equipment Site Addit	5,600		5,600
Army NG	SOUTH CAROLINA	Greenville	Readiness Center	13,000		13,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army NG	SOUTH CAROLINA	Greenville	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	13,000		13,000
Army NG	TEXAS	Fort Worth	Armed Forces Reserve Center Add	14,270		14,270
Army NG	WYOMING	Afton	National Guard Readiness Center	10,200		10,200
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	29,005	–5,000	24,005
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	12,240		12,240
Total Military Construction, Army National Guard				**320,815**	**–5,000**	**315,815**
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Camp Parks	Army Reserve Center	17,500		17,500
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Fort Hunter Liggett	TASS Training Center (TTC)	16,500		16,500
Army Res	MARYLAND	Bowie	Army Reserve Center	25,500		25,500
Army Res	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base Mcguire-Dix-Lakehurst	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun (MPMG)	9,500		9,500
Army Res	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base Mcguire-Dix-Lakehurst	Central Issue Facility	7,900		7,900
Army Res	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base Mcguire-Dix-Lakehurst	Consolidated Dining Facility	13,400		13,400
Army Res	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base Mcguire-Dix-Lakehurst	Modified Record Fire Range	5,400		5,400
Army Res	NEW YORK	Bullville	Army Reserve Center	14,500		14,500
Army Res	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Army Reserve Center	24,500		24,500
Army Res	WISCONSIN	Fort Mccoy	Access Control Point/Mail/Freight Center	17,500		17,500
Army Res	WISCONSIN	Fort Mccoy	NCO Academy Dining Facility	5,900		5,900
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	14,212		14,212
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,748		1,748
Total Military Construction, Army Reserve				**174,060**	**0**	**174,060**
N/MC Res	CALIFORNIA	March AFB	NOSC Moreno Valley Reserve Training Center	11,086		11,086

N/MC Res	MISSOURI	Kansas City	Reserve Training Center—Belton, Missouri	15,020		15,020
N/MC Res	TENNESSEE	Memphis	Reserve Boat Maintenance and Storage Facility	4,330		4,330
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR Planning & Design	1,500		1,500
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USMCR Planning and Design	1,040		1,040
Total Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps Reserve				**32,976**	**0**	**32,976**
Air NG	ALABAMA	Birmingham IAP	Add to and Alter Distributed Ground Station F	8,500		8,500
Air NG	INDIANA	Hulman Regional Airport	Add/Alter Bldg 37 For Dist Common Ground Sta	7,300		7,300
Air NG	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	175th Network Warfare Squadron Facility	4,000	–4,000	0
Air NG	MARYLAND	Martin State Airport	CYBER/ISR Facility	8,000	–8,000	0
Air NG	MONTANA	Great Falls IAP	Intra-Theater Airlift Conversion	22,000		22,000
Air NG	NEW YORK	Fort Drum	MQ–9 Flight Training Unit Hangar	4,700		4,700
Air NG	OHIO	Springfield Beckley-Map	Alter Intelligence Operations Facility	7,200		7,200
Air NG	PENNSYLVANIA	Fort Indiantown Gap	Communications Operations and Training Facili	7,700		7,700
Air NG	RHODE ISLAND	Quonset State Airport	C–130J Flight Simulator Training Facility	6,000		6,000
Air NG	TENNESSEE	Mcghee-Tyson Airport	TEC Expansion- Dormitory & Classroom Facility	18,000		18,000
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	13,400		13,400
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	13,000		13,000
Total Military Construction, Air National Guard				**119,800**	**–12,000**	**107,800**
AF Res	CALIFORNIA	March AFB	Joint Regional Deployment Processing Center,	19,900		19,900
AF Res	FLORIDA	Homestead AFS	Entry Control Complex	9,800		9,800
AF Res	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	Air Control Group Squadron Operations	12,200		12,200
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	2,229		2,229
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,530		1,530
Total Military Construction, Air Force Reserve				**45,659**	**0**	**45,659**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Con Army	WISCONSIN	Fort Mccoy	Family Housing New Construction (56 units)	23,000		23,000
FH Con Army	GERMANY	South Camp Vilseck	Family Housing New Construction (29 units)	16,600		16,600
FH Con Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Family Housing P & D	4,408		4,408
Total Family Housing Construction, Army				**44,008**	**0**	**44,008**
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	33,125		33,125
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leased Housing	180,924		180,924
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property Facilities	107,639		107,639
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	54,433		54,433
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Military Housing Privitization Initiative	25,661		25,661
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous	646		646
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services	13,536		13,536
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	96,907		96,907
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Army				**512,871**	**0**	**512,871**
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	72,093		72,093

FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	4,267		4,267
Total Family Housing Construction, Air Force				**76,360**	**0**	**76,360**
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	39,470		39,470
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Privatization	41,436		41,436
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	54,514		54,514
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance (RPMA RPMC)	110,786		110,786
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	53,044		53,044
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	1,954		1,954
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	16,862		16,862
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	70,532		70,532
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Air Force				**388,598**	**0**	**388,598**
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Design	4,438		4,438
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	68,969		68,969
Total Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps				**73,407**	**0**	**73,407**
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	21,073		21,073
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	74,962		74,962

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	90,122		90,122
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	60,782		60,782
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	362		362
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Privatization Support Costs	27,634		27,634
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	20,596		20,596
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	94,313		94,313
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps				**389,844**	**0**	**389,844**
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	67		67
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	20		20
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	3,196		3,196
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	10,994		10,994
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	40,433		40,433
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	311		311

FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	74		74
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	418		418
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	32		32
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	288		288
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	12		12
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide				**55,845**	**0**	**55,845**
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,780		1,780
Total DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund				**1,780**	**0**	**1,780**
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Army	Base Realignment and Closure	180,401		180,401
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Navy	Base Realignment & Closure	108,300		108,300
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DoD BRAC Activities—Air Force	126,376		126,376
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–100: Planing, Design and Management	7,277		7,277
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–101: Various Locations	20,988		20,988
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–138: NAS Brunswick, ME	993		993
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–157: MCSA Kansas City, MO	40		40
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA	5,766		5,766

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Agreement
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP	1,216		1,216
Total Base Realignment and Closure Account				**451,357**	**0**	**451,357**
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Savings—ANG Unspecified Minor Construction	0	–45,623	–45,623
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Savings—Army Bid Savings	0	–14,000	–14,000
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Savings—Army Planning and Design FY12	0	–50,000	–50,000
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Savings—Defense Wide Bid Savings	0	–358,400	–358,400
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Savings—Defense Wide Unspecified Minor Construction.	0	–16,470	–16,470
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Savings—Navy Bid Savings	0	–49,920	–49,920
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Savings—Section 1013 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, as amended.	0	–50,000	–50,000
Total Prior Year Savings				**0**	**–584,413**	**–584,413**
Total Military Construction				**11,011,633**	**–938,340**	**10,073,293**

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs			
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	16,000	–16,000	0
Nuclear Energy	94,000	0	94,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	7,868,409	220,000	8,088,409
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	2,140,142	0	2,140,142
Naval reactors	1,246,134	0	1,246,134
Office of the administrator	397,784	–8,000	389,784
Total, National nuclear security administration	**11,652,469**	**212,000**	**11,864,469**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental cleanup	5,316,909	–358,000	4,958,909
Other defense activities	749,080	0	749,080

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,065,989**	**–358,000**	**5,707,989**
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,718,458**	**–146,000**	**17,572,458**
Total, Discretionary Funding	**17,828,458**	**–162,000**	**17,666,458**
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Infrastructure security & energy restoration (HS)	16,000	–16,000	0
Nuclear Energy			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	94,000		94,000
Weapons Activities			
Life extension programs and major alterations			
B61 Life extension program	537,044	44,000	581,044
W76 Life extension program	235,382	9,700	245,082
W78/88–1 Life extension program	72,691	5,600	78,291
W88 ALT 370	169,487		169,487
Total, Stockpile assessment and design	**1,014,604**	**59,300**	**1,073,904**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	83,536		83,536
W76 Stockpile systems	47,187		47,187
W78 Stockpile systems	54,381		54,381
W80 Stockpile systems	50,330		50,330
B83 Stockpile systems	54,948	6,000	60,948
W87 Stockpile systems	101,506		101,506
W88 Stockpile systems	62,600		62,600

Total, Stockpile systems	**454,488**	**6,000**	**460,488**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	49,264		49,264
Stockpile services			
Production support	321,416	29,600	351,016
Research and development support	26,349	3,200	29,549
R&D certification and safety	191,259	18,300	209,559
Management, technology, and production	214,187		214,187
Plutonium sustainment	156,949	9,500	166,449
Total, Stockpile services	**910,160**	**60,600**	**970,760**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**2,428,516**	**125,900**	**2,554,416**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	54,730		54,730
Primary assessment technologies	109,231		109,231
Dynamic materials properties	116,965		116,965
Advanced radiography	30,509		30,509
Secondary assessment technologies	86,467		86,467
Total, Science campaign	**397,902**	**0**	**397,902**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	51,771	2,500	54,271
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	23,727		23,727
Nuclear survivability	19,504		19,504
Enhanced surveillance	54,909	4,000	58,909
Total, Engineering campaign	**149,911**	**6,500**	**156,411**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	80,245		80,245

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Support of other stockpile programs	15,001		15,001
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	59,897		59,897
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,024		5,024
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,198		8,198
Facility operations and target production	232,678		232,678
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**401,043**	**0**	**401,043**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	564,329		564,329
Readiness Campaign			
Component manufacturing development	106,085		106,085
Tritium readiness	91,695		91,695
Total, Readiness campaign	**197,780**	**0**	**197,780**
Total, Campaigns	**1,710,965**	**6,500**	**1,717,465**
Nuclear programs			
Nuclear operations capability	265,937		265,937
Capabilities based investments	39,558		39,558
Construction:			
12–D–301 TRU waste facilities, LANL	26,722		26,722
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL	30,679		30,679
07–D–220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	55,719		55,719
06–D–141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y–12	325,835		325,835
Total, Construction	**438,955**	**0**	**438,955**
Total, Nuclear programs	**744,450**	**0**	**744,450**
Secure transportation asset			

Operations and equipment	122,072		122,072
Program direction	97,118		97,118
Total, Secure transportation asset	**219,190**	**0**	**219,190**
Site stewardship			
Nuclear materials integration	17,679		17,679
Corporate project management	13,017		13,017
Minority serving institution partnerships program	14,531		14,531
Enterprise infrastructure			
Site Operations	1,112,455		1,112,455
Site Support	109,561		109,561
Sustainment	433,764	65,100	498,864
Facilities disposition	5,000		5,000
Subtotal, Enterprise infrastructure	**1,660,780**	**65,100**	**1,725,880**
Total, Site stewardship	**1,706,007**	**65,100**	**1,771,107**
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	664,981		664,981
Construction:			
14–D–710 DAF Argus, NNSS	14,000		14,000
Total, Defense nuclear security	**678,981**	**0**	**678,981**
NNSA CIO activities	148,441	22,500	170,941
Legacy contractor pensions	279,597		279,597
Subtotal, Weapons activities	**7,916,147**	**220,000**	**8,136,147**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	–47,738		–47,738

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, Adjustments	**–47,738**	**0**	**–47,738**
Total, Weapons Activities	**7,868,409**	**220,000**	**8,088,409**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs			
Global threat reduction initiative	424,487	23,000	447,487
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D			
Operations and maintenance	388,838		388,838
Nonproliferation and international security	141,675		141,675
International material protection and cooperation	369,625	–23,000	346,625
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition			
Operations and maintenance			
U.S. plutonium disposition	157,557		157,557
U.S. uranium disposition	25,000		25,000
Total, Operations and maintenance	**182,557**	**0**	**182,557**
Construction:			
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	320,000		320,000
Total, Construction	**320,000**	**0**	**320,000**
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	**502,557**	**0**	**502,557**
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**502,557**	**0**	**502,557**

Legacy contractor pensions	93,703		93,703
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	**1,920,885**	**0**	**1,920,885**
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response program	181,293		181,293
Counterterrorism and counterproliferation programs	74,666		74,666
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,176,844**	**0**	**2,176,844**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	–36,702		–36,702
Total, Adjustments	**–36,702**	**0**	**–36,702**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,140,142**	**0**	**2,140,142**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	455,740	–2,000	453,740
Naval reactors development	419,400		419,400
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	126,400		126,400
S8G Prototype refueling	144,400		144,400
Program direction	44,404		44,404
Construction:			
14–D–902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL	1,000		1,000
14–D–901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	45,400		45,400
13–D–905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL	21,073		21,073
13–D–904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	600	2,000	2,600
Naval Reactor Facility, ID	1,700		1,700
Total, Construction	**69,773**	**2,000**	**71,773**
Subtotal, Naval Reactors	**1,260,117**	**0**	**1,260,117**
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances (Naval reactors)	–13,983		–13,983
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,246,134**	**0**	**1,246,134**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	397,784	–8,000	389,784
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**397,784**	**–8,000**	**389,784**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	4,702		4,702
Hanford site:			
River corridor and other cleanup operations	393,634		393,634
Central plateau remediation	513,450		513,450
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701		14,701
Total, Hanford site	**921,785**	**0**	**921,785**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	362,100		362,100
Idaho community and regulatory support	2,910		2,910
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**365,010**	**0**	**365,010**
NNSA sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,476		1,476
Nuclear facility D & D Separations Process Research Unit	23,700		23,700
Nevada	61,897		61,897
Sandia National Laboratories	2,814		2,814

Los Alamos National Laboratory	219,789		219,789
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**309,676**	**0**	**309,676**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
OR Nuclear facility D & D	73,716		73,716
OR cleanup and disposition	115,855		115,855
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,365		4,365
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**193,936**	**0**	**193,936**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01–D–416 A-E/ORP-0060 / Major construction	690,000		690,000
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	520,216		520,216
Total, Office of River protection	**1,210,216**	**0**	**1,210,216**
Savannah River sites:			
Savannah River risk management operations	432,491		432,491
SR community and regulatory support	11,210		11,210
Radioactive liquid tank waste:			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	552,560	95,000	647,560
Construction:			
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	92,000		92,000
Total, Construction	**92,000**	**0**	**92,000**
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**644,560**	**95,000**	**739,560**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,088,261**	**95,000**	**1,183,261**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	203,390		203,390
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**203,390**	**0**	**203,390**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Program direction	280,784		280,784
Program support	17,979		17,979
Safeguards and Security:			
Oak Ridge Reservation	18,800		18,800
Paducah	9,435		9,435
Portsmouth	8,578		8,578
Richland/Hanford Site	69,078		69,078
Savannah River Site	121,196		121,196
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,977		4,977
West Valley	2,015		2,015
Technology development	24,091	10,000	34,091
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**4,853,909**	**105,000**	**4,958,909**
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000	–463,000	0
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,316,909**	**–358,000**	**4,958,909**
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security			
Health, safety and security	143,616		143,616
Program direction	108,301		108,301
Total, Health, safety and security	**251,917**	**0**	**251,917**
Specialized security activities	196,322		196,322

Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	163,271		163,271
Program direction	13,712		13,712
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**176,983**	**0**	**176,983**
Defense-related activities			
Defense related administrative support			
Chief financial officer	38,979		38,979
Chief information officer	79,857		79,857
Total, Defense related administrative support	**118,836**	**0**	**118,836**
Office of hearings and appeals	5,022		5,022
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**749,080**	**0**	**749,080**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**749,080**	**0**	**749,080**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

APRIL 26, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find a draft of proposed legislation, titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014", that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 113th Congress.

The purpose of each provision in the proposed bill is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The PAYGO effects of section 701 (Revisions to TRICARE cost sharing requirements) are:

	Fiscal Years (deficit decreases in millions of dollars)									
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Direct Spending Effects	9	98	181	298	515	666	810	987	1,158	1,328

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

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.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING.

Enclosure: As Stated

MAY 7, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 113th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

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.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING.

Enclosure: As Stated

MAY 15, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 113th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

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.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. KING

Enclosure: As Stated

MAY 22, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 113th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

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.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. KING.

Enclosure: As Stated

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1960 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 is, of course, 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, Space, and Technology.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Science, Space, and Technology Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this and any similar legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest be placed in the legislative report on H.R. 1960 and the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

I look forward to working with you on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Natural Resources in matters being considered in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1960 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 Natural Resources 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 Natural Resources 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,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. 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 request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. The section provisions attached to this letter contain subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans Affairs. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of these provisions.

The Committee on Veterans Affairs 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 Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1960 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

With warm personal regards I am,

Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. JEFF MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, which contains substantial matter that falls within the Rule X legislative jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I appreciate the cooperation that allowed us to work out mutually agreeable text on numerous matters prior to your markup.

Based on that cooperation and our associated understandings, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup. However, this decision in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Foreign Affairs Committee in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request your support for the appointment of House Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

As the committee with legislative jurisdiction over U.S. intervention abroad and declarations of war, and as the traditional committee of sole referral for legislative authorizations for the use of military force (including the post-9/11 AUMF enacted as Public Law 107–40), the Foreign Affairs Committee requires knowledge of where, and against whom, such authority is used. For that reason, I appreciate your commitment to add the Foreign Affairs Committee as a recipient of the reporting required by section 1038 of the Chairman's mark, and to include additional language in your Committee report to expressly note that any reports required by section 1041 are in addition to War Powers Resolution (P.L. 93–148) reporting, which should continue.

Finally, I respectfully request that you include this letter and your response in your committee report on the bill, and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1960 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC June 7, 2013.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. 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 request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this legislation, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 1960 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction.

Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on the Judiciary in matters being considered in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1960 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 the Judiciary, 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 the Judiciary 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,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. 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 request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary

is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in matters being considered in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1960 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 Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Oversight and Government Reform 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,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. 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 request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdic-

tion. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 1960 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 1960, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 1960 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction.

Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 1960, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014." I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 1960 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 1960 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1960 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recognition of the importance of expediting the passage of H.R. 1960, the "National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2014," the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in several provisions of H.R. 1960, including intelligence and intelligence-related authorizations and provisions contained in the bill and provisions that may affect sensitive reporting with respect to covert action.

The Committee has specific and unresolved concerns with respect to certain provisions of the bill, and takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's jurisdictional interest over this bill or any similar bill and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during the House debate on H.R. 1960. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MIKE ROGERS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. MIKE ROGERS,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction.

Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: On June 6, 2013, the Committee on Armed Services ordered H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as amended, to be reported favorably to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1960, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the 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 that fall within our Rule X 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.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1960, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and/or in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to a certain provision in this important legislation,

and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Financial Services is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, which was expected to be marked up in the Committee on Armed Services this week.

In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 1960, the Committee on the Budget will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1960, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Agriculture in matters being considered in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1960 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 Agriculture, 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 ask 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,

FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I agree that the Committee on Agriculture has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Agriculture is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to you regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. There are certain provisions of this legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to the House floor, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1960. However, I do so only with the mutual understanding that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security over matters contained in this or similar legislation is in no way diminished or altered. I further request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

I request that you include this letter and your response into the committee report on H.R. 1960 and into the Congressional Record. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2013.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. I am most appreciative of your support and interest in this important legislation. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
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 2014 and each of the following 5 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)(1) 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

JUNE 7, 2013.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON
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. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on June 6, 2013. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 1960, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

Based on legislative language for H.R. 1960 that was provided to CBO from May 30 through June 5, CBO estimates that enacting this bill would decrease net direct spending by $26 million in 2014, $18 million over the 2014–2018 period, and $2 million over the 2014–2023 period (see attached table). Because the bill would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply.

The largest costs over that 10-year period result from a provision that would authorize special immigrant visas for certain Iraqi and Afghan allies and a provision that would increase spending from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to acquire additional materials. H.R. 1960 also would increase spending for Tricare beneficiaries whose eligibility derives from service in the Coast Guard, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Uniformed Corps of the Public Health Service and for loan guarantees made by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Those costs would be offset by savings from a provision that would modify the calculation for computing the amount of the initial retirement benefit for certain military retirees.

Enacting H.R. 1960 also would decrease revenues by requiring that certain payments made to a small number of servicemembers be treated as nontaxable income; however, CBO estimates that those effects would be insignificant for each year.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is David Newman, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

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 2014 and for the ensuring 5 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.

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.

ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

The committee finds that H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as reported, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

With respect to clause 3(c) 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)(1) 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. 1960 is to meet the national security needs of a nation at war while preparing our warfighters for the threats of tomorrow wherever and whenever they might emerge. This legislation would meet that goal while taking steps to make the difficult choices of fiscal stewardship incumbent upon Congress in a time of economic stress. Only by providing for the common defense in an efficient, fiscally

responsible manner can the nation address our national security challenges.

The bill would sustain equipment and weapon systems vital to the success of our service men and women while taking steps to provide them more efficiently. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee took steps to promote competition and to provide authorities to the Department of Defense to procure systems more cost-effectively.

The committee bill would also modify quarterly reporting requirements for major programs, to require that the Secretary of Defense report not only on a program's baseline cost estimate, but also to provide detailed information regarding the Department's assessment of the risk and sensitivity associated with that estimate, including an identification of the primary risk parameters associated with that point estimate. By including this requirement, the committee hopes to identify acquisition programs that are at highest risk for cost growth early and monitor fluctuations in the Department's confidence in its cost estimation on a quarterly basis.

The committee would also require reporting on estimated termination liability for major weapon systems. The committee believes that a greater understanding of termination liability would inform both the Department and the Congress of likely outcomes for troubled acquisition programs.

The committee continues to reiterate the need for fiscal accountability and transparency. Elsewhere in this report, the committee would note the importance of achieving a clean financial audit by 2017 and would impose a similar requirement for 2018.

Likewise, the committee continues to advocate for the Department to make personnel resourcing decisions within the context of total force management, considering the appropriate mix of military, civilians, and contractors to perform the Department's missions. The committee bill would ensure that end strength requests are within the limitations for reductions set by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), in light of concerns that budgetary pressures will force each service to reduce its end strength too quickly and to divest vital battlefield experience and know how. At the same time, the committee takes steps to reduce bureaucracy within the headquarters functions of various agencies and combatant commands.

On the battlefield, the committee would expand authorities aimed at combating contracting with the enemy, to ensure taxpayer dollars are not inadvertently going to opposing forces. This measure would expand efforts that have worked well within U.S. Central Command.

The bill also would examine the strength of the national defense strategic planning process in order to provide a solid basis for future Quadrennial Defense Reviews. The committee would task the National Defense Panel, established by section 118 of title 10, United States Code, to also incorporate an assessment of the ongoing Strategic Choices and Management Review into the Panel's assessment of the 2013 Quadrennial Defense Review. The committee believes that proper strategic planning, particularly when conducted regularly and within authorized frameworks, can reduce

waste while protecting the joint warfighting capability of the Department of Defense from arbitrary cuts.

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

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act are created by this legislation.

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).

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

No provision of H.R. 1960 establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULE MAKINGS

The committee estimates that H.R. 1960 requires 11 directed rule makings.

COMMITTEE 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. 1960. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 1960 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 59–2, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 1

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Duckworth amendment, Log 175r2.

Description: Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of additional F–35 aircraft and F–135 engines.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews		x	
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson		x	
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart		x	
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks				Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**10**	**51**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 2

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Smith amendment, Log 086.

Description: Strike and replace sec. 2711 of the mark with language that would clarify that nothing in the Act shall be construed to authorize an additional BRAC round in 2014 and 2015.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline	x			Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**18**	**44**	**00**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 3

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Andrews amendment, Log 016.

Description: Extends the limitation on aggregate annual amount available for contract services through FY2015.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Mr. McIntyre	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster	x			Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan	x			Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook	x						
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**37**	**25**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 4

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Lamborn amendment, Log 142.

Description: Would prohibit the purchase or lease of electric vehicles if a cheaper conventional vehicle option is available.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Thornberry	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mr. Andrews		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Mr. Carson		x	
Mr. Rigell	x			Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. Kilmer		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Runyan	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Mr. Palazzo	x			Mr. Enyart		x	
Mrs. Roby	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Nugent	x						
Mrs. Noem	x						
Mr. Cook	x						
Mr. Bridenstine	x						
Dr. Wenstrup	x						
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**31**	**31**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 5

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Enyart amendment, Log 063r1.

Description: Shall require all military services to use a joint combat camouflage uniform, including color and pattern variants designed for specific combat environments.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson	x			Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**32**	**30**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 6

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Andrews amendment, Log 021r1.

Description: Inclusion in the chaplain corps of persons available to provide guidance and counsel to members of the Armed Forces who are atheist, agnostic, or belong to no organized faith group.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen*			
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart		x	
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**18**	**43**	**0**				

*Pursuant to Rule 17(d) of the Committee on Armed Services rules, members of the committee who were unable to vote during the committee markup because they were in attendance at other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting are noted by asterisk.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 7

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Fleming amendment, Log 266.

Description: Clarifies religious freedom protections for members of the Armed Forces and directs the Secretary of Defense to consult with official military faith-group representatives in issuing regulations for such protections.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Thornberry			x	Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Mr. McIntyre	x		
Mr. Forbes			x	Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mr. Andrews		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Wittman			x	Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Mr. Carson		x	
Mr. Rigell	x			Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. Kilmer		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Runyan	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Mr. Palazzo	x			Mr. Enyart		x	
Mrs. Roby	x			Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Nugent	x						
Mrs. Noem	x						
Mr. Cook	x						
Mr. Bridenstine	x						
Dr. Wenstrup	x						
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**26**	**3**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 8

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Turner amendment, Log 003.

Description: Additional missile defense site in the US for optimized protection of the homeland.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Thornberry	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mr. Andrews		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Mr. Carson		x	
Mr. Rigell	x			Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. Kilmer		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Runyan				Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Mr. Palazzo				Mr. Enyart		x	
Mrs. Roby	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Nugent	x						
Mrs. Noem	x						
Mr. Cook	x						
Mr. Bridenstine	x						
Dr. Wenstrup	x						
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**27**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 9

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Garamendi amendment, Log 218r1.

Description: Reduces funding for ballistic missile defense mid-course segment.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**36**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 10

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Turner amendment, Log 004.

Description: Limitation on availability of funds or consolidation of dual-capable aircraft based in Europe.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Thornberry	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mr. Andrews		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson		x	
Mr. Rigell	x			Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. Kilmer		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Runyan	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Mr. Palazzo	x			Mr. Enyart		x	
Mrs. Roby	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Nugent	x						
Mrs. Noem	x						
Mr. Cook	x						
Mr. Bridenstine	x						
Dr. Wenstrup	x						
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**32**	**30**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 11

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Lamborn amendment, Log 106.

Description: Limitation on availability of funds for Global Threat Reduction Initiative.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Thornberry	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mr. Andrews		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Hanabusa		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Mr. Carson		x	
Mr. Rigell	x			Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. Kilmer		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Runyan	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Mr. Palazzo	x			Mr. Enyart		x	
Mrs. Roby	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Nugent	x						
Mrs. Noem	x						
Mr. Cook	x						
Mr. Bridenstine	x						
Dr. Wenstrup	x						
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**29**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 12

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Sanchez amendment, Log 057.

Description: Reduce the total amount of NNSA nuclear weapons activities to the President's budget.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 13

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Larsen amendment, Log 009.
Description: Strike section 3202.
Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**28**	**34**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 14

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Larsen amendment, Log 010.
Description: Strike section 3112.
Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 15

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Veasey amendment, Log 138.
Description: Would strike section 3120.
Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Mr. McIntyre	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**28**	**34**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 16

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Smith amendment, Log 244.
Description: Would strike section 1035.
Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**23**	**38**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 17

H.R. 1960

On agreeing to the Cooper amendment, Log 275.
Description: Increases transfer authority to $20 billion.
Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		x		Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Thornberry		x		Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller		x		Mr. Andrews		x	
Mr. Wilson		x		Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Turner		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Loebsack		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Mr. Carson		x	
Mr. Rigell		x		Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan		x		Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo		x		Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby		x		Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent		x					
Mrs. Noem		x					
Mr. Cook		x					
Mr. Bridenstine		x					
Dr. Wenstrup		x					
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**16**	**45**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 18

H.R. 1960

Description: On motion by Mr. Thornberry to report the bill H.R. 1960, as amended, favorably to the House, with a recommendation that it do pass.

Wednesday, June 05, 2013.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	x			Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Thornberry	x			Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	x		
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller	x			Mr. Andrews	x		
Mr. Wilson	x			Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Turner	x			Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Kline	x			Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Rogers	x			Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Loebsack	x		
Mr. Shuster	x			Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Conaway	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Hanabusa	x		
Mr. Hunter	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Barber	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Mr. Carson	x		
Mr. Rigell	x			Ms. Shea-Porter	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Maffei	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. Kilmer	x		
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Runyan	x			Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Peters	x		
Mr. Palazzo	x			Mr. Enyart	x		
Mrs. Roby	x			Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Nugent	x						
Mrs. Noem	x						
Mr. Cook	x						
Mr. Bridenstine	x						
Dr. Wenstrup	x						
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**59**	**02**	**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 ROBERT A. BRADY

I would like to state for the record my opposition to an amendment that was offered during the committee's consideration of H.R. 1960, The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

The amendment, number 175r2, would delay the release of FY 2014 funding for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter program. I initially voted in favor of this amendment because I am supportive of the intent to ensure accountability for this program. However, upon further review of the impacts that additional funding delays would have on the program, I believe that this amendment would actually increase costs, damage the supplier base, and risk over 100,000 direct and indirect jobs.

I oppose this amendment and am pleased that it failed by a significant margin.

ROBERT A. BRADY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

I congratulate the Chairman for this 52nd National Defense Authorization mark and thank him for including many good provisions in the bill. I wish, however, to outline concerns about certain provisions which I believe undermine national security.

The bill blocks New START Treaty implementation, potentially causing potential additional cost and delays, and complicating implementation of this US binding-commitment to make prudent nuclear weapons reductions. This measure also sends a dangerous signal to Russia as Russia implements its commitments under the Treaty. The bill further prevents further nuclear weapons reductions below New START levels, setting a dangerous precedent in blocking progress that would reduce the dangers posed by nuclear weapons and that would strengthen strategic stability.

The bill also wastes funds providing nearly $500 million increase above the President's budget request for nuclear weapons sustainment, for missile defense interceptors and for an additional Ground-based Midcourse Defense site, funds that the administration likely cannot execute and did not request. Forcing the Administration to embark on a $4 billion construction project for a missile defense site before the system is technically reliable, proven and cost-effective is ill-advised, particularly in an era of sequestration and higher security priorities to address the most urgent threats. In addition, the bill fences funds for important nuclear non-proliferation efforts that reduce the risk of nuclear terrorism.

I am also concerned about provisions that may weaken oversight of health, safety and security at the National Nuclear Security Administration nuclear weapons complex. As we maintain a safe, secure and reliable arsenal, we must maintain high standards for the safety and health of workers and the public.

These measures waste scarce taxpayers dollars in the midst of sequestration challenges and do not increase our national security.

Regarding recorded vote number 1 on amendment number 175r2 to H.R. 1960, The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, I would like to state for the record that I oppose the amendment despite my yes vote, and I intend to vote no should the amendment come before the full House.

The amendment would preclude the expenditure of any FY 14 funds for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps F–35 aircraft and engine procurement until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense has certified certain benchmarks are met.

While I respect and sympathize with the good government goals of the amendment, I believe that this amendment would lead to at least a one year delay in production of the F–35, causing potentially tens of thousands of layoffs across the national industrial base, including in my home state of Georgia. It could also increase

F–35 unit costs at a time when unit costs have come down over 50%. The amendment may also cause international partners and customers to cancel procurement plans, putting the entire program at risk.

I voted yes out of concerns over the cost of the program, particularly given the fiscal climate we are in. However, upon further reflection, I am now convinced that a no vote is in the best interest of our national defense and workforce.

This program is already at an advanced stage, with 96 percent of the F–35's software already coded, and 88 percent of the software currently in flight and lab testing. The underlying bill satisfies my concerns about procurement costs through the creation of an Independent team to review the software development program and report back to the Committee.

The bottom line is that this amendment would significantly delay the program, cause damage to the aerospace industrial base and prevent 5th Generation Stealth capability from reaching the warfighter when needed. The F–35 program is a good program that, like all programs, requires careful Congressional oversight. I am satisfied that the underlying bill provides an appropriate level of oversight and that the amendment would have harmful consequences for a program that I do support.

HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JACKIE SPEIER

I strongly support the committee's inclusion of our amendment to strengthen whistleblower protections for victims of sexual assault and whistleblowers, but believe that these provisions would be further strengthened by the restoration of language to protect witnesses who cooperate with Inspector General investigations and guaranteed administrative due process for corrections of the records of whistleblowers that have been retaliated against.

The Judiciary Committee objected on jurisdictional grounds to a provision that would have ensured that witnesses and others who cooperate with an IG investigation are protected from retaliation.

As Congress looks to change the culture and to prevent sexual assaults and other waste, fraud, and abuse in the military, all service members need to know that they have protections for providing information to stem abuses. The protections need to apply to individuals who first report the information. And, it is critically important that similar protections apply to those who witnessed the event or the waste, and are willing to cooperate and provide a statement in a command or IG investigation.

Just last year, Congress unanimously passed amendments to the government employee whistleblower protection act. Those amendments ensured that all witnesses have the same protections for disclosing waste, fraud, and abuse in the course of an investigation, as do whistleblowers who first disclose this information. Every other whistleblower law in the U.S. Code protects supporting witnesses for those who challenge misconduct or file a retaliation claim. The reason is fundamental. Whistleblower rights would be illusory unless it is safe to bear witness in their defense. There is no basis for withholding the same protections for members of the military who may be called upon to provide open and honest testimony.

The Judiciary Committee's concerns about this provision were based on an overly-broad reading of the provision. The Judiciary Committee expressed concerns that the protections could apply to private sector investigations of misconduct. However, the amendment clearly limits the protections to whistleblower disclosures under this provision of title 10, and related investigations. I hope we can include this critical provision and address the Judiciary's committee's concerns in the final version of the legislation.

The Judiciary Committee also expressed concerns that the three year statute of limitations to file a case could cause confusion with review by the Secretary in section 1552. I believe that for this concern to be valid there would have to be a landmark change in how statutes of limitation are applied. It is long-established law that, unless specified otherwise, a statute of limitations only applies to the specific provision for which it is attached. It simply is irrelevant for other due process stages. Any realistic concern easily can

be fixed with a technical edit that the statute of limitations controls only the particular subsection or provision to which it is attached. Since 1988, corrections boards have routinely denied hearing requests. The right to a guaranteed due process day in administrative court is the foundation for meaningful reform.

A continued Defense Department and Service Inspector General enforcement monopoly is unacceptable. Since 1988, every federal whistleblower law has included the right to administrative due process for either party after an initial, informal investigation. The Government Accountability Office has systematically condemned their track record of enforcement of Military Whistleblower Protections, finding that investigative and corrective action processes are so disconnected that only 19 percent of those with substantiated claims apply for relief. The Defense Inspector General has also criticized its own processes, disagreeing with the conclusions of its reprisal unit to dismiss reprisal cases more than half of the time. Without mandatory due process, this provision will be insufficient to create meaningful deterrence against retaliation.

JACKIE SPEIER,
Member of Congress.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JACKIE WALORSKI

I greatly appreciate the efforts made by Chairman McKeon to address the disturbing prevalence of sexual violence in the military. This epidemic of sexual assault erodes the foundations of trust and camaraderie upon which our proud military tradition was firmly built.

A recent report from the Pentagon is alarming. It confirms 3,604 victims of sexual assault last year—that is 3,604 victims too many. Additionally, the report found 62 percent of those who reported unwanted sexual contact felt they experienced some sort of retaliation. This is simply unacceptable. Troops who have sacrificed so much for the cause of liberty should not be subject to reprisal from their chain of command after having just been subject to the emotional and physical pain of a sexual crime.

To address the issue of underreporting and create an environment where victims feel comfortable reporting sexual violence, I authored a provision aimed at strengthening existing victim protections. The provision specifically includes reports of sexual assault as a form of communication under whistleblower protections. This change ensures victims can not face reprisal for reporting acts of sexual assault.

I was glad to be a part of this process and to work with a number of my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to craft serious and prudent reforms. I commend Chairman McKeon, Ranking Member Smith, and the staff of the House Armed Services Committee for their diligent work to produce this version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and for making efforts to combat sexual assault in the military a cornerstone of the bill.

H.R. 1960 represents sound policy and was crafted in an open process befitting of this institution. I look forward to continuing to work with this Committee on this issue, and am hopeful the House and Senate can work together to move closer to making these provisions law.

JACKIE WALORSKI.

DISSENTING VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN GARAMENDI

While I appreciated working with my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee in preparing the committee version of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for fiscal year 2014, there are a number of improvements that need to be made to the bill before it is something I could feel proud of voting in favor of.

The bill significantly expands our already excessive nuclear arsenal and includes wasteful spending on projects such as the over-budget MOX facilities at the Savannah River site and an extra $250 million for an East Coast Missile Defense Site—funds the DOD has specifically said it does not need. A logical next step to modernizing our strategic weapons capabilities would be to update outdated comprehensive assessments of our threats and capabilities. Unfortunately, the Committee rejected such a proposal. The bill also provides more than $80 billion in new funding for the war in Afghanistan, exceeding what the administration requested and almost reaching last year's funding levels, despite the fact that U.S. troop levels will drop by 40 percent from last year to this. Included in this is $2.6 billion for new aircraft and military equipment for the Afghanistan National Security Force, despite their questionable capacity to operate or maintain these systems. Finally, the current version of the NDAA fails to ensure that the basic civil liberties of Americans, enshrined in our Constitution, are protected by barring indefinite detention, and it prevents the transfer of detainees from Guantanamo Bay, undermining America's moral authority throughout the world.

While the aforementioned concerns prevented me from voting Aye, there are numerous provisions in the bill I strongly support. Prominently among these are a 1.8 percent pay increase for our troops, positive steps made toward reforming the way the military handles sexual assault, and a requirement of a minimum of 180 days notification for deployment for reservists.

I am confident that through the Floor amendment and conference processes we can find ways to address these shortcomings and shape the current draft legislation into a bill that is consistent with American values and that moves us beyond both the Cold War and the wars of the last decade. As the representative for service members at Travis Air Force Base, in Fairfield, California, which carries out a mobility mission, and Beale Air Force Base near Marysville, which conducts an Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance mission, I will continue to advocate for investing in

the technologies and military capabilities that are effective against 21st century threats.

Sincerely,

JOHN GARAMENDI,
Member of Congress.

○