

**Union Calendar No. 433**

111th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Report 111-710

REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
FOR THE  
ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS



JANUARY 3, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on  
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

99-006

WASHINGTON : 2011

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina	JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York, <i>Ranking Member</i> <sup>1</sup>
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas	HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi	<i>Ranking Member</i> <sup>2</sup>
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii <sup>3</sup>	ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas	MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas	WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
ADAM SMITH, Washington	W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California	J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina	JEFF MILLER, Florida
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California <sup>4</sup>	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania	FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey	ROB BISHOP, Utah
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California	MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island	JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
RICK LARSEN, Washington	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
JIM COOPER, Tennessee	TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia	BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania <sup>5</sup>
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam	CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana	K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
PATRICK J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania <sup>6</sup>	DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire	ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut	MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa	DUNCAN HUNTER, California
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York <sup>7</sup>	JOHN C. FLEMING, Louisiana
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania	MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts	TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania <sup>8</sup>
GLENN NYE, Virginia	CHARLES K. DJOU, Hawaii <sup>9</sup>
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine	
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina	
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico	
FRANK M. KRATOVIL, Jr. Maryland	
ERIC J.J. MASSA, New York <sup>10</sup>	
BOBBY BRIGHT, Alabama	
SCOTT MURPHY, New York <sup>11</sup>	
WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York <sup>12</sup>	
JOHN GARAMENDI, California <sup>13</sup>	
MARK S. CRITZ, Pennsylvania <sup>14</sup>	
LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa <sup>15</sup>	
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma <sup>16, 17</sup>	
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia <sup>18</sup>	

III

PAUL ARCANGELI, *Staff Director*  
ZACH STEACY, *Director, Legislative Operations*

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Mr. McHugh resigned from the Committee on June 3, 2009.  
<sup>2</sup> Mr. McKeon became Ranking Member on June 16, 2009.  
<sup>3</sup> Mr. Abercrombie resigned from the House of Representatives on Feb. 28, 2010.  
<sup>4</sup> Ms. Tauscher resigned from the House of Representatives on June 26, 2009.  
<sup>5</sup> Mr. Shuster resigned from the Committee on May 27, 2010.  
<sup>6</sup> Mr. Murphy (PA) resigned from the Committee on May 6, 2010.  
<sup>7</sup> Ms. Gillibrand resigned from the House of Representatives on Jan. 26, 2009.  
<sup>8</sup> Mr. Platts was appointed to the Committee on June 16, 2009.  
<sup>9</sup> Mr. Djou was appointed to the Committee on May 27, 2010.  
<sup>10</sup> Mr. Massa resigned from the House of Representatives on Mar. 8, 2010.  
<sup>11</sup> Mr. Murphy (NY) was appointed to the Committee on Apr. 30, 2009.  
<sup>12</sup> Mr. Owens was appointed to the Committee on Nov. 19, 2009.  
<sup>13</sup> Mr. Garamendi was appointed to the Committee on May 6, 2010.  
<sup>14</sup> Mr. Critz was appointed to the Committee on May 25, 2010.  
<sup>15</sup> Mr. Boswell was appointed to the Committee on May 6, 2010.  
<sup>16</sup> Mr. Boren took a leave of absence from the Committee on Feb. 5, 2009.  
<sup>17</sup> Mr. Boren was appointed to the Committee on Apr. 30, 2009.  
<sup>18</sup> Mr. Johnson was ranked immediately after Mr. Boren on May 6, 2010.



**LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, January 3, 2011.*

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,  
*Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. MILLER: Pursuant to House Rule XI 1(d), there is transmitted herewith the report of activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 111th Congress.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON, *Chairman.*



## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Powers and Duties, Committee on Armed Services—111th Congress .....	1
Background .....	1
Constitutional Powers and Duties .....	2
House Rules on Jurisdiction .....	3
Investigative Authority and Legislative Oversight .....	3
Committee Rules .....	5
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services—111th Congress .....	16
Subcommittees of the Committee on Armed Services—111th Congress .....	18
Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces .....	18
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	19
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	20
Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces .....	21
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	22
Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities .....	23
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	24
Full Committee Panel .....	25
Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform .....	25
Committee Staff .....	26
Committee Meetings .....	28
Legislative Actions .....	29
Legislation Enacted Into Law .....	29
Legislation Passed by Both Houses of Congress and Presented to the President .....	33
Legislation Reported but Not Enacted .....	36
Legislation Not Reported but Managed by the House Committee on Armed Services on the Floor of the House of Representatives .....	41
Oversight Activities .....	58
Other Activities of the Full Committee .....	123
Budget Activity .....	123
Full Committee Hearings .....	125
Other Activities of the Subcommittees and the Panel .....	132
Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces .....	132
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	133
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	134
Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces .....	137
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	141
Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities .....	142
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	144
Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform .....	147
Publications .....	149
Committee Prints .....	149
Published Proceedings .....	149
House Reports .....	161
Public Laws .....	162
Press Releases .....	163



## Union Calendar No. 433

111TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
111-710

---

---

### REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 111TH CONGRESS

JANUARY 3, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

### R E P O R T

ON

### POWERS AND DUTIES, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—111TH CONGRESS

#### BACKGROUND

The House Committee on Armed Services, a standing committee of Congress, was established on January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812), by merging the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. The Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs were established in 1882. In 1885, jurisdiction over military and naval appropriations was taken from the Committee on Appropriations and given to the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, respectively. This practice continued until July 1, 1920, when jurisdiction over all appropriations was again placed in the Committee on Appropriations.

In the 93rd Congress, following a study by the House Select Committee on Committees, the House passed H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, to be effective January 3, 1975. As a result of those amendments, the jurisdictional areas of the Committee on Armed Services remained essentially unchanged. However, oversight functions were amended to require each standing committee to review and study on a continuing basis all matters and jurisdiction of the committee. Also, the Committee on Armed Services was to review and study on a continuing basis all laws, programs, and government activities dealing with or involv-

ing international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in school.

The rules changes adopted by the House (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1977, placed new responsibilities in the field of atomic energy in the Committee on Armed Services. Those responsibilities involved the national security aspects of atomic energy previously within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Public Law 95-110, effective September 20, 1977, abolished the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

With the adoption of H. Res. 658 on July 14, 1977, which established the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services over intelligence matters was diminished.

That resolution gave the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence oversight responsibilities for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs of the U.S. Government. Specifically, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has exclusive legislative jurisdiction regarding the Central Intelligence Agency and the director of Central Intelligence, including authorizations. Also, legislative jurisdiction over all intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs was vested in the permanent select committee except that other committees with a jurisdictional interest may request consideration of any such matters. Accordingly, as a matter of practice, the Committee on Armed Services shared jurisdiction over the authorization process involving intelligence-related activities.

The committee continues to have shared jurisdiction over military intelligence activities as set forth in rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

With the adoption of House rules (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1995, the Committee on National Security was established as the successor committee to the Committee on Armed Services, and was granted additional legislative and oversight authority over merchant marine academies, national security aspects of merchant marine policy and programs, and interoceanic canals. Rules for the 104th Congress also codified the existing jurisdiction of the committee over tactical intelligence matters and the intelligence related activities of the Department of Defense.

On January 6, 1999, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 106th Congress, in which the Committee on National Security was redesignated as the Committee on Armed Services.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

The powers and duties of Congress in relation to national defense matters stem from Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which provides, among other things, that the Congress shall have power to:

- Raise and support armies;
- Provide and maintain a navy;
- Make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;
- Provide for calling forth the militia;
- Provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States;

Exercise exclusive legislation . . . over all places purchased for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings; and

Make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

#### HOUSE RULES ON JURISDICTION

Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives established the jurisdiction and related functions for each standing committee. Under the rule, all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall be referred to such committee. The jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule X is as follows:

(1) Ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; and Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments.

(2) Common defense generally.

(3) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

(4) The Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, generally.

(5) Interoceanic canals generally, including measures relating to the maintenance, operation, and administration of interoceanic canals.

(6) Merchant Marine Academy and State Maritime Academies.

(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.

(8) Tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of Defense.

(9) National security aspects of merchant marine, including financial assistance for the construction and operation of vessels, maintenance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industrial base, cabotage, cargo preference, and merchant marine officers and seamen as these matters relate to the national security.

(10) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

(11) Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

(12) Selective service.

(13) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

(15) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction and general oversight function, the Committee on Armed Services has special oversight functions with respect to international arms control and disarmament and military dependent education.

#### INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

H. Res. 988 of the 93rd Congress, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, amended clause 1(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to provide general authority for each committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That amendment established a permanent investigative authority and

relieved the committee of the former requirement of obtaining a renewal of the investigative authority by a House resolution at the beginning of each Congress. H. Res. 988 also amended rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by requiring, as previously indicated, that standing committees are to conduct legislative oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, and by establishing specific oversight functions for the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 279 was approved by the House on March 31, 2009, and provided funds for, among other things, committee oversight responsibilities to be conducted in the 111th Congress. The committee derives its authority to conduct oversight from, among other things, clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to general oversight responsibilities), clause 3(b) of rule X (relating to special oversight functions), and clause 1(b) of rule XI (relating to investigations and studies).

## COMMITTEE RULES

The committee held its organizational meeting on January 14, 2009, and adopted the following rules governing rules and procedure for oversight hearings conducted by the full committee and its subcommittees.

(H.A.S.C. 111-1; Committee Print 1)

### RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the “Committee”) and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

### RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “Chairman”), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

### RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee Chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee Chairmen, and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

### RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

#### *(a) Jurisdiction*

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security and humanitarian assistance (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer

and export controls, joint interoperability, the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, Department of Energy nonproliferation programs, detainee affairs and policy, and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (2), the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of seven standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces: All Army and Air Force acquisition programs (except strategic missiles, special operations and information technology programs). In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for deep strike bombers and related systems, National Guard and Army and Air Force reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, reserve component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces: Navy and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, and information technology programs) and Naval Reserve equipment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5, 6, and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense, intelligence policy and national programs, and Department of Energy national security programs (except non-proliferation programs).

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities: Department of Defense counter-proliferation and counterterrorism programs and initiatives. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Special Operations Forces; science and technology policy, including the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and information technology programs; force protection policy; homeland defense and consequence management programs within the Committee's jurisdiction; and related intelligence support.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations: Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

*(b) Membership of the Subcommittees*

(1) Subcommittee memberships, with the exception of membership on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's caucus and the Minority party's conference, respectively.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's caucus and the Minority party's conference, respectively. Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all other Majority members of the subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all other Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(4) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

## RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

*(a) Committee Panels*

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

*(b) Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces*

(1) The Chairman of the Committee, or a Chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee, may designate a task force to inquire into and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and Ranking Minority

Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as Chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall similarly appoint the Ranking Minority Member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee whose Chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

#### RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

#### RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing before that body at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest,

promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly posted to the internet web page maintained by the Committee.

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee or subcommittee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter

to the Chairman, only one member of that member's personal staff, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

#### RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

#### RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the

member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee may be recognized by a subcommittee chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the Majority and the Minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

#### RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Secret or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

#### RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

#### RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by

members are within the discretion of the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

#### RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, or panel will be published officially in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

#### RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or the most senior Minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

#### RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, Minority, additional or dissenting views, that member shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such

views, in writing and signed by that member, with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

#### RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

#### RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information that is received which is classified as Secret or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

#### RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task force designated by the Chairman or chairmen

of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—  
111TH CONGRESS

Pursuant to H. Res. 8, election of the chairman (adopted January 6, 2009), H. Res. 12, election of the ranking member (adopted January 6, 2009), H. Res. 24, election of majority members (adopted January 7, 2009), H. Res. 38, election of minority members (adopted January 9, 2009), H. Res. 137, technical corrections to H. Res. 24, election of majority members (adopted February 9, 2009), H. Res. 381, election of majority members (adopted April 30, 2009), H. Res. 548, election of the ranking member (adopted June 16, 2009), H. Res. 921, election of a majority member (adopted November 19, 2009), H. Res. 1334, election of majority members (adopted May 6, 2010), H. Res. 1397, election of a majority member (adopted May 26, 2010), H. Res. 1415, election of a minority member (adopted May 28, 2010), the following members served on the Committee on Armed Services in the 111th Congress:

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina  
 SOLOMON ORTIZ, Texas  
 GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi  
 NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii<sup>3</sup>  
 SILVESTRE REYES, Texas  
 VIC SNYDER, Arkansas  
 ADAM SMITH, Washington  
 LORETTA SANCHEZ, California  
 MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina  
 ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California<sup>4</sup>  
 ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania  
 ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey  
 SUSAN A. DAVIS, California  
 JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island  
 RICK LARSEN, Washington  
 JIM COOPER, Tennessee  
 JIM MARSHALL, Georgia  
 MADELEINE BORDALLO, Guam  
 BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana  
 PATRICK J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania<sup>6</sup>  
 CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire  
 JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut  
 DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa  
 KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York<sup>7</sup>  
 JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania  
 GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona  
 NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts  
 GLENN NYE, Virginia  
 CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine  
 LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina  
 MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico  
 FRANK M. KRATOVIL JR., Maryland  
 ERIC J.J. MASSA, New York<sup>10</sup>  
 BOBBY BRIGHT, Alabama  
 SCOTT MURPHY, New York<sup>11</sup>  
 WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York<sup>12</sup>  
 JOHN GARAMENDI, California<sup>13</sup>  
 MARK S. CRITZ, Pennsylvania<sup>14</sup>  
 LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa<sup>15</sup>  
 DAN BOREN, Oklahoma<sup>16, 17</sup>  
 HANK JOHNSON, Georgia<sup>18</sup>

JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York, *Ranking Member*<sup>1</sup>  
 HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California, *Ranking Member*<sup>2</sup>  
 ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland  
 MAC THORNBERRY, Texas  
 WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina  
 W. TODD AKIN, Missouri  
 J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia  
 JEFF MILLER, Florida  
 JOE WILSON, South Carolina  
 FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey  
 ROB BISHOP, Utah  
 MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio  
 JOHN KLINE, Minnesota  
 MIKE ROGERS, Alabama  
 TRENT FRANKS, Arizona  
 BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania<sup>5</sup>  
 CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington  
 K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas  
 DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado  
 ROB WITTMAN, Virginia  
 MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma  
 DUNCAN HUNTER, California  
 JOHN C. FLEMING, Louisiana  
 MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado  
 THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida  
 TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania<sup>8</sup>  
 CHARLES K. DJOU, Hawaii<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. McHugh resigned from the committee on June 3, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. McKeon became Ranking Member and resigned from the Subcommittees on Air and Land Forces and Strategic Forces on June 16, 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Abercrombie resigned from the House of Representatives on Feb. 28, 2010.

<sup>4</sup> Ms. Tauscher resigned from the House of Representatives on June 26, 2009.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Shuster resigned from the committee on May 27, 2010.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Murphy (PA) resigned from the committee on May 6, 2010.

<sup>7</sup> Ms. Gillibrand resigned from the House of Representatives on Jan. 26, 2009.

<sup>8</sup> Mr. Platts was appointed to the committee and assigned to the Subcommittees on Air and Land Forces and Oversight and Investigations on June 16, 2009.

<sup>9</sup> Mr. Djou was appointed to the committee and to the Subcommittees on Readiness and Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities on May 27, 2010.

<sup>10</sup> Mr. Massa resigned from the House of Representatives on Mar. 8, 2010.

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Murphy (NY) was appointed to the committee on Apr. 30, 2009.

<sup>12</sup> Mr. Owens was appointed to the committee and the Subcommittees on Air and Land Forces and Strategic Forces on Nov. 19, 2009.

<sup>13</sup> Mr. Garamendi was appointed to the committee on May 6, 2010.

<sup>14</sup> Mr. Critz was appointed to the committee and the Subcommittees on Military Personnel and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces on May 25, 2010.

<sup>15</sup> Mr. Boswell was appointed to the committee on May 6, 2010.

<sup>16</sup> Mr. Boren took a leave of absence from the committee on Feb. 5, 2009.

<sup>17</sup> Mr. Boren was appointed to the committee on Apr. 30, 2009.

<sup>18</sup> Mr. Johnson was ranked immediately after Mr. Boren on May 6, 2010.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED  
SERVICES—111TH CONGRESS

The following subcommittees were established at the committee's organizational meeting on January 14, 2009.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND LAND FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Legislative jurisdiction over all Army and Air Force acquisition programs (except strategic missiles, special operations and information technology programs). In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for deep strike bombers and related systems, National Guard and Army and Air Force reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, *Chairman*<sup>19, 20</sup>

Mr. SMITH *Chairman*<sup>21</sup>

Mr. SPRATT  
Mr. REYES  
Mr. McINTYRE  
Ms. TAUSCHER<sup>22</sup>  
Mr. BRADY  
Mr. COOPER  
Mr. MARSHALL  
Mr. BOREN<sup>24</sup>  
Mr. SESTAK  
Ms. GIFFORDS  
Ms. TSONGAS  
Mr. KISSELL  
Mr. KRATOVIL  
Mr. MASSA<sup>25</sup>  
Mr. BRIGHT  
Mr. OWENS<sup>27</sup>  
Mr. GARAMENDI<sup>28</sup>  
Mr. BOSWELL<sup>29</sup>  
Mr. BOREN<sup>30</sup>

Mr. BARTLETT, *Ranking Member*  
Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (WA)  
Ms. FALLIN  
Mr. HUNTER  
Dr. FLEMING  
Mr. COFFMAN  
Mr. McKEON<sup>23</sup>  
Mr. AKIN  
Mr. MILLER  
Mr. WILSON  
Mr. LOBIONDO  
Mr. BISHOP  
Mr. TURNER  
Mr. PLATTS<sup>26</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Mr. Abercrombie resigned as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on Jan. 20, 2010.

<sup>20</sup> Mr. Abercrombie resigned from the House of Representatives on Feb. 28, 2010.

<sup>21</sup> Mr. Smith was elected as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on Jan. 21, 2010.

<sup>22</sup> Ms. Tauscher resigned from the House of Representatives on June 26, 2009.

<sup>23</sup> Mr. McKeon became Ranking Member and resigned from the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on June 16, 2009.

<sup>24</sup> Mr. Boren took a leave of absence from the committee on Feb. 5, 2009.

<sup>25</sup> Mr. Massa resigned from the House of Representatives on Mar. 8, 2010.

<sup>26</sup> Mr. Platts was appointed to the Committee and assigned to the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on June 16, 2009.

<sup>27</sup> Mr. Owens was appointed to the committee and the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on Nov. 19, 2009.

<sup>28</sup> Mr. Garamendi was assigned to the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on May 7, 2010.

<sup>29</sup> Mr. Boswell was assigned to the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces on May 7, 2010.

<sup>30</sup> Mr. Boren was appointed to the committee on Apr. 30, 2009.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Military personnel policy, reserve component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Mrs. DAVIS, *Chairwoman*

Dr. SNYDER  
Ms. SANCHEZ  
Ms. BORDALLO  
Mr. MURPHY (PA)<sup>1</sup>  
Ms. SHEA-PORTER  
Mr. LOEBSACK  
Ms. TSONGAS  
Mr. CRITZ<sup>4</sup>  
Mr. JOHNSON<sup>5</sup>

Mr. WILSON, *Ranking Member*  
Mr. JONES  
Mr. KLINE  
Mr. ROONEY  
Mr. WITTMAN<sup>2</sup>  
Ms. FALLIN  
Dr. FLEMING<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Murphy (PA) resigned from the committee on May 6, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Wittman resigned from the Subcommittee on Military Personnel on Feb. 3, 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Fleming was assigned to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel on Feb. 3, 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Critz was appointed to the committee and assigned to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel on May 25, 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Johnson was ranked immediately after Mr. Boren on May 6, 2010.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Legislative jurisdiction over military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process.

Mr. ORTIZ, *Chairman*

Mr. TAYLOR  
Mr. ABERCROMBIE<sup>1</sup>  
Mr. REYES  
Mr. MARSHALL  
Ms. BORDALLO  
Mr. BOREN<sup>3</sup>  
Ms. SHEA-PORTER  
Mr. COURTNEY  
Ms. GIFFORDS  
Mr. NYE  
Mr. KISSELL  
Mr. HEINRICH  
Mr. BRIGHT  
Mr. GARAMENDI<sup>6</sup>  
Mr. BOREN<sup>8</sup>  
Mr. JOHNSON<sup>9</sup>

Mr. FORBES, *Ranking Member*  
Mr. BISHOP  
Mr. ROGERS (AL)  
Mr. FRANKS  
Mr. SHUSTER<sup>2</sup>  
Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (WA)<sup>4</sup>  
Mr. CONAWAY  
Mr. LAMBORN  
Mr. WITTMAN  
Ms. FALLIN  
Dr. FLEMING  
Mr. LOBIONDO  
Mr. TURNER<sup>5</sup>  
Mr. DJOU<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Abercrombie resigned from the House of Representatives on Feb. 28, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Shuster resigned from the Committee on May 27, 2010.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Boren took a leave of absence from the Committee on Feb. 5, 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Mrs. McMorris Rodgers resigned from the Subcommittee on Readiness on Feb. 12, 2009.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Turner was assigned to the Subcommittee on Readiness on Feb. 12, 2009.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Garamendi was assigned to the Subcommittee on Readiness on May 7, 2010.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Djou was appointed to the Committee and assigned to the Subcommittee on Readiness on May 27, 2010.

<sup>8</sup> Mr. Boren was appointed to the Committee and assigned to the Subcommittee on Readiness on Apr. 30, 2009.

<sup>9</sup> Mr. Johnson was ranked immediately after Mr. Boren on May 6, 2010.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND EXPEDITIONARY FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Navy and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, and information technology programs), and Naval Reserve equipment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the committee as delineated in paragraphs 5, 6, and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAYLOR, *Chairman*

Mr. ORTIZ	Mr. AKIN, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mr. LANGEVIN	Mr. WITTMAN
Mr. LARSEN	Mr. BARTLETT
Mr. ELLSWORTH	Mr. FORBES
Mr. COURTNEY	Mr. HUNTER
Mr. SESTAK	Mr. COFFMAN
Mr. NYE	Mr. ROONEY
Ms. PINGREE	
Mr. MASSA <sup>1</sup>	
Mr. CRITZ <sup>2</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Massa resigned from the House of Representatives on Mar. 8, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Critz was appointed to the committee and assigned to the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces on May 25, 2010.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense, intelligence policy and national programs, and Department of Energy national security programs (except non-proliferation programs).

Ms. TAUSCHER, *Chairman*<sup>1</sup>

Mr. LANGEVIN, *Chairman*<sup>2</sup>

Mr. SPRATT

Ms. SANCHEZ

Mr. ANDREWS

Mr. LARSEN

Ms. GILLIBRAND<sup>4</sup>

Mr. HEINRICH

Mr. MURPHY (NY)<sup>6</sup>

Mr. OWENS<sup>7</sup>

Mr. TURNER, *Ranking Member*

Mr. McKEON<sup>3</sup>

Mr. THORNBERRY

Mr. FRANKS

Mr. LAMBORN

Mr. HUNTER<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Tauscher resigned from the House of Representatives on June 26, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Langevin was elected Chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on July 9, 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. McKeon became Ranking Member and resigned from the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on June 16, 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Ms. Gillibrand resigned from the House of Representatives on Jan. 26, 2009.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Hunter was assigned to the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on June 16, 2009.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Murphy (NY) was assigned to the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on May 6, 2009.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Owens was appointed to the committee and assigned to the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on Nov. 19, 2009.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND  
CAPABILITIES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Department of Defense counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Special Operations Forces; science and technology policy, including the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and information technology programs; force protection policy; homeland defense and consequence management programs within the committee's jurisdiction; and related intelligence support.

Mr. SMITH, *Chairman*<sup>1</sup>  
Ms. SANCHEZ, *Chairwoman*<sup>2</sup>

Mr. McINTYRE	Mr. MILLER, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mr. ANDREWS	Mr. LoBIONDO
Mr. LANGEVIN	Mr. KLINE
Mr. COOPER	Mr. SHUSTER <sup>3</sup>
Mr. MARSHALL	Mr. CONAWAY
Mr. ELLSWORTH	Mr. ROONEY
Mr. MURPHY (PA) <sup>4</sup>	Mr. THORNBERRY
Ms. GILLIBRAND <sup>5</sup>	Mr. DJOU <sup>6</sup>
Mr. BRIGHT	
Mr. MURPHY (NY) <sup>7</sup>	

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Smith resigned as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities on Jan. 21, 2010.

<sup>2</sup>Ms. Sanchez was elected as Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities on Jan. 21, 2010.

<sup>3</sup>Mr. Shuster resigned from the committee on May 27, 2010.

<sup>4</sup>Mr. Murphy (PA) resigned from the committee on May 6, 2010.

<sup>5</sup>Ms. Gillibrand resigned from the House of Representatives on Jan. 26, 2009.

<sup>6</sup>Mr. Djou was appointed to the committee and assigned to the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities on May 27, 2010.

<sup>7</sup>Mr. Murphy (NY) was assigned to the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities on May 6, 2009.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee, subject to the concurrence of the chairman of the committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

Dr. SNYDER, *Chairman*

Mr. SPRATT	Mr. WITTMAN, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Ms. SANCHEZ <sup>1</sup>	Mr. JONES
Ms. TAUSCHER <sup>2</sup>	Mr. ROGERS (AL)
Mrs. DAVIS	Mr. FRANKS
Mr. COOPER	Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (WA)
Mr. SESTAK	Mr. LAMBORN
Mr. NYE	Mr. HUNTER <sup>3</sup>
Ms. PINGREE	Mr. PLATTS <sup>4</sup>
Ms. TSONGAS <sup>5</sup>	

<sup>1</sup>Ms. Sanchez resigned from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on Jan. 21, 2010.

<sup>2</sup>Ms. Tauscher resigned from the House of Representatives on June 26, 2009.

<sup>3</sup>Mr. Hunter resigned from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on June 16, 2009.

<sup>4</sup>Mr. Platts was appointed to the committee and assigned to the Subcommittee and Oversight and Investigations on June 16, 2009.

<sup>5</sup>Ms. Tsongas was assigned to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on Mar. 3, 2010.

FULL COMMITTEE PANEL

The following full committee panel was appointed during the 111th Congress (appointed March 19, 2009, reappointed September 18, 2009):

PANEL ON DEFENSE ACQUISITION REFORM

*Purpose*—To examine the defense acquisition system and possible ways to improve the system.

Mr. ANDREWS, *Chairman*

Mr. COOPER  
Mr. ELLSWORTH  
Mr. SESTAK

Mr. CONAWAY, *Ranking Member*  
Mr. HUNTER  
Mr. COFFMAN

## COMMITTEE STAFF

By committee resolution adopted at the organizational meeting on January 14, 2009, or by authority of the chairman, the following persons were appointed to the staff of the committee during the 111th Congress:

Erin C. Conaton, *Staff Director* (resigned Mar. 12, 2010)  
Paul Arcangeli, *Staff Director*  
Debra S. Wada, *Deputy Staff Director*  
Paul Oostburg Sanz, *General Counsel* (resigned Mar. 11, 2010)  
Paul L. Lewis, *General Counsel* (appointed Mar. 15, 2010)  
Betty B. Gray, *Executive Assistant*  
Michael R. Higgins, *Professional Staff Member*  
John D. Chapla, *Professional Staff Member*  
John F. Sullivan, *Professional Staff Member*  
Nancy M. Warner, *Professional Staff Member*  
Thomas E. Hawley, *Professional Staff Member*  
William H. Natter, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned May 22, 2009)  
Jesse D. Tolleson, III, *Professional Staff Member*  
Douglas C. Roach, *Professional Staff Member*  
Linda Burnette, *Printing Clerk* (resigned Oct. 31, 2009)  
Robert L. Simmons, *Professional Staff Member*  
Mark R. Lewis, *Professional Staff Member and Senior Policy Advisor to the Chairman*  
Loren Dealy, *Press Secretary* (resigned July 5, 2009)  
Jeanette S. James, *Professional Staff Member*  
Rebecca A. Ross, *Professional Staff Member*  
Andrew Hunter, *Professional Staff Member*  
Heath R. Bope, *Professional Staff Member*  
Lynn M. Williams, *Professional Staff Member*  
Joshua C. Holly, *Professional Staff Member*  
John Wason, *Professional Staff Member*  
Bob DeGrasse, *Professional Staff Member*  
Roger Zakheim, *Counsel* (appointed Jan. 23, 2009)  
Jeness Simler, *Professional Staff Member*  
Julie Unmacht, *Counsel* (resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
Lorry M. Fenner, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
Derek Scott, *Staff Assistant* (resigned Aug. 31, 2009)  
Eryn Robinson, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned June 24, 2010)  
Alexander Kugajevsky, *Professional Staff Member*  
Kari Bingen, *Professional Staff Member*  
John Kruse, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
Andrew H. Tabler, *Research Assistant* (resigned June 11, 2010)  
Aileen K. Alexander, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned July 31, 2010)  
Cyndi Howard, *Staff Assistant*  
Douglas Bush, *Professional Staff Member*  
Rudy Barnes, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Mar. 5, 2010)  
Lara Battles, *Press Secretary*  
Frank Rose, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned June 19, 2009)  
Christine Lamb, *Staff Assistant* (resigned July 1, 2009)  
William Ebbs, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
Cathy Garman, *Professional Staff Member*  
Vickie Plunkett, *Professional Staff Member*  
Roy Phillips, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Mar. 13, 2009)  
Suzanne McKenna, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Feb. 28, 2010)  
Sasha Rogers, *Research Assistant* (resigned July 1, 2009)  
Timothy McClees, *Professional Staff Member*  
Joe Hicken, *Program Analyst* (resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
Kevin Gates, *Professional Staff Member*

Dave Kildee, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
 Mike Casey, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Alicia Haley, *Staff Assistant* (resigned Oct. 23, 2009)  
 Benjamin Glerum, *Staff Assistant* (resigned July 6, 2009)  
 David Sienicki, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Caterina Dutto Fox, *Staff Assistant* (resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
 Kathleen Kelly, *Executive Assistant* (resigned July 23, 2010)  
 Kyle Wilkens, *Special Assistant to the Chairman* (resigned Feb. 28, 2009)  
 Michael McErlean, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned Apr. 1, 2009)  
 Trey Howard, *Staff Assistant* (resigned Aug. 18, 2010)  
 Rosellen C. Kim, *Staff Assistant* (resigned Dec. 31, 2009)  
 Megan Putnam, *Staff Assistant* (resigned Apr. 30, 2010)  
 Zach Steacy, *Director, Legislative Operations*  
 Elizabeth Drummond, *Staff Assistant* (resigned Aug. 31, 2010)  
 Everett Coleman, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Craig Greene, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Anne LeMay, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed Jan. 3, 2009, resigned June 30, 2009)  
 Mary Kate Cunningham, *Staff Assistant* (appointed Jan. 12, 2009)  
 Abraham Kanter, *Intern* (appointed Feb. 2, 2009, resigned May 21, 2009)  
 Phil MacNaughton, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed Mar. 1, 2009)  
 Jack Schuler, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed Apr. 13, 2009)  
 Megan Howard, *Intern* (appointed May 6, 2009, resigned July 31, 2009)  
 Krissy Ellison, *Intern* (appointed May 19, 2009, resigned July 31, 2009)  
 Nate Allen, *Intern* (appointed June 2, 2009, resigned Sept. 26, 2009)  
 Katy Bloomberg, *Staff Assistant* (appointed June 3, 2009)  
 Scott Bousum, *Staff Assistant* (appointed June 15, 2009)  
 Ryan Crumpler, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed July 1, 2009)  
 John N. Johnson, *Staff Assistant* (appointed July 1, 2009)  
 William S. Johnson, *Counsel* (appointed July 9, 2009)  
 Jennifer Kohl, *Press Secretary* (appointed Sept. 4, 2009)  
 Will Chapman, *Intern* (appointed Sept. 12, 2009, resigned Oct. 30, 2009)  
 Jaime Cheshire, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed Oct. 19, 2009)  
 Peter Kavanewsky, *Intern* (appointed Nov. 2, 2009, resigned Feb. 25, 2010)  
 Alejandra Villarreal, *Staff Assistant* (appointed Nov. 9, 2009)  
 Megan Howard, *Staff Assistant* (appointed Jan. 4, 2010)  
 Peter Villano, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed Jan. 19, 2010)  
 James Weiss, *Staff Assistant* (appointed Feb. 1, 2010)  
 Jeff Cullen, *Staff Assistant* (appointed Mar. 15, 2010)  
 Zach Warma, *Intern* (appointed Mar. 29, 2010, resigned Aug. 6, 2010)  
 Leonor Tomero, *Counsel* (appointed Apr. 12, 2010)  
 Jamie R. Lynch, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed May 17, 2010)  
 Christine Wagner, *Staff Assistant* (appointed May 27, 2010)  
 John Harris, *Intern* (appointed July 6, 2010, resigned Aug. 12, 2010)  
 Michele Pearce, *Counsel* (appointed July 9, 2010)  
 Famid Sinha, *Staff Assistant* (appointed July 12, 2010)  
 Amy D'Arella, *Intern* (appointed July 13, 2010, resigned Aug. 19, 2010)  
 Catherine Sendak, *Executive Assistant* (appointed July 15, 2010)  
 Jay Grimes, *Staff Assistant* (appointed Sept. 1, 2010, resigned Jan. 2, 2011)  
 Benjamin Runkle, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed Sept. 8, 2010)  
 John Bailey, *Intern* (appointed Sept. 8, 2010, resigned Dec. 10, 2010)  
 Melissa Tuttle, *Staff Assistant* (appointed Sept. 20, 2010)  
 Anna Hagler, *Intern* (appointed Sept. 27, 2010)

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS

A total of 340 meetings and markups were held by the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees and panel during the 111th Congress. A breakdown of the meetings follows:

Full Committee .....	99
Subcommittees:	
Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces .....	23
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	29
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	31
Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces .....	32
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	35
Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities ...	43
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	29
Full Committee Panel:	
Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform .....	19

## LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

### LEGISLATION ENACTED INTO LAW

#### PUBLIC LAW 111–61 (H. J. RES. 44)

Recognizing the service, sacrifice, honor, and professionalism of the  
Noncommissioned Officers of the United States Army

H. J. Res. 44, “Recognizing the service, sacrifice, honor, and professionalism of the Noncommissioned Officers of the United States Army,” was introduced on April 29, 2009, by Mr. Skelton and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. J. Res. 44, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Marshall moved to consider H. J. Res. 44, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on July 27, 2009. On August 4, 2009, H. J. Res. 44 passed the Senate without amendment and with a preamble by Unanimous Consent. On August 19, 2009, H. J. Res. 44 was signed by the President and became Public Law 111–61.

#### PUBLIC LAW 111–84 (H.R. 2647)

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes

Public Law 111–84, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, authorizes funds totaling \$680.2 billion in budget authority for national defense programs, of which \$550.2 billion is directed to the base budget and \$130.0 billion is directed to “overseas contingency Operations.”

#### *Division A*

Division A of Public Law 111–84 authorizes funds for fiscal year 2010 for the Department of Defense.

Subtitle A of title I authorizes \$105,029,379,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons and tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, and other procurement for the armed forces, defense agencies, Reserve Components of the armed forces, and Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund.

Subtitles B through E of title I establish additional program requirements, restrictions, limitations, transfers of, or funds for specified programs for the Armed Forces, including: procuring additional F–35 aircraft for use by the Air National Guard; conditional authority for the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for F/A–18E/F and EA–18G aircraft procurement; and terminates production of the F–22A aircraft.

Subtitle A of title II authorizes \$79,251,608,000 for research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces and the defense agencies, including amounts for basic research and development-related matters.

Subtitle B of title II establishes certain program requirements, restrictions, and limitations on 12 separate research and development-related matters, including: the Joint Multi-Mission Submersible program; individual body armor and associated components; Army tactical ground network program; program elements for the F-35B and F-35C Joint Strike Fighter aircraft; and ground combat vehicle and self-propelled howitzer capabilities.

Subtitles C through E of title II address ballistic missile defense programs, reports and miscellaneous matters.

Subtitle A of title III authorizes \$156,179,872,000 for operation and maintenance.

Subtitles B through F of title III address environmental provisions, workplace and depot issues, energy security, studies and reports relating to military readiness, and other miscellaneous matters.

Title IV provides military personnel authorizations for the active and reserve forces for fiscal year 2010 and authorizes appropriations of \$136,016,281,000 for military personnel for fiscal year 2010. The end strengths for active duty personnel for fiscal year 2010 are as follows:

- (1) The Army, 562,400.
- (2) The Navy, 328,800.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 202,100.
- (4) The Air Force, 331,700.

The Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2010 are as follows:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 358,200.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 205,000.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 65,500.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 39,600.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 106,700.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 69,500.
- (7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 10,000.

The end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the Reserve Components for fiscal year 2010 are as follows:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 32,060.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 16,261.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 10,818.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 14,555.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 2,896.

Title V sets military personnel policy, including provisions that address officer personnel policy; Reserve Component management; joint qualified officers and requirements; general service authorities; education and training; Defense Dependents Education system; military justice; decorations, awards, and honorary promotions; military families; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title VI addresses compensation and other personnel benefits, including pay and allowances; bonuses and special and incentive pays; travel and transportation allowances; retired pay and sur-

vivor benefits; commissary and nonappropriated fund instrumentality benefits and operations; and other matters.

Title VII contains military health care provisions, such as improvements to military health benefits; preventative care; wounded warrior matters; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title VIII addresses acquisition policy, acquisition management and related matters, including provisions relating to major defense acquisition programs; amendments to general contracting authorities, procedures, and limitations; provisions relating to acquisition workforce and inherently governmental functions; Department of Defense contractor matters; matters relating to Iraq and Afghanistan; government-wide acquisition improvements; and other matters.

Title IX contains Department of Defense organization and management provisions, including space activities; intelligence-related matters; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title X addresses general provisions relating to financial matters; naval vessels and shipyards; counter-drug activities; miscellaneous authorities and limitations; studies and reports; and other matters.

Title XI addresses Department of Defense civilian personnel matters, including civilian personnel benefits, compensation, and leave; repeal of the National Security Personnel System; and other federal government civilian personnel matters.

Title XII concerns matters relating to foreign nations, including; assistance and training; matters relating to Iraq and Afghanistan; and reports.

Title XIII addresses Cooperative Threat Reduction with states of the Former Soviet Union.

Title XIV authorizes miscellaneous authorizations totaling \$34,033,949,000 for the defense health program; drug interdiction and counter-drug activities; the Office of the Inspector General, chemical agents and munitions destruction, revolving and management funds; and the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Title XV includes authorization of \$128,594,760,000 for overseas contingency operations.

Title XVII addresses Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility demonstration project.

Title XVIII addresses military commissions.

Title XIX contains provisions regarding federal employee benefits.

#### *Division B*

Division B of Public Law 111–84 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$24,573,949,000 for military construction and military family housing in support of the active forces, the Reserve Components, and the NATO security investment program for fiscal year 2010. In addition, Division B contains military construction and family housing program changes; property and facilities administration; provisions related to Guam realignment; provisions concerning land conveyances; energy security; and other matters.

#### *Division C*

Division C of Public Law 111–84 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$16,512,450,000 for Department of Energy national se-

curity programs for fiscal year 2010. Division C also includes authorization for and/or addresses the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; Naval Petroleum Reserves; and the Maritime Administration.

*Division D*

Division D of Public Law 111–84 contains funding tables that provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities.

*Division E*

Division E of Public Law 111–84 includes the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act that would: (1) prohibit hate crimes based on the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability of any person; (2) provide support for the criminal investigation and prosecution of hate crimes by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officials; and (3) prohibit attacks on United States service members based on their military service.

The Committee on Armed Services reported H.R. 2647, as amended, to the House on June 18, 2009. The measure passed the House, as amended, on June 25, 2009. The Senate passed H.R. 2647 by unanimous consent with an amendment, on July 23, 2009, subsequent to striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of a similar measure, S. 1390. The conference report was agreed to in the House on October 8, 2009, and in the Senate on October 22, 2009. H.R. 2647 was signed by the President and became law October 28, 2009.

(H. Rept. 111–166; parts I & II; S. Rept. 111–35; Conf. Rept. 111–288; H.A.S.C. 111–45; H.A.S.C. 111–56 through H.A.S.C. 111–62; H.A.S.C. 111–64; H.A.S.C. 111–65; H.A.S.C. 111–66; H.A.S.C. 111–68; H.A.S.C. 111–69; H.A.S.C. 111–70; H.A.S.C. 111–71; H.A.S.C. 111–73; H.A.S.C. 111–75)

PUBLIC LAW 111–238 (H.R. 6102)

To amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to enter into multiyear contracts for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G aircraft

H.R. 6102, “To amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to enter into multiyear contracts for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G aircraft,” was introduced on August 10, 2010, by Mr. Taylor and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces. Chairman Taylor and Ranking Member Akin of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces waived subcommittee consideration of H.R. 6102, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Taylor moved to consider H.R. 6102, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on September 14, 2010. On September 16, 2010, H.R. 6102 passed the Senate without amendment by Unanimous Consent. On September 27, 2010, H.R. 6102 was signed by the President and became Public Law 111–238.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS AND  
PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

## H.R. 6523

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes

H.R. 6543, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, and the material found in the committee print are the product of an agreement between the Chairman the House Armed Services Committee and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Armed Services Committees on the reconciliation of H.R. 5136, as passed by the House of Representatives on May 28, 2010, and S. 3454, as reported out of committee on June 4, 2010. The negotiated agreement was introduced as an original bill by Chairman Skelton on December 15, 2010, and was passed by the House, as amended, two days later. The Senate passed the bill with an amendment offered by Chairman Levin and Ranking Member McCain by Unanimous Consent on December 22. The House concurred in the Senate amendment and passed H.R. 6523 the same day. H.R. 6523 was presented to the President on December 29, 2010, and was awaiting further action at the time of transmittal of this report.

H.R. 6523 authorizes \$724.6 billion national defense discretionary programs and includes \$548.2 billion for the base budget of the Department of Defense, \$158.7 billion for overseas contingency operations, and \$17.7 billion for national security programs in the Department of Energy. In addition, H.R. 6523 authorizes an increase to title XV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) of \$33.1 billion for increased overseas contingency operations.

*Division A*

Division A of H.R. 6523 authorizes funds for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of Defense.

Subtitle A of title I authorizes \$110,432,638,000 for procurement, including for aircraft, missiles, weapons and tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, and shipbuilding and conversion; and the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund.

Subtitles B and C of title I establish additional program requirements, restrictions, and limitations for specified programs for the Armed Forces, Creates a counter-IED database and enhances the effort to develop new, lightweight body armor; and Ensures that the Navy and Marine Corps have the planes needed to meet mission requirements.

Subtitle A of title II authorizes \$76,586,915,000 for research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces and the defense agencies, including amounts for basic research and development-related matters.

Subtitle B of title II establishes certain program requirements, restrictions, and limitations on separate research and development-related matters, including enhancing our defense against cyber at-

tacks as well as for advanced ground vehicles, ground vehicle systems, and components.

Subtitles C through E of title II address ballistic missile defense programs, reports and miscellaneous matters.

Subtitle A of title III authorizes \$168,150,992,000 for operation and maintenance.

Subtitles B through F of title III address environmental provisions, workplace and depot issues, energy security, studies and reports relating to military readiness, and other miscellaneous matters.

Title IV provides military personnel authorizations for the active and reserve forces for fiscal year 2011 and authorizes appropriations of \$138,540,700,000 for military personnel for fiscal year 2011. The end strengths for active duty personnel for fiscal year 2011 are as follows:

- (1) The Army, 569,400.
- (2) The Navy, 328,700.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 202,100.
- (4) The Air Force, 332,200.

The Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2011 are as follows:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 358,200.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 205,000.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 65,500.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 39,600.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 106,700.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 71,200.
- (7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 10,000.

The end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the Reserve Components for fiscal year 2011 are as follows:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 32,060.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 16,261.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 10,688.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 14,584.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 2,992.

Title V establishes military personnel policy, including provisions addressing officer personnel policy; Reserve Component management; joint qualified officers and requirements; general service authorities; education and training; Defense Dependents Education system; military justice; decorations, awards, and honorary promotions; military families; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title VI addresses compensation and other personnel benefits, including pay and allowances; bonuses and special and incentive pays; travel and transportation allowances; retired pay and survivor benefits; commissary and nonappropriated fund instrumentality benefits and operations; and other matters.

Title VII contains military health care provisions, such as improvements to military health benefits; preventative care; wounded warrior matters; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title VIII addresses acquisition policy, acquisition management and related matters, including provisions relating to major defense acquisition programs; amendments to general contracting authorities, procedures, and limitations; provisions relating to acquisition

workforce and inherently governmental functions; Department of Defense contractor matters; matters relating to Iraq and Afghanistan; government-wide acquisition improvements; and other matters.

Title VIII also includes agreed upon provisions from H.R. 5013—The IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010, concerning: (1) civilian management of the defense acquisition system; (2) acquisition related functions of chiefs of the Armed Forces; and (3) performance assessments of the defense acquisition system.

Title IX contains Department of Defense organization and management provisions, including space activities; intelligence-related matters; cyber warfare and cyber security related matters, and other miscellaneous matters.

Title X addresses general provisions relating to financial matters; naval vessels and shipyards; counter-drug activities; miscellaneous authorities and limitations; studies and reports; and other matters.

Title XI addresses Department of Defense civilian personnel matters, including the civilian personnel benefits, compensation, and leave; and other federal government civilian personnel matters.

Title XII concerns matters relating to foreign nations, including; assistance and training; matters relating to Iraq and Afghanistan; and reports.

Title XIII addresses Cooperative Threat Reduction.

Title XIV authorizes miscellaneous authorizations totaling \$36,274,325,000 for the defense health program; drug interdiction and counter-drug activities; the Office of the Inspector General, chemical agents and munitions destruction, revolving and management funds; and the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Title XV includes authorization of \$157,527,108,000 for overseas contingency operations.

Title XVI contains provisions addressing improved sexual assault prevention and response in the Armed Forces.

#### *Division B*

Division B authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$19,413,399,000 for military construction and military family housing in support of the active forces, the Reserve Components, and the NATO security investment program for fiscal year 2011. In addition, Division B contains military construction and family housing program changes; property and facilities administration; provisions related to Guam realignment; provisions concerning land conveyances; energy security; and other matters.

#### *Division C*

Division C authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$17,715,831,000 for Department of Energy national security programs for fiscal year 2011. Division C also includes authorization for and/or addresses the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; Naval Petroleum Reserves; and the Maritime Administration.

(Committee Print 5; H. Rept. 111–491 parts I & II; S. Rept. 111–201; H. Rept. 111–465; H.A.S.C. 111–120; H.A.S.C. 111–123; H.A.S.C. 111–124; H.A.S.C. 111–126; H.A.S.C. 111–129; H.A.S.C. 111–132; H.A.S.C. 111–137; H.A.S.C. 111–138; H.A.S.C. 111–141; H.A.S.C. 111–142; H.A.S.C. 111–145; H.A.S.C. 111–147; H.A.S.C.

111-148; H.A.S.C. 111-151; H.A.S.C. 111-153; H.A.S.C. 111-157;  
H.A.S.C. 111-159; H.A.S.C. 111-170)

LEGISLATION REPORTED BUT NOT ENACTED

H.R. 2101

Weapons Acquisition System Reform Through Enhancing Technical Knowledge and Oversight Act of 2009

The purpose of H.R. 2101, the Weapons Acquisition System Reform Through Enhancing Technical Knowledge and Oversight Act of 2009, was to amend title 10, United States Code, and to establish other new statutory requirements, to improve efficiency and the quality of outcomes in the acquisition of major weapons systems of the Department of Defense.

This bill seeks to improve the efficiency and quality of outcomes in major weapons system acquisition using four primary mechanisms. It focuses additional oversight on the early stages of major defense acquisition programs, during which time more than 70 percent of total program costs are determined. It also focuses oversight on programs that demonstrate lack of performance: either by failing to satisfy the statutory criteria for entering into development for production or by experiencing a Nunn-McCurdy breach. It promotes greater use of competition. And it promotes and enables the consideration of trade-offs between cost, schedule, and performance. The bill requires the Secretary of Defense to designate an official or officials to perform three critical oversight functions: cost estimation, systems engineering, and performance assessment. These officials will assist the Secretary in implementing the mechanisms the bill establishes. The bill makes other organizational improvements in the Department by increasing the role of the combatant commanders in setting requirements for major defense acquisition programs, requiring the Department to address potential organizational conflicts of interest of contractors, and rewards excellence in acquisition. The committee believes that in addition to improving the operation of the Department, the bill will result in the development and submission of more accurate and objective information to support the committee's review of major defense acquisition programs.

H.R. 2101 was introduced on April 27, 2009, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On May 7, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H.R. 2101, as introduced. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered reported H.R. 2101, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a record vote of 59-0, and was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 47. Pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 432, H.R. 2101 was considered passed House as amended on May 13, 2009. For further action, please see S. 454.

(H. Rept. 111-101)

H.R. 5013

Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010

The purpose of H.R. 5013, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acqui-

sition Act of 2010, is to amend title 10, United States Code, and to establish other new statutory requirements, to improve performance and the quality of outcomes in the defense acquisition system.

On March 17, 2009, Armed Services Committee Chairman Ike Skelton and then-Ranking Member John McHugh appointed a Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform from among Members of the committee to carry out a comprehensive review of the defense acquisition system. A central finding of this review was that while the nature of defense acquisition has substantially changed in the last two decades, the defense acquisition system has not kept pace. The system remains structured primarily for the acquisition of weapon systems at a time when services represent a much larger share of the Department's acquisitions. As a result, the Department's acquisition policy has limited application to the majority of the Department's acquisitions. Furthermore, the acquisition system is poorly designed for the acquisition of information technology. This legislation seeks to establish a statutory framework to achieve comprehensive improvements in defense acquisition. H.R. 5013 would require the Department of Defense to use performance management techniques to improve the defense acquisition system and the acquisition workforce. The bill would also require new standards and techniques for training and rewarding that workforce.

H.R. 5013 was introduced on April 14, 2010, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. On April 21, 2010, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H.R. 5013, as introduced. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered reported H.R. 5013, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a record vote of 56-0. The measure passed the House, as amended, on April 28, 2010 by a recorded vote of 417-3 (Roll no. 230). On April 29, 2010, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Please see H.R. 5136 and H.R. 6523 for further action.

(H. Rept. 111-465; House Committee Print 5; H.A.S.C. 111-36; H.A.S.C. 111-44; H.A.S.C. 111-63; H.A.S.C. 111-72; H.A.S.C. 111-77; H.A.S.C. 111-82; H.A.S.C. 111-84; H.A.S.C. 111-94; H.A.S.C. 111-95; H.A.S.C. 111-98; H.A.S.C. 111-100; H.A.S.C. 111-104; H.A.S.C. 111-127; H.A.S.C. 111-134)

#### H.R. 5136

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes

On April 26, H.R. 5136 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The bill would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2011: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the

personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military construction and family housing; (6) authorize appropriations for overseas contingency operations; (7) authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for the Maritime Administration.

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

On May 19, 2010, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H.R. 5136. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered reported H.R. 5136, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a record vote of 59–0. The measure passed the House, as amended, on May 28, 2010 by a recorded vote of 229–186 (Roll no. 336). On June 28, 2010, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders. Calendar No. 447. No further action was taken on H.R. 5136. For further action on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, please see H.R. 6523.

(H. Rept. 111–491 parts I & II; S. Rept. 111–201; H. Rept. 111–465; House Committee Print 5; H.A.S.C. 111–120; H.A.S.C. 111–123; H.A.S.C. 111–124; H.A.S.C. 111–126; H.A.S.C. 111–129; H.A.S.C. 111–132; H.A.S.C. 111–137; H.A.S.C. 111–138; H.A.S.C. 111–141; H.A.S.C. 111–142; H.A.S.C. 111–145; H.A.S.C. 111–147; H.A.S.C. 111–148; H.A.S.C. 111–151; H.A.S.C. 111–153; H.A.S.C. 111–157; H.A.S.C. 111–159; H.A.S.C. 111–170)

#### H. RES. 477

Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year shipbuilding plan relating to the long-term shipbuilding strategy of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231 of title 10, United States Code

H. Res. 477, "Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year shipbuilding plan relating to the long-term shipbuilding strategy of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231 of title 10,

United States Code,” was introduced on May 21, 2009, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Section 231 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of Defense to submit along with the budget request required by section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year, a long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels. The long-range plan must describe the naval force required to meet the current national security strategy or the current Quadrennial Defense Review; and must certify that the construction plan and budget request for the current year, and for programmed future years is sufficient to maintain such a naval force.

The budget request submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2010 did not contain the long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels. On May 21, 2009, the Honorable Randy Forbes of Virginia introduced H. Res. 477, a resolution of inquiry that would direct the Secretary of Defense to transmit, within 14 days of the adoption of the resolution, to the House of Representatives, the long-range construction plan for naval vessels along with all documents, including telephone and electronic mail records, logs and calendars, and records of internal discussions in the possession of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to the long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels.

On June 16, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H. Res. 477, as introduced. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered to be reported H. Res. 477, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by voice vote. H. Res. 477, as amended, was placed on the House Calendar, Calendar No. 77. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 111–167)

#### H. RES. 478

Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year aviation plan relating to the long-term aviation plans of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231a of title 10, United States Code

H. Res. 478, “Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year aviation plan relating to the long-term aviation plans of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231a of title 10, United States Code,” was introduced on May 21, 2009, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Section 231(a) of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of Defense to submit along with the budget request required by section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year, a long-range aviation plan. The long-range plan must describe the aircraft force structure required to meet current national security strategy or quadrennial defense review and must certify that the procurement plan and budget request for the current year and programmed for future years are sufficient to maintain such a naval force.

The budget request submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 10, United States Code, for fiscal year 2010 did not contain the

long-range aviation plan. On May 21, 2009, the Honorable Randy Forbes of Virginia submitted H. Res. 478, a resolution of inquiry, which would direct the Secretary of Defense to transmit, within 14 days of the adoption of the resolution, to the House of Representatives, the long-range aviation plan for aircraft along with all documents, including telephone and electronic mail records, logs and calendars, and records of internal discussions in the possession of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to the long-range procurement plan for aircraft. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

On June 16, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H. Res. 478, as introduced. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered to be reported H. Res. 478, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by voice vote. H. Res. 478, as amended, was placed on the House Calendar, Calendar No. 78. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 111–168)

#### H. RES. 602

Requesting that the President and directing that the Secretary of Defense transmit to the House of Representatives all information in their possession relating to specific communications regarding detainees and foreign persons suspected of terrorism

H. Res. 602, “Requesting that the President and directing that the Secretary of Defense transmit to the House of Representatives all information in their possession relating to specific communications regarding detainees and foreign persons suspected of terrorism,” was introduced on June 26, 2009, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The resolution requests the President, and directs the Secretary of Defense, to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of the resolution, copies of any portions of all documents, records, and communications in their possession referring or relating to the notification of rights under *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), by the Department of Justice, including all component agencies, to foreign persons, captured in Afghanistan, who are suspected of terrorism and detainees in the custody of the Armed Forces of the United States in Afghanistan.

On July 21, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H. Res. 602, as introduced. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered to be reported H. Res. 602, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by voice vote. H. Res. 602 was amended to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan, by December 31, 2009, or three months after the adoption of the resolution, whichever comes later, on the impact of giving *Miranda* warnings to detainees overseas. H. Res. 602, as amended, was placed on the House Calendar, Calendar No. 95. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 111–221)

## H. RES. 924

A resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives certain documents in the possession of the Department of Defense relating to detainees held at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who are to be prosecuted in the United States

On November 19, 2009, Ranking Member McKeon introduced H. Res. 924 that was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The resolution, as introduced, would direct the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of the resolution, copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to the trial or detention of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, Walid Muhammad Salih Mubarak Bin 'Attash, Ramzi Binalshibh, Ali Abdul Aziz Ali, or Mustafa Ahmed Adam al Hawsawii.

On December 15, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H. Res. 924, as introduced. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered to be reported H. Res. 924, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a voice vote. H. Res. 924 was amended to direct the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives certain documents and records not later than 30 days prior to the transfer of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, Walid Muhammad Salih Mubarak Bin 'Attash, Ramzi Binalshibh, Ali Abdul Aziz Ali, or Mustafa Ahmed Adam al Hawsawii from the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States, to include, as also required by section 1041 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), the location(s) at which the detainee will be held, attendant costs, a summary of the consultation required by section 1041, and certification that the detainee poses little or no risk in compliance with section 1041. Additionally, the title of H. Res. 924 was amended. H. Res. 924, as amended, was placed on the House Calendar, Calendar No. 147. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 111-383)

LEGISLATION NOT REPORTED BUT MANAGED BY THE COMMITTEE  
ON ARMED SERVICES ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## H.R. 24

To redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

H.R. 24, "To redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps," was introduced on January 6, 2009, by Mr. Jones and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Heinrich moved to consider H.R. 24, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on May 4, 2010. On May 5, 2010, H.R. 24 was received in the Senate and read twice, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. No further action was taken.

## H.R. 2990

## Disabled Military Retiree Relief Act of 2009

H.R. 2990, "Disabled Military Retiree Relief Act of 2009," was introduced on April 29, 2009, by Mr. Skelton and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H.R. 2990 and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McHugh waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Skelton moved to consider H.R. 2990, introduced, under Suspension of the Rules of the House, and it was agreed to by yeas and nays, 404–0 (Roll no. 433) on June 24, 2009. Pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 572, H.R. 2990 was laid on the table. Please reference H.R. 2647 for further action.

## H.R. 6494

To amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to improve the Littoral Combat Ship program of the Navy

H.R. 6494, "To amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to improve the Littoral Combat Ship program of the Navy," was introduced on December 2, 2010, by Mr. Taylor and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Taylor moved to consider H.R. 6494, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on December 15, 2010. On December 16, 2010, H.R. 6494 was received in the Senate. On December 22, 2010, the bill was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. No further action was taken.

## H.R. 6540

## Defense Level Playing Field Act

H.R. 6540, "Defense Level Playing Field Act," was introduced on December 17, 2010, by Mr. Inslee and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Inslee moved to consider H.R. 6540, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House. Mr. Inslee and Mr. Moran (KS), both of whom are not members of House Armed Services committee, managed the time on the Floor during consideration of the measure. H.R. 6540 was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 325–23 (Roll no. 658), on December 21, 2010. On December 21, 2010, H.R. 6540 was received in the Senate, and the following day, it was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. No further action was taken.

## H. CON. RES. 64

Urging the President to designate 2009 as the "Year of the Military Family"

H. Con. Res. 64, "Urging the President to designate 2009 as the 'Year of the Military Family'" was introduced on February 26, 2009, by Chairman Skelton and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McHugh waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr.

Skelton moved to consider H. Con. Res. 64, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 422–0 (Roll no. 119), on March 11, 2009. On March 12, 2009, the resolution was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. No further action was taken.

## H. CON. RES. 129

Congratulating the Sailors of the United States Submarine Force upon the completion of 1,000 Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) deterrent patrols

H. Con. Res. 129, “Congratulating the Sailors of the United States Submarine Force upon the completion of 1,000 Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) deterrent patrols,” was introduced on May 20, 2009, by Mr. Dicks and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces. Chairman Taylor and Ranking Member Akin of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces waived subcommittee consideration of H. Con. Res. 129, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon subsequently waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Kissell moved to consider H. Con. Res. 129, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 412–0 (Roll no. 915), on December 2, 2009. On December 3, 2009, the resolution was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. No further action was taken.

## H. CON. RES. 139

Congratulating the first graduating class of the United States Air Force Academy on their 50th graduation anniversary and recognizing their contributions to the Nation

H. Con. Res. 139, “Congratulating the first graduating class of the United States Air Force Academy on their 50th graduation anniversary and recognizing their contributions to the Nation,” was introduced on June 3, 2009, by Mr. Lamborn and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Con. Res. 139, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon subsequently waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mrs. Davis (CA) moved to consider H. Con. Res. 139, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 411–0 (Roll no. 860), on November 5, 2009. On November 6, 2009, the resolution was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. No further action was taken.

## H. CON. RES. 199

Recognizing the 10th Anniversary of the redesignation of Company E, 100th Battalion, 442d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army and the sacrifice of the soldiers of Company E and their families in support of the United States

H. Con. Res. 199, “Recognizing the 10th Anniversary of the redesignation of Company E, 100th Battalion, 442d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army and the sacrifice of the soldiers of Company E and their families in support of the United States,”

was introduced on October 13, 2009, by Mr. Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Con. Res. 199, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon subsequently waived full committee consideration of the measure. Ms. Bordallo moved to consider H. Con. Res. 199, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 400–0 (Roll no. 932), on December 8, 2009. On December 9, 2009, the resolution was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. No further action was taken.

#### H. CON. RES. 206

Commending the soldiers and civilian personnel stationed at Fort Gordon and their families for their service and dedication to the United States and recognizing the contributions of Fort Gordon to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom and its role as a pivotal communications training installation

H. Con. Res. 206, “Commending the soldiers and civilian personnel stationed at Fort Gordon and their families for their service and dedication to the United States and recognizing the contributions of Fort Gordon to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom and its role as a pivotal communications training installation,” was introduced on October 28, 2009, by Mr. Broun and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness. Chairman Ortiz and Ranking Member Forbes of the Subcommittee on Readiness waived subcommittee consideration of H. Con. Res. 206, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon also waived full committee consideration of the measure. Ms. Bordallo moved to consider H. Con. Res. 206, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 404–0 (Roll no. 933), on December 8, 2009. On December 22, 2009, the resolution was agreed to in the Senate without amendment and with a preamble by Unanimous Consent.

#### H. CON. RES. 286

Recognizing the 235th birthday of the United States Army

H. Con. Res. 286, “Recognizing the 235th birthday of the United States Army,” was introduced on June 16, 2010, by Mr. Edwards and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Con. Res. 286, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Ortiz moved to consider H. Con. Res. 286, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on June 17, 2010. On June 18, 2010, the resolution was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which was subsequently discharged. H. Con. Res. 286 passed the Senate with amendments on June 28, 2010.

## H. CON. RES. 319

Recognizing the anniversary of the tragic shootings that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009

H. Con. Res. 319, "Recognizing the anniversary of the tragic shootings that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009," was introduced on September 22, 2010, by Mr. Carter (TX) and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Con. Res. 319, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon also waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Critz moved to consider H. Con. Res. 319, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on September 28, 2010. On September 29, 2010, the resolution was received in the Senate, considered, and agreed to by Unanimous Consent without amendment and with a preamble.

## H. RES. 259

Expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the House of Representatives for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II

H. Res. 259, "Expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the House of Representatives for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II," was introduced on March 18, 2009, by Mr. Boozman and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 259, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McHugh also waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Kratovil moved to consider H. Res. 259, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on June 2, 2009.

## H. RES. 329

Recognizing the anniversary of the tragic accident of the steamboat ship *SS Sultana*

H. Res. 329, "Recognizing the anniversary of the tragic accident of the steamboat ship *SS Sultana*," was introduced on April 2, 2009, by Dr. Snyder and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McHugh waived full committee consideration of the measure. Dr. Snyder moved to consider H. Res. 329, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 393-0 (Roll no. 207), on April 27, 2009.

## H. RES. 339

Expressing the sense of the United States House of Representatives regarding the hijacking of the Maersk Alabama, the kidnapping of Captain Richard Phillips by Somali pirates, the rescue of Captain Phillips by United States Navy SEALs and the crews of the *USS Bainbridge*, *USS Boxer*, *USS Halyburton* AND PATROL SQUADRON (VP) 8, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

H. Res. 339, “Expressing the sense of the United States House of Representatives regarding the hijacking of the Maersk Alabama, the kidnapping of Captain Richard Phillips by Somali pirates, the rescue of Captain Phillips by United States Navy SEALs and the crews of the *USS Bainbridge*, *USS Boxer*, *USS Halyburton* and Patrol Squadron (VP) 8, and for other purposes,” was introduced on April 21, 2009, by Mr. Welch and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McHugh waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Langevin moved to consider H. Res. 339, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote, on April 22, 2009.

## H. RES. 377

Recognizing Armed Forces Day and the exemplary service of the members of the United States Armed Forces

H. Res. 377, “Recognizing Armed Forces Day and the exemplary service of the members of the United States Armed Forces,” was introduced on April 29, 2009, by Mr. Calvert and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 377, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McHugh waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Massa moved to consider H. Res. 377, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by yeas and nays, 420–0 (Roll no. 263), on May 14, 2009.

## H. RES. 408

Recognizing the vital role family readiness volunteers play in supporting service members and their families

H. Res. 408, “Recognizing the vital role family readiness volunteers play in supporting service members and their families,” was introduced on May 6, 2009, by Mrs. Davis and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 408, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mrs. Davis moved to consider H. Res. 408, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on October 14, 2009.

## H. RES. 445

Recognizing 100 years of military aviation and expressing continued support for military aviators of the United States Armed Forces

H. Res. 445, “Recognizing 100 years of military aviation and expressing continued support for military aviators of the United States Armed Forces,” was introduced on May 14, 2009, by Mr. Olson and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 445, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon also waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Smith (WA) moved to consider H. Res. 445, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on October 14, 2009.

## H. RES. 471

Expressing sympathy to the victims, families, and friends of the tragic act of violence at the combat stress clinic at Camp Liberty, Iraq, on May 11, 2009

H. Res. 471, “Expressing sympathy to the victims, families, and friends of the tragic act of violence at the combat stress clinic at Camp Liberty, Iraq, on May 11, 2009,” was introduced on May 21, 2009, by Mr. Kratovil and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 471, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McHugh waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Kratovil moved to consider H. Res. 471, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 416–0 (Roll no. 299), on June 3, 2009.

## H. RES. 494

Recognizing the exemplary service of the soldiers of the 30th Infantry Division (Old Hickory) of the United States Army during World War II

H. Res. 494, “Recognizing the exemplary service of the soldiers of the 30th Infantry Division (Old Hickory) of the United States Army during World War II,” was introduced on June 2, 2009, by Mr. Kissell and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 494, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Kissell moved to consider H. Res. 494, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 415–0 (Roll no. 914), on December 2, 2009.

## H. RES. 627

Honoring the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard of the State of Washington, including the 81st Brigade Combat Team (Heavy) of the Washington Army National Guard

H. Res. 627, “Honoring the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard of the State of Washington, including the 81st Brigade Combat

Team (Heavy) of the Washington Army National Guard,” was introduced on July 10, 2009, by Mr. Smith (WA) and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 627, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Smith (WA) moved to consider H. Res. 627, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on October 14, 2009.

## H. RES. 699

Expressing the appreciation of Congress for the service and sacrifice of the members of the 139th Airlift Wing, Air National Guard

H. Res. 699, “Expressing the appreciation of Congress for the service and sacrifice of the members of the 139th Airlift Wing, Air National Guard,” was introduced on July 30, 2009, by Mr. Graves and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 699, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon also waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Marshall moved to consider H. Res. 699, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 421–0 (Roll no. 84), on March 4, 2010.

## H. RES. 747

Congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America’s Best College for 2009

H. Res. 747, “Congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America’s Best College for 2009,” was introduced on September 15, 2010, by Mr. Hall (NY) and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 747, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Marshall moved to consider H. Res. 747, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 416–0 (Roll no. 79), on March 3, 2010.

## H. RES. 754

Honoring the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard of the State of Pennsylvania, including the 56th Brigade Combat Team (Stryker) of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard on its return to the United States from deployment in Iraq

H. Res. 754, “Honoring the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard of the State of Pennsylvania, including the 56th Brigade Combat Team (Stryker) of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard on its return to the United States from deployment in Iraq,” was introduced on September 17, 2009, by Mr. Holden and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 754, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Smith (WA) moved to consider H. Res. 754, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on October 14, 2009.

## H. RES. 812

Recognizing the significant contributions of the Military Working Dog Program to the United States Armed Forces

H. Res. 812, "Recognizing the significant contributions of the Military Working Dog Program to the United States Armed Forces," was introduced on October 7, 2009, by Mr. Leonard and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 812, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon also waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Marshall moved to consider H. Res. 812, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on March 2, 2010.

## H. RES. 845

Recognizing the United States Air Force and Dyess Air Force Base for their success in achieving energy savings and developing energy-saving innovations during Energy Awareness Month

H. Res. 845, "Recognizing the United States Air Force and Dyess Air Force Base for their success in achieving energy savings and developing energy-saving innovations during Energy Awareness Month," was introduced on October 20, 2009, by Mr. Neugebauer and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness. Chairman Ortiz and Ranking Member Forbes of the Subcommittee on Readiness waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 845, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Ms. Bordallo moved to consider H. Res. 845, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 409-0 (Roll no. 935), on December 8, 2009.

## H. RES. 856

Recognizing the Commissioning of the *USS New York* LPD 21

H. Res. 856, "Recognizing the Commissioning of the *USS New York* LPD 21," was introduced on October 22, 2009, by Mr. Nadler and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces. Chairman Taylor and Ranking Member Akin of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 856, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Taylor moved to consider H. Res. 856, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 420-0 (Roll no. 855), on November 4, 2009.

## H. RES. 861

Supporting the goals and ideals of Military Family Month

H. Res. 861, "Supporting the goals and ideals of Military Family Month," was introduced on October 22, 2009, by Mr. Rooney and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 861, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon also waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Kissell moved to consider H. Res. 861, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 417-0 (Roll no. 916), on December 2, 2009.

## H. RES. 868

Honoring and recognizing the service and achievements of current and former female members of the Armed Forces

H. Res. 868, "Honoring and recognizing the service and achievements of current and former female members of the Armed Forces," was introduced on October 23, 2009, by Mrs. Davis (CA) and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 868, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mrs. Davis (CA) moved to consider H. Res. 868, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 366-0 (Roll no. 858), on November 5, 2009.

## H. RES. 895

Honoring the lives of the brave soldiers and civilians of the United States Army who died or were wounded in the tragic attack of November 5, 2009, at Fort Hood, Texas

H. Res. 895, "Honoring the lives of the brave soldiers and civilians of the United States Army who died or were wounded in the tragic attack of November 5, 2009, at Fort Hood, Texas," was introduced on November 6, 2009, by Mr. Carter (TX) and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 895, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Skelton moved to consider H. Res. 895, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 428-0 (Roll no. 888), on November 7, 2009.

## H. RES. 900

Honoring the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War and encouraging the people of the United States to participate in local and national activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of those individuals

H. Res. 900, "Honoring the sacrifices and contributions made by members of the Armed Forces during the Cold War and encour-

aging the people of the United States to participate in local and national activities honoring the sacrifices and contributions of those individuals,” was introduced on November 6, 2009, by Mr. Israel and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 900, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Ms. Bordallo moved to consider H. Res. 900, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 429–0 (Roll no. 161), on March 21, 2010.

#### H. RES. 925

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the meritorious service performed by aviators in the United States Armed Forces who, as a result of hostile action, mechanical failures, or other problems, were forced to evade or escape enemy capture, were captured but subsequently escaped, or were compelled to endure arduous confinement, retaliation, and even death as a result of their efforts to evade capture or escape.

H. Res. 925, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the meritorious service performed by aviators in the United States Armed Forces who, as a result of hostile action, mechanical failures, or other problems, were forced to evade or escape enemy capture, were captured but subsequently escaped, or were compelled to endure arduous confinement, retaliation, and even death as a result of their efforts to evade capture or escape,” was introduced on November 19, 2009, by Mr. DeFazio and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 925, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Ms. Bordallo moved to consider H. Res. 925, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 426–0 (Roll no. 164), on March 21, 2010.

#### H. RES. 940

Recognizing and honoring the National Guard on the occasion of its 373rd anniversary

H. Res. 940, “Recognizing and honoring the National Guard on the occasion of its 373rd anniversary,” was introduced on December 1, 2009, by Mr. Latta and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 940, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Ms. Bordallo moved to consider H. Res. 940, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 401–0 (Roll no. 934), on December 8, 2009.

## H. RES. 1052

Honoring the members of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the State of Oklahoma for their service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States since September 11, 2001

H. Res. 1052, "Honoring the members of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the State of Oklahoma for their service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States since September 11, 2001," was introduced on February 2, 2010, by Mr. Boren and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1052, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Boren moved to consider H. Res. 1052, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 378-0 (Roll no. 519), on September 14, 2010.

## H. RES. 1066

Recognizing the bravery and efforts of the United States Armed Forces, local first responders, and other members of Operation Unified Response for their swift and coordinated action in light of the devastation wrought upon the nation of Haiti after a horrific 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Port-Au-Prince and surrounding cities on January 12, 2010

H. Res. 1066, "Recognizing the bravery and efforts of the United States Armed Forces, local first responders, and other members of Operation Unified Response for their swift and coordinated action in light of the devastation wrought upon the nation of Haiti after a horrific 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Port-Au-Prince and surrounding cities on January 12, 2010," was introduced on February 3, 2010, by Mr. Meek and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Skelton moved to consider H. Res. 1066, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 406-0 (Roll no. 52), on February 23, 2010.

## H. RES. 1075

Commending the members of the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard and the National Guard Bureau for their efforts, together with personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, to modernize agriculture practices and increase food production in war-torn countries

H. Res. 1075, "Commending the members of the Agri-business Development Teams of the National Guard and the National Guard Bureau for their efforts, together with personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, to modernize agriculture practices and increase food production in war-torn countries," was introduced on February 4, 2010, by Mr. Luetkemeyer and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Skelton moved to consider H. Res. 1075, as amended, under sus-

pension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 418–3 (Roll no. 158), on March 21, 2010.

H. RES. 1099

Recognizing the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima

H. Res. 1099, “Recognizing the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima,” was introduced on February 23, 2010, by Mr. Braley and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1099, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Owens moved to consider H. Res. 1099, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 421–0 (Roll no. 168), on March 21, 2010.

H. RES. 1119

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all people in the United States should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad

H. Res. 1119, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all people in the United States should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad,” was introduced on February 25, 2010, by Mr. Peters and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1119, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Ms. Bordallo moved to consider H. Res. 1119, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 400–0 (Roll no. 169), on March 21, 2010.

H. RES. 1132

Honoring the USS New Mexico as the sixth Virginia-class submarine commissioned by the U.S Navy to protect and defend the United States

H. Res. 1132, “Honoring the USS New Mexico as the sixth Virginia-class submarine commissioned by the U.S. Navy to protect and defend the United States,” was introduced on March 2, 2010, by Mr. Heinrich and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces. Chairman Taylor and Ranking Member Akin of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1132, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Heinrich moved to consider H. Res. 1132, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 378–1 (Roll no. 245), on May 4, 2010.

## H. RES. 1153

Recognizing the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local responders for their work rescuing 17 individuals from a downed military helicopter on a rugged, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line

H. Res. 1153, "Recognizing the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local responders for their work rescuing 17 individuals from a downed military helicopter on a rugged, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line," was introduced on March 9, 2010, by Mr. Rahall and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1153, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Critz moved to consider H. Res. 1153, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on June 29, 2010.

## H. RES. 1217

Honoring Fort Drum's soldiers of the 10th Mountain Division for their past and continuing contributions to the security of the United States

H. Res. 1217, "Honoring Fort Drum's soldiers of the 10th Mountain Division for their past and continuing contributions to the security of the United States," was introduced on March 24, 2010, by Mr. Owens and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1217, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Owens moved to consider H. Res. 1217, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by recorded vote, 415-0 (Roll no. 594), on December 1, 2010.

## H. RES. 1251

Recognizing and honoring the American troops who gave their lives on D-Day at the Battle of Normandy

H. Res. 1251, "Recognizing and honoring the American troops who gave their lives on D-Day at the Battle of Normandy," was introduced on April 14, 2010, by Mr. Poe and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1251, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Taylor moved to consider H. Res. 1251, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on September 14, 2010.

## H. RES. 1385

Recognizing and honoring the courage and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes

H. Res. 1385, "Recognizing and honoring the courage and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes," was introduced on May 20, 2010, by Mr. Skelton and was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Skelton moved to consider H. Res. 1385, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 414-0 (Roll no. 303), on May 26, 2010.

## H. RES. 1411

Honoring the service and commitment of the 111th Fighter Wing, Pennsylvania Air National Guard

H. Res. 1411, "Honoring the service and commitment of the 111th Fighter Wing, Pennsylvania Air National Guard," was introduced on May 27, 2010, by Ms. Schwartz and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1411, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Critz moved to consider H. Res. 1411, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by recorded vote, 417-0 (Roll No. 460), on July 21, 2010.

## H. RES. 1483

Recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifice of the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division of the United States Army, known as the Liberators, during World War II

H. Res. 1483, "Recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifice of the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division of the United States Army, known as the Liberators, during World War II," was introduced on June 28, 2010, by Mr. Gingrey and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1483, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Critz moved to consider H. Res. 1483, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on July 20, 2010.

## H. RES. 1516

Recognizing the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, honoring the service members who fought in World War II and their families, and honoring the service members who are currently serving in combat operations

H. Res. 1516, "Recognizing the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, honoring the service members who fought in World War II and their families, and honoring the service members who are currently serving in combat operations," was introduced on July 14, 2010, by Mr. Skelton and was referred to the House

Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1516, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Skelton moved to consider H. Res. 1516, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 408–0 (Roll no. 453), on July 20, 2010.

## H. RES. 1585

Honoring and recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifice of the 60th Air Mobility Wing, the 349th Air Mobility Wing, the 15th Expeditionary Mobility Task Force, and the 615th Contingency Response Wing civilians and families serving at Travis Air Force Base, California

H. Res. 1585, “Honoring and recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifice of the 60th Air Mobility Wing, the 349th Air Mobility Wing, the 15th Expeditionary Mobility Task Force, and the 615th Contingency Response Wing civilians and families serving at Travis Air Force Base, California,” was introduced on July 30, 2010, by Mr. Garamendi and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1585, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Garamendi moved to consider H. Res. 1585, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by recorded vote, 408–0 (Roll no. 585), on November 30, 2010.

## H. RES. 1605

Recognizing the service of the medical and air crews in helping our wounded warriors make the expeditious and safe trip home to the United States and commending the personnel of the Air Force for their commitment to the well-being of all our service men and women

H. Res. 1605, “Recognizing the service of the medical and air crews in helping our wounded warriors make the expeditious and safe trip home to the United States and commending the personnel of the Air Force for their commitment to the well-being of all our service men and women,” was introduced on July 30, 2010, by Mr. Thompson and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1605, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Critz moved to consider H. Res. 1605, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote, on September 28, 2010.

## H. RES. 1630

Expressing support for National POW/MIA Recognition Day

H. Res. 1630, “Expressing support for National POW/MIA Recognition Day,” was introduced on September 16, 2010, by Mr. Lipinski and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking

Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1630, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Critz moved to consider H. Res. 1630, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by voice vote on September 28, 2010.

## H. RES. 1724

Commending the City of Jacksonville, Arkansas, for its outstanding support in creating a unique and lasting partnership with Little Rock Air Force Base, members of the Armed Forces stationed there, and their families

H. Res. 1724, "Commending the City of Jacksonville, Arkansas, for its outstanding support in creating a unique and lasting partnership with Little Rock Air Force Base, members of the Armed Forces stationed there, and their families," was introduced on November 17, 2010, by Dr. Snyder and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness. Chairman Ortiz and Ranking Member Forbes of the Subcommittee on Readiness waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1724, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Dr. Snyder moved to consider H. Res. 1724, as amended, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 411-0 (Roll no. 595), on December 1, 2010.

## H. RES. 1740

Recognizing and honoring the National Guard on the occasion of its 374th anniversary

H. Res. 1740, "Recognizing and honoring the National Guard on the occasion of its 374th anniversary," was introduced on November 29, 2010, by Mr. Latta and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. Chairwoman Davis and Ranking Member Wilson of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel waived subcommittee consideration of H. Res. 1740, and Chairman Skelton and Ranking Member McKeon waived full committee consideration of the measure. Mr. Garamendi moved to consider H. Res. 1740, as introduced, under suspension of the Rules of the House, and the measure was agreed to by recorded vote, 404-0 (Roll no. 586), on November 30, 2010.

## OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

### NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY, NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY AND RELATED DEFENSE POLICY ISSUES

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its traditional interest in the overarching national security challenges facing the United States and how the nation might best posture itself to face them, in both the near- and long-term. The committee placed an emphasis on conducting oversight on issues surrounding Department of Defense efforts to improve United States military capabilities to address 21st century security challenges, including the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Throughout both sessions of Congress, the committee received numerous presentations and briefings from representatives of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the joint staff, the military services, the combatant commands, noted academics, and other experts.

The committee also explored certain strategic issues that have not been a prominent part of recent discussions of defense strategy, including long-term budget trends, the global financial crisis, and the threat of international piracy. On the issue of piracy, the committee focused on piracy in the waters off the Horn of Africa and the coast of Somalia. The committee had a full committee hearing on the topic and included several provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) such as increased security requirements for ships transiting high-risk waters while carrying Department of Defense materiel.

Much of the committee's oversight on overarching defense policy was a byproduct of posture and budget hearings. In addition, the committee held hearings on the Quadrennial Defense Review, discussed further below, and Secretary Gates' vision of the Department of Defense's priorities.

### QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW

The committee has remained concerned about both the process of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the report required at the conclusion of the review and, anticipating the delivery of the 2010 QDR, reiterated and clarified those concerns in the first session of the 111th Congress. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), Congress required additional reporting requirements and added 12 congressionally appointed members to the Secretary of Defense's independent review panel. The committee met regularly with Department of Defense personnel to influence the review as it was being conducted, and then held two hearings and a major classified briefing on the QDR once the report was released.

## THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The committee continued its pattern of conducting vigorous oversight of issues related to the war in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee held numerous hearings, detailed elsewhere, on the status of U.S. strategy in Afghanistan and the way ahead in that conflict, including two with General David Petraeus, the former Commander of United States Central Command and current Commander of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations also conducted a series of three hearings to receive testimony from independent experts on options for U.S. strategy in Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq.

The committee acted on a number of legislative proposals to enhance U.S. progress in Afghanistan and oversight of the United States effort in that country. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the committee provided authority to transfer certain defense articles from United States stocks in Iraq and the State of Kuwait to the Afghan National Security Forces. The committee further required the Department of Defense to develop a program for the registration and end-use monitoring of defense articles and defense services transferred to Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Public Law 111–84 also updated a number of reporting requirements, including modifying the report on progress towards stability and security in Afghanistan and the report on the command and control structure for military forces in Afghanistan. In addition, the Act required a new report on community-based security programs in Afghanistan and required the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to begin regular reporting on the campaign plan for Afghanistan.

The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), further adjusted reporting requirements to take into consideration the President's new strategy in Afghanistan by requiring a discussion the conditions that would need to exist to transition security responsibilities in key areas to the Afghan National Security Forces. The Act also established a new, stand-alone authority to fund projects and activities related to reintegrating former Taliban fighters into Afghan society, and established that each combat brigade deployed to Afghanistan should be provided the requisite number of combat enablers. In addition, the Act would require that the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, in consultation with the Inspectors General of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Agency for International Development, to issue recommendations for additional oversight of contractors in Afghanistan. The Act also limits the amount of funds that could be provided for elections in Afghanistan until the President of the United States made certifications about the ability of certain Afghan governmental institutions to oversee such elections. Finally, the Act requires a study of the long-term costs of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

During the 111th Congress, members and staff of the House Committee on Armed Services traveled to Afghanistan on numerous occasions to conduct oversight on the ground and meet with

commanders, U.S. troops, diplomats, and Afghan officials to improve the members understanding of U.S. objectives and operations. At least 30 members of the committee and 27 members of the committee staff led or participated in more than 22 trips to Afghanistan.

#### THE WAR IN IRAQ

In the 111th Congress, the committee continued its pattern of vigorous oversight of the war in Iraq. The committee held several hearings regarding the war, including with the commander of Multi-National Forces—Iraq (now United States Forces—Iraq), the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, the GAO, senior officials from the Department of Defense, and experts from outside the government. In addition, the committee held a number of classified briefings, particularly on the subject of the redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq, which included briefers from the Joint Staff, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and the commander of Multi-National Forces—Iraq.

The committee also continued to enact provisions and report requirements concerning Iraq and the redeployment of U.S. forces from that country. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the committee formalized a requirement for the GAO to examine and report on shortcomings in the Joint Campaign Plan jointly authored by commander of Multi-National Forces—Iraq (now United States Forces—Iraq) and the U.S. Ambassador to Baghdad. The committee also provided authority for the Department of Defense to transfer certain military equipment present in Iraq or Kuwait to the Government of Iraq to assist in further building the Iraqi Security Forces.

The committee took further action in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), modifying some reporting requirements to better reflect the ongoing redeployment of United States Forces from Iraq. In addition, the committee required a report on the long-term costs associated with the war in Iraq. Finally, following on the heels of legislation passed in the 110th Congress, the committee required a report on the status of Iraqi citizens who worked on behalf of the United States or associated organizations.

Members of the committee and committee staff continued to travel to Iraq during the 111th Congress to provide on-the-ground oversight and to meet with U.S. commanders, officials from the Department of State, and officials of the government of Iraq. At least 22 members of the committee and 19 committee staff led or participated in more than 12 trips to Iraq, and a number of members and staff traveled to Iraq on more than one occasion.

#### INTERAGENCY PROCESS AND REFORM

In the 111th Congress, the committee continued its longstanding interest in efforts to improve and reform the interagency national security process. The committee held a number of hearings and briefings to conduct oversight on how the Department of Defense works with, coordinates with, and supports other departments. The committee also held hearings throughout the 111th Congress con-

ducting oversight of U.S. Southern Command and U.S. Africa Command; two combatant commands at the forefront of reorganizing to better integrate interagency partners and address transnational threats through whole-of-government approaches.

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations also conducted two hearings examining recommendations to strengthen and reform interagency cooperation. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–81), the committee required the Secretary of Defense to commission a study of the interagency national security system by an independent, non-profit, nonpartisan organization. The resulting study, conducted by the Project on National Security Reform (PNSR), recommended sweeping reforms of the Government’s national security system. The subcommittee held a hearing to receive testimony, commentary, and alternative views from independent witnesses on the findings and recommendations of the PNSR report. In a follow-up hearing, the subcommittee explored next-steps that could be taken by the committee and Congress to enhance interagency national security collaboration.

As a result of this oversight, the committee undertook significant legislative activities to further address problems regarding the interagency national security system. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the President to commission a study on creation of a system for the development and management of interagency national security professionals across the United States Government. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) requires the Secretary of Defense to commission a study to assess the current state of interagency national security knowledge and skills possessed by Department of Defense civilians and uniformed personnel. The committee expects this study to provide the Department and Congress a baseline understanding of the interagency knowledge and skills of Department personnel and provide actionable recommendations for how to improve such knowledge and skills. Another provision in the Act would require the Comptroller General to assess the need for and implications of a common alignment of world regions in the internal organization of departments and agencies with international responsibilities.

#### BUILDING PARTNERSHIP CAPACITY

The committee continued its oversight of “building partnership capacity,” a phrase used to describe a series of Department of Defense initiatives designed to strengthen (i.e. “train and equip”) the security forces of partner nations critical to the national security of the United States. These initiatives require the Department of Defense to engage in significant consultation and coordination with the Department of State, which sets policy for foreign military assistance. Accordingly, the committee conducted multiple train and equip related briefings with the Department of Defense, in conjunction the Department of State and other governmental agencies, both as part of the routine congressional notification process and as part of an ongoing effort to evaluate the building partnership capacity-related programs. The committee also sent several delegations overseas to observe the execution of these programs.

As part of this effort, the committee worked with the Department of Defense to clarify congressional intent on how the global train and equip authority could be used, and in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), extended that authority through fiscal year 2012.

The committee is also aware of an ongoing effort within the U.S. Government to take a holistic look at the security assistance and security cooperation authorities that current law provides both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State in an effort to determine the proper mix and design of these authorities in the future. Therefore, the committee extended the authority for the Secretary of Defense to provide support to the Secretary of State for the purposes of security and stability assistance for one year in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), and then allowed it to expire, while strongly encouraging the Administration to move that funding into the Department of State’s budget for fiscal year 2011. The Administration complied with this direction.

#### ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In keeping with the tradition established in the Goldwater Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–433), the committee continued to exercise oversight of the organization and management of the Department of Defense during the 111th Congress. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) established specific legislative requirements to standardize certain senior positions to streamline the Department’s organization. The Department was required to submit a plan as to how it would comply with that statute. Upon receipt of the plan, the committee allowed the Department to enact those changes within the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). The committee also examined the critical issues of management and organization described immediately below.

In upholding its responsibilities to mitigate waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in federal government programs, and pursuant to House Rule XI, clauses 2(n), (o), and (p), the committee met several times to conduct oversight over Department of Defense activities, as detailed below in this report.

(H.A.S.C. 111–7; H.A.S.C. 111–14; H.A.S.C. 111–15; H.A.S.C. 111–57; H.A.S.C. 111–61)

#### ROLES AND MISSIONS

The committee received the report of the quadrennial roles and missions review along with the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2010 as required by section 181b of title 10, United States Code. In addition to outlining the Department’s overall approach to organizing its roles and missions and identifying the Department’s core mission areas and core competencies, the review contained specific recommendations on the division of responsibilities within the Department in the areas of irregular warfare, cyberspace, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intra-theater lift. During the 111th

Congress, the committee performed significant oversight on these focus areas as detailed below in this report.

#### CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICERS

The committee continued to perform oversight on the Department's implementation of the requirements to establish a Chief Management Officer for the Department of Defense, a Deputy Chief Management Officer, and Chief Management Officers of the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force. In addition to receiving testimony from these officials as previously discussed, the committee reviewed the resources and staffing associated with these officials' organizations as part of its review of the President's budget requests for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 to determine their sufficiency in enabling better management capabilities.

#### EFFICIENCY INITIATIVE

The Department of Defense began a major process in May 2010 of identifying efficiencies in the way it operates. The efficiency initiative was undertaken in response to the long-term budget challenges confronting the Department which will constrain its ability to sustain the budget and program growth of the previous decade. The committee explored the Department's long-term budget challenges in-depth in a hearing with defense budget experts in November 2009. After the efficiency initiative was announced, the committee provided oversight to the initiative in two hearings with senior Department witnesses as well as with numerous additional staff and member-level exchanges. The committee's focus has been on ensuring that the Department has a solid analytical basis for decisions made in the efficiency initiative to ensure that these decisions both support national security and reduce cost.

(H.A.S.C. 111-108)

#### NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND THREAT REDUCTION

The committee conducted oversight of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program and Department of Energy nuclear nonproliferation programs. The committee held hearings and briefings on specific programs and issues, including a hearing on the report of the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, and briefings on the nuclear programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Islamic Republic of Iran, and on nuclear smuggling.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), the committee authorized program funding increases, including for the Department of Energy Global Threat Reduction Initiative to secure and eliminate vulnerable nuclear and radiological material around the world. The committee also authorized funding for new CTR initiatives to strengthen and expand the CTR Program. In addition, the committee provided authority for urgent nonproliferation and threat reduction activities; provided authority to accept international contributions for certain program activities; and required the Secretary of Defense to develop metrics

for the CTR Program. In the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), the committee authorized the full amount of the budget request for the CTR Program and Department of Energy nuclear nonproliferation programs.

#### DETAINEE AFFAIRS

The committee dedicated significant attention to the evolving legal and policy-based framework related to detention operations and trials by military commission. The committee held two full committee hearings dedicated to these issues. On July 16, 2009, the committee received testimony from senior military lawyers on the implications of proposed reforms to the Military Commissions Act of 2006 on the prosecutions of certain detainees for violations of the law of war and other crimes. The following week, on July 24, 2009, the committee received testimony from Administration witnesses on the same subject matter. In addition to these two public hearings, which centered specifically on laws and policies affecting detainees, and four posture hearings, which addressed these same matters as part of a broader discussion, the committee conducted numerous member and staff-level briefings related to detainee affairs. Many of the particulars involving the custody, interrogation, treatment, and prosecution of detainees are sensitive law enforcement matters and are classified. Consequently, much of the committee's oversight of detainee issues was conducted in classified form and cannot be delineated in this report. Additionally, members and staff of the committee made several trips to U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, the Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and Thomson, Illinois to review actual and proposed detainee operations at these locations.

The committee's activities with respect to detainee affairs resulted in numerous legislative provisions being enacted into law. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) incorporated the Military Commissions Act of 2009, which superseded the Military Commissions Act of 2006 and introduced various substantive and procedural reforms to the statutory basis for using military commissions to try certain detainees accused of violations of the law of war or other criminal offenses. Public Law 111-84 also included provisions that: prohibit contractor personnel from interrogating detainees; prohibit members of the Armed Forces from issuing Miranda warnings to individuals captured or detained as an enemy belligerent outside of the United States; provided notification and access for the International Committee of the Red Cross to detainees held at Bagram Air Base, Afghanistan; and limited the use of funds for the transfer or release of individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The Act also required the President to submit to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive plan for the disposition of those individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) imposes a prohibition on the use of funds to effect the transfer or release of individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba into the United States, and it specifies certain limitations and procedures related to transfer of those detainees to foreign destinations. It prohibits the use of funds

to modify or construct facilities in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house detainees transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba for the purposes of detention or imprisonment. The Act also requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the merits, costs, and risks of using any facility within the United States, its territories, or possessions for those same purposes.

#### GLOBAL SECURITY ASSESSMENT AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

In keeping with its past practice, the committee remained mindful that potential areas of conflict beyond those where current operations are underway require significant attention and also that understanding the regional context of ongoing operations is critical to developing strategies for success, particularly with respect to stability operations. During each session of the 111th Congress, first on February 26, 2009, and then on April 28, 2010, the committee was briefed by the intelligence community on its classified assessment of global security issues. The committee held a number of hearings and classified intelligence briefings regarding emerging threats and matters of strategic intelligence. On February 24, 2009, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces was briefed by the intelligence community on the Iranian space launch and possible missile test by the North Korean government. On March 17, 2009, the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces held a briefing on threats to the future naval force. On June 3, 2009, the committee was briefed on North Korea's recent nuclear test and missile launches; and then, on June 24, 2009, on North Korea's long-range missile capabilities. On October 28, 2009, the committee received a classified briefing on the status of the Iranian nuclear program.

On January 13, 2010, the committee received a briefing on terrorist threats emanating from Yemen. On March 11, 2010, the committee was briefed on Iranian threats to U.S. forces in the Middle East. On March 24, 2010, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces was briefed on ballistic missile proliferation issues in Iran and North Korea. On May 5, 2010, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces was briefed by the Defense Intelligence Agency analysts on nuclear weapons capabilities of Russia and China. On September 15, 2010, the committee was briefed on Hezbollah, Hamas and Lebanon. On November 30, 2010, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a hearing that examined the continued crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo and the implications for U.S. national security.

The committee continued to coordinate with the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence in the implementation of the new Military Intelligence Program. In particular, the committees worked to adopt a common perspective on major system acquisitions including satellite systems and unmanned aerial vehicles. Several issues, detailed immediately below, received particular focus in the committee's oversight.

## PAKISTAN

The committee held hearings on security and stability in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, focusing both on the internal security and stability of that nation, and on the unique security challenges arising in the Afghanistan/Pakistan border region. The committee also held numerous briefings on issues relating to Pakistan including intelligence briefings and briefings on the use of Department of Defense coalition support funds for Pakistan and the Department of Defense Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund. The committee reviewed several specific issues related to Pakistan whose classification level precludes any discussion in this report, but which were nonetheless important to the committee's oversight.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), the committee extended the requirement for detailed notifications on coalition support funds for Pakistan; provided authority for the funds to be used for specialized training, supplies and equipment; and required quarterly reports on the use of the funds. Additionally, the committee authorized the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund to improve the counterinsurgency capabilities of Pakistan security forces and to provide limited humanitarian assistance to Pakistan as part of civil-military training exercises. The committee also required a program for the registration and end-use monitoring of defense articles and services transferred to Afghanistan and Pakistan; a Department of Defense assessment of possible alternatives to coalition support funds for Pakistan; and a semi-annual presidential report on progress toward security and stability in Pakistan, which would include goals, objectives and timelines for achieving progress in specified areas and metrics to measure progress.

In the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), the committee provided authority for coalition support funds to be used by Pakistan to confront the threat posed by Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Pakistan; and also extended the requirement for detailed notifications on coalition support funds for Pakistan. Additionally, the committee authorized a one-year extension of the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund.

## IRAN

During the 111th Congress, the committee held two classified briefings to consider aspects of the situation concerning the Islamic Republic of Iran. These briefings addressed the Iranian nuclear program and Iran's relationship to various terrorist organizations in the Middle East, particularly Hezbollah and Hamas. These briefings were conducted by members of the intelligence community and representatives from the Department of Defense.

The committee enacted a number of pieces of significant legislation concerning Iran as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). The committee required a report on United States engagement with Iran as well as a new annual report on the military power of Iran. The Act also included a sense of Congress concerning sanctions on Iran, and included the Victims of Iranian Censorship (the "VOICE Act"). This Act authorized funds to expand Farsi language broadcasting into

Iran, enhance technology to counter efforts to block or censor the Internet in Iran, and other purposes.

The committee continued to pay close attention to Iran and to enact legislation on this subject in the second session of the 111th Congress. As part of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), the committee included a requirement for the Department of Defense to produce a National Military Strategic Plan to Counter Iran. In addition, the committee included a prohibition on defense contracts with any entity or successor entity that engages in commercial activity in the energy sector of Iran.

#### CHINA

The committee continued to monitor a range of significant security developments in the People's Republic of China. The committee held hearings and briefings on a range of specific issues, including China's defense budget and military modernization; U.S.-China military-to-military contacts and security cooperation; the security situation in the Taiwan Strait and the South and East China Seas; and the findings of the Department of Defense Annual Report to Congress: Military Power of the People's Republic of China, required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65). Additionally, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities addressed the impact of China activities in cyberspace through a number of briefings and hearings related to U.S. computer network operations.

Additionally, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), the committee expanded the scope of the Annual Department of Defense Report to include information on U.S. engagement and cooperation with China on security matters, including through military-to-military contacts, and the U.S. strategy for such engagement and cooperation in the future.

#### KOREAN PENINSULA

The committee continued to monitor the security situation on the Korean peninsula. The committee held briefings on North Korea's nuclear and missile activities, as well as the sinking of a South Korean navy ship, the *Cheonan*, on March 26, 2010, and the firing on Yeonpyeong Island on November 23, 2010.

The committee also continued to monitor progress of the relocation of U.S. forces in the Republic of Korea and the plan to transfer wartime operational control of Republic of Korea forces to the Republic of Korea.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

The committee continued its oversight of Department of Defense involvement in worldwide drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, and was generally supportive of those efforts. The Department's drug interdiction and counter-drug activities budget was structured in fiscal year 2010 to address four broad priorities: (1) international support; (2) domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology support; and (4) demand reduction. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84)

authorized \$1.4 billion to fund execution of these priorities, including \$356.6 million for international support within the U.S. Central Command's area of operations. The Act also devoted an entire subtitle to counter-drug activities provisions, which included re-authorizations of important counter-drug programs, such as the ongoing unified counter-drug and counter-terrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia, and expanded reporting requirements regarding foreign assistance and joint task force support to law enforcement agencies conducting counterterrorism activities.

The President's fiscal year 2011 budget request for Department of Defense drug interdiction and counter-drug activities was prioritized in the same manner as the fiscal year 2010 budget. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) authorizes \$1.6 billion toward these priorities, and it supports various programmatic extensions and reporting requirements. It extends and modifies the authority for joint task force support to law enforcement agencies conducting counterterrorism activities, and it expands a notice requirement for military construction projects for facilities supporting counter-drug activities.

During the 111th Congress, the committee monitored numerous regional developments in the production, trafficking, and usage of illicit drugs. The committee voiced particular concern over growth trends in the drug trade and related criminal activities in Central and Southern Asia, the United Mexican States, Central America, and the African continent, and, with respect to certain regions, the committee subsequently recommended legislative and policy-based responses.

The committee worked closely with the Department of Defense to optimize the Department's participation in inter-agency, counter-drug efforts in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, wherein poppy cultivation and opium production continue to flourish. However, the committee expressed concern that the Department has not adequately focused its counter-drug resources with respect to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The committee noted that the Department primarily allocates counter-drug funding to efforts along the Makran coast and to counter-insurgency/counterterrorism efforts within the Northwest Frontier Province, rather than to address pronounced trafficking through Baluchistan, Pakistan. To reduce duplicative efforts with respect to counter-insurgency and counterterrorism efforts, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 prohibited the use of Department of Defense drug interdiction and counter-drug funds for the construction, expansion, repair, or operation and maintenance of any border coordination center in Afghanistan or Pakistan, absent a waiver from the Secretary of Defense predicated on vital national security interests. The committee has consistently encouraged the Department to focus more of its interdiction and counter-drug efforts on the difficult situation in Baluchistan and to keep the committee informed of its progress.

The committee was also particularly attentive to significant increases in drug cartel crime and violence in the United Mexican States, especially along the U.S.-Mexico border. Conditions conducive to illicit activities along Mexico's borders with Belize and the Republic of Guatemala prompted the committee to support coordi-

nated Departmental and inter-agency efforts to build governmental capacities to remedy those conditions in each of the three neighboring states. The committee also registered its concerned interest over the recent influx of illicit drug trafficking operations that effect intercontinental transshipments via one or more African states. Because of these regionally contextualized concerns and others, the committee supported Department of Defense drug interdiction and counter-drug activities for fiscal year 2011.

#### ACQUISITION ISSUES

The acquisition policy of the Department of Defense serves as an important enabler for both the modernization and operation of the Armed Forces. At the same time, acquisition policy must protect the taxpayers' interest and ensure the optimal use of the Department's resources. The committee continued its tradition of seeking to strike the proper balance between these sometimes competing priorities.

#### PANEL ON DEFENSE ACQUISITION REFORM

On March 17, 2009, the committee organized a panel on defense acquisition reform pursuant to Committee Rule 5(a). The committee was responding to widespread concerns among its members that the defense acquisition system was not responsive enough to the Department's current mission needs; not rigorous enough in protecting taxpayers; and not disciplined enough in the acquisition of weapons systems for tomorrow's wars. The breadth of the problems that had come to light in the committee's oversight efforts led the committee to conclude that a systemic examination was appropriate. The panel's oversight covered three phases, including: an examination of how the Department of Defense measures performance in defense acquisition; a look at a range of specific issues in defense acquisition ranging from acquisition of weapon systems to contracted services to information technology to identify common problems and solutions; and an effort to get feedback on the committee's initial findings from outside experts and the Department of Defense. The panel took a year to perform its review, holding 14 hearings and several other briefings and meetings. It delivered its final findings and recommendations to the full committee on March 23, 2010. These findings served as the basis for committee, and subsequent House of Representatives, approval of H.R. 5013, Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010). The IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 was included as subtitle F of title VIII of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

#### CONTINGENCY CONTRACTING

Since September 11, 2001, contingency contracting has been a major area of focus of the committee's oversight. During the 111th Congress, much of this work was carried out by the Subcommittee on Readiness, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, and the Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing examining the

progress made by the Department of Defense and the Army in implementing the recommendations of the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations (known as the “Gansler Commission”). The Gansler Commission found substantial workforce, organizational, and doctrinal problems with the Army’s contingency contracting capabilities. The commission made a series of recommendations to ensure that contracting in future contingency operations has greater effectiveness, efficiency, and transparency to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse. In section 849 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–18), the committee required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report evaluating the commission’s recommendations and detailing any plans for implementing them. The report supported several provisions related to contingency contracting in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), and the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 (H.R. 5013).

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations also held two hearings examining interagency coordination of contracts in contingency environments. These hearings assessed progress made by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) regarding coordination of their contracting in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. As a result of these hearings, several actions were taken both by the committee and by the Administration. Section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) clarified that the requirements of section 861 of Public Law 110–18 applies to “grants” and “cooperative agreements” as well as contracts to improve coordination of all such activities and amended thresholds applicable to covered contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements. The committee also addressed concerns expressed by several major nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) operating in Iraq and Afghanistan under U.S. grants and cooperative agreements about the collection of detailed personal information on their employees. In title VIII of the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee included an item of special interest, “Matters Relating to the Common Database for Tracking Contracts and Contractor Personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan,” which clarified that the statute does not require the collection of detailed personal information on such employees unless they are performing private security functions, require access to U.S. facilities or support, or desire consideration for refugee or special immigrant status under the Refugee Crisis in Iraq Act of 2007 (subtitle C of title XII of Public Law 110–181).

Other provisions of law were adopted as a direct result of the committee’s extensive oversight of contingency contracting. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) extended the term of the Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan to enable the commission sufficient time to complete its review of policy issues associated with contingency contracting. The committee also examined the issue of

unsafe conditions at facilities used in contingency operations that were maintained by contractors. Public Law 111-84 authorized the Secretary of Defense to deny or reclaim award fees paid to contractors when a determination is made that a contractor's performance resulted in serious bodily injury or death for Department of Defense personnel. As detailed elsewhere in this report, the committee also acted on several matters relating to the use of private security contractors in both contingency and non-contingency operations.

#### ACQUISITION WORKFORCE

Recognizing that improving quality and performance of the Department's acquisition workforce are as important as improvements to acquisition processes and structures, the committee continued its efforts to ensure that the Department's acquisition workforce is adequately staffed, skilled and trained. As the committee noted in the report of the Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform, the Department is probably the largest buying enterprise in the world. From fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2008, the Department's annual purchase of goods and services more than doubled to \$388 billion. The number of contract actions also increased significantly and grew in dollar value and complexity. Yet, the size of the acquisition workforce within the Department remained relatively steady over that timeframe, between 126,000 and 129,000 civilian personnel. For fiscal year 2010, the Department announced that it would increase in-house civilian and military personnel by 4,765 authorizations for positions, with the intent to grow the acquisition workforce to 147,000 total personnel by 2015. The Department also undertook a comprehensive review of its acquisition workforce capabilities.

To support these efforts, the committee recommended provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to enhance the expedited hiring authority for defense acquisition workforce positions and make further improvements to the defense acquisition workforce development fund. Furthermore, the committee's Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform focused significant attention on defense acquisition workforce issues, and held a hearing on July 21, 2009, entitled "shaping a workforce for today's acquisition environment that can meet DOD's needs." In its final report, the Panel made several recommendations related to the acquisition workforce. These recommendations included: establishing a career path for civilian and military personnel in the acquisition field, implementing the performance management and hiring reforms authorized in Public Law 111-84, extending the Acquisition Workforce Demonstration Program, expanding workforce incentive and internship programs, and enhancing the education, training and recertification requirements of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (Public Law 101-510). These recommendations were incorporated into the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 (H.R. 5013), which passed the House on April 28, 2010. This measure subsequently was included as subtitle F of title VIII of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

## CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES

The committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense's contracts for services. As the committee previously has noted, while weapon systems remain the prime focus for defense acquisition, the money is actually shifting to services, with the acquisition of services now representing a majority of the DOD budget. Building on efforts to improve accountability of service contracting, the committee recommended provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that required an independent assessment of improvements and oversight in service contracting, and clarified requirements related to the annual service contracting inventory and the fiscal year budget displays for the acquisition of services.

Furthermore, the committee's Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform focused significant attention on service contracting and supply chain management issues. As noted in its final report, the panel believes that service contracts require at least the same level of discipline as weapon systems acquisition. Such discipline is critical for planning, requirements definition, market research, price reasonableness determinations, and project management and oversight. The panel held two hearings related to service contracting. In its final report, the panel recommended that each military service develop specific processes for identifying, assessing and approving requirements for the acquisition of services, and recommended regulatory changes to better address service contracting acquisition and accountability. These recommendations were incorporated into the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 (H.R. 5013), which passed the House on April 28, 2010. This measure subsequently was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

## MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

The committee continued its traditional work on acquisition policy relating to major defense acquisition programs and the acquisition of major weapon systems. In the 111th Congress, its most notable acquisition oversight activities were in support of its consideration of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (H.R. 2101), which dealt exclusively with major defense acquisition programs, and the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 (H.R. 5013), which dealt with issues relating to major defense acquisition programs as well as the acquisition of services and information technology. The section of this report regarding the committee's legislative actions more fully describes the details of this legislation.

The committee held two major hearings on acquisition reform prior to considering the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009. The Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform held 14 hearings and several meetings and briefings in support of committee consideration of the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) set a deadline for the Department of Defense to incorporate consideration of manufacturing risk into its evaluation of major defense acquisition programs and clarified the manner in which cost estimates are to be used for contract negotiations.

## GOVERNMENT-WIDE ACQUISITION POLICY

The committee also continued its tradition of working closely with other committees, and especially with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to enact legislation making improvements to government-wide acquisition policy and contracting authorities. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) clarified the application of the government-wide suspension and debarment process to ensure that the suspension and debarment of contractors extends to the award of subcontracts with only limited exceptions. It also extended the authority for the use of simplified acquisition procedures for commercial items under the federal acquisition regulation and required public written justification and approval documentation for the award of sole-source contracts over \$20.0 million to certain native corporations. In the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), the committee required a review of the usage of the national security exception to competition under the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984 (10 U.S.C. 2304 and 41 U.S.C. 253).

## DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE AND TECHNOLOGY CONTROLS

As part of the committee’s longstanding interest in the defense industrial base, particularly the need to ensure the supply of strategic materials critical for defense, the committee conducted active oversight of these issues during the 111th Congress. Title IV of the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 (subtitle F of title VIII of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011) requires the Department of Defense to expand and strengthen the defense industrial base, including through the establishment of a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy and an Industrial Base Fund.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States to study the domestic and worldwide availability of rare earth elements for use in defense systems and conduct an analysis of actions or events that could restrict Department of Defense access to such elements. The provision also required the Comptroller General to assess which defense systems are dependent upon rare earth elements and identify any actions the Department has taken or is planning to take to address rare earth element supply chain risks. On April 1, 2010, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) submitted the report resulting from this study to Congress. The GAO report highlighted a number of issues and concerns, particularly the People’s Republic of China’s near-monopoly in many steps of the rare earth element supply chain, the long lead-time associated with rebuilding a domestic supply chain, the widespread usage of rare earth elements in diverse defense applications, the current lack of substitutes for rare earth elements in many applications, and the Department of Defense’s lack of hard data on its demand for and usage of rare earth elements.

As a result of the GAO report, in April 2010 the committee directed the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations to con-

duct an investigation of rare earth elements, their prevalence in the defense supply chain, and any potential national security vulnerabilities resulting from their usage in defense applications. The subcommittee met with a variety of experts from across the government and military, independent think-tanks and universities, and the rare earth element industry. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) also addressed rare earth elements. It would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the supply chain for rare earth elements and determine which, if any, rare earth elements are strategic or critical to national security. In the event the Secretary determines that a rare earth element is strategic or critical to national security, the provision would require the Secretary to develop a plan to ensure the long-term availability of the materials.

The committee also acted to ensure the continued supply of beryllium for certain defense uses by raising the threshold applicable to an industrial support project for beryllium being carried out by the Department of Defense under the Defense Production Act. After committee oversight determined that the Department was utilizing several important definitions relating to strategic and critical materials that were inconsistent with title 10, United States Code, the committee included two provisions in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) that would clarify these definitions to ensure that more strategic and critical materials are subject to review by the Department.

The committee also acted to increase the Department's focus on industrial security by requiring the Secretary of Defense to review whether to extend the current requirement for government security committees on corporate boards to all contractors required to maintain a facility clearance, not just those subject to foreign ownership, control, and influence.

In the area of technology controls, the committee engaged in regular oversight of the Administration's activities relating to the reform of export controls, working with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee's oversight informed certain aspects of the executive branch's deliberations over export control reforms, and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 included a requirement for the Department of Defense to report on its implementation of these reforms in 2011.

## MILITARY READINESS

### READINESS OF MILITARY FORCES

The committee expanded its oversight of the readiness of the armed services in the 111th Congress through hearings, briefings, and site visits focused on personnel and equipment readiness and training. These activities showed that after nine years of continuous combat, overall readiness remained tenuous. Repeated deployments with limited dwell time reduced the ability of U.S. military forces to train across the full spectrum of conflict, increasing risk to national security if the military had to respond quickly to emergent contingencies because of the gap in the Department of Defense's ability to source sufficient ground forces. Because units were focused on deployment to the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic

Republic of Afghanistan ahead of all other missions, skills not required for the fights in Iraq and Afghanistan atrophied and will need time to restore once sufficient dwell time at home station is available. Briefings conducted by the military services for the committee and work done on the committee's behalf by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) revealed that the readiness levels of most non-deployed units remained low, due to a combination of equipment shortfalls, personnel shortfalls, and a lack of time to train.

To address these shortfalls, the committee increased training funding for all the active-duty forces. To reduce budgetary risk to readiness in areas where the services identified unfunded requirements, the committee provided funding above the levels contained in the budget request. These areas included Navy ship and aviation depot maintenance to eliminate deferred maintenance requirements for active and reserve forces, which were identified by the Chief of Naval Operations as the Navy's top unfunded priorities. Additionally, the committee increased funding for Army reserve depot maintenance and Air Force weapon system sustainment and support equipment. For military installations, the committee increased funding for sustainment of facilities, including Department of Defense schools, and added funding to improve the quality of trainee barracks in the Army and to support Reserve Component military construction.

The committee continued to work with GAO in reviewing the Department of Defense's approach to managing the deployment of forces to meet operational needs in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the implications of these commitments for overall force readiness. This review evaluated the Department's efforts to establish processes and responsibilities for analyzing and responding to requests for force capabilities from operational commanders; the Department's ability to provide ground forces, combat support, and other specialized capabilities, such as transition teams to train Iraqi and Afghan security forces; and factors affecting the Department's ability to meet demands for both operations as well as to maintain sufficient forces and capabilities to meet other commitments; and any challenges the Department faces in adjusting training capacity and scope to support larger deployments to Afghanistan.

In addition, the committee tasked GAO to conduct a number of reviews: to review the Army's plans for augmenting its brigade combat teams to perform the advisory and assistance mission, and the use of the teams to support ongoing operations; to review the Air Force's ability to train on core mission capabilities; to evaluate the availability of full-time trainers in the Army; to review the Army's and Marine Corps' ability to complete home-station training requirements; and to review Army and Marine Corps readiness reporting so that the committee can better understand the extent to which changes in the unit readiness reporting system will help the services to capture data more accurately on the readiness of their forces.

## ARMY READINESS

Throughout the 111th Congress, the Army faced historic levels of stress on the force. As a hedge against the uncertainties facing the Army in these challenging circumstances, the committee focused its oversight efforts on Army readiness funding accounts and understanding the Army's new rotational readiness model. To set the stage for future oversight work, the committee closely examined the reasons for the persistent readiness shortfalls facing the Army and plans to improve readiness. To conduct this oversight, the committee closely reviewed annual budget requests and conducted a series of hearings, meetings with Army leaders, classified readiness briefings, and staff oversight visits.

The committee's oversight of Army readiness revealed that the Army was able to support Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) requirements, but that to generate these forces almost all other Army ground combat capability suffered significant readiness shortfalls, particularly in equipment and training. In essence, the two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan continued to consume as many ready forces as the Army was able to generate, leaving very little reserve capacity for another contingency. While the drawdown in Iraq took some pressure off Army readiness, the simultaneous 2010 buildup in Afghanistan resulted in very slow progress toward rebuilding the readiness of non-deployed forces.

Although the Army was able to respond to some emergent requirements, including the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the committee determined that this shortfall left the nation without an adequate ground force strategic reserve. Had another large-scale land conflict arisen, the Army likely would not have been able to meet expected deployment timelines, resulting in possible mission failure. Army leaders at all levels expressed significant concerns about this lack of reserve capacity in hearings and briefings throughout the 111th Congress. These same Army leaders expressed confidence that completion of the drawdown in Iraq to approximately 50,000 troops, in combination with the Army's new rotational readiness model, would provide some units with additional time to restore readiness through training and receipt of needed equipment.

In addition to the quantitative shortfall in fully ready Army forces, the committee also sought to understand a major qualitative change in the forces the Army was providing to meet ongoing and emergent requirements. Specifically, the committee found that Army forces deploying to OIF or OEF often deployed to conduct a different mission than their core combat mission. As a result, units were often extensively reconfigured in terms of equipment and personnel during their training and deployment periods. While these non-core missions were deemed appropriate for OIF and OEF, the committee found that over time many Army units lost core combat skills simply due to a lack of time to train on them. For example, many artillery units were found to have almost no recent artillery training because they were being deployed to do a myriad of other tasks, such as motorized infantry, detainee operations, and convoy security. In addition to unit readiness challenges, the committee

found that repeated deployments to conduct non-core combat tasks also may have a long-term negative impact on the core skill levels of Army leaders at all levels, some of whom have not trained on core combat tasks for years.

Overall, the committee found that while Army leaders still claim the Army is capable of full-spectrum operations, it is in fact today a force that is almost entirely tailored to conduct counterinsurgency missions. Given the ongoing mission in Iraq and the increased force levels in Afghanistan planned for 2010–2011, the amount of time and resources required to reconstitute the Army's capability for high-intensity, full-spectrum combat operations remained unclear.

In trying to understand the reasons for these readiness shortfalls, the committee spent significant time examining the Army's new readiness model, the "Army Force Generation," or ARFORGEN, system. This new rotational readiness system allows, by design, one-third of Army forces to be at the lowest levels of combat readiness, with another one-third in a state of partial readiness. The remaining third, roughly equal to 20 brigade combat teams and associated support assets, is intended to be fully ready for any possible contingency. In addition, the committee closely examined and tracked the Army's complementary new readiness tracking system, the "Defense Readiness Reporting System," which allows units to report two separate measures of readiness: one for traditional combat missions and one for "assigned" missions, where there is a significant difference. For example, an Army artillery battalion may now simultaneously report it is at a C-4 readiness level for its core artillery mission, but C-1 for its assigned mission of convoy security. Taken together, this new rotational readiness system and readiness reporting system marked a dramatic change in how the Army postures and resources itself for contingency operations and could have significant impact on the Army's resource needs in the future.

A final element of Army readiness examined by the committee was that of the reserve component. The committee found that the Army National Guard and Army Reserve have achieved unprecedented levels of readiness due to the constant demand for their forces to support OIF, OEF, and other operations. The committee also discovered, however, that the Army has no clear plan to provide the resources necessary to maintain these improved reserve component readiness levels. Given this uncertainty, the committee sought to preserve these high readiness levels by increasing funding for Army Reserve and Army National Guard readiness accounts during the 111th Congress.

#### NAVAL READINESS

Through hearings, briefings and site visits, the committee learned that the Navy's next-to-deploy forces, like the Army's, reported high levels of readiness but this also came at the expense of the non-deployed forces who experienced fewer training opportunities as resources were prioritized toward meeting Global Force Management demands. Navy requirements to support non-standard mission and requests for individual augmentees continued to grow, reducing opportunities for Navy sailors and officers to train

for core missions with a full complement of personnel. Marine Corps leadership reported to the committee that the Marine Corps experienced equipment usage rates as much as seven times greater than peacetime rates, reducing the expected lifespan of gear. The pace and nature of ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan adversely affected Marine Corps readiness, as evidenced in the Marine Corps' overall readiness assessment, the reported readiness of next-to-deploy and non-deployed Marine units, and in the service's assessed ability to perform key warfighting functions. Non-deployed units were used to satisfy equipment needs for deployed and next-to-deploy units.

The committee focused attention on the readiness of the Navy's non-nuclear surface fleet following reports that some ships remained in degraded material condition and that crews were experiencing shortages of parts and tools, addressing this issue in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491). In preparation for hearings, committee staff conducted a site visit to the Great Lakes Naval Training Center and toured public and private ship repair facilities of the Pacific and Atlantic fleets and in the Central Command area of operation.

On March 25, 2009, the Subcommittee on Readiness received testimony on readiness and sustainment of the Navy's surface fleet. The Navy reported at that hearing that it had begun taking steps to address gaps in ship maintenance funding and to assess ship material conditions through a pilot program of technical inspections. Both are aimed at ensuring the Navy's surface combatant ships achieve their intended service life, which is a key underpinning of the Navy's 30-year shipbuilding plan.

In a related session, the Readiness Subcommittee on March 23, 2010, met with the Seapower and Expeditionary Forces Subcommittee to receive a briefing from Department of Navy officials regarding the Navy's proposed decommissioning of Oliver Hazard Perry Class frigates. The briefing highlighted the operation and maintenance challenges of extending the ships' service life beyond their intended timeline.

A second hearing on July 28, 2010, by the Readiness and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces Subcommittees examined readiness of the Navy's non-nuclear surface fleet. The hearing came on the heels of a Fleet Review Panel report that surface force readiness had degraded to a point that it was well below acceptable levels to support reliable, sustained operations at sea. This report and other incidents brought to the committee's attention once again raised the issue of whether the Navy can achieve, let alone extend, the design service life of its surface force ships and questioned the ability of the surface fleet to accomplish assigned missions. The hearing focused on contributing factors such as manpower and manning, training, equipment, command and control, and material readiness.

(H.A.S.C. 111-174)

## AIR FORCE READINESS

The committee continued to monitor the significant readiness challenges facing the Air Force through the annual budget posture hearings and site visits to all the Air Force logistics centers and several individual Air Force bases in the Continental United States, as well as in the Pacific, European and Central Command areas of operation. Maintenance challenges have reduced overall mission capability to rates below levels seen in prior years and are particularly alarming given that procurement programs for new aircraft will not fill capability gaps until the years beyond the Future Years Defense Plan. Furthermore, weapons systems sustainment not only was funded at only 71 percent in the Air Force base budget request for fiscal year 2010 but topped the unfunded requirements list for fiscal year 2011.

In addition, like the Navy, the Air Force requirements to support non-standard mission and requests for individual joint expeditionary taskings (JET) continued to grow, reducing opportunities for airmen to train for core missions with a full complement of personnel. In addition, the committee found that airmen often deployed to a different JET mission than originally tasked and for which they had been trained to perform. This left them ill-prepared to undertake the new tasking, with training being conducted on the ground in theater.

The committee expressed concern about the potential capability gap that could result from the Air Force's May 2009 announcement of its combat air forces restructuring plan. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee addressed several troubling factors regarding the Air Force's restructuring plan. These included the fact that the Air Force already had projected shortfalls in its required 2,200-aircraft fighter inventory beginning in fiscal year 2017 with the expectation that this shortage would reach approximately 800 aircraft by fiscal year 2024; replacement aircraft were still being tested and were not yet available for fielding; and the Air Force had not identified, for all of the affected bases, the follow-on missions that would serve to fill force structure and capability gaps. As a result of the committee's concern, a provision was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that prohibited the retirement of additional combat aircraft, with the exception of the five already slated for retirement, until 30 days after the Air Force submitted a report to the congressional defense committees; a classified version of the report was provided on March 4, 2010. The report stated that, though the risk to achieving its national defense strategy objectives in the 2010 to 2020 timeframe is slightly increased, the Air Force through the restructuring plan sought to build a smaller, but more capable, force while at the same time maintaining a bridge to an increasingly fifth-generation fighter force structure.

## PREPOSITIONED STOCKS

Prepositioned stocks are critical warfighting stocks located in strategic land- and ship-based worldwide locations. Prepositioned

stocks are important in reducing strategic lift requirements and improving force closure times. Because both the Army and Marine Corps have depleted their prepositioned stocks over the past nine years to support overseas operations and Grow-the-Force efforts, the reconstitution of these stocks are an important piece of equipment reset. As such, the committee examined these issues during the July 9, 2009, and December 10, 2009, hearings on reset held jointly by the Readiness, Air and Land Forces, and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces Subcommittees. The committee expressed particular concern that the Army's plan to reconstitute its prepositioned stocks was extended from a completion date of 2013 to 2015.

Additionally, committee staff during the 111th Congress conducted site visits to the Pacific, European and Central Command areas of operation to view first-hand Army Prepositioned Stocks consisting of pre-positioned unit sets of combat equipment, operational projects, sustainment stocks, and war reserve secondary items such as rations, tents, chemical defense equipment, packaged petroleum products, barbed wire and other barrier materiel, medical supplies, and repair parts. Staff also visited the Marine Corps Prepositioning Program—Norway which was used to source equipment in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and to provide humanitarian assistance in the nation of Georgia.

#### EQUIPMENT RESET

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the services' reset strategies to repair, recapitalize, and replace equipment damaged or worn out through nine years of continuous combat operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in OEF and in OIF. This oversight expanded in 2010 to include the retrograde of equipment from the Republic of Iraq back to the United States as combat operations there declined and for redeployment to Afghanistan to support the surge in combat operations in that country.

The Readiness, Air and Land Forces, and Seapower and Expeditionary Subcommittees convened a joint hearing on July 9, 2009, and again on December 10, 2009, to receive testimony on Army and Marine Corps reset requirements. The hearing informed members about reset funding history, current-year funding and execution, the eventual movement of reset dollars into the Army's and Marine Corps' base budgets; how well Army and Marine Corps depots and the industrial base were meeting the demand for reset equipment in terms of workload, production of major end items, long-lead items, and spare parts; and the reset equipment requirement for drawdown in Iraq and buildup in Afghanistan. Additionally, committee staff received periodic briefings on Army and Marine Corps reset efforts, monitored monthly reset reports provided by the Department of the Army, and participated in Workload Production Updates hosted by Army Materiel Command throughout 2009 and 2010.

The committee continued to monitor the balance of funding for ground forces' depot maintenance in support of reset and voiced concern that the amount of the Army's depot maintenance request funded in the base budget remained alarmingly low (at 11.4 per-

cent). The committee had the same concern for Marine Corps depot maintenance, where 86 percent of the fiscal year 2011 budget was in the Overseas Contingency Operations accounts

#### DEPOT AND ARSENAL CAPABILITY

With the nation's military depots functioning at peak capacity in support of ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the committee in the 111th Congress continued its oversight of policies affecting the Nation's government-owned arsenals, depots, air logistics centers, and shipyards, as well as the private-sector support provided through the annual operation and maintenance budget.

The committee took action in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to clarify depot-maintenance policy in regard to the installation of major modifications and upgrades. The sense of Congress included in that Act states that such installation is considered a part of the definition of depot-level maintenance under section 2466 of title 10, United States Code.

Also in Public Law 111-84, the committee required the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive plan for improving its inventory management systems. The action followed a series of examinations by GAO performed on the committee's behalf on the services' and the Defense Logistics Agency's inventory management systems that showed the Department of Defense needs to improve its demand forecasting procedures and provide better information to item managers.

The committee, through Public Law 111-84 and again through the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) extended authorization of the Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI).

In December 2010, the committee received the report of an independent, 22-month assessment of post-reset depot capability required to provide life-cycle sustainment of military systems and equipment. The report was mandated by the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), and will be used by the committee in the 112th Congress to examine the statutory framework that underpins depot and arsenal capability. The report will inform the committee on future depot policy and operations in the context of reduced depot-maintenance funding following the cessation of combat operations in Iraq.

Also in the 111th Congress, the committee took action toward better management and more expanded use of the working capital funds. A provision in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) would require an independent review of each Department of Defense working capital fund to determine the appropriate cash corpus required to maintain good financial management of the fund. The committee reported that it believes the current cash minimum balances are arbitrary and outdated. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) also allows supply parts developed through continuous technology refreshment to be purchased with working capital funds, enabling the military departments to make vital progress in resolving critical supply problems affecting military readiness.

## LIFE-CYCLE SUSTAINMENT

With operation and support (O&S) costs constituting up to 70 percent of the lifecycle cost to the government for a weapon system, the committee in the 111th Congress continued its oversight of how effectively the Department of Defense is developing and procuring weapons systems and equipment with consideration of life-cycle sustainment and support costs in mind. Particularly, the committee voiced concern that the military services may not be planning sufficiently for the O&S costs that will be incurred when non-standard items fielded under rapid fielding initiatives in response to Joint Urgent Operational Needs migrate to programs of record. First among these are the Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected (M-RAP) vehicle and its Afghanistan variant, the Military All Terrain Vehicle, or MATV, whose O&S costs are expected to average at least \$2.0 billion per year.

Furthermore, the committee examined the extent to which the acquisition community and the logistics community collaborate during system design and development. As noted, decisions made during this critical phase can unnecessarily create sustainment problems that drive millions of dollars in depot-level maintenance once the system is fielded. As a result of this oversight, the committee included provisions addressing life-cycle sustainment in the Weapon Systems Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) and the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (H.R. 5013). In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) included a provision that required the development of product support strategies for major weapon systems and mandated that each system be supported by a properly qualified military or civilian product support manager; these requirements could apply to other acquisition programs as well.

The committee also addressed the cost to avoid, control, and mitigate corrosion in the context of life-cycle O&S. Despite the validated 50-to-1 return on investment from the 169 projects implemented through the Department of Defense's corrosion office, the committee expressed disappointment that the Department's budget request for corrosion control and mitigation continues to fall far short of the known total requirement. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee mandated the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to evaluate the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter programs' corrosion efforts, which draw extensively from the lessons learned from the F-22 program. The evaluation concluded that the corrosion problems observed on the F-22 were inevitable and could have been anticipated, and that neither program has a life-cycle cost requirement to motivate attention to long-term sustainment considerations, such as corrosion.

## CIVILIAN PERSONNEL AND WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT

The committee continued to explore initiatives that would provide the Department with the necessary tools to hire, retain, and train a qualified federal civilian workforce with the right skills to effectively contribute to the success of the Department's mission.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) included provisions to clarify hiring authorities for participants in the national security education program as well as the science, mathematics and research, and information technology scholarship programs; and enhance special personnel authorities within the DOD science and technology reinvention laboratories. In addition, Public Law 111–84 codified a congressionally mandated requirement for the Department to develop an annual human capital plan to shape its workforce to achieve the proper balance between military, civilian and contractor personnel. Furthermore, Public Law 111–84 addressed comprehensive changes to the re-employment of annuitants and to retirement benefits for all Federal civilian employees.

#### BENEFITS FOR DEPLOYED CIVILIANS

The committee continued its efforts to provide special incentives and benefits for federal civilian employees serving in active combat zones, especially in light of the Department of Defense's civilian expeditionary workforce initiative. Both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) contained initiatives to expand such incentives. These included an extension of authority to waive limitations on premium pay, and extending benefits to federal civilian employees on official duty in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. However, as noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee had been anticipating that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), in coordination with the Departments of Defense, State and Labor, would be proposing a broader package of pay, leave, workman's compensation, health benefits, and other incentives for all Federal agencies that send personnel to hazardous duty areas. While the committee was disappointed that this proposal was not provided by OPM in time for the committee to take action on it in fiscal year 2011, the committee expects to address these issues in the 112th Congress.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM

During the 111th Congress, the committee conducted extensive oversight of the Department's civilian personnel system. This effort began with the committee's request to Department of Defense Secretary Robert Gates urging the Department to discontinue converting DOD employees to the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) until the executive branch and Congress could properly address the future of the Department's personnel system. Consistent with this request, President Barack Obama directed the Department to undertake a comprehensive review of NSPS, which was conducted by the Defense Business Board (DBB) and completed in August 2009. On April 1, 2009, the Subcommittee on Readiness met to receive testimony on NSPS and the ongoing DBB review. As a result of the hearing and the recommendations in the DBB report, the committee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to re-

peal the authority for NSPS and require the transition of NSPS employees to previously existing civilian personnel systems by January 1, 2012. The provision also provided the Secretary of Defense with new personnel flexibilities which would apply across the civilian workforce of the Department of Defense. In particular, the provision authorized the Secretary, in coordination with the Director of OPM, to develop new methods for hiring and assigning personnel, and for appraising employee performance. In addition, the provision directed the Secretary to develop special training programs for managers to implement the personnel authorities granted, and to establish an incentive fund to reward individual or team performance.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491), the committee applauded the Department’s actions to move forward with the conversions before the January 1, 2012, deadline. However, the committee expressed concern that certain issues have arisen as a result of the rapid conversion, such as personnel being placed in a retained pay status, and requested a briefing on the Department’s plans for the January 2011 nationwide adjustment along with any other salary increases, including for individuals in a pay-retention status. Furthermore, the committee staff monitored progress on compliance with the authorities provided in Public Law 111–84 through regular meetings with the Department’s NSPS transition team.

#### INSOURCING

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates announced on April 6, 2009, his decision to scale back significantly the role of contractors in support services and bring appropriate contracted-out functions back in-house. This announcement aligned with the President’s March 4, 2009, memo on government contracting that was intended to ensure that “inherently governmental” functions and those closely associated with inherently governmental functions, as well as certain personal services contracts, are performed by federal government personnel and not by contractor personnel. The committee noted that section 2463 of Title 10, United States Code already required managers within the Department of Defense and the military services to consider using federal civilian employees for work that is new or currently being performed by contractors in certain circumstances.

While generally supportive of the Department’s announced insourcing initiative, the committee noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 that it should not be driven by random goals or arbitrary budget reductions, rather it should be considered as part of an overall strategic plan that looks at the total workforce (military, federal civilian, and contractor) required to accomplish the Department’s mission. As a result of these concerns, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on its insourcing implementation plan, including how it intended to address the impacts of insourcing on contractor employees, and to comply with other relevant laws (i.e., section 2463 as well as the establishment of service contract inventories); that report was submitted in December 2009.

As a follow-up to the Department's December report, the Subcommittee on Readiness held a briefing on March 12, 2010, with representatives from the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, the Department of Defense, and the Departments of the Army, Air Force, and Navy. The briefers focused on their agency's insourcing initiatives, implementing guidance, and the criteria by which they determined which functions should be brought back in-house. As a result of the briefing, a provision was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) to prohibit the establishment of arbitrary goals or targets to convert work from performance by private sector contractors to performance by federal civilian employees; the provision also required an insourcing review by the Secretary of Defense and GAO.

#### PRIVATE SECURITY GUARDS

The committee continued to question the use of private security contractors both at domestic military installations and in areas of combat or contingency operations. The committee particularly was concerned with the harmful impact to military missions and foreign relations that can be caused by the misconduct of private security contractors. To address this concern, the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 called for the Secretary of Defense to assess the feasibility of a third-party certification process that would screen out companies not being able to conform to specific operational, business and training standards. The Department's report, issued in April 2010, supported a mandatory third-party certification as a prerequisite for contract award. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) included a provision to implement this recommendation by requiring a Department of Defense review of operational and business standards applicable to private security contractors. It also allows the Department to consider a third-party certification for all contractors who provide security services to the Department to ensure the quality and experience of private security contractors.

Furthermore, the committee addressed the mandate to reduce reliance on private security guards at domestic and overseas military installations, pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314). In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee directed the Department to review, and provide a written letter of compliance, on its guidance related to conversion of private security positions and include prioritization for use of federal civilian employees to fill those positions

#### PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION

Following up on several initiatives taken during the 110th Congress, the committee in the 111th Congress continued its review of public-private competitions conducted under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) included provisions that eliminated the de minimis standard and imposed time limitations

for the conduct of public-private competitions as well as established a debriefing requirement for federal employee representatives similar to that provided to all contract offerors, and made technical amendments to the bid protest process for Federal civilian employees. In addition, Public Law 111-84 temporarily suspended DOD public-private competitions until the Secretary of Defense certified that the Department was in compliance with certain statutory requirements and conducted a review of the adequacy of DOD guidance to undertake public-private competitions. The committee is awaiting the final report and may take additional action, as necessary, in the 112th Congress.

#### SECURITY CLEARANCE REFORM

An effective and efficient process for administering security clearances is critical to military readiness, and both the executive branch and Congress have focused attention on improving the security clearance process. During the 111th Congress, the committee continued to monitor progress toward developing a revamped security clearance system. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee directed the Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team (which includes DOD representatives as well as representatives from the Office of Management and Budget and OPM) to provide a report on the status of implementing all elements of the security clearance reform plan, rationale for any delays, and any obstacles that have been encountered. Responding to the report, which was submitted in February 2010, the committee noted in H. Rept. 111-491 that while significant progress has been made as a result of increased resources and improved information technology system, the executive branch should continue to demonstrate its commitment to sustaining that progress and identifying areas for further improvement.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

##### REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION, MAINTENANCE AND DISPOSAL

The real property management process requires extensive oversight to maintain more than \$650.0 billion in infrastructure at an annual cost of over \$50.0 billion, or nearly 11 percent, of the Department of Defense's budget. The Subcommittee on Readiness in the 111th Congress reviewed issues pertaining to military construction, family housing, and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities of the Department of Defense. The Readiness Subcommittee held a budget hearing on June 3, 2009, on the fiscal year 2010 budget request and a hearing on March 18, 2010, on the fiscal year 2011 budget request to review military construction, family housing, BRAC activities, and facility operations and maintenance. The Readiness Subcommittee also conducted a hearing on February 24, 2009, on the Acquisition and Disposal of Military Lands. As a result of this oversight, additional real property conveyance authorities were included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to provide authority to the Department of Defense to expedite conveyance of ex-

cess property at or below fair market value. This authority also allows the property recipient to enter into an agreement with the Department of Defense to provide Department of Defense compensation after property conveyance. The committee also reviewed the Army Base Operating Services account and found that significant shortfalls needed to be addressed to manage basic services. The committee supported various reprogramming requests in fiscal year 2010 to address critical shortfalls in the Army Base Operating Services account.

During the 111th Congress, committee staff conducted numerous site visits throughout the United States to assess the state of infrastructure and quality of life provided to the forces. The committee supported the expansion of Army and Marine Corps force structure and the subsequent infrastructure expansion that is being constructed to support the military expansion.

#### BASING

The Department of Defense is undergoing a significant change in force structure both in the United States and overseas. These force-structure changes are being performed by two infrastructure programs including the 2005 BRAC decisions and the Global Defense Posture Review. These rebasing movements affect not only U.S. global posture but they also have significant repercussions on readiness, surge capability, military construction, and quality of life for military members and their families.

After concluding a briefing on Army and Marine Corps Grow the Force initiatives on March 10, 2009, the Subcommittee on Readiness included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) that directed an assessment of the global defense posture realignment and inter-agency review to better assess the impacts of varying overseas basing proposals. The subcommittee also conducted a specific review of the Department of Defense’s intent to realign 8,000 Marines from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. Public Law 111–84 and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) each included a legislative subsection that would support the realignment of Marine Corps assets to Guam that includes the following provisions: clarifying the use of Japanese contributions; defining the appropriate use of H2B visa workers required to support the construction effort; placing conditions of acceptance on new U.S. airfields in Japan; and assessing community assistance to Guam.

Additionally, the committee continued to provide oversight on the significant rebasing efforts that are occurring throughout the world. Rebasing efforts to support U.S. troop movements in Japan and Korea are expected to exceed \$50 billion. In Europe, the Department of Defense continues to consolidate the force structure and evaluate the required force mix and realign assets to better support the strategic posture of the United States. The committee staff during the 111th Congress conducted site visits to the Pacific, European and Central Command areas of operation to view the myriad of basing agreements with international partners and assess the long term viability of these cooperative agreements.

The committee completed a comprehensive review of the BRAC implementation process and as a result several legislative provisions were enacted. The Readiness and Military Personnel Subcommittees held a joint hearing on December 2, 2009, on the implementation of the Walter Reed Army Medical Command realignment that was included in BRAC 2005. The Readiness and Military Personnel Subcommittees also held a joint hearing on March 18, 2009, on Medical Infrastructure and the proper use of medical facilities funding for new construction and renovation projects. As a result of this oversight hearing, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) included a provision that detailed the requirements related to providing a world-class military medical facility in the National Capital Region.

#### FACILITIES PRIVATIZATION

The Department of Defense has made extensive use of privatization of military assets including family housing, bachelor quarters, and utility-related infrastructure. The Department has leveraged available capital in Department of Defense infrastructure and entered into long-term contracts with private property managers. The Subcommittee on Readiness in the 111th Congress reviewed this privatization initiative and included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to modify the utility systems conveyance authority to eliminate duplicative reviews and provide thresholds for utility conveyance to private partners.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMMING

There is increasing evidence that sufficient infrastructure in the United States may not be available to support a rapid reduction in overseas forces and concurrently sustain the Army's and Marine Corps' Grow-the-Force initiatives. The committee completed a detailed review of the Department's military construction program to manage the overall capacity of the Department's infrastructure and ensure prudent long-term military construction investments are provided. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) concluded that the Department had overpriced the military construction program and that significant savings were being realized in construction projects. Public Law 111–84 reduced the overall account by \$529 million. A similar savings review was conducted in the context of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

As an additional issue for construction programming, the committee continued its efforts to provide combatant commanders limited authority to rapidly implement contingency construction to address emerging construction requirements. Both Public Law 111–84 and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) contained provisions that authorized the use of Operations and Maintenance funds for contingency construction.

## ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

ENERGY SECURITY AND NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF  
CLIMATE CHANGE

During the 111th Congress, the committee conducted vigorous oversight of the Department's energy activities and closely examined the strategies and policies for both installations energy and operational energy. In order to reduce the dependence on fossil fuel and reliance on foreign oil, the committee believes it is necessary for the Department to reduce its consumption and achieve efficiencies both on installations and in the operational theater. Additionally, the committee continued to remain concerned about national security implications and potential consequences of global climate change. Committee staff conducted site visits across installations in the continental United States and outside the United States to determine how policies were being implemented, to ensure necessary action was being taken, and to identify areas where potential legislation would help facilitate action across the Department of Defense.

The committee believes that Department of Defense installations provide significant opportunity for advancing renewable energy technologies, pursuing energy security, and reducing overall demand. Congressional mandates, executive orders, federal and state legislation all have a role in directing the Department to advance the renewable energy market, reduce energy consumption, and achieve energy security in the event of a compromise to the public grid. The Subcommittee on Readiness took action in this area in both the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) to direct energy efficiencies, facilitate energy security, and fund investments in renewable energy technologies. It also directed the development of a comprehensive Energy Performance Master Plan in order to organize its activities in the context of the energy security laws, mandates and goals.

On February 24, 2010, the Subcommittee on Readiness received testimony from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and each of the military services on defense energy management and initiatives on military installations. This hearing highlighted the Department's initiatives and also highlighted additional areas of increased oversight for inclusion in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). In addition, committee staff visited installations such as Fort Bliss, Nellis Air Force Base, Naval Air Weapon Station China Lake and Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center 29 Palms where the Services are undertaking large-scale renewable energy projects in response to mandates and goals.

As Department of Defense installations respond to overarching directives for renewable energy on installations, they also compete with readiness demands impacted by increased encroachment of renewable energy projects in proximity to installations. The committee closely examined the impact on military readiness as renewable energy continued to proliferate throughout the country due to increased subsidies and funding provided by The American Recov-

ery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111–5). On June 29, 2010, the Subcommittee on Readiness received testimony from Department of Defense officials, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and an industry representative on the impact of wind farms on military installations, their missions, and radar interference that might adversely impact military readiness. Accordingly, the subcommittee in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) included a provision directing the Department to better organize its internal review of applications, encourage early engagement with industry, and establish a coherent review process jointly with the FAA for renewable energy applications.

With a continued presence of U.S. forces in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Subcommittee on Readiness in the 111th Congress continued its oversight and emphasis of reducing demand for operational energy at forward-deployed locations to relieve the significant logistical burden and force protection requirements, and decrease operational vulnerabilities. The Subcommittee on Readiness received testimony on March 3, 2009, regarding Department of Defense Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations and Operational Energy Initiatives. The hearing informed members about the Department's establishment of the Power Surety Task Force to address the need to reduce military dependence on fuel for power generation, the three-year Net-Zero Plus Joint Concept Technology Demonstration to assess technologies for tactical bases, and investments in research and development for biofuels and renewable energy technologies.

Additionally in the 111th Congress, the committee pursued several provisions and report requirements to facilitate increased oversight and coordinated policies for operational energy. Specifically, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) authorized funding for the Office of the Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs and directed a report on implementation of fuel demand management initiatives at forward-deployed locations. The committee continues to encourage the Department to seek efficiencies, cost savings, and decreased demand for fuel in theater.

The Department addressed the criticality of climate change and its impact on defense in the February 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review for shaping the operating environment, roles, and missions that the Department undertakes. In light of the committee's continued concerns about the implications and potential consequences of global climate change on the Department's facilities, capabilities, and missions, the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491), directed the Secretary of Defense to submit a report capturing an assessment of the strategic national security objectives and restrictions in the Arctic Region, and an assessment on mission capabilities required to support the strategic national security objectives.

#### ENVIRONMENT

The committee conducted oversight of environmental issues resulting from Department of Defense activities on military installations, training ranges, and operational activities to include the

military services' environmental restoration program and adherence to federal, state and local cleanup, compliance, and pollution prevention requirements. An area of sustained interest to the committee is exposure to and cleanup of contaminants on Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), the committee included a provision that directed the Department to prescribe regulations prohibiting the disposal of waste in burn pits during contingency operations, with limited exceptions. Additionally, the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 included language regarding continued oversight and study of Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, drinking water and potential impacts to affected populations. In the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee took further action regarding Camp Lejeune, requiring the Department of the Navy to make all information available to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to facilitate their continuing review, and it also limits the Department of the Navy's use of funds for adjudication of claims subject to Congressional notification. Additionally, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) directed the Comptroller General to assess various issues associated with environmental exposures on military installations, including impacts to current and former members of the Armed Forces, their dependents, and civilian employees. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491), the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct an Exposure Registry Feasibility Study capturing each incidence of exposure of occupational and environmental chemical hazards during conflicts, to monitor possible health risks and provide necessary treatment to those exposed.

In addition to the continued scrutiny and oversight, Public Law 111-84 also reauthorized title 1 of the Sikes Act through fiscal year 2014 to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations. Committee staff made site visits across installations to ensure the Department is providing necessary protections for endangered species, and taking appropriate precautions to prevent and mitigate any preexisting environmental issues.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL AND FAMILY MATTERS

### END STRENGTH

During fiscal year 2011, the committee continued its initiatives from the previous Congress to increase the size of both the active Army and active Marine Corps. The committee also supported the Department of Defense request to increase the Air Force and Navy end strengths to support growth in specific career fields and fill wartime manpower requirements. Due to the flexibility provided to the Department of Defense during the 110th Congress to accelerate increases in service end strength levels, both the Army and Marine Corps achieved their end strength goals early during fiscal year 2010 and Congress supported maintaining these elevated strength levels. During the second session of the 111th Congress, the com-

mittee again supported an increase in Army end strength to 569,400 to assist the Army with managing of the force, maintaining readiness, and increasing dwell time for soldiers.

The committee also continued to recognize the need to increase requirements for fulltime support of the reserve components. The National Defense Authorization Act for 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense to assess the requirements of the National Guard for non-dual status technicians. Although the report was not submitted in a timely manner the committee still supported the administration request for an increase in the number of non-dual status technicians in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

#### RECRUITING AND RETENTION

The committee continued to monitor recruiting and retention trends closely throughout the 111th Congress to ensure that programs remained effective notwithstanding the relatively large number of youth that are ineligible for enlistment, the increasing college attendance rate, and the growing awareness of the hardships and risks of war among potential recruits and their influencers. Largely due to the decline in economic conditions, the recruiting and retention environment has changed to drastically favor the military. All of the active services and their reserve components have met their goals for recruiting numbers and quality benchmarks for the past two years. This is a significant change from previous years. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel remains concerned that the services will not be able to sustain their recruiting and retention programs should economic conditions improve and the Nation remains engaged in Afghanistan and Iraq. The subcommittee held two hearings during the 111th Congress to review the current status of the recruiting and retention programs and to understand the future challenges the Department of Defense faces with respect to these programs. The committee responded to Department of Defense legislative requests to bolster existing programs and launch new programs, and worked to anticipate active duty and reserve recruiting and retention program requirements for both officer and enlisted members.

#### MILITARY COMPENSATION

The committee continued to closely monitor compensation programs during the 111th Congress to ensure an adequate quality of life for service members and their families and to ensure that pay and benefits met the needs of the wartime military and kept pace with private sector standards. The committee's active oversight of these issues resulted in legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) that authorized a 3.4 percent raise in basic pay during fiscal year 2010. This military pay raise was one-half of one percent above the Employment Cost Index (ECI) and extended to 11 the number of consecutive years where Congress authorized pay raises above the ECI level. Although the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 5136) included a pay raise that was one-half of one percent above the ECI level, a pay raise

of 1.4 percent, equaling the ECI level, was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). The committee also extended the authorities to pay bonuses and special pays during fiscal years 2010 and 2011 and monitored the value of those bonuses and special pays to ensure they were sufficient to achieve the recruiting and retention objectives for which they were developed to address. The committee also continued to review pay issues related to wartime operations. To that end, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) included legislation that:

- (1) Provided for special compensation for military members with catastrophic injuries or illnesses;
- (2) Provided travel and transportation allowances for survivors of deceased military members to attend memorial services; and
- (3) Provided travel and transportation allowances for designated individuals of wounded, ill, or injured members of the uniformed services for the duration of inpatient treatment.

#### MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

During the 111th Congress, the committee provided extensive oversight of the military health system. The committee continued its work to avoid the potential adverse impact of uncontrolled cost growth within the military health care system on the Department of Defense. The committee worked to improve the health status of beneficiaries and control cost growth within the military health care system by holding hearings on a number of discrete problem areas within the Defense Health Program, to include: medical military construction, health information technology, health budgeting, and Department of Defense Health Affairs/TRICARE Management Activity organization. These hearings resulted in legislative provisions to develop a plan to improve military health care, limit the obligation of fund on health information technology until certain reviews were conducted, explore new approaches for preventing suicides, energize Department of Defense efforts to find new solutions to improve access to and quality of mental health care, enhance Department of Defense research efforts to improve identification and treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, and impose a temporary limitation on inpatient fee increases. The committee also examined alternatives to the current system of providing Reserve Component medical and dental readiness, which led to the expansion of TRICARE benefits for members of the reserve components from 90 days before mobilization to 180 days and the enhancement of transitional dental care following demobilization, both contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). To ensure that the medical care interests of service members and families are protected, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) included provisions that authorized TRICARE beneficiaries to extend health coverage to their adult dependent children up to age 26 like other Americans under health care reform, continued to bar medical care premium increases, and expanded medical officer accession benefits and eligibility criteria. It should also be noted that that the House version of the National

Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 5136) also included a provision that would have authorized the establishment of a Unified Medical Command designed to enhance access to quality medical care and achieve efficiencies in medical management and structure to save critical medical appropriations. The provision was not included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

#### WOUNDED WARRIOR CARE

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its efforts to ensure that wounded and disabled service members and their families are afforded the support they need. Significant improvements to the programs and policies that support wounded and disabled service members have been made over the past several years. For example, a Department of Defense Task Force on the Care, Management, and Transition of Recovering Wounded, Ill, and Injured Members of the Armed Forces was mandated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to ensure that independent evaluations of the Department of Defense's wounded warrior programs continue to evolve to address issues that are raised by service members and their families, and that the circumstances that led to the scandal at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center are not allowed to happen again. The committee also continued its work to assess, improve, and expand programs for mental health and traumatic brain injuries, holding multiple hearings and oversight visits that resulted in legislative provisions to increase the mental health capabilities of the Department of Defense, study the management of medications for members of the Armed Forces, conduct clinical trials on cognitive rehabilitative therapy, and conduct an independent study on post-traumatic stress disorder efforts. Finally, the committee continued its vigorous oversight of the merger of Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center mandated by the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to ensure that the resulting military treatment facilities in the National Capital Region provide world class medical care. The committee held a hearing to consider the findings and recommendations of the National Capital Region Base Realignment and Closure Health Systems Subcommittee of the Defense Health Board, which led to the committee codifying many of the recommendations into law in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

#### NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued to provide flexible authorities to support the transformation of the National Guard and Reserves to an operational Reserve and to maintain Reserve Component end strengths at levels that promote readiness and stability. Although the committee included portions of the National Guard Empowerment Act of 2007 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) and other initiatives during the 111th Congress, there are still many issues to be resolved as the Reserve Components transition to an

operational Reserve. The committee is waiting on several reports from the Department of Defense that could establish the foundation for the future of the Reserve Components that will be a focus during the 112th Congress.

#### FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

The high operational tempo has not only taken a toll on service members, but their families as well, particularly military children. During the 111th Congress, the committee held two hearings specifically on family support programs for the first time in decades. The hearings examined the strength, vitality, and sustainability of family support programs and the resiliency of military children confronted with multiple deployments of parents. The committee continued its efforts to oversee these programs and to ensure that families are provided adequate support as they cope with unprecedented numbers of deployments and operational stress. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required a number of important studies in this area including a report on domestic violence in military families, an assessment of the impact of repeated deployments on military children, and a report on financial assistance for childcare for members of the Armed Forces.

#### UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE AND INVESTIGATIONS

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the military justice system to ensure that its processes are transparent and just. The committee focused on prevention and response initiatives related to sexual assault. The committee also continued to monitor investigations into misconduct in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan which may indicate recruiting, screening, and training deficiencies, and issues pertaining to command responsibility.

#### PRISONER OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION AFFAIRS

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its increased oversight of Prisoner of War (POW) and Missing in Action (MIA) programs and policies which fall under the jurisdiction of the committee. During the first session of the 111th Congress, the committee held a hearing to receive an update on the activities and programs under the purview of the Defense Prisoner of War and Missing Personnel Office (DPMO), and understand the status and challenges of the programs operated by the Joint Prisoner of War and Missing in Action Accounting Command (JPAC). The hearing also provided testimony from nongovernmental organizations involved in the POW/MIA community. The hearing led to legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) requiring the Secretary of Defense institute a plan to increase the number of identifications dramatically to a rate of 200 per year by 2015. This requirement will increase synergy within the POW/MIA accounting community through increased collaboration required to achieve the mandate. During the second session of the 111th Congress, the committee made visits to several organizations in the POW/MIA accounting community to in-

clude recovery sites in Asia in order to assess progress in building capacity for the increased identification mandate.

#### GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER MANAGEMENT

During the 111th Congress, the committee, as it has for many years, sought to closely manage general and flag officers because of the importance of their leadership to mission readiness and operational success. In a continuing effort to provide oversight and assist the Department of Defense to retain management flexibility, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) directed the Secretary of Defense to provide assessments of the propriety of title 10 provisions that exclude general and flag officers from authorized strength levels and the sufficiency of the number of general and flag officers in an active status in the reserve components. Although the review was completed in late July 2010, its transmission to Congress was delayed due to the cost efficiency review being conducted by the Secretary of Defense to determine whether a decrease of general and flag officers would increase the cost effectiveness of the force. The committee expects the report to be transmitted in order to continue its oversight efforts on the management of general and flag officers.

#### YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program through site visits to ensure such programs are properly structured and funded. As a result, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) authorized travel and transportation allowances for yellow ribbon events for persons who are significant to the reintegration of service members, but who are not family members and promoted more robust program outreach to service members and families.

#### SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its ongoing efforts to prevent and resolve sexual assault offenses by or against military members. Congress required the creation of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services (DTFSAMS) as an extension of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies. Once the DTFSAMS final report was received during the 111th Congress, the committee noted its depth, breadth, thoughtfulness, in addition to the quality of the recommendations during a hearing on the subject. The committee acted on many of the DTFSAMS recommendations when it included 10 sections on sexual assault in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) to improve sexual assault prevention and response by the Department of Defense in the following areas: strategic direction; prevention and training; response to victims; and accountability. The committee remained strongly committed to ensuring that comprehensive measures are implemented to improve sexual assault prevention and response (SAPR) programs within the Department of Defense. Oversight activities included monitoring

budgeting and funding for SAPR programs, evaluating program effectiveness, and reviewing the effectiveness of Uniform Code of Military Justice provisions on sexual assault.

#### ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

On June 10, 2010, the Secretary of the Army announced sweeping changes in the management and oversight of Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) following the completion of a series of investigations and inspections conducted by the Military District of Washington and Inspector General of the Army as a result of allegations of lost accountability of gravesites and mishandling of remains. The committee conducted a full committee investigative hearing, numerous staff briefings, and one on-site examination to understand the failures of ANC management authorities and the Army's supporting activities. The committee was committed to seeing honor and dignity restored to this National shrine and closely monitored the Army's initiatives to establish management controls, revise regulations, complete a 100 percent audit of the cemetery grave sites, finalize criminal or administrative action against former employees, resolve the budget and manpower questions, and correct the acquisition and contracting processes. The committee remains committed in its oversight responsibilities of this most hallowed ground.

#### MILITARY RESALE AND MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION (MWR) PROGRAMS

During the 111th Congress, the committee acted to improve the effectiveness and quality of military exchanges and commissaries and morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) programs and to protect these critical programs for future generations of service members. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel conducted a hearing during the 111th Congress and received numerous staff briefings that fully explored policy issues and the fiscal status of the commissary and military exchange stores and the service MWR programs. These issues included adequacy of appropriated funding for MWR programs, adequacy of funding for recapitalization of military resale and MWR facilities, propriety of exchange consolidation, continuation of appropriated second destination transportation funding for military resale goods shipped overseas, continuation of unofficial personal information services, protection of commissary appropriated funding levels, adequacy of access to quality child care services, continuation of military resale activities at base closure sites, and approval of new business concepts such as exchange lifestyle centers. The Department of Defense consulted the committee on a wide range of management proposals regarding new construction or facility renovation, store expansions or closures, public-private ventures, business practices, and new business opportunities and models. In each case, the committee provided guidance and decisions, as requested. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) included legislative initiatives to address the concerns that had been brought to the attention of the committee and to im-

prove the policies and processes used to manage military resale and MWR programs.

#### MAJOR PERSONNEL SYSTEM REFORMS

During the 111th Congress, the committee examined various proposals to reduce the cost of military personnel programs and reform major elements of the military personnel system to include compensation, recruiting, retention, promotion, disability evaluation, separation, and retirement policies and programs. The committee has explored and researched the proposals during hearings and staff briefings throughout the 111th Congress. When incremental elements of reform could be identified they were included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

#### GAY MEN, LESBIANS, AND BISEXUALS IN THE MILITARY

During the 110th and the 111th Congress, the committee continued the process of examining the law and policy surrounding the issue of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals serving in the military by conducting hearings within the Subcommittee on Military Personnel that examined the various divergent perspectives on the issue to include advocates for both retaining and repealing the current law and the process by which the Department of Defense intended to assess the actions that would be required to successfully repeal current law. The committee also received a briefing on the results of a DOD comprehensive review of the issues associated with the repeal of the current law. Ultimately, repeal of current law was included in the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (H.R. 6523) which establishes a process leading to repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" code following the certification of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that a review of the requirements to support repeal of the law has been completed, that all policies and regulations to support repeal has been prepared, and that the policies and regulations supporting repeal are consistent with the standards and requirements to maintain military readiness, military effectiveness, unit cohesion, and recruiting and retention of the Armed Forces. This same provision had been previously adopted in the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 5136).

#### PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

During the 111th Congress, the Oversight and Investigations examined officer in-resident professional military education (PME) in March 2009. The committee released a bipartisan report, "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel" (Committee Print 4, 111th Congress), in April 2010. The subcommittee undertook this project with the view that professional military education (PME) is a critical investment in the most important element of our military, its people. At the same time, the examination was conducted recognizing that PME is but one component of officer development, with

training, experience, and self-study also contributing. In the current period of high operational tempo, however, the subcommittee was concerned that the services may be tempted to shortchange educational opportunities. The subcommittee held six hearings and conducted numerous member briefings and fact-finding trips in support of this effort.

The subcommittee found that the current PME system, although basically sound, could be improved to meet the country's needs of today and tomorrow. The findings of the investigation concentrated on two broad areas: the overall PME system and issues related to individual schools, and their leaders, faculty members, and students. Additionally, joint and service efforts at cultivating military strategists were assessed.

The subcommittee recommended specific areas for departmental action and for further congressional oversight to promote continuing improvement of the system.

## MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

### FORCE PROTECTION

The committee selected force protection for special oversight, focusing on areas having direct impact on the safety of U.S. military personnel engaged in operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The objective of committee activity was to expedite the promulgation of policies and equipment programs to prevent or reduce combat casualties. The committee continued to emphasize and support capabilities to protect personnel and equipment against both symmetrical and asymmetrical threats from an offensive as well as defensive perspective.

The Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces both held separate and joint hearings and briefings throughout the 111th Congress on specific force protection issues in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Focus areas included: effective and realistic requirements generation, standardizing test and evaluation procedures for vehicles and personal equipment across the military services; production, fielding, and modernization of the family of mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles; properly resourced and adequate quantities of body and improved add-on vehicle armor to counter any new emerging threats; promoting effective and non-duplicative counter-improvised explosive device (IED) equipment throughout the military services; tactical persistent surveillance in support of ground operations, particularly prevention of IED emplacement; capabilities to counter indirect fires at forward operating bases; and individual warfighter equipment that could help mitigate traumatic brain injury.

Consistent with the areas of inquiry in furtherance of force protection of past Congresses, the committee also continued its in-depth oversight activities, including: visits to contractor and government production sites and assembly lines; assessing manufacturing processes and schedules; active oversight of various aspects of testing, including developmental testing, field testing and source selection testing; and identification and referral to the Department

of Defense of sources and vendors with capability and capacity to meet critical requirements and deployment timelines.

Finally, the committee maintained close oversight of the Joint IED Defeat Organization and other Department of Defense task forces to ensure appropriate intra-departmental coordination and communication for fielding effective and affordable force protection measures.

#### MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTECTED VEHICLE ACQUISITION

The committee has long been concerned whether the immediate force protection needs of the warfighter were being met by the Department of Defense (DOD) in a timely and urgent manner, to include vehicle armor and protection. During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its intensive oversight of the family of mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicle, to include the production and fielding of a lighter, smaller, more maneuverable variant, the MRAP All-Terrain Vehicle (MATV), which was intended for and is used exclusively in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The committee ensured that DOD was placing the highest possible priority on MATV production and fielding by delegating subcommittee staff oversight teams to: visit the sole source MATV contractor, where teams observed and analyzed production capability and met with senior company officials; visited suppliers for low density/high demand items for the MATV, such as radio-controlled electronic counter measures; traveled to Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland to observe test and evaluation procedures, analyze lessons learned regarding the performance of current MRAP vehicles in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, as well as development, testing, and fielding of add-on armor kits for MRAP vehicles to protect against explosively formed penetrators (EFP) and rocket propelled grenades; completed multiple oversight visits to the primary facility being used for all government furnished equipment integration and installation on MATVs, in order to observe the facility's capability to meet demand and determine whether possible chokepoints existed for MATV production; meet with officials from United States Transportation Command to assess airlift and sealift capacity for transporting MATVs to the combat theater in the most expeditious manner; meet with officials from the DOD Office of Industrial Policy and the Defense Contract Management Agency to review on-going Industrial Capabilities Assessments for the MRAP vehicle program; and meet with officials from the Office of the Director for Operational Test and Evaluation to assess MRAP and MATV performance against evolving threats.

The committee also continued to cite the importance of having an adequate supply of vehicles to meet home station training requirements and encouraged the use of vehicle simulators for next-to-deploy units if the actual vehicles were unavailable for training.

In order to assist in detailed oversight of this program, the committee also requested the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to monitor and observe the MRAP vehicle and MATV programs. The committee received quarterly updates on the GAO's observations and findings. Additionally, the committee continues to receive weekly status updates from the MRAP joint program office on

MRAP and MATV production and fielding; operation and support status; product improvement efforts, and supply chain management.

Because of direct congressional involvement and the willingness of the Secretary of Defense to make this program a top priority, over 25,000 MRAP vehicles will have been produced by December 2010. Since the start of the MRAP family of vehicles program in 2007, Congress, largely a result of committee activity, has authorized and appropriated full funding for the program totaling over \$40.0 billion, to accelerate production, fielding, and mobilization of the industrial base. It has been estimated by United States Central Command that the use of MRAPs have helped reduce casualties from improvised explosive devices by almost 80 percent. Department of Defense officials have stated that the casualty rate for MRAPs is 6 percent of that experienced by the other vehicles, making it “the most survivable vehicle we have in our arsenal, by a multitude.”

#### BODY ARMOR PROGRAMS

The committee continued its extensive oversight of individual body armor programs throughout the 111th Congress through hearings, briefings, and other activities. The committee maintained strong interest and support for any new technology developments that could provide significant improvements in body armor, and in particular, advancements in lighter-weight solutions.

To ensure fairness to competing contractors; transparency of the testing and selection process; and improve standardization within the testing process, the committee required the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation as well as the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to provide procedural and technical oversight over the body armor test and evaluation procedures and processes used for Department of Defense body armor programs. As a result of this effort, the DOD’s body armor program will have a standardized set of test procedures and protocols that will improve confidence and statistical knowledge regarding the overall performance of body armor systems. This should allow for higher-confidence procurement decisions, ensuring that the best possible individual body armor capability is qualified, produced, procured, and issued to the warfighter in a timely manner. The Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces, in correspondence to the Department of Defense, strongly encouraged the Secretary of Defense to apply these standardized processes and implement recommendations reported by the GAO regarding improvements to body armor test procedures.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required individual procurement and research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) line items be established for body armor beginning in fiscal year 2011 in order to provide increased visibility and oversight within the Department of Defense and Congress. The committee noted the total body armor program has evolved from a \$40.0 million program in 1999, to over a \$6.0 billion program through 2010. This represents significant investment by the military services for individual personnel protection. The establishment of RDT&E program elements would pro-

vide better visibility within the DOD acquisition accounts for body armor programs, increasing the likelihood that: the warfighter is equipped with the most current personal protection equipment; technology funding is forthcoming and sufficient to pursue ways to reduce weight with current technologies; and increased investment is provided for promising technologies that would eventually achieve reduced weight and increased protection together, as well as maximize flexibility and modularity. The establishment of an individual procurement line item would generate better accountability and transparency in long-term planning, programming, and investment by the military services for the acquisition of body armor.

The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) directs the Secretary of Defense to identify a federally funded research and development center to examine the requirements for lighter weight body armor systems as well as to provide recommendations in how the Secretary and the secretary of each military department may more effectively address the research, development, and procurement requirements regarding reducing the weight of body armor.

Largely as a result of committee leadership, Congress authorized and appropriated over \$1.0 billion for individual body armor and associated components in the 111th Congress.

#### JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT ORGANIZATION

To date, Congress has provided approximately \$19.0 billion [2006–2010] to JIEDDO to address the IED threat through JIEDDO's three lines of operation: attacking the network, defeating the device, and training the force.

In the 111th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), the Department of Defense's focal point for the counter-improvised explosive devices (C-IED) mission. In October 2009, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations continued to conduct hearings on JIEDDO to follow up on prior hearings and determine whether shortcomings identified previously had been rectified. Previously identified deficiencies included a lack of rigor within JIEDDO management and reporting; concerns regarding JIEDDO's line of authority under the Deputy Secretary of Defense; and JIEDDO's effectiveness in transferring counter-IED technologies to the services.

The subcommittee continued to find that although the nearly 3,100-person strong JIEDDO obligates over \$2.0 billion annually, and it reports significant progress in the counter-IED mission, it is not clear how well the organization is accomplishing its mission. In particular, the subcommittee found that JIEDDO does not actively lead all DOD C-IED efforts, as its charter calls for. In fact, in November 2009, Secretary Gates chartered a task force to combat IEDs, the Counter-IED Senior Integration Group (C-SIG) that was co-led by the Under Secretary of Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Director of Operations of the Joint Staff. C-SIG was originally chartered to report monthly and complete its tasking by June 2010. The subcommittee held two classified member briefings with the C-SIG members. The C-SIG appears to have been very

effective in facilitating C-IED initiatives in support of the troop surge in Afghanistan. However, it remains unclear whether the C-SIG will replace the integrating function originally envisioned for JIEDDO or evolve into something else. It also remains unclear whether JIEDDO's charter to lead all C-IED efforts remains valid.

The subcommittee made various recommendations to the Department, subcommittee findings identified in the follow-on report contributed to the committee's oversight of JIEDDO, and force protection, more generally. In addition, the subcommittee continues to follow the progress of other DOD C-IED initiatives, in particular the C-SIG.

In addition to the subcommittee's persistent work and detailed analysis, the committee also required JIEDDO to provide monthly updates on all obligations and expenditures. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) requires the Secretary of Defense to direct the Director of JIEDDO to work with the military services and to develop a comprehensive Department of Defense-wide database for all C-IED initiatives. This database would help to improve visibility, knowledge, transparency, and accountability across the Department in managing C-IED programs as well as prevent duplication of effort.

#### INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAMS

The Department of Defense procurement budget request for non-space-based or tactical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) systems for fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011 was approximately \$4.0 billion and \$5.0 billion, respectively. Funding for ISR is requested in all four service budgets and the Special Operations Command. In many cases, this funding is for very similar capabilities. Throughout the 111th Congress, because of the integral role ISR assets contribute to force protection, the committee continued to provide close oversight over myriad projects operated throughout the Department of Defense. As currently configured, many ISR programs not only provide ISR, but have a collateral on-board kinetic capability that allows for immediate targeting of threats posed to U.S. and coalition forces. This capability makes ISR assets all the more critical to U.S. force protection capability. Longstanding concerns of the committee regarding DOD policy, roles and missions and acquisition of ISR assets include: lack of an adequate long-term ISR architecture and acquisition strategy; lack of oversight and management by the Office of the Secretary of Defense of the military services' programs; failure of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System to fulfill its role in screening proposed programs from the services and commands; lack of supporting analysis for programmatic decisions; failure to balance collection programs data output with adequate resources to process, exploit, and disseminate data and analysis; unnecessary proliferation of unmanned and manned vehicles, sensors, and ground stations; and a fundamental failure to establish roles and missions of the military services for such ISR assets as unmanned aerial systems.

The committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) expressed the committee's concern that DOD was not balancing its collection assets with the required analytical capabilities and directed the Secretary of

Defense to provide the GAO required information and data to meet the committee's request to support oversight requirements. Also, due to committee concern that ISR assets were not being effectively allocated to the force protection mission, the committee directed that a study be conducted of the effectiveness of aerial ISR systems in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, with the particular emphasis on the allocation and tasking of these systems, and the relative benefits and trade-offs of providing control of a dedicated system or platform to ground force commanders versus centrally controlling individual assets across the theater of operations.

#### MILITARY MODERNIZATION AND INVESTMENT ISSUES

Throughout the 111th Congress, particular attention was again given to continuing examination of military equipment modernization with respect to military capability. In many cases, major weapons system development and acquisition programs have experienced cost growth and schedule delays. The committee assessed the need for legislative action by examining causes of these problems including: mil poor cost estimating; improper funding profiles; over-capacitization for achieved production rates; labor and material cost increases; poor program execution; and program instability.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) included the following legislative provisions to address acquisition-related cost, schedule, and performance issues with programs: limitation on low-rate initial production quantities for the Future Combat Systems Spin-Out Early-Infantry Brigade Combat Team equipment; limitation on costs of littoral combat ships; designation of the Littoral Combat Ship program as a major defense acquisition program; limitation on the availability of funds pending reports regarding surface combatant shipbuilding programs; conditional authorization of multi-year procurement for F/A-18E, F/A-18E/F or EA-18G aircraft; limitation on reduction of the pace of execution of the E-8C Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems re-engining program; establishment of dedicated line items for body armor procurement and research and development programs; limitation on obligation of procurement funding until certification of approved joint and common requirement for unmanned cargo-carrying-capable aerial vehicles; limitation on the expenditure of research and development funding for the joint submersible program pending an assessment of cost-sharing; establishment of dedicated procurement and research and development line items for the F-35B and F-35C aircraft programs; limitation of funding for the Army Tactical Ground Network program pending a report; assessment of technology maturity and integration risk of specified Army modernization programs; assessment of research and development activities for modernization of the combat vehicle fleet and the armored tactical vehicle fleet; assessment of the coordination of energy storage device requirements purchases and investments; requirement for the conduct of an annual review of the F-35 aircraft program; limitation of funding until completion of a report on the integration of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities; report on the future research and develop-

ment of man-portable and vehicle-mounted guided missile systems; and report on command and control systems.

The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) included the following legislative provisions to address acquisition-related issues: multiyear funding for detail design and construction of LHA Replacement ship designated LHA-7; requirement to maintain Navy airborne signals intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities; reports on service-life extension of F/A-18 aircraft by the Department of the Navy; limitations on biometric system funds; system management plan and matrix for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program; study of lightweight body armor solutions; integration of solid state laser systems into certain aircraft; contracts for commercial imaging satellite capacities; program for research, development, and deployment of advanced ground vehicles, ground vehicle systems, and components; demonstration and pilot projects on cybersecurity; acquisition accountability reports on the ballistic missile defense system; report on analysis of alternatives and program requirements for the Ground Combat Vehicle program; cost benefit analysis of future tank-fired munitions; annual Comptroller General report on the VH-(XX) presidential helicopter acquisition program; sense of congress affirming the importance of Department of Defense participation in development of next generation semiconductor technologies; pilot program on collaborative energy security; and pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of defense systems.

#### ARMY AVIATION PROGRAMS

During the 111th Congress, the Army sustained operations in the Republic of Iraq in 2009 and the first half of 2010, initiating the drawdown of forces in mid-2010, while Army operations surged in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in 2010. Large numbers of legacy rotorcraft deployed to the Central Command area of operations continued, continued to be operated at high tempos. Aircraft deployed included the CH-47, UH-60, AH-64, and OH-58. The committee fully supported funding requirements for these aircraft, including research and development and procurement of significant aircraft survivability equipment upgrades to provide warning and protection against the insurgent surface-to-air missile threat. Further, due to committee concerns that the Army was not fully addressing the significant effort required to fully address sustainment of the fleet of OH-58 aircraft, the committee directed in the report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (H. Rept. 111-166), that a report be provided detailing the requirements for upgrading the power train for the OH-58 Kiowa Warrior aircraft.

#### FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS PROGRAM

The committee devoted considerable oversight efforts to the long-troubled Army Future Combat Systems (FCS) program. These efforts focused on ensuring adequate testing of all FCS elements and reducing risk to the program by encouraging the Army to take a more measured, cautious path to beginning large-scale production.

Although the Army terminated the FCS program in June 2009, the committee's efforts ensured that the residual program elements were not rushed to production before they were ready, saving substantial sums that were available to meet other Army priorities. In addition to adjusting program funding, the committee included two legislative provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that restricted the Army's ability to move beyond production rates otherwise established by Department of Defense standards for low-rate initial production and ensured that post-FCS research and development efforts met other Department of Defense requirements for technology maturity.

#### ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE PROGRAMS

The committee increased its oversight activities regarding Army missile programs due to the very high production rates proposed in budget requests and concerns about the long-term health of the tactical missile industrial base. While supporting warfighter needs, the committee was able to identify significant savings in both fiscal years 2010 and 2011 based on production efficiencies and increasing foreign military sales for Army tactical missile systems. Oversight efforts focused on ensuring upgrades or replacement programs were in place for the Tube-Launched, Optically-Tracked, Wire-Guided (TOW), Javelin, and Stinger missile systems. In addition, the committee included legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that required the Army to further clarify its plans for future missile production.

#### ARMY ARMORED VEHICLE MODERNIZATION

The committee focused closely on the Army's plans for upgrading current combat vehicles and starting new replacement programs. These oversight efforts included the committee's continued efforts to reshape and reduce funding for the eight manned ground vehicles (MGV) that the Army originally planned to procure through the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program, based on concerns regarding vehicle survivability, cost, and complexity. After years of cost growth and schedule delays, the Army terminated all eight variants of the MGV in June 2009, largely justifying the committee's long-standing concerns about the requirements and acquisition strategy the Army was using for this troubled program. In the aftermath of this termination, the committee focused on ensuring the Army's plans for the Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) did not repeat the errors of previous programs.

With regard to existing armored vehicles, the committee's sought to protect and strengthen vehicle upgrade programs, for which the Army showed varying levels of support. In particular, the committee attempted to place continued upgrades to the M1 Abrams tank, M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, Stryker Vehicles, and Paladin Artillery Vehicles on a firm footing for the future by ensuring the Army carried through with upgrade plans and used authorized funds as directed. These oversight efforts included hearings, site visits, close coordination with Army leadership, and careful scrutiny of reprogramming requests.

## TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE ACQUISITION STRATEGY

Throughout the 111th Congress, the committee paid particular attention to the Department's attempt to develop a comprehensive, joint tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) strategy. From 2003 to 2010, Congress provided \$43.0 billion for the procurement and recapitalization of TWVs, which consists of 260,000 light, medium and heavy vehicles; the sheer magnitude of which presents many challenges.

Despite strong support from Congress through legislation and authorization of appropriations, the committee through hearings, briefings, and legislation observed that DOD still does not have a comprehensive long-term TWV acquisition strategy that takes into consideration joint requirements and sustainment. The committee repeatedly noted that a potential risk exists of unplanned overlap in capabilities throughout the military services in TWV procurement and this particular risk needs to be better managed by the Department of Defense. Since 2004, a major portion of TWV modernization procurement funding has been provided through Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), supplemental appropriations, through annual requirements-based contracts, which the committee believes to be inefficient and preclude the Department from benefiting from potential cost savings.

During the 111th Congress, the committee requested GAO to continue its work in the area of TWV acquisition and fleet management and the committee continues to receive quarterly updates from GAO. The committee requested GAO to conduct a performance audit of the Army and Marine Corps's tactical wheeled vehicle investment strategies as well as the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) all-terrain vehicle (MATV) program and Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program. The committee specifically required GAO to assess the current status of acquiring and fielding MATVs, including estimated acquisition cost and demonstrated performance; JLTVs expected features and cost compared to that of other TWV such as the MATV; and the extent to which current plans for MATV and JLTV are consistent with the broad objectives and strategies that the Army and Marine Corps have stated in their TWV investment strategies.

The JLTV program is the largest new procurement of tactical wheeled vehicles planned for the Department of Defense. No firm quantities have been determined for the JLTV, but the current estimate is that the Army alone would like to have one-third of the light tactical vehicle fleet be JLTVs, approximately 50,000 vehicles. Accordingly, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) required the establishment of separate research, development, test, and evaluation program elements for the JLTV program in order to improve oversight of the JLTV program.

## ARMY TACTICAL NETWORK PROGRAMS

Due to a significant increase in Army funding for tactical communications equipment, the committee pursued aggressive oversight efforts to shape the Army's plans for future battlefield networking equipment. These efforts stemmed from the committee's

concern that the Army was procuring an incompatible combination of commercial and military communications equipment based on redundant programs, unclear requirements, and uncoordinated acquisition plans. In response, the committee pursued a combination of legislative restrictions, funding adjustments to select programs, hearings, reprogramming decisions, and outside expert reports to help guide the Army to a more suitable and affordable path forward. Due in large part to the committee's efforts, senior Army leaders in 2010 began taking the necessary actions to address and correct the numerous challenges facing the Army in this critical area.

#### FIGHTER AIRCRAFT FORCE STRUCTURE ADEQUACY

During the 111th Congress, the committee investigated the adequacy of fighter force structure in both the Navy and the Air Force. The Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces held a hearing on May 19, 2009. The Navy witness testified that F/A-18A/B/C/D aircraft are reaching their projected service-life and will require replacement or modifications to further extend their service-life to eventual deployment of the F-35 aircraft. The committee later learned that the Department of the Navy estimated its strike fighter shortfall to be 146 aircraft. The Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces held a hearing on May 20, 2009, on Air Force modernization programs, at which the Air Force witness testified to the planned retirement of 254 fighter aircraft in fiscal year 2010. Air Force officials briefed the committee that the proposed fighter aircraft retirements were an acceleration of retirements already planned in the near term, and would not worsen fighter shortfalls projected between fiscal years 2017 and 2024. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) authorized an increase of nine F/A-18E/F aircraft for the Navy and also authorized other Navy and Air Force requests for the procurement of new fighter aircraft, including F-35s for both the Navy and the Air Force.

On March 24, 2010, the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces and the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces held a joint hearing on fiscal year 2011 Navy and Air Force combat aviation programs. At this hearing, Navy witnesses noted that, with the changes in the fiscal year 2011 budget request, the strike fighter shortfall analysis was updated and the peak Department of the Navy shortfall rose from 146 to 177 aircraft, primarily due to an F-35 delivery ramp reduction of 55 aircraft and removing the assumption of aircraft reaching 10,000 flight hours. The Navy witnesses also testified that the peak shortfall can be managed to about 100 aircraft in 2018. Also at this hearing, Air Force witnesses testified that in April 2008 the Air Force informed Congress of a projected fighter gap of over 800 aircraft in 2024, and that since that testimony, three key fighter force structure assumptions have changed. First, during the Department's fiscal year 2010 budget cycle, the Air Force elected to accept increased short to mid-term war fighting risk and a subsequent smaller fighter force in exchange for modernization. Second, the Air Force F-35 procurement rate used for planning was increased from 48 to 80 per year. Third, the approach to fighter service life computations was refined. The

combination of these changes significantly reduced the fighter gap. Consequently, the Air Force witness testified that the Air Force did not see a fighter inventory shortfall at that time. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), authorized an increase of eight F/A-18E/F aircraft for the Navy and also authorized other Navy and Air Force requests for the procurement of new fighter aircraft, including F-35s for both the Navy and the Air Force. However, it also decreased the Air Force Overseas Contingency Operations budget request by one F-35, justified as a replacement for an operational loss of a F-15E aircraft, because the committee believed that the Air Force could alternatively choose to retire one less aircraft than planned, immediately meeting its requirement. Additionally, Public Law 111-238, which was initiated by the House Armed Services Committee and signed into law by the President on September 27, 2010, provided the Navy with the authority to procure additional F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft under a multiyear procurement contract, and is expected to reduce the procurement unit cost of these future aircraft.

#### F-35 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued oversight of the F-35 program, particularly the competitive propulsion system, the F136 alternate engine, program. The F-35 competitive propulsion system program is developing the F136 engine, which is intended to eventually provide F-35 equipped forces a competitive choice between the primary F135 engine and the F136 engine. Congress and the Department of Defense had originally supported the competitive engine initiative since 1995, but the Department of Defense has not included funding for the competitive propulsion system program in its budget requests since 2006. The Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces held a hearing on May 20, 2009. At that hearing, the Office of the Secretary of Defense witness testified that the F-35 acquisition strategy contains provisions for a competitive engine program, provided funds are available to execute that strategy, and that the Department continues to execute appropriated F136 development funding to ensure that a competitive engine program remains viable while there is funding is available. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) witness testified that the GAO's prior analysis indicated that competitive pressures could yield enough savings to offset the costs of engine competition over the F-35 program's life. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) authorized \$430.0 million for continued development and \$130.0 million for procurement of the F-35 competitive propulsion system.

On March 24, 2010, the Subcommittees on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces and Air and Land Forces held a joint hearing on fiscal year 2011 Navy and Air Force aviation programs. The Secretary of Defense witness testified that \$2.9 billion remains to be invested to fund the competitive engine program to provide for an engine competition in fiscal year 2017. Further a 2010 update of the 2007 Department of Defense business case for the F-35 alternate engine, which accounts for the additional funding provided by Congress since fiscal year 2007 and more recent engine program actual cost

performance, concludes that the second engine is at the break-even point in net present value. The GAO witness testified that under certain assumptions, the additional costs of continuing the F136 alternate engine program could be recouped if competition were to generate approximately 10.1 to 12.6 percent savings over the life of the program. Additionally, the GAO witness testified that Air Force data on the first four years of competition for engines on the F-16 aircraft projected they would recoup at least that much and that competition could also provide non-quantifiable benefits with respect to better contractor responsiveness, technical innovation and improved operational readiness. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), authorized the amounts necessary for the Department of the Navy requests for F-35, F/A-18E/F, and EA-18G fighter aircraft, and for the Department of the Air Force request for F-35 fighter aircraft. Additionally, Public Law 111-238, which was sponsored by a member of the Committee on Armed Services and signed into law by the President on September 27, 2010, provided the Navy with the authority to procure additional F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft under a multiyear procurement contract, and is expected to reduce the procurement unit cost of these future aircraft.

#### F-22A AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued oversight of the Air Force F-22 aircraft procurement program. Fiscal year 2009 was the final year of a three-year, 60-aircraft F-22 aircraft multiyear procurement program that will result in a force structure of 187 F-22 aircraft, including the four additional F-22s appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-32). During committee deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) members expressed concern about the disposition of tooling used to produce F-22 aircraft, and recommended that the Department of the Air Force submit a report on the preservation and storage of unique tooling for F-22 aircraft. Section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) required the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on the plan to preserve and store unique F-22 tooling related to the production of hardware and end-items for F-22 aircraft.

#### LONG-RANGE STRIKE AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

During the 111th Congress, the committee maintained close oversight of the Department's long-range strike bomber programs. The Nation maintains a legacy fleet of 163 long range strike aircraft.

The fiscal year 2010 budget request contained approximately \$1.1 billion for modernization of 20 B-2 bomber (\$699.4 million), 76 B-52 bomber (\$172.7 million), and 67 B-1 bomber (\$276.1 million) aircraft.

The fiscal year 2011 budget request contains \$817.3 million for modernization of 20 B-2 bomber, 76 B-52 bomber, and 67 B-1 bomber aircraft. The budget request also contains \$200.0 million for sustainment of the industrial base bomber workforce, and in total, \$1.7 billion is included in fiscal years 2011 through 2015 for

development of a long-range strike platform. According to Air Force budget officials, the \$1.7 billion is divided into the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP): \$200 million in each of fiscal years 2011 and 2012; \$300 million in fiscal year 2013; \$400 million in fiscal year 2014; and, \$600 million in fiscal year 2015.

Prior to the release of the fiscal year 2010 budget request, the Secretary of Defense announced on April 6, 2009, that the Department “will not pursue a development program for a follow-on Air Force bomber until we have a better understanding of the need, the requirement, and the technology. We will examine all of our strategic requirements during the Quadrennial Defense Review, the Nuclear Posture Review, and in light of post-Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) arms control negotiations.”

Out of concern for the imperative of sustaining the industrial base for long range strike aircraft capability, the engineering and manufacturing workforce related to highly specialized and unique work involved with the Next Generation Bomber (NGB) program, the committee authorized \$140.0 million in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to continue key technology development efforts associated with long-range strike aircraft requirements.

In testimony on the fiscal year 2011 DOD budget request the Secretary of Defense stated that a new Air Force bomber “would probably not appear into the force until the late ’20s” and that the Department is “still wrestling” with the type of bomber platform to pursue (e.g., stand-off, penetrating, manned, unmanned, nuclear, non-nuclear, or some combination of those attributes).

In accordance with Section 231a of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for FY09, the Secretary of Defense submitted the Departments of the Navy and Air Force 30-year Aircraft Investment Plan with the fiscal year 2011 President’s Budget. In this report, the Department categorized its aircraft capabilities into four principal investment objectives, with the following highlights for the long-range strike category: “Modernize long-range strike capabilities . . . the current fleet of Air Force bombers continues to be modernized since much of the inventory has a planned service-life through FY 40. A study is currently underway to identify the “right mix” of manned and unmanned technologies that will provide future long-range strike capabilities and to determine the right balance between range, payload, speed, stealth, and on-board sensors. A result of that study should be the identification of a replacement aircraft for the legacy bomber fleet with an associated timing and funding profile required to support recapitalization of long-range strike bombers.”

The report states that the FY11–FY40 aviation plan is consistent with the tenets of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and meets the national security requirements of the United States, and that the future years defense plan (FYDP) provides the funding needed to implement the aviation plan through FY 15. However, for the years beyond the FYDP, the funding projections presented in the plan assume three percent real growth, on average, in annual investments, which is acknowledged as optimistic. The report also states that the aviation plan incorporates realistic projections of program costs within the FYDP. According to the bomber inven-

tory plan in the report, the Air Force plans to maintain a total of 162 bomber aircraft in fiscal years 2011 through 2020. Additionally, the QDR states that the Air Force plans to maintain a force structure of 5 bomber wings and a total of 96 primary mission aircraft.

Over the past 18 years, the Air Force has conducted numerous studies and analyses with the assistance of the Institute for Defense Analyses and the Defense Science Board to determine options for a new bomber platform. The committee understands that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council approved an Initial Capabilities Document and that the Next Generation Bomber acquisition strategy formulated by the Air Force, was approved by the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics in late 2008. The committee also understands that efforts were underway in early 2009 for the Air Force to seek approval by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council of the Capabilities Development Document. Because of committee concerns of continued delays in the long range strike aircraft program, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) included a provision, which would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees outlining the plan for current bomber modernization and sustainment, as well as a comparative cost and requirements analysis of developing a single long-range strike platform as compared to a “family of systems.”

#### KC-X AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT ACQUISITION PROGRAM

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued to support the Air Force’s number one acquisition program of tanker recapitalization, believing that the ability for aerial refueling during military operations is a critical enabling capability in meeting National Military Strategy objectives. The committee noted that recapitalization of the KC-135 fleet of 415 aircraft, currently delayed 9 years because of failures internal to the Pentagon’s acquisition system, once initiated, would take over 30 years to complete, based on current budget constraints and other Department of Defense priorities that require significant funding.

Subsequent to the Secretary of Defense’s direction to suspend the KC-X competition on September 10, 2008, he announced on April 6, 2009, that the program would be restarted and a 179-aircraft KC-X contract would be awarded in March or April 2010. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 authorized the Department’s budget request of \$439.6 million for this purpose. Since the Secretary’s announcement on April 6, 2009, further delays have resulted in an estimated contract award date of January 2011. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) authorized an amount necessary in the appropriation for Air Force research, development, test and evaluation to provide for the Air Force KC-X development program in fiscal year 2011.

## INTER/INTRA-THEATER AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT PROGRAMS

The 111th Congress continued to closely oversee the modernization and sustainment of its inter/intra theater airlift aircraft. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces on February 25, 2009, the Commander of the United States Transportation Command testified that a force structure of 205 C-17s, 52 C-5Ms, and 59 C-5As modified with the avionics modernization program, a total of 316 strategic airlift aircraft, meets the requirement to transport 33.95 million ton-miles per day. Additionally, the committee noted that the previous Commander of the United States Transportation Command and the current Air Force Chief of Staff identified 316 strategic airlift aircraft as the global mobility inter-theater aircraft requirement. Accordingly, the committee recommended a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that would require the Department of Defense to maintain a minimum strategic airlift force structure of 316 aircraft. Committee concerns on C-5 basing resulting from projected C-5 aircraft retirements also resulted in a legislative provision that would require the Department of Defense to submit a report at least 120 days before such retirements would occur on how C-5 retirements would affect installations, which was also included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). Finally, committee members' concern regarding legislative restrictions on the Air Force's ability to fully retire C-130E aircraft due to previous congressional restrictions, resulted in a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that repealed the requirement to maintain certain C-130E aircraft.

On April 28, 2010, the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces held a hearing on Air Mobility Programs at which the primary focus was on a recently released Department of Defense Mobility Capabilities Study (MCS) 2016 and the KC-X aerial refueling tanker acquisition program. Members expressed concern about whether the Department of Defense met its stated objectives in the MCS 2016, and, as a result, directed the GAO to conduct a study on the Department of Defense's methodology for MCS 2016 and to determine whether MCS 2016 met the Department's stated objectives. The GAO report is planned to be submitted in November 2010. Committee members also expressed concern at this hearing about the effect of foreign subsidies impacting the competition in the KC-X aerial refueling tanker acquisition program. The House passed a bill, H.R. 6540, to require the removal of any unfair competitive advantage in the pending competition for KC-X.

## COMBAT SEARCH AND RESCUE-X (CSAR-X) AIRCRAFT ACQUISITION PROGRAM

In the 111th Congress, the committee continued to remain concerned about the Air Force CSAR-X acquisition program which had been intended to procure 141 helicopters to replace the existing HH-60G fleet with a helicopter capable of greater range, increased payload, and improved engine performance compared to the HH-60G. In 2007, following a series of protests by the CSAR-X offerors

and new proposals in 2008, the Secretary of Defense announced on April 6, 2009, that the Department had canceled the Air Force CSAR-X program and that the Department would review the requirement for a specialized Air Force search-and-rescue aircraft and determine whether it should be a joint capability. For fiscal year 2010, the budget request included \$90.0 million in Air Force research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) for the CSAR-X program, of which the Air Force budgeted \$75.0 million for the procurement of two HH-60M helicopters to replace HH-60G operational losses. The committee recommended a reduction of \$75.0 million based on the absence of justification for the request for two HH-60M helicopters. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) did not authorize any funds for Air Force CSAR-X RDT&E.

On March 24, 2010, the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces and the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces held a joint hearing on fiscal year 2011 Navy and Air Force combat aviation programs. At this hearing, Air Force witnesses testified that the budget request included funding for six HH-60G Operational Loss Replacement aircraft, including three from Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding, and that those aircraft would continue to restore the legacy HH-60G fleet to the 112-aircraft program of record. The Air Force witness also testified that the Air Force is working with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Joint Staff to finalize the requirements and acquisition strategy for a full fleet recapitalization of the legacy HH-60G fleet. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) authorized an amount necessary in the Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation appropriation for the budget request for development of HH-60 recapitalization. The Act also authorized an amount required in the Air Force aircraft procurement appropriation for the budget request for operational loss replacement aircraft.

#### SPACE PROGRAMS

Concerns about the vulnerability of space-based national security capabilities were underscored by two events during the 111th Congress: the collision of a defunct Russian Cosmos satellite with an Iridium communications satellite on February 10, 2009 and the Chinese test of a missile defense interceptor on January 11, 2010 that was similar to the anti-satellite system tested in February 2007. On March 18, 2009, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held an open hearing that explored three key issues related to space and U.S. security: First, do we have the right national policy to ensure the security of our space assets, particularly those supporting the warfighter and national intelligence collection? Second, do we have the right investment strategy for protecting and defending critical space assets and capabilities? Finally, what role can diplomacy play in ensuring the security of our space assets? Subsequently, the committee proposed legislation, ultimately included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), making permanent the pilot program for sharing space surveillance data with state governments, U.S. and foreign commercial entities, and foreign governments in an effort to

reduce potential satellite collisions. On July 21, 2009, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a classified briefing on the space protection program from the joint sponsors, Air Force Space Command and the National Reconnaissance Office. On November 17, 2009, the subcommittee was briefed on cyber threats to strategic systems, including the implications for key satellite capabilities.

With a number of military space programs behind schedule and over cost, the committee continued its oversight of national security space acquisitions. On April 30, 2009, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on space system acquisitions and the industrial base focused on the following questions: What are the root causes of cost growth and schedule delays in the acquisition of national security space systems? Are plans for national security space acquisitions properly balanced with the industry's capacity to deliver? And finally, what recommendations should the Congress and the executive branch consider for addressing these problems? One recommendation that emerged from the hearing was the need for a research and development strategy, coordinated across the Department of Defense and the intelligence community, to provide an overall plan for maintaining and improving our space capabilities. A requirement for such a strategy was included as section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

The committee continued tracking the performance of several high profile space programs including the Advanced Extremely High Frequency communications satellite, the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS), and the Space-Based Infrared System-High missile warning program. In the case of NPOESS program, the committee included significant directive language in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). Given the cost and schedule problems encountered by the NPOESS program, and recognizing that military commanders must have access to accurate and timely weather information in order to prepare for operations, the committee supported legislation directing the President to develop a strategy for the management and funding of the tri-agency (Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, and the National Aviation and Space Administration) program, and an implementation plan for that strategy. Subsequently, the President recommended a major restructuring of the nation's weather observation program.

In addition, particular attention was given to efforts that increase the responsiveness of space capabilities to meet the evolving needs of the warfighter. The committee has long been at the forefront of encouraging the Department to develop low-cost, rapid reaction, operationally responsive space (ORS) satellite and launch capabilities that can provide prompt, focused space support to warfighters in their theaters of operations and more rapidly fill the void that exists between space science, technology efforts, and operational space requirements development. In that regard, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces recommended an increase of \$23.0 million to support the launch of the first ORS imaging satellite in its markup of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal

Year 2010. This satellite program was triggered by an urgent need from United States Central Command to address a gap in surveillance coverage and should be launched by the end of 2010.

The committee coordinated its oversight of space activities with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence through joint briefings on issues of mutual concern. Specifically, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held joint briefings with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence on the way ahead on overhead commercial imagery on November 17, 2009, and the state of the U.S. space launch enterprise on January 13, 2010.

Committee delegations visited the United States Strategic Command and several military installations to gain insight into warfighter needs and the integration of space in military operations, as well as service laboratories and industry sites to assess technology development in tactical satellites, responsive launch vehicles, and progress on major space acquisition programs.

#### MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

In addition to the annual Missile Defense Agency oversight hearings carried out by the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, the committee focused significant attention on evaluating the President's decision, announced on September 17, 2009, to adopt a new strategy for defending our European allies, forward-deployed troops, and the United States homeland from the threat of an Iranian ballistic missile attack. Based on a full committee hearing on the matter held on October 1, 2009, House conferees agreed to provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that: (1) authorized of up to \$309.0 million for the President's European missile defense plan, known as the Phased Adaptive Approach, if the Secretary of Defense certified that the system is operationally effective and cost-effective in providing protection for Europe and the United States; (2) permanently extended the prohibition on deployment of long-range missile defense interceptors in Europe until the Secretary of Defense certifies these interceptors will be operationally effective and have the ability to accomplish the mission; and (3) required an independent assessment of the Phased Adaptive Approach.

The committee also focused on encouraging effective integration of operational testing into the missile defense procurement process. On February 25, 2009, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing to ascertain the current status of the missile defense testing program; Missile Defense Agency (MDA) plans to restructure the testing program to collect data necessary to validate, verify, accredit models and simulations; and the specific steps needed to ensure a high level of confidence that the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) will work in an operationally effective, suitable, and survivable manner. The committee's concern about BMDS testing was reflected in section 236 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) which required the Secretary of Defense to establish a comprehensive plan for the developmental and operational testing and evaluation of the ballistic missile defense system and its various elements. On April 14, 2010, the Strategic Forces Subcommittee held a classified

briefing on the efforts of the MDA and the Operational Test and Evaluation community to develop an integrated testing plan.

Finally, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces took a special interest in the transition of the Airborne Laser (ABL) program from an acquisition effort to a test bed. The subcommittee received a briefing on April 15, 2010 from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering and the Director of the MDA on potential uses of the ABL platform for testing and the roadmap for research on directed energy weapons for strategic purposes.

#### U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES AND POSTURE

United States nuclear forces received significant oversight attention during the course of the 111th Congress. On May 6, 2009, the committee received the final report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, which the committee had initiated through section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The bipartisan Commission, chaired by William Perry and James Schlesinger concluded that it was a “moment of opportunity to revise and renew U.S. nuclear strategy, but also a moment of urgency.” It recommended additional investment in the scientific, technical, and physical infrastructure that supports the stockpile; the maintenance of safe, secure, and reliable nuclear arsenal; the development and, where appropriate, the deployment of missile defenses against regional nuclear aggressors; and a renewal of arms control with the Russian Federation.

On April 6, 2010, the Administration submitted to the committee its Nuclear Posture Review required by section 1070 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). This new nuclear strategy review, the first since the 2001 nuclear posture review, reaffirmed the importance of a strong deterrent and offered a plan for focusing nuclear policy on the gravest threats to our security: nuclear terrorism and nuclear proliferation. On April 14, 2010, the committee held an oversight hearing on the Nuclear Posture Review that assessed the role of nuclear weapons and missile defenses, nuclear deterrence, force structure requirements, and nuclear complex plans.

The committee continues to oversee and assess the safety and surety of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. On January 21, 2010, the Strategic Forces Subcommittee held an oversight hearing on status of the Air Force Nuclear Security Roadmap to follow up on changes made in the Air Force to improve the management and culture related to maintaining and deploying nuclear weapons. The committee took a leadership role in seeking the remediation of significant shortcomings that had resulted in the mistaken shipment of missile nosecones to Taiwan in lieu of helicopter batteries, and the unauthorized transfer of nuclear weapons from Minot Air Force Base in North Dakota to Barksdale Air Force Base in Louisiana on August 30, 2007.

#### MILITARY APPLICATIONS OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

As the nation’s nuclear weapons arsenal continues to age, the committee took action to assure the continued safety, security, and

reliability of our nuclear deterrent forces. Building on the findings of the Congressional Strategic Posture Commission, the committee recommended a provision creating a “stockpile management program” to provide better guidance to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for extending the effective life of our nuclear weapons. That provision, which was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), established three fundamental objectives for managing the stockpile: to increase its reliability, safety, and security; to further reduce the likelihood of a return to nuclear weapons testing; and to achieve reductions in the future size of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The Administration embraced the Stockpile Management Program in its Nuclear Posture Review, which was released on April 6, 2010, along with the recommendation of the commission to substantially increase investments that support the stockpile. On July 1, 2010, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a briefing on the NNSA’s first Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan.

The subcommittee also continued its intensive oversight of the NNSA, the organization within the Department of Energy (DOE) responsible for the safety, security, and reliability of United States nuclear weapons. The subcommittee was briefed regularly on the status of the weapons stockpile, life extension programs, infrastructure needs, and scientific progress in understanding weapons performance. Subcommittee members and staff visited every laboratory and site within the NNSA nuclear weapons complex. In late 2009, the NNSA released an independent report by the JASON scientific panel which the subcommittee had requested in 2008 in an effort to better understand options for stockpile life extension. The subcommittee explored the findings of the JASON panel in a classified briefing on July 14, 2010. Issues identified during these briefings and visits led the committee to recommend increased funding for experimentation and stockpile support at selected weapons production facilities, and to require the NNSA Administrator to submit a revised plan for stockpile surveillance in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

The subcommittee also conducted oversight of the Department of Energy’s management of defense nuclear waste and defense environmental management activities, including critical cleanup activities at the Hanford Site in Washington State and the Savannah River Site in South Carolina, as well as the Miamisburg Mound Closure Project in Ohio. Oversight of these waste management efforts was intensified in light of the substantial increase in funding provided by the President’s economic stimulus plan. In addition, the subcommittee regularly reviewed the DOE’s efforts to consolidate and dispose of special nuclear materials.

#### OTHER REPORTS

During the 110th Congress, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations examined the Department’s efforts to improve language skills, cultural awareness, and regional expertise. The committee released a bipartisan report, “Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: Bridging the Gap” (Com-

mittee Print 11, 110th Congress), in November 2008. The interest in this area was prompted to a large degree by the profound implications that these capabilities have for the nation's success in irregular warfare. At the time the subcommittee initiated this investigation, the Department was in the process of completing the implementation of the tasks in its 2004 "Defense Language Transformation Roadmap." The subcommittee undertook the initial study to determine the extent to which the tasks had been fully implemented, and what additional progress was necessary to provide the capabilities needed by the combatant commands. The subcommittee recommended specific areas for departmental action and for further congressional oversight to promote continuing improvement building these competencies. In addition, section 529 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) directed the Secretary of Defense to establish language training centers at universities and the senior military colleges to accelerate the development of expertise in critical and strategic languages. In a continuing oversight capacity, the subcommittee held a hearing in June 2010 along with briefings, interviews, and fact-finding trips to ascertain the progress in implementing the subcommittee's recommendations. This follow-on oversight effort is to result in a report update titled, "Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: Bridging the Gap," in December 2010 which finds that, although the Department has largely addressed the recommendations in the November 2008 report, there are still shortcomings which merit further oversight. The subcommittee's follow-on oversight effort prompted two items of legislation, in part, addressing these deficiencies. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee instructs the Government Accountability Office to review the services' language, regional expertise, and cultural awareness training of the general purpose forces, particularly for ground components. In H. Rept. 111-491, the committee also encourages the services to provide the Foreign Language Proficiency Bonus Pay for special operations personnel testing at the lower, but still required, proficiency levels.

The subcommittee continued its oversight of the Defense Travel System (DTS) during the 111th Congress. In 2009, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations conducted a follow-on study of the DTS to determine whether shortcomings identified in 2008 by the subcommittee and the Government Accountability Office had been rectified. This study resulted in an ISI in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 that in part directed the Department to enforce the order that DTS serve as the only on-line travel system. The subcommittee, in coordination with the Readiness Subcommittee, conducted a follow-up effort in 2010 to review the Department's efforts to streamline and simplify all travel conducted under its purview. This project attempted to assess the extent to which the Defense Travel Management Office, which has jurisdiction over Defense travel, implemented the recommendations in the committee's report (H. Rept. 111-166). In addition, Congress required the Department to produce a report on Defense Travel Simplification on or before December 31, 2009. This report

was delivered on May 24, 2010, and discusses a “multi-pronged, incremental approach over multiple years” but does not give a specific time-frame for the implementation of this plan. The subcommittee published follow-up reports on DTS in 2009 and 2010. The latter found that several of the recommendations had not been implemented and that detailed plans for defense simplification were lacking. The subcommittee made various recommendations to the Department in support of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

The Subcommittee on Readiness and the Committee on Government Oversight and Reform referred a whistleblower from the 275th Military Police Company, a unit of the Washington, D.C., Army National Guard, to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations in 2008. The subcommittee conducted a case study of the unit including its readiness status, personnel, equipment, and training at home station and under the First Army at Camp Shelby, Mississippi in 2007. The subcommittee issued an internal committee report in 2009 for the Military Personnel and Readiness Subcommittees. The Readiness and the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee staffs conducted a follow-up review of Camp Shelby in 2010. Also in 2010, a second, unrelated whistleblower reported similar readiness, personnel, training, and equipment pre-deployment issues related to the U.S. Army Reserve’s 656th Transportation Company, which the subcommittees explored.

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), the Department of Defense’s focal point for the battle against improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee worked closely with the Air and Land Forces and the Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Subcommittees to follow up on work in the 110th Congress and to determine whether shortcomings identified previously had been corrected. Through two hearings, two reports, and numerous briefings, the subcommittee continued to find that although the nearly 3,100-person strong JIEDDO spends over \$2.0 billion annually and it reports significant progress in the Counter-IED (C-IED) fight, it is not clear how well the organization is accomplishing its mission. In November 2009, Secretary Gates called for a task force to combat IEDs that resulted in the Counter-IED Senior Integration Group (C-SIG) co-led by the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and Director of Joint Staff for Operations (J-3). The subcommittee made various recommendations to the Department in its follow-up reports contributing to the committee’s and other subcommittees’ oversight of JIEDDO and of force protection, more generally. In addition, the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee continues to follow the progress of other Department of Defense C-IED initiatives, in particular, the C-SIG.

In 2010, the subcommittee also investigated and convened a hearing on the problem of outbreaks of multidrug-resistant infections in military hospitals, which emerged early on during military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The outbreaks created challenges for the military and it took several years to bring the infections under control. The subcommittee found that the number of infections is now significantly lower because the Department and services strengthened infection surveillance, control, and preven-

tion in military hospitals, particularly those that treat combat-wounded service members. However, the infection problem has not been completely solved and new outbreaks will be a continuing risk because drug-resistant infections are a national and global problem in civilian and military hospitals. The subcommittee found that the Department needs better capabilities to monitor infections and enhanced training and expertise in infection control practices. In addition, while the Department and services have supported a number of research and development studies and projects in response to the outbreak of these types of infections, there is no coordinated and sustained approach in place for continuing to conduct needed research in this area. The subcommittee issued a report entitled, "DOD's Response to Multidrug-Resistant Infections in Military Hospitals" in early December 2010.



## OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

### BUDGET ACTIVITY

On March 13, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services forwarded its views and estimates regarding the budget outline for the National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2010 to the Committee on the Budget.

The committee noted that the President's fiscal year 2010 budget outline requested \$533.7 billion for the Department of Defense's base budget. The President's budget outline also requested \$75.5 billion in supplemental funding for 2009 and \$130.0 billion for 2010 to support the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee looked forward to reviewing all the programmatic details when they become available.

In the absence of these details but in review of the preliminary submission, the committee believed the budget request was the minimum necessary to support both our core national security requirements and on-going military operations. The committee supported war time supplemental funding that provided the resources necessary for American servicemembers fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee noted that the President's request planned to incorporate into the base budget many items previously funded in emergency supplementals, such as medical services, family support initiatives, security assistance to foreign governments, and enhancements to intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. The committee also supported efforts to fold foreseeable war-time costs into the baseline budget, but identified that these war costs were in addition to core national security requirements that resided in the base budget. The budget outline suggested a balance between ensuring our forces had what they would need to protect this nation, as well as a commitment both to fiscal responsibility in challenging economic times and to weeding out waste wherever possible.

However, within the Department's base budget funding request, the committee highlighted several concerns. First, with respect to mandatory funding, the committee respectfully requested an increase to the committee's allocation for mandatory spending to implement the President's concurrent receipt proposal and to continue to protect our beneficiaries from exorbitant health care fees. Second, with respect to readiness, the committee noted that continuous combat operations over the past seven and one-half years, with repeated deployments and limited dwell times, have stretched our forces and consumed readiness just as quickly as it was obtained. As the war in Iraq wound down and our efforts in Afghanistan ramped up, the Department would face huge reset costs associated with moving troops and materiel, repairing and replacing worn out equipment, and re-orienting training programs to assure

that our troops could function in a full-spectrum environment. The committee argued that it was critical to the nation's security that our readiness levels be improved and that sufficient investments be made to ensure this. Third, with respect to acquisition programs, very little was known regarding the priorities of the new Administration and, with a pending Quadrennial Defense Review, an updated National Military Strategy, and a Nuclear Posture Review, it was difficult to know what the proper funding level should be for acquisition programs. The committee understood that the Department was attempting to make the best decisions on important acquisition programs, and would closely review them when the detailed budget request was received. Finally, the committee discussed that its efforts would continue to develop recommendations for improving government performance and, where appropriate, develop legislation. The committee noted the establishment of a Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform to comprehensively identify the root causes of acquisition failures and recommend further changes to improve acquisition processes. The committee expected that such efforts, when properly implemented, would reduce wasteful spending by the agencies within its jurisdiction.

On March 4, 2010, the Committee on Armed Services forwarded its views and estimates regarding the budget request for National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2011 to the Committee on the Budget.

The committee noted that the President's fiscal year 2011 budget request totaled \$573.8 billion in discretionary budget authority for national defense. Of this total, \$548.9 billion was for the Department of Defense, \$17.8 billion was for the Department of Energy's defense activities, and \$7.0 billion was for other defense-related activities. The President's budget also included \$5.6 billion in mandatory budget authority.

In addition to the base budget request, the committee noted that as required by Section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the President's budget for fiscal year 2011 included a separate request of \$159.3 billion for war-related expenditures in support of ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, presented as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). The Department of Defense also submitted an additional request of \$33.0 billion in OCO funds for fiscal year 2010 in support of increased military personnel and operations in Afghanistan. The committee was pleased that the focus of the Department of Defense's request was to ensure scarce resources received were dedicated to the needs of the warfighter. The committee supported the progress made by the Department, considering the Nation's limited resources.

The committee supported the complete allocation of funds by the Committee on the Budget to the levels requested in the President's fiscal year 2011 budget for the National Defense Budget Function, to include contingency operations and mandatory spending. The committee noted—in light of the ongoing military conflicts, significant reset and modernization needs of the services, and the substantial investments required to recruit and retain highly qualified servicemembers and families—that the budget request was the

minimum necessary level to support our national security requirements.

However, within the Department's base budget funding request, the committee highlighted several concerns. First, with respect to mandatory funding, the committee was pleased that the President's budget again included a proposal to fully fund concurrent receipt for military retirees that were retired due to disability, but was disappointed to learn that the budget request also failed to identify the \$5.1 billion in mandatory offsets over ten years necessary to adopt the proposal. Second, with respect to readiness, the committee noted that in fiscal year 2011 the readiness levels of ground forces, both in the aggregate and in terms of full-spectrum training, may finally have begun to improve. The committee identified that improving readiness levels was critical to the Nation's security and that sufficient investments should be made to ensure this, requiring sustained funding levels for readiness and reset over a period of years. Third, with respect to acquisition programs, the committee noted that it will need to carefully review investment programs to determine whether the Department's investment strategy matched the resources needed to meet National Military Strategy requirements. For example, the F-35 development program had been delayed due to late delivery of test aircraft and the accomplishment of fewer than ten percent of the planned test flights in fiscal year 2009. Delays in the test program led to unexpected and unprecedented concurrency of development and production. Despite the delay, the Air Force requested to retire approximately 250 aircraft in fiscal year 2010. Finally, the committee asserted that it undertakes careful and detailed analysis of each of the programs within its jurisdiction with an eye toward cutting any unjustified expense and reallocating funds where appropriate to higher-priority and well-executing programs. The committee planned to continue this same level of oversight while reviewing the fiscal year 2011 budget request. As an example, the committee intended to emphasize the need for the Department of Defense and its subordinate entities to put in place the necessary financial management systems and internal controls to produce auditable financial statements, resulting in the eventual receipt of an unqualified audit opinion.

#### FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

During the 111th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services held numerous hearings in accordance with its legislative and oversight roles. These hearings focused on areas including the budget of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the posture of the armed services and combatant commands, strategy, the Quadrennial Defense Review, the war in the Republic of Iraq, the war in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, combating terrorism, Department of Defense management and acquisition reform, detainee policy, U.S. policy toward Russia, China, and Japan and the Guam realignment, Pakistan, nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear weapons and missile defense policy, the Army's investigation into Arlington National Cemetery, Fort Hood, and the stand-up of US Cyber Command. A full account of these hearings is below.

(H.A.S.C. 111-1; H.A.S.C. 111-2; H.A.S.C. 111-3; H.A.S.C. 111-4; H.A.S.C. 111-5; H.A.S.C. 111-6; H.A.S.C. 111-7; H.A.S.C. 111-8; H.A.S.C. 111-9; H.A.S.C. 111-10; H.A.S.C. 111-11; H.A.S.C. 111-12; H.A.S.C. 111-13; H.A.S.C. 111-14; H.A.S.C. 111-15; H.A.S.C. 111-16; H.A.S.C. 111-18; H.A.S.C. 111-19; H.A.S.C. 111-20; H.A.S.C. 111-21; H.A.S.C. 111-23; H.A.S.C. 111-24; H.A.S.C. 111-26; H.A.S.C. 111-27; H.A.S.C. 111-28; H.A.S.C. 111-29; H.A.S.C. 111-30; H.A.S.C. 111-31; H.A.S.C. 111-32; H.A.S.C. 111-33; H.A.S.C. 111-34; H.A.S.C. 111-35; H.A.S.C. 111-37; H.A.S.C. 111-38; H.A.S.C. 111-39; H.A.S.C. 111-40; H.A.S.C. 111-41; H.A.S.C. 111-42; H.A.S.C. 111-43; H.A.S.C. 111-44; H.A.S.C. 111-45; H.A.S.C. 111-46; H.A.S.C. 111-47; H.A.S.C. 111-48; H.A.S.C. 111-49; H.A.S.C. 111-50; H.A.S.C. 111-52; H.A.S.C. 111-53; H.A.S.C. 111-55; H.A.S.C. 111-56; H.A.S.C. 111-57; H.A.S.C. 111-58; H.A.S.C. 111-59; H.A.S.C. 111-60; H.A.S.C. 111-61)

#### POSTURE AND BUDGET

During the 111th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services held multiple hearings on the posture, financial requirements, and status of the U.S. Armed Forces as they continue to fight in several theaters of combat. These hearings, combined with the committee's responsibility for assembling the annual defense authorization bill, are a central element in the discharge of the committee's oversight responsibilities.

During the first session of the 111th Congress, the committee held a series of budget and posture hearings. On January 27, 2009, the committee convened a hearing with Robert M. Gates, Secretary of Defense, to discuss the priorities of the Department of Defense in the new administration. On May 13, 2009, the committee received testimony from Robert M. Gates, Secretary of Defense, and Admiral Michael G. Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to review the budget request for funding and authorities during fiscal year 2010.

In addition to this hearing, the committee held posture hearings in which it sought and received testimony from each of the military departments. On May 14, 2009, Peter Geren, Secretary of the Army, and the Chief of Staff of the Army, General George Casey, appeared before the committee to discuss their service's portion of the fiscal year 2010 budget request. Later that day, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from B.J. Penn, the Acting Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Gary Roughead, the Chief of Naval Operations; and General James T. Conway, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who appeared before the committee to testify on the United States Navy's portion of the fiscal year 2010 budget request. The following week, on May 19, 2009, Michael B. Donley, Secretary of the Air Force; and General Norton A. Schwartz, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, testified on the budget as it related to the U.S. Air Force.

In addition to the uniformed services, which are primarily responsible for training and equipping their respective forces, commanders of the unified combatant commands appeared before the committee to discuss the security situation in their respective areas of responsibility. These hearings began with testimony from Admiral James G. Stavridis, the Commander of U.S. Southern Com-

mand; General Victor Eugene “Gene” Renuart, the Commander of U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command; General James N. Mattis, the Commander of U.S. Joint Forces Command and Supreme Allied Commander Transformation for NATO; and General William E. “Kip” Ward, the Commander of U.S. Africa Command, on March 18, 2009. This hearing was followed one week later by Admiral Timothy J. Keating, the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command; General Bantz J. Craddock, the Commander of U.S. European Command and NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe; and General Walter L. “Skip” Sharp, the Commander of United Nations Command, the Republic of Korea-United States Combined Forces Command, and the United States Forces Korea, on March 24, 2009. On April 2, 2009, the committee received testimony from the Honorable Michèle Flournoy, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; General David H. Petraeus, the Commander of U.S. Central Command; and Admiral Eric Olson, the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command.

During the second session of the 111th Congress in 2010, the committee held a series of budget and posture hearings in preparation for the fiscal year 2011 budget. On February 3, 2010, the committee received testimony on the fiscal year 2011 budget request from the Department of Defense. It heard testimony from Robert M. Gates, Secretary of Defense, and Admiral Michael G. Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On February 23, 2010, the committee convened on the fiscal year 2011 budget request from the Department of the Air Force, receiving testimony from Michael B. Donley, Secretary of the Air Force; and General Norton A. Schwartz, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. The following day, on February 24, 2010, Ray Mabus, Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Gary Roughead, the Chief of Naval Operations; and General James T. Conway, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, testified on the Navy’s portion of the fiscal year 2011 budget request. On February 25, 2010, the committee concluded its service posture hearings by receiving testimony from John McHugh, Secretary of the Army, and General George Casey, Jr., the Chief of Staff of the Army, on the Army’s budget request.

The committee also received testimony from the unified combatant commanders on the posture of their commands in 2010. On March 10, 2010, Admiral James G. Stavridis, the Commander of U.S. European Command; General William E. “Kip” Ward, the Commander of U.S. Africa Command; and General James N. Mattis, the Commander of U.S. Joint Forces Command. The following week, on March 17, 2010, the committee convened to hear testimony from General David H. Petraeus, the Commander of U.S. Central Command; Admiral Eric Olson, Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command; and General Duncan McNabb, the Commander of U.S. Transportation Command on the status of their commands. The committee received testimony on March 18, 2010 from General Douglas Fraser, the Commander of U.S. Southern Command; and General Victor E. Renuart, Jr., Commander of the U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command. One week later, on March 25, 2010, the committee met to receive testimony from Admiral Robert F. Willard, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command; and General Walter L. “Skip” Sharp,

Commander of U.S. Forces Korea, United Nations Command, and Republic of Korea-United States Command Forces Command.

(H.A.S.C. 111-3; H.A.S.C. 111-8; H.A.S.C. 111-9; H.A.S.C. 111-11; H.A.S.C. 111-18; H.A.S.C. 111-19; H.A.S.C. 111-20; H.A.S.C. 111-21; H.A.S.C. 111-40; H.A.S.C. 111-42; H.A.S.C. 111-43; H.A.S.C. 111-44; H.A.S.C. 111-45; H.A.S.C. 111-46; H.A.S.C. 111-47; H.A.S.C. 111-48)

#### STRATEGY

The committee views the role of strategy as a critical component of Department of Defense decision-making. During the first session of the 111th Congress, the committee met to discuss emerging concerns regarding Department of Defense strategy. On March 5, 2009, the committee heard testimony on “Combating Piracy on the High Seas.” The following week, on March 11, 2009, the committee met to receive testimony on “Security Challenges Arising from the Global Financial Crisis.” On November 18, 2009, the committee met again to discuss another key strategy issue, receiving testimony on “Resourcing the National Defense Strategy: Implications of Long Term Defense Budget Trends.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-5; H.A.S.C. 111-6; H.A.S.C. 111-32)

#### THE QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW

The committee dedicated significant oversight resources on the Department of Defense’s Quadrennial Defense Review process and the findings of the final report. On February 4, 2010, the committee met to receive testimony on “The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review.” The committee also met to receive testimony from the Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel. On April 15, 2010, the committee received testimony on the independent panel’s assessment of the Quadrennial Defense Review. Later, on July 29, 2010, the committee reconvened to receive testimony on the “Final Report of the Independent Panel’s Assessment of the Quadrennial Defense Review.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-41; H.A.S.C. 111-50; H.A.S.C. 111-59)

#### WAR IN IRAQ

The committee devoted significant oversight resources to the war in the Republic of Iraq and the effect of that war on the Department of Defense and the broader national security interests of the United States. On February 12, 2009, the committee convened a hearing on “Addressing U.S. Strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan: Balancing Interests and Resources.” The following month, on March 25, 2009, the committee received testimony on “Effective Counterinsurgency: How the Use and Misuse of Reconstruction Funding Affects the War Effort in Iraq and Afghanistan.” On September 30, 2009, the committee held a hearing on the “Status of Ongoing U.S. Efforts in Iraq.” On October 21, 2009, the committee heard testimony on “U.S. Military Redeployment from Iraq: Issues and Challenges.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-4; H.A.S.C. 111-10; H.A.S.C. 111-28; H.A.S.C. 111-31)

## WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

In the 111th Congress, the committee renewed its commitment to provide focused oversight to the war in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee held a hearing on February 12, 2009 on “Addressing U.S. Strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan: Balancing Interests and Resources.” It followed up with another hearing the next month on “Effective Counterinsurgency: How the Use and Misuse of Reconstruction Funding Affect the War Efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan” on March 25, 2009. On April 2, 2009, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony on the “New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan and Developments in the U.S. Central Command and Special Operations Command.” On October 30, 2009, the committee met to receive testimony on “Afghanistan: Getting the Strategy Right.” The committee continued its vigorous oversight over the war in Afghanistan, holding two back-to-back hearings in December 2009. On December 3, 2009, the committee held the first of two hearings on “Afghanistan: The Results of the Strategic Review, Part I.” The following week, the committee convened to hold the second hearing of the series, “Afghanistan: The Results of the Strategic Review, Part II.”

In the second session of the 111th Congress, the committee held a hearing on May 5, 2010 on “Developments in Security and Stability in Afghanistan.” On June 16, 2010, the committee held another follow-up hearing on “Developments in Afghanistan.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-4; H.A.S.C. 111-10; H.A.S.C. 111-11; H.A.S.C. 111-30; H.A.S.C. 111-34; H.A.S.C. 111-35; H.A.S.C. 111-53; H.A.S.C. 111-55)

## COMBATING TERRORISM

The committee conducted oversight over the ongoing threat of terrorism. On January 27, the committee met to receive testimony on “Al Qaeda in 2010: How Should the U.S. Respond?”

(H.A.S.C. 111-39)

## DETAINEE POLICY

Over the course of the 111th Congress, the committee held hearings on issues related to the treatment of detainees in U.S. custody at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. On July 16, 2009, the committee received testimony on “Prosecuting Law of War Violations: Reforming the Military Commissions Act of 2006.” On July 24, 2009, the committee met again to discuss “Reforming the Military Commissions Act of 2006 and Detainee Policy.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-24; H.A.S.C. 111-26)

## DOD MANAGEMENT AND ACQUISITION REFORM: MITIGATING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

In upholding its responsibilities to mitigate waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in federal government programs, and pursuant to House Rule XI, clauses 2(n), (o), and (p), the committee met several times to conduct oversight over Department of Defense activities, as noted above in this report. On March 12, 2009, the committee held a hearing on the “Department of Defense at High Risk: Recommendations of the Comptroller General for Improving De-

partmental Management.” The following month, on April 30, 2009, the committee met to receive testimony on the “Reform of Major Weapons System Acquisition and Related High Risk Areas.” On May 6, 2009, the committee reconvened to receive testimony on the “Department of Defense at High Risk: The Chief Management Officer’s Recommendations for Acquisition Reform and Related High Risk Areas.”

During the second session of the 111th Congress, the committee continued its oversight activities on Department of Defense management. On July 22, 2010, the committee held a hearing on “Managing the Department of Defense in a Time of Tight Budgets.” On September 29, 2010, the committee convened to receive testimony on “The Department of Defense’s Efficiency Initiative.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-7; H.A.S.C. 111-14; H.A.S.C. 111-15; H.A.S.C. 111-57; H.A.S.C. 111-61)

#### NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND THREAT REDUCTION

The committee continued its efforts to monitor and address the security threats related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. On January 22, 2009, the committee met to hear testimony on the December 2, 2008 report of the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, entitled “World at Risk”.

On July 15, 2009, the committee met to hear testimony on U.S. efforts to address a new generation of security threats from weapons of mass destruction, including through Department of Energy nonproliferation programs and the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

(H.A.S.C. 111-2; H.A.S.C. 111-23)

#### NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND MISSILE DEFENSE

The committee continued its oversight over U.S. policy on nuclear weapons and missile defense. During the first session of the 111th Congress, on May 6, 2009, the committee met to receive testimony on the “Report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States.” On October 1, 2009, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony on “President Obama’s New Plan for Missile Defense in Europe and Implications for International Security.”

During the second session of the 111th Congress, on April 14, 2010, the committee met to receive testimony on “United States Nuclear Weapons Policy and Force Structure.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-16; H.A.S.C. 111-29; H.A.S.C. 111-49)

#### RUSSIA

On July 30, 2009, the committee met to receive testimony on the “U.S. Security Relationship with Russia and Its Impact on Transatlantic Security.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-27)

#### CHINA

The committee continued its effort to remain cognizant of longer-term security issues beyond those relating to current operations.

On January 13, 2010, the committee met to hear testimony on security developments involving China.

(H.A.S.C. 111-37)

#### JAPAN AND GUAM

The committee continued its oversight issues related to the U.S.-Japan security relationship and issues pertaining to Guam, including the realignment of 8,000 Marines from Japan to Guam. On December 2, 2009, the committee held a hearing on “Assessing the Guam War Claims Process.” On July 27, 2010, the committee received testimony on “Recent Security Developments Involving Japan.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-33; H.A.S.C. 111-58)

#### PAKISTAN

On April 23, 2009, the committee met for the first of two hearings on effective counterinsurgency in Pakistan and the future of the U.S.-Pakistan military partnership. On April 29, 2009, the committee met to hear testimony on the Administration’s perspective on effective counterinsurgency in Pakistan and the future of the U.S.-Pakistan military partnership.

During the second session of the 111th Congress, the committee convened on April 29, 2010, to hear testimony on security and stability in Pakistan and developments in U.S. policy and funding.

(H.A.S.C. 111-12; H.A.S.C. 111-13; H.A.S.C. 111-52)

#### ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

On June 30, 2010, the committee met to receive testimony on a “Review of Army Investigation of Arlington National Cemetery.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-56)

#### FORT HOOD

On January 20, 2010, the committee convened to receive testimony on the “Department of Defense Independent Review Relating to Fort Hood.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-38)

#### U.S. CYBER COMMAND

The committee has been actively engaged in overseeing the stand-up of US Cyber Command. On September 23, 2010, it met to receive testimony on “US Cyber Command: Organizing for Cyberspace Operations.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-60)

## OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES AND THE PANEL

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND LAND FORCES

The Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces provided oversight of all Departments of the Army and Air Force acquisition programs (with the exception of space programs, strategic missile and information technology programs), including Army and Air Force Reserve and National Guard equipment programs. The subcommittee conducted 13 oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011 Department of Defense (DOD) budget requests, including: February 4, 2009, Army and Marine Corps Force Protection Programs; February 25, 2009, U.S. Transportation Command's Airlift, Sealift, and Surface Lift Programs; March 26, 2009, The Status of the Future Combat Systems Program; April 23, 2009, Army Aircraft Programs; May 5, 2009, Army National Guard and Air National Guard Equipment Programs; May, 21, 2009, Army acquisition, reset, and modernization programs; July 9, 2009, the status of Army and Marine Corps reset requirements, Part I; December 10, 2009, the status of Army and Marine Corps reset requirements, Part II; March 10, 2010, Army acquisition and modernization programs; March 17, 2010, force protection equipment programs for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan; March 24, 2010, Department of the Navy and Air Force combat aviation programs; April 22, 2010, Army and Air Force National Guard and Reserve Component equipment posture; and April 28, 2010, aircraft mobility programs.

In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee received briefings from representatives of the Department of Defense on the following: surface-to-surface munitions and laser threats; special access programs; Afghanistan force protection; improvised explosive devices; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems; body armor protection for warfighters; mine resistant ambush protected vehicle programs; and body armor protection equipment.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on June 12, 2009, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), and met to consider and report legislation on May 13, 2010, that was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). The legislation covered a range of issues, including the Future Combat Systems Spin Out Early-Infantry Brigade Combat Team equipment; 4.5 generation fighter aircraft; F-22A aircraft; E-8C Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System re-engining; retirement of C-130E aircraft; retirement of C-5 aircraft; strategic airlift aircraft, body armor procurement and separate program elements for body armor; unmanned cargo carrying capable aerial vehicles; data links for tactical unmanned aerial ve-

hicles; Army tactical ground network program; Army ground combat vehicle and self-propelled howitzer capability; operation, sustainment, modernization, and personnel of major ranges and test facilities; assessment of technological maturity and integration risk of Army modernization programs; technology modernization of combat vehicle and armored tactical wheeled vehicle fleets; annual report of the F-35 aircraft program; report on integration of DoD ISR capabilities; man-portable and vehicle mounted guided missile systems; command and control systems; extended range modular sniper rifle systems; and next generation bomber aircraft.

(H.A.S.C. 111-5; H.A.S.C. 111-9; H.A.S.C. 111-35; H.A.S.C. 111-45; H.A.S.C. 111-50; H.A.S.C. 111-69; H.A.S.C. 111-78; H.A.S.C. 111-133; H.A.S.C. 111-140; H.A.S.C. 111-146; H.A.S.C. 111-158; and H.A.S.C. 111-162.)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel conducted a series of hearings to review and evaluate matters under its jurisdiction in the fiscal years 2010 and 2011 budget requests: May 15, 2009, Fiscal Year 2010 National Defense Authorization Budget Request on the Defense Health Program; May 21, 2009, Fiscal Year 2010 National Defense Authorization Budget Request on Military Personnel Overview; February 3, 2010, Report of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military; March 3, 2010, Review of the DOD Process for Assessing the Requirements to Implement Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell; March 9, 2010, Reviewing the Studies of the Effects of Deployment on Military Children; March 15, 2010, Legislative Priorities in Support of Families; March 17, 2010, Military Personnel Legislative Priorities; March 23, 2010 Military Associations' Legislative Priorities; April 13, 2010, DOD Medical Centers of Excellence; April 15, 2010 Supporting the Reserve Component as an Operational Reserve and Key Personnel Legislative Initiatives; April 20, 2010, Implementation of Requirement to Provide a Medical Examination Before Separating Members Diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) or Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) and the Capacity of DOD to Provide Care to PTSD Cases; April 21, 2010; Defense Health Program.

In addition to its budget request hearings, the subcommittee conducted hearings related to the following topics: January 28, 2009, Sexual Assault in the Military: Victim Support and Advocacy; February 25, 2009, Beneficiary and Advocacy Overview; March 3, 2009, Recruiting, Retention, and End Strength; March 6, 2009, Sexual Assault in the Military; March 12, 2009, Overview of Military Resale and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation; March 18, 2009, Joint hearing with the Readiness Subcommittee on Prioritization of Health Affairs/TRICARE Management with the Services Requirements on Medical Infrastructure; March 24, 2009, Joint hearing with the Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee on Future of the Department of Defense Health Information Technology, AHTLA; April 2, 2009, Improving the Recovery and Full Accounting of POW/MIA Personnel from all past conflicts; April 29, 2009, Future Organization of the Military Health Care System and TRICARE Management Activity; July 22, 2009, Oversight of Family Support Programs; July 29, 2009, Psycho-

logical Stress in the Military: What Steps are Leaders Taking?; December 2, 2009, Joint hearing with the Readiness Subcommittee on New Walter Reed: Are We on the Right Track?

The subcommittee also conducted a briefing on the following topic: March 9, 2010, unclassified briefing on the Navy's Plans to Assign Women to Submarines; June 17, 2010, unclassified briefing on the status of the Comprehensive Review Working Group on the Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell; June 23, 2010, unclassified brief on the Wanat, Afghanistan Battle; July 28, 2010, unclassified briefing on the Army Study on Suicides.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on June 11, 2009, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) and met to consider and report legislation on May 12, 2010, that was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). The legislation covered a range of military personnel issues, including the following: force structure, end strengths, recruiting, retention, decorations, promotion, education, training, separation, retirement, personnel policy, compensation systems, benefits, and health care.

(H.A.S.C. 111-4; H.A.S.C. 111-11; H.A.S.C. 111-12; H.A.S.C. 111-17; H.A.S.C. 111-22; H.A.S.C. 111-26; H.A.S.C. 111-29; H.A.S.C. 111-40; H.A.S.C. 111-48; H.A.S.C. 111-60; H.A.S.C. 111-70; H.A.S.C. 111-85; H.A.S.C. 111-90; H.A.S.C. 111-109; H.A.S.C. 111-121; H.A.S.C. 111-130; H.A.S.C. 111-131; H.A.S.C. 111-135; H.A.S.C. 111-139; H.A.S.C. 111-143; H.A.S.C. 111-149; H.A.S.C. 111-154; H.A.S.C. 111-155; H.A.S.C. 111-156)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

The Subcommittee on Readiness reviewed the programs within the operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 to ensure that appropriate funds were available to maintain a high level of military readiness. The subcommittee held hearings on May 20, 2009, and March 16, 2010, to receive testimony on the military services' operation and maintenance budget requests for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, respectively. As a result, the subcommittee authorized \$156.2 billion in the operation and maintenance accounts in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), plus \$88.3 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) operation and maintenance. The subcommittee recommended \$167.6 billion in O&M for Fiscal Year 2011 and \$114.0 billion for OCO operation and maintenance.

To provide context for its actions on the fiscal years 2010 and 2011 defense authorization acts, the subcommittee on April 30, 2009, received a briefing on the classified readiness status of the Army and Marine Corps, and on July 27, 2010, the subcommittee hosted a classified briefing for the full committee on the current readiness status of all the military services.

The subcommittee held a hearing on April 22, 2009, to review the Department's air sovereignty alert (ASA) operations and examine the readiness of the forces tasked with carrying out this priority mission. The ASA mission is aimed at protecting U.S. airspace. During the Cold War, this mission was focused on potential

air threats from the Soviet Union. Following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the Department initiated Operation Noble Eagle which added the protection of U.S. airspace from internal threats to NORAD's responsibility, and DOD policy reiterates that protecting the U.S. homeland from direct attacks is the Department's highest priority. The Air Force provides 100 percent of the mission's fighter aircraft at 18 sites throughout the United States; the Air National Guard primarily performs this mission.

Testimony at the April hearing focused on a January 2009 report issued by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) that highlighted the current and future challenges affecting the units that conduct ASA operations in the homeland. In summary, GAO found that: NORAD had not conducted routine risk assessments to determine ASA operational requirements, including the appropriate levels and types of units, personnel, and aircraft for the mission; the readiness of the units conducting these operations on a daily basis is not fully assessed because their mission document statements do not reflect their ASA responsibilities or the personnel, training, and equipment necessary to conduct these operations; and the Air Force had not developed plans to address challenges going forward to ASA operation, specifically, the recapitalization of the F-15 and F-16 aircraft that conduct these operations. In addition to GAO, witnesses included representatives from the Department of Defense, the U.S. Air Force and the Air National Guard. While the subcommittee was pleased that funding for the ASA mission was included in the fiscal year 2011 budget request, pursuant to a requirement in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), it remained concerned that most of the GAO recommendations remained unimplemented. Accordingly, a provision was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) to require a report by NORAD, and an independent analysis of such report by the National Guard Bureau, on the ASA mission and the actions being taken to implement the GAO recommendations to improve management of the ASA mission.

The subcommittee on July 23, 2009, met to receive testimony from officials of the Department of Defense and the Institute for Defense Analyses on the proposed reconfiguration of the national defense stockpile. The subcommittee noted that in 2006 and 2007 Congress asked the Department of Defense to review its current stockpiling strategy. This review included the possibility of reconfiguring the Stockpile and proposing changes in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1979 to allow for stockpile requirements based on economic purposes in peacetime. Non war-related stockpiling was prohibited under current law. The subcommittee concluded that testimony from the witnesses did not effectively address the issue from a federal government perspective; rather, the discussion was focused on current requirements specifically under the Department of Defense. The subcommittee also identified that a subsequent President's budget request should address its current stockpiling strategy across all pertinent departments of the federal government, to include the Departments of Commerce and Energy. Subsequently, the subcommittee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

2010 (Public Law 111–84) that required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on any actions the Secretary plans to take in response to the recommendations in the April 2009 report entitled “Reconfiguration of the National Defense Stockpile Report to Congress.” The subcommittee is still awaiting the Department’s response to the requirement in Public Law 111–84.

The subcommittee continued to assess the performance of the Defense Travel System (DTS) during the 111th Congress. After several informal staff-level briefings, the subcommittee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) that required the Department to address ways to simplify the Defense Travel System on or before December 31, 2009. This report was delivered on May 24, 2010, and included suggestions which the subcommittee is analyzing and could incorporate in future legislation. In coordination with the subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation also held two hearings on DTS.

The subcommittee received two classified briefings related to the logistical challenges of moving troops and supplies to support military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The first briefing, held on January 21, 2010, focused on the critical role played by the U.S. Transportation Command and the Defense Logistics Agency in simultaneously supporting the drawdown of forces in the Republic of Iraq and fulfilling requirements for the troop surge into the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan while continuing to carry out their other missions throughout the globe. Briefers included representatives from the Joint Staff, the U.S. Transportation Command, the Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command, the 618th Tanker Airlift Control Center, and the Defense Logistics Agency. The second briefing, held on July 28, 2010, focused on the redeployment from and disposal of equipment in the Republic of Iraq. Briefers included representatives from the U.S. Transportation Command and the Defense Logistics Agency.

The subcommittee on February 24, 2010, met to receive testimony from DOD officials on energy management and initiatives on military installations. The subcommittee heard that the Department of Defense owns vast amounts of property, comprising more than 500 permanent installations and more than 300,000 buildings and 2 billion square feet of space. As such, it is a critical asset that requires significant investment and deliberate policy oversight to ensure energy security, energy reduction, and deliberate pursuit of renewable energy projects. The Department provided increased emphasis on energy security as a priority from defense leadership and included it in the Quadrennial Defense Review in 2010. The Department’s strategy included reduced demand for energy, increased supply of renewable and alternative energy, and continued investment in research and development to stimulate new technologies. Accordingly, the subcommittee, in both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523), included several provisions specific to installation

energy, energy security, and demand reduction domestically, internationally and in operations.

On April 27, 2010, the subcommittee met for a hearing on Army Reserve, Army National Guard, and Air National Guard training, operations, and readiness. The focus of the hearing was the resource requirements for maintaining these reserve component forces in an operational reserve posture, with the witnesses testifying that significant funding had to migrate from Overseas Contingency Operations funding to the base budget. The Chief of the Army Reserve stated that a “demand signal” of at least 20,000 Army Reserve soldiers per year, along with the necessary training funding, was needed to maintain the Army Reserve in an operational reserve status. The Acting Director, Army National Guard did not specify a figure, but testified that, absent large-scale mobilizations and full base budget funding, the Army National Guard would have to go back to a strategic reserve status. The Air National Guard witness focused his remarks on the need for recapitalization of the Air National Guard fighter inventory, which he stated was required for maintaining current air sovereignty mission capability. As a result of this hearing, the subcommittee increased recommended funding levels for operation and maintenance accounts for the reserve components in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

On July 20, 2010, the subcommittee met to receive testimony from DOD officials and an industry representative on the use of modeling and simulation (M&S) to enhance military readiness. The subcommittee heard that the military services have all, to some degree, invested in modeling and simulation (M&S) to improve training, reduce costs, and improve fidelity of budgetary and material maintenance projections. These efforts vary in complexity and are evolving as technological advances in M&S provide improved capability shaped to meet the Department’s needs. Some of the most notable current uses of M&S in the Department described to the subcommittee included tools for modeling readiness levels and maintenance requirements, flight simulators for aviation training, and immersive training devices for infantry training. When used appropriately, the subcommittee believes these tools can enhance training, reduce operations and maintenance costs, and increase the lifecycle of weapons systems. Accordingly, the subcommittee in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) included a provision to require a Congressional Budget Office review of M&S tools used by the Department to develop and analyze the annual budget submission.

(H.A.S.C. 111-8; H.A.S.C. 111-13; H.A.S.C. 111-31; H.A.S.C. 111-38; H.A.S.C. 111-42; H.A.S.C. 111-65; H.A.S.C. 111-73; H.A.S.C. 111-78; H.A.S.C. 111-86; H.A.S.C. 111-109; H.A.S.C. 111-125; H.A.S.C. 111-137; H.A.S.C. 111-142; H.A.S.C. 111-159; H.A.S.C. 111-167; H.A.S.C. 111-171; H.A.S.C. 111-174)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND EXPEDITIONARY FORCES

The Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces conducted a series of hearings to review programs included in the Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition budget requests for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 during the 111th Congress, including; Feb-

ruary 25, 2009, U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) airlift, sealift, and surface lift programs (Joint with Air and Land Forces Subcommittee); March 10, 2009, Littoral Combat Ship Program; May 15, 2009, Fiscal year 2010 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of the Navy Shipbuilding acquisition programs; May 19, 2009, Fiscal Year 2010 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of the Navy Acquisition Programs; March 3, 2010, Fiscal Year 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of the Navy shipbuilding acquisition programs; March 24, 2010, Department of the Navy and Department of the Air Force combat aviation programs (Joint with Air and Land Forces Subcommittee), July 14, 2010, Oversight Hearing on Activities of the Maritime Administration.

In addition to its traditional oversight responsibilities regarding DOD budget requests, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following: February 4, 2009, Army and Marine Corps Force Protection Programs (Joint with Air and Land Forces Subcommittee); March 26, 2009, Requirements for the Future Capabilities of the United States Maritime Forces; July 9, 2009, Status of Army and Marine Corps Reset Requirements (Joint with Readiness and Air and Land Forces Subcommittees); July 16, 2009, Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System (EMALS); July 30, 2009, Efforts to Improve Shipbuilding Effectiveness; December 10, 2009, Status of Army and Marine Corps Reset Requirements, Part II (Joint with Readiness and Air and Land Forces); January 20, 2010, Issues Affecting Naval Force Structure; March 17, 2010, Force Protection Equipment Programs for Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (Joint with Air and Land Forces); July 28, 2010, Surface Fleet Readiness (Joint with Readiness Subcommittee).

Furthermore, in addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted numerous briefings on the following topics: February 4, 2009, Force Protection Programs; February 12, 2009, Afghanistan Operations-Intelligence; March 3, 2009, the Marine Corps' Investigation into the F/A-18 mishap in Miramar, California; March 4, 2009, the Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) Task Force; March 5, 2009, the Littoral Combat Ship contracts; March 17, 2009, Threats to the Future Naval Force; May 5, 2009, VH-71 Presidential Helicopter Program; September 15, 2009, Force Protection Issues in Afghanistan; September 23, 2009, Littoral Combat Ship; October 22, 2009, USS Hartford Collision; March 11, 2010, Future Surface Combat Radar Hull Study; March 23, 2010, Oliver Hazard Perry Class Frigates (FFGs); June 10, 2010, Force Protection Programs in Afghanistan; and June 23, 2010, the Ohio-class Submarine Replacement Program.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on June 12, 2009 that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) and considered and reported legislation on May 13, 2010 that was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). The legislation covered a range of issues, including (contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84)), authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and eval-

uation programs for the Department of the Navy, special contract authority for a multi-ship acquisition strategy for the LCS, authorization to use advance procurement funding for production planning and related support services and in the case of the vessel designated CVN 79, use of advance procurement funding for advance construction of components, conditional authority for multi-year procurement of F/A-18E, F/A-18F, or EA-18G aircraft (this authority was subsequently extended by passage of H.R. 6102 (Public Law 111-238)), granting a temporary reduction in the number of operational aircraft carriers in the battle force fleet of the Navy, one time authority to transfer certain military hardware along with limitations on modification of government furnished equipment for developmental programs, authorization of appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund, authorization of appropriations for the activities of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation, five separate provisions allowing the Maritime Administration to correct past financial and management irregularities at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and a requirement for self defense protective measures for commercial vessels under contract with the United States for the carriage of military cargo.

For fiscal year 2011, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523) contained: authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and evaluation programs for the Department of the Navy, incremental funding authority for certain large naval vessels, multi-year procurement authority for certain naval strike fighter aircraft (note, this authority was subsequently granted by passage of H.R. 6102 (Public Law 111-238)), requirements for the content of the long range plans for the construction of naval vessels, three separate provisions dealing with the retirement of naval vessels, authorization of appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund, authorization of appropriations for the activities of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation, extension of the authorization for the Maritime Security Program, clarification of the nominating official for appointment to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for residents of the Northern Mariana Islands, technical corrections to the Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program, and revisions in the process for the processing of loans for the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program authorized under chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code.

In accordance with the Committee Oversight plan submitted for the 111th Congress in accordance with clause 2(d) of rule X of the House of Representatives, the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary held numerous hearings and briefings on the tactical aircraft force structure for the Department of the Navy, the industrial base supporting construction of naval vessels, and the maintenance of a viable national defense sealift fleet.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year authorized: an increase of nine F/A-18E/F aircraft beyond the planned procurement of the Department of the Navy, an increase for advanced procurement of economic order quantity items, an increase for EA-18G support items, and an increase in funds to establish

core depot maintenance capability for the ALQ-214 electronic countermeasures system on Navy and Marine Corps tactical aircraft. In addition, the legislation granted multi-year procurement contract authority for F/A-18E/F and EA-18G to the Secretary of the Navy and authorized the budget requests for the procurement of new fighter aircraft, including F-35s for the Navy, Marine Corps and the Air Force. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 authorizes an increase of F/A-18E/F aircraft for the Navy.

Lastly, Public Law 111-238, signed into law by the President on September 27, 2010, renewed the Secretary of the Navy's expired multi-year procurement authority provided in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and reduced the procurement cost of new F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft.

The committee investigated through briefings, hearings, and site visits, the issues associated with rising costs for naval ship construction. The committee proposed legislation subsequently adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 that supports increased efficiency of planning and technical support prior to construction of vessels by authorizing the use of funding prior to the construction contract for those purposes. In addition, the committee authorized advance construction of modules and assemblies for the vessel designated CVN 79 for the purpose of garnering efficiency from the stability of the industrial work force. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 continues to expand the committee's desire to improve the efficiency of construction by allowing certain large naval vessels to be appropriated in multiply fiscal years up to the number that is three quarters of the number of years of planned ship construction.

The committee took significant action in the 111th Congress to address emergent needs at the United States Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA). Poor oversight from the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation had allowed a number of financial and management irregularities to exist at the USMMA. The committee, after briefings, hearings, and site visits acted to propose legislation subsequently adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) that allowed for the imposition of correct financial controls and management structure at the USMMA. The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 grants authority to the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to continue corrective actions at the USMMA. The Act also streamlines the process for commercial ship-owners to obtain favorable mortgage terms for the construction of new vessels in U.S. utilizing the maritime guarantee loan program (46 U.S.C. 537), and extends the Maritime Security Program to fiscal year 2025 insuring a robust fleet of U.S. flagged commercial vessels capable of serving the on-going or emergent needs of the Department of Defense.

The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 included the following provisions: authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and evaluation programs for the Department of the Navy; a report on naval force structure and missile defense; an annual Comptroller General report on the VH-(XX) presidential helicopter

acquisition program; requirements for the content of the long range plans for the construction of naval vessels; expressing the sense of Congress regarding the naming of a naval combat vessel after Father Vincent Capodanno; authorization of appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund; authorization of appropriations for the activities of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation; extension of the authorization for the Maritime Security Program; and, clarification of the nominating official for appointment to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for residents of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(H.A.S.C. 111-5, H.A.S.C. 111-9, H.A.S.C. 111-18, H.A.S.C. 111-34, H.A.S.C. 111-61, H.A.S.C. 111-64, H.A.S.C. 111-78, H.A.S.C. 111-83, H.A.S.C. 111-92, H.A.S.C. 111-117, H.A.S.C. 111-129, H.A.S.C. 111-140, H.A.S.C. 111-146, H.A.S.C. 111-170. H.A.S.C. 111-174)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces addressed strategic forces programs (except deep strike systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense programs, intelligence policy and national programs, as well as Department of Energy national security programs (except nuclear non-proliferation programs), by conducting hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011 budget requests, including: May 13, 2009, Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities; May 21, 2009, national security space and missile defense programs; March 16, 2010, United States strategic forces; March 25, 2010, Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities; April 15, 2010, report on the Ballistic Missile Defense Review and missile defense programs; April 21, 2010, national security space activities.

In addition to its oversight responsibilities regarding the budget requests, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following: February 25, 2009, the future of missile defense testing; March 17, 2009, the status of U.S. strategic forces; March 18, 2009, space and U.S. security; March 26, 2009, future roles and missions of the Missile Defense Agency; April 30, 2009, space system acquisitions and the industrial base; and January 21, 2010, status of the Air Force Nuclear Security Roadmap.

In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted briefings on the following topics: February 24, 2009, Iranian space launch and possible missile test by the North Korean government; March 4, 2009, military space systems and architecture; March 12, results of the Institute for Defense Analyses' study on alternative missile defense options in Europe; March 31, status of the U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal; April 28, 2009, joint briefing with the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces, the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities on intelligence programs; May 5, 2010, nuclear weapons capabilities of Russia and China; July 21, 2009, space protection program; July 29, 2009, Missile Defense Agency special programs; October 7, 2009, Department of Energy's Environmental Management program; October 21, 2009, status of the Nuclear Posture Review; October 28, joint briefing with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Sub-

committee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, the way ahead on overhead commercial imagery; November 17, 2009, cyber threats to strategic systems; January 13, 2010, joint briefing with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, state of the U.S. space launch enterprise; March 24, 2010, ballistic missile proliferation issues in Iran and North Korea; April 14, 2010, Missile Defense Agency's Integrated Master Test Plan; April 15, 2010, Missile Defense Agency's Airborne Laser Test Bed; July 1, 2010, Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan; July 14, 2010, JASON Panel Life Extension Program study and status of U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile; September 15, 2010, phased adaptive approach to missile defense in Europe.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on June 11, 2009, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). Among other initiatives, that legislation: established a stockpile management program to assure the continued safety, security and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile consistent with the recommendations of the bipartisan commission on the U.S. nuclear posture; required the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of the Ground-based, Midcourse Defense program; made permanent the pilot program for sharing space surveillance data with state governments, U.S. and foreign commercial entities, and foreign governments in an effort to reduce potential satellite collisions with space debris; and required the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to jointly develop and submit a biannual space science and technology strategy to ensure coordination in maintaining and improving U.S. space capabilities.

The subcommittee also considered and reported legislation on May 12, 2010, that was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (HR 6523). Legislation initiated by the subcommittee would: limit the deployment of medium- or long-range missile defense until basing agreements are ratified by host nations and the interceptors are certified as operationally effective based on flight testing; repeal the ban on contracting directly with a foreign government for missile defense activities to allow more direct collaboration with our friends and allies on missile defense; fully fund the Administration's request for the NNSA's Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programs; and fully authorize funding for critical defense environmental cleanup activities.

(H.A.S.C. 111-10; H.A.S.C. 111-23; H.A.S.C. 111-25; H.A.S.C. 111-33; H.A.S.C. 111-57; H.A.S.C. 111-71; H.A.S.C. 111-118; H.A.S.C. 111-136; H.A.S.C. 111-148; H.A.S.C. 111-153; H.A.S.C. 111-157)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities provided oversight of the majority of Department of Defense counter-terrorism and unconventional warfare programs

and other activities under the subcommittee's jurisdictional responsibility.

During the 111th Congress the subcommittee devoted substantial attention assessing the Department's strategy and capabilities to defend against the global terrorist threat. Related hearings included: February 12, 2009, Strategies for Countering Violent Extremists Ideologies; March 3, 2009, Special Operations Forces: Challenges and Opportunities; March 11, 2009, Tracking and Disrupting Terrorist Financial Networks: A potential model for Inter-agency success; April 2, 2009, Terrorism and the New Age of Irregular Warfare: Challenges and Opportunities; May 7, 2009, Counterinsurgency and Irregular Warfare: Issues and Lessons Learned; October 22, 2009, Counterterrorism within Afghan Counterinsurgency; and December 16, 2009, Understanding Cyberspace as a Medium for Radicalization and Counter-Radicalization.

The subcommittee continued its review and oversight of the Department's information technology (IT) policies and programs to improve efficiencies through better use of IT technologies and improve information assurance against the cyber threat. The following hearings addressed these areas: March 24, 2009 and held jointly with the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, Department of Defense Health Information Technology: AHLTA is Intolerable, Where Do We Go From Here; and May 5, 2009, Cyberspace as a Warfighting Domain: Policy, Management and Technical Challenges to Mission Assurance. In addition, the subcommittee, on July 28, 2009, received testimony from the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Policy, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, the Commander, U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, and the Director Defense Capabilities and Management of the U.S. Government Accountability Office on the current state of readiness and coordination in responding to a domestic chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear or high-yield explosives attack.

Hearings pertaining to a review of the budget request for fiscal year 2010 included: May 20, 2009, Fiscal Year 2010 National Defense Authorization Budget Request—Department of Defense Science and Technology Priorities; and June 4, 2009, Fiscal Year 2010 National Defense Authorization Act Budget Request—U.S. Special Operations Command.

Hearings pertaining to the budget request for fiscal year 2011 included: March 23, 2010, Fiscal Year 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request Department of Defense's Science and Technology Programs; and April 14, 2010, Fiscal Year 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program and Counterproliferation Initiatives.

The subcommittee continued to address the Departments efforts toward countering terrorism, including the cyber threat during the second session of the 111th Congress. Related hearings included: January 20, 2010, Threat posed by al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and other regions; February 25, 2010, Private Sector Perspectives on Department of Defense Information Technology and Cybersecurity Activities; April 27, 2010, Closing the Gap: Addressing Critical Rotary Wing Shortfalls for U.S. Special Operations Forces

in Fiscal Year 2011 and Beyond; July 28, 2010, Harnessing small business innovation for national security cyber needs; and September 23, 2010, Operating in the Digital Domain: Organizing the Military Departments for Cyber Operations. The subcommittee, on September 29, 2010, conducted a hearing titled on small business' role and opportunities in restoring affordability to the Department of Defense. Additionally, the subcommittee on November 30, 2010, conducted a hearing on the continued crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo and the implications for U.S. national security.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on June 11, 2009, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 13, 2010, that was included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). The legislative provisions covered a range of issues, to include: a provision to codify the position of the acquisition executive at Special Operations Command; provisions to provide an extension and expansion of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism; a requirement to improve government-wide strategic communication initiatives; and greater acquisition authority to improve information technology capabilities.

In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee held a total of 17 briefings which included: February 26, 2009, Biometrics; March 5, 2009, 1208 Program; March 11, 2009, Counter Threat Finance; March 12, 2009, Army Special Operations Command; March 17, 2009, Marine Special Operations Command; March 19, 2009, Air Force Special Operations Command; March 24, 2009, Afghanistan and Pakistan; March 26, 2010, Naval Special Operations Command; April 29, 2009, Trusted Microelectronics; May 7, 2009, Counter-proliferation policy and issues; July 21, 2009, Global disposition of Special Operations Command; July 23, 2009, Department of Defense efforts to curb drug cartel activity; December 9, 2009, Internet propaganda. Additional briefings included: February 24, 2010, Special Operations Forces combat medicine; March 24, 2010, Air Force Special Operations Forces; May 6, 2010 and joint with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence was a briefing on Al Qaeda in Iraq leadership; and November 16, 2010 on Yemen and the foiled cargo airliner plot.

The subcommittee sponsored a technology demonstration, March 3, 2010, with the U.S. Army Medical Research, Science, and Technology Office to highlight advances in military medical technologies intended to support the warfighter. On March 18, 2010, the subcommittee met with visiting Special Forces officers from the Republic of Iraq.

(H.A.S.C. 111-7; H.A.S.C. 111-14; H.A.S.C. 111-20; H.A.S.C. 111-41; H.A.S.C. 111-51; H.A.S.C. 111-55; H.A.S.C. 111-66; H.A.S.C. 111-75; H.A.S.C. 111-88; H.A.S.C. 111-102; H.A.S.C. 111-113; H.A.S.C. 111-116; H.A.S.C. 111-119; H.A.S.C. 111-128; H.A.S.C. 111-145; H.A.S.C. 111-151; H.A.S.C. 111-161; H.A.S.C. 111-176; H.A.S.C. 111-180; H.A.S.C. 111-183; H.A.S.C. 111-185)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

The subcommittee was reestablished by the 110th Congress and, pursuant to Committee Rule 4, conducts oversight and investiga-

tion over any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee. The subcommittee's work includes not only its own separate subcommittee hearings and reports, but also supports the hearings and oversight responsibilities of the other subcommittees and the full committee. The subcommittee continued work on areas it addressed in the 110th Congress as well as exploring new areas. Through its efforts, the subcommittee supported efforts of the subcommittees to include provisions within the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523). Furthermore, the subcommittee identified best practices and model organizations as well as those in need of improvement or reform within the Department of Defense and other related areas within the committee's jurisdiction.

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations examined officer in-resident professional military education (PME) in March 2009. The committee released a bipartisan report, "Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel" (Committee Print 4, 111th Congress), in April 2010. The Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the service chiefs each provided their views on the report as directed in House Report 111-491. In general, they concurred with the report's findings and expressed a commitment to improve the Department's and service PME systems.

During the 111th Congress, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations examined the Department's efforts to improve language skills, cultural awareness, and regional expertise. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), directed the Secretary of Defense to establish language training centers at universities and the senior military colleges to accelerate the development of expertise in critical and strategic languages. In its continuing oversight capacity, the subcommittee held a hearing in June 2010 along with briefings, interviews, and fact-finding trips to ascertain the progress in implementing the subcommittee's recommendations. This follow-on oversight effort resulted in a report update titled, "Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: Bridging the Gap," in December 2010 which finds that, although the Department has largely addressed the recommendations in the November 2008 report, there are still shortcomings which merit further oversight. The subcommittee's follow-on oversight effort prompted two items of legislation, in part, addressing these deficiencies. The committee report (H. Rpt. 111-491) instructs the GAO to review the services' language, regional expertise, and cultural awareness training of the general purpose forces, particularly for ground components.

The subcommittee continued its oversight of the Defense Travel System (DTS) during the 111th Congress, in coordination with the Readiness Subcommittee. This project attempted to assess the extent to which the Defense Travel Management Office, which has jurisdiction over Defense travel, implemented the recommendations set forth by the review. The subcommittee made various rec-

ommendations to the Department in support of the Readiness Subcommittee.

During the 111th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), the Department of Defense's focal point for the battle against improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee worked closely with the Air and Land Forces and the Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Subcommittees to follow up on work in the 110th Congress and to determine whether shortcomings identified previously had been corrected. Through two hearings, two reports, and numerous briefings, the subcommittee continued to find that although the nearly 3,100-person strong JIEDDO spends over \$2.0 billion annually and it reports significant progress in the Counter-IED (C-IED) fight, it is not clear how well the organization is accomplishing its mission.

In 2010, the subcommittee also investigated and convened a hearing on the problem of outbreaks of multidrug-resistant infections in military hospitals, which emerged early on during military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The subcommittee found that the Department needs better capabilities to monitor infections and enhanced training and expertise in infection control practices. In addition, while the Department and services have supported a number of research and development studies and projects in response to the outbreak of these types of infections, there is no coordinated and sustained approach in place for continuing to conduct needed research in this area. The subcommittee plans to issue a report entitled, "DOD's Response to Multidrug-Resistant Infections in Military Hospitals" in early December 2010.

The subcommittee held two hearings on interagency national security reform and supported legislation requiring a study on the creation of a system for development and management of national security professionals. Also of note, the subcommittee: (1) held four hearings and a member briefing in support of committee acquisition reform efforts; (2) examined alternative strategies during three hearings on Iraq and Afghanistan; and, (3) investigated and conducted oversight on defense requirements for rare earth elements in support of committee policy efforts and Readiness Subcommittee stockpile responsibilities and supporting several provisions related to rare earth elements in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (H.R. 6523).

The subcommittee also conducted a study involving briefings and fact-finding trips, and held a hearing on the Department of Defense's oversight of the quality of off-duty college education programs available to service members using government-provided tuition assistance. The subcommittee found that while the Department and the services have had policies and processes in place to oversee college programs located on military installations, there was little focus on distance learning programs. The Department and the services now plan to increase their oversight of distance learning and for-profit schools. The committee will continue to monitor the Department's oversight efforts in this area.

The subcommittee also continued work with the Project on Government Reform and the Congressional Research Service on the ability of the Department of Defense's audit and inspector general

organizations to adequately conduct oversight of the Department. This work supports oversight of the Defense Contract Audit Agency and the Defense Contract Management Agency as well as the Department's and the services' IGs.

(H.A.S.C. 111-16; H.A.S.C. 111-27; H.A.S.C. 111-32; H.A.S.C. 111-37; H.A.S.C. 111-46; H.A.S.C. 111-67; H.A.S.C. 111-74; H.A.S.C. 111-76; H.A.S.C. 111-80; H.A.S.C. 111-89; H.A.S.C. 111-93; H.A.S.C. 111-103; H.A.S.C. 111-105; H.A.S.C. 111-106; H.A.S.C. 111-107; H.A.S.C. 111-144; H.A.S.C. 111-160; H.A.S.C. 111-165)

#### PANEL ON DEFENSE ACQUISITION REFORM

The Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform held 14 hearings in support of its mandate to examine the defense acquisition system. These hearings were held in three phases: 1) examining how the Department of Defense measures performance in the defense acquisition system, 2) examining specific issues in the performance of the defense acquisition systems, and 3) obtaining feedback on the panel's initial findings and recommendations.

During the first phase of the panel's hearings, the panel met on April 1, 2009, to receive testimony on "Measuring Value and Efficiency: How to Assess the Performance of the Defense Acquisition System." On April 23, 2009, the Panel met to receive testimony on "Measuring Value and Risk in Services Contracts." On May 19, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "Measuring Performance: Developing Good Acquisition Metrics."

In the second phase of the panel's hearing, the committee examined discrete problems in the defense acquisition system that had been identified as significant problems that cause the Department of Defense to receive less than full value in the defense acquisition system. The panel met on June 3, 2009 to receive testimony on "Coordinating Requirements, Budgets, and Acquisition: How Does It Affect Costs and Acquisition Outcomes?" On June 9, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "Challenges to Effective Acquisition and Management of IT Systems." On July 16, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "Managing Service Contracts: What Works and What Doesn't." On July 21, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "Shaping a Workforce for Today's Acquisition Environment That Can Meet DOD's Needs." On September 17, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "The Department of Defense and Industry: Does DOD Effectively Manage its Industrial Base and Match its Acquisition Strategies to the Marketplace?" On September 24, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "DOD Supply Chain Management: Can the Department Identify and Meet its Supply Needs Efficiently?" On October 8, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "The Department of Defense's Rapid Acquisition Process: Is It a Model for Improving Acquisition?" On October 15, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "Can the Department of Defense Protect Taxpayers When It Pays Its Contractors?" On October 29, 2009, the panel met to receive testimony on "Can DOD Improve Innovation and Competition in Acquisition by Better Utilizing Small Business?"

In the third phase of the panel's hearings, the panel received feedback from outside experts and Department of Defense wit-

nesses on its initial findings and recommendations. On February 25, 2010, the panel met to receive testimony on “Expert Perspectives on Managing the Defense Acquisition System and the Defense Acquisition Workforce.” On March 11, 2010, the panel met to receive testimony on “Administration Perspectives on Managing the Defense Acquisition System and the Defense Acquisition Workforce.”

(H.A.S.C. 111-36; H.A.S.C. 111-44; H.A.S.C. 111-63; H.A.S.C. 111-72; H.A.S.C. 111-77; H.A.S.C. 111-82; H.A.S.C. 111-84; H.A.S.C. 111-94; H.A.S.C. 111-95; H.A.S.C. 111-98; H.A.S.C. 111-100; H.A.S.C. 111-104; H.A.S.C. 111-127; H.A.S.C. 111-134)

## PUBLICATIONS

### COMMITTEE PRINTS

111-1—Committee Rules of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, adopted January 4, 2009.

111-2—A Ceremony Unveiling the Portrait of the Honorable Duncan L. Hunter. September 15, 2009.

111-4—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Report—Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Two Decades After the Goldwater—Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel. April 2010.

111-5—Ike Skelton National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2011—Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany H.R. 6523. December, 2010.

### PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

H.A.S.C. 111-1—Full Committee hearing on Committee Organization. January 14, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-2—Full Committee hearing on Preventing Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism. January 22, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-3—Full Committee hearing on Priorities of the Department of Defense in the New Administration. January 27, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-4—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Sexual Assault in the Military: Victim Support and Advocacy. January 28, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-5—Subcommittees on Air and Land Forces and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces joint hearing on Army and Marine Corps Force Protection Programs. February 4, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-6—Full Committee hearing on Addressing U.S. Strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan: Balancing Interests and Resources. February 12, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-7—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities hearing on Strategies for Countering Violent Extremist Ideologies. February 12, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-8—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Acquisition and Disposal of Military Lands: Department of Defense's Real Property Management Challenges in the 21st Century. February 24, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-9—Subcommittees on Air and Land Forces and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces joint hearing on U.S. Transportation Command's (USTRANSCOM) Airlift, Sealift, and Surface Lift Programs. February 25, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-10—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on The Future of Missile Defense Testing. February 25, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-11—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on The Views of Military Advocacy and Beneficiary groups. February 25, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-12—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Recruiting, Retention and End Strength Overview. March 3, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-13—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Department of Defense Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations and Operational Energy Initiatives. March 3, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-14—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities hearing on U.S. Special Operations Command: Challenges and Opportunities. March 3, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-15—Full Committee hearing on Combating Piracy on the High Seas. March 5, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-16—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Can DOD Travelers Book A Trip? Defense Travel System Update. March 5, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-17—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Sexual Assault in the Military: Prevention. March 6, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-18—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on The Navy Littoral Combat Ship Program. March 10, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-19—Full Committee hearing on Security Challenges Arising from the Global Financial Crisis. March 11, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-20—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities hearing on Tracking and Disrupting Terrorist Financial Networks: A Potential Model for Interagency Success? March 11, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-21—Full Committee hearing on the Department of Defense at High Risk: Recommendations of the Comptroller General for Improving Departmental Management. March 12, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-22—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Resale and Morale, Welfare and Recreation Overview. March 12, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-23—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on The Status of U.S. Strategic Forces. March 17, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-24—Full Committee hearing on Security Developments in the Areas of Responsibility of the U.S. Southern Command, Northern Command, Africa Command, and Joint Forces Command. March 18, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-25—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Space and U.S. Security. March 18, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-26—Subcommittees on Military Personnel and Readiness joint hearing on Medical Infrastructure: Are Health Affairs/TRICARE Management Activity Priorities Aligned with Service Requirements? March 18, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-27—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on The Project on National Security Reform: Commentary and Alternative Views. March 19, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-28—Full Committee hearing on Security Developments in the Areas of Responsibility of the U.S. Pacific Command, U.S. European Command, and U.S. Forces Korea. March 24, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-29—Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Joint Hearing on Department of Defense Health Information Technology: AHTLA is “Intolerable,” Where Do We Go From Here? March 24, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-30—Full Committee hearing on Effective Counter-insurgency: How the Use and Misuse of Reconstruction Funding Affect the War Effort in Iraq and Afghanistan. March 25, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-31—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Readiness and Sustainment of the Navy's Surface Fleet. March 25, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-32—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Contingency Contracting: Has the Call for Urgent Reform Been Answered? March 25, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-33—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Future Roles and Missions of the Missile Defense Agency. March 26, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-34—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on Future Roles and Missions of the United States Navy and Marine Corps. March 26, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-35—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on the Status of the Future Combat Systems Program. March 26, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-36—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Measuring Value and Efficiency: How to Assess the Performance of the Defense Acquisition System. April 1, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-37—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Coordinating Contract Support on the Battlefield: Defense, State and USAID. April 1, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-38—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Department of Defense National Security Personnel System. April 1, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-39—Full Committee hearing on The New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan and Developments in U.S. Central Command and Special Operations Command. April 2, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-40—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Improving Recovery and Full Accounting of POW/MIA Personnel from All Past Conflicts. April 2, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-41—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Terrorism and the New Age of Irregular Warfare: Challenges and Opportunities. April 2, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-42—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Air Sovereignty Alert Operations. April 22, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-43—Full Committee hearing on Effective Counter-insurgency: The Future of the U.S.-Pakistan Military Partnership. April 23, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-44—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Measuring Value and Risk in Service Contracts. April 23, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-45—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Army Aircraft Programs. April 23, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-46—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on The Acquisition Workforce: Merely a Business Expense or a Force Multiplier for the Warfighter? April 28, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-47—Full Committee hearing on Effective Counter-insurgency: The Administration's Perspective on the Future of the U.S.-Pakistan Military Partnership. April 29, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-48—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on The Military Health System: Health Affairs/TRICARE Management Activity Organization. April 29, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-49—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Space Systems Acquisition and the Industrial Base. April 30, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-50—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on Army National Guard and Air National Guard Equipment Programs. May 5, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-51—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Cyberspace as a Warfighting Domain: Policy, Management, and Technical Challenges to Mission Assurance. May 5, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-52—Full Committee hearing on The Department of Defense at High Risk: The Chief Management Officer's Recommendations for Acquisition Reform and Related High Risk Areas. May 6, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-53—Full Committee hearing on Report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States. May 6, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-54—Full Committee hearing on Reform of Major Weapons System Acquisition and Related Legislative Proposals. April 30, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-55—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities hearing on Counterinsurgency and Irregular Warfare: Issues and Lessons Learned. May 7, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-56—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of Defense. May 13, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-57—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of Energy Atomic Energy Defense Activities. May 13, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-58—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Navy. March 14, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-59—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Army. May 14, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-60—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Defense Health Program Overview. May 15, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-61—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of the Navy Shipbuilding Acquisition Programs. May 15, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-62—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Pre-

viously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force. May 19, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–63—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Measuring Performance: Developing Good Acquisition Metrics. May 19, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–64—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of the Navy Aviation Programs. May 19, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–65—Subcommittee Readiness hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for the Military Services' Operation and Maintenance Funding. May 20, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–66—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs. May 20, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–67—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Another Crossroads? Professional Military Education Twenty Years After the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the Skelton Panel. May 20, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–68—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Air Force Modernization Programs. May 20, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–69—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Army Acquisition, Reset and Modernization Programs. May 21, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–70—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Military Personnel Overview. May 21, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–71—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for National Security Space and Missile Defense Programs. May 21, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–72—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Coordinating Requirements, Budgets, and Acquisition: How Does it Affect Costs and Acquisition Outcomes? June 3, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–73—Subcommittee on Readiness on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Military Construction, Family Housing, Base Closure, Facilities Operation and Maintenance. June 3, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111–74—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Thinkers and Practitioners: Do Senior Professional Military Education Schools Produce Strategists? June 4, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-75—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for the U.S. Special Operations Command. June 4, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-76—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Raising Thinking from the Tactical to the Operational Level: JPME I and JPME II at the Services' and Joint Command and Staff Colleges. June 25, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-77—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Challenges to Effective Acquisition and Management of Information Technology Systems. July 9, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-78—Subcommittees on Readiness, Air and Land Forces, and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces joint hearing on Army and Marine Corps Reset Requirements (Parts I and II). July 9, 2009 and December 10, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-79—Full Committee hearing on Addressing a New Generation of Threats from Weapons of Mass Destruction: Department of Energy Nonproliferation Programs and the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. July 15, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-80—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Beyond Service Core Competency: Are Our Junior Officers Prepared for Today's Security Environment? July 15, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-81—Full Committee hearing on Prosecuting Law of War Violations: Reforming the Military Commissions Act of 2006. July 16, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-82—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Managing Service Contracts: What Works and What Doesn't. July 16, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-83—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on Oversight of the Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System (EMALS). July 16, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-84—Defense Acquisition Reform Panel hearing on Shaping A Workforce for Today's Acquisition Environment That Can Meet DOD's Needs. July 21, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-85—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Oversight of Family Support Programs. July 22, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-86—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Proposed Reconfiguration of the National Defense Stockpile. July 23, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-87—Full Committee hearing on Reforming the Military Commissions Act of 2006 and Detainee Policy. July 24, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-88—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Yield Explosives Consequence Management. July 28, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-89—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Investing in Our Military Leaders: The Role of Professional Military Education in Officer Development. July 28, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-90—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on the Psychological Stress in the Military: What Steps are Leaders Taking? July 29, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-91—Full Committee hearing on the U.S. Security Relationship with Russia and Its Impact on Transatlantic Security. July 30, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-92—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on Efforts to Improve Shipbuilding Effectiveness. July 30, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-93—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Charting the Course for Effective Professional Military Education. September 10, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-94—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on The Department of Defense and Industry: Does DOD Effectively Manage Its Industrial Base and Match Its Acquisition Strategies to the Marketplace? September 17, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-95—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on DOD Supply Chain Management: Can the Department Identify and Meet Its Supply Needs Efficiently? September 24, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-96—Full Committee hearing on the Status of Ongoing U.S. Efforts in Iraq. September 30, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-97—Full Committee hearing on President Obama's New Plan for Missile Defenses in Europe and the Implications for International Security. October 1, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-98—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on The Department of Defense's Rapid Acquisition Process: Is It a Model for Improving Acquisition? October 8, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-99—Full Committee hearing on Afghanistan: Getting the Strategy Right. October 14, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-100—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Can the Department of Defense Protect Taxpayers When It Pays Its Contractors? October 15, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-101—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Military Redeployment from Iraq: Issues and Challenges. October 21, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-102—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Counterterrorism Within the Afghanistan Counterinsurgency. October 22, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-103—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Afghanistan and Iraq: Perspectives on U.S. Strategy, Part 1. October 22, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-104—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Can DOD Improve Innovation and Competition in Acquisition by Better Utilizing Small Business? October 29, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-105—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Defeating the Improvised Explosive Device (IED) and Other Asymmetric Threats: Reviewing the Performance and Oversight of the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO). October 29, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-106—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Afghanistan and Iraq: Perspectives on U.S. Strategy, Part 2. November 5, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-107—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Afghanistan and Iraq: Perspectives on U.S. Strategy, Part 3. November 17, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-108—Full Committee hearing on Resourcing the National Defense Strategy: Implications of Long Term Defense Budget Trends. November 18, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-109—Subcommittees on Readiness and Military Personnel joint hearing on The New Walter Reed: Are We On the Right Track? December 2, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-110—Full Committee hearing on Assessing the Guam War Claims Process. December 2, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-111—Full Committee hearing on Afghanistan: The Results of the Strategic Review, Part I. December 3, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-112—Full Committee hearing on Afghanistan: The Results of the Strategic Review, Part II. December 8, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-113—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Understanding Cyberspace as a Medium for Radicalization and Counter-Radicalization. December 16, 2009.

H.A.S.C. 111-114—Full Committee hearing on China: Recent Security Developments. January 13, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-115—Full Committee hearing on Findings of the Department of Defense Independent Review Relating to Fort Hood. January 20, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-116—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on The Threat Posed by al Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula and Other Regions. January 20, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-117—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on Issues Affecting Naval Force Structure. January 20, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-118—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Status of the Air Force Nuclear Security Roadmap. January 21, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-119—Full Committee hearing on Al Qa'ida in 2010: How Should the U.S. Respond? January 27, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-120—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of Defense. February 3, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-121—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on the Report of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services. February 3, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-122—Full Committee hearing on The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review. February 4, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-123—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force. February 23, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-124—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Navy. February 24, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-125—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Energy Management and Initiatives on Military Installations. February 24, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-126—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Army. February 25, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-127—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Expert Perspectives on Managing the Defense Acquisition System and the Defense Acquisition Workforce. February 25, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-128—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Private Sector Perspectives on Department of Defense Information Technology and Cybersecurity Activities. February 25, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-129—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of the Navy Shipbuilding Acquisition Programs. March 3, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-130—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on A Review of the DOD Process for Assessing the Requirements to Implement Repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” March 3, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-131—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Recent Studies on the Effects of Deployment on Military Children. March 9, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-132—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Requests from the U.S. European Command, U.S. Africa Command, and U.S. Joint Forces Command. March 10, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-133—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on Army Acquisition and Modernization Programs. March 10, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-134—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform hearing on Administration Perspectives on Managing the Defense Acquisition System and the Defense Acquisition Workforce. March 11, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-135—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Legislative Priorities in Support of Families. March 15, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-136—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on The Status of United States Strategic Forces. March 16, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-137—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for the Military Services’ Operation and Maintenance Funding. March 16, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-138—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Requests from the U.S. Central Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and U.S. Transportation Command. March 17, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-139—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Personnel Legislative Priorities. March 17, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-140—Subcommittees on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces and Air and Land Forces joint hearing on Force Protection Equipment Programs for Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. March 17, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-141—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Requests from the U.S. Southern Command and U.S. Northern Command. March 18, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-142—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Military Construction, Family Housing, Base Closure, Facilities Operation and Maintenance. March 18, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-143—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Associations' Legislative Priorities. March 23, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-144—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Interagency Coordination of Grants and Contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan: Progress, Obstacles, and Plans. March 23, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-145—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of Defense's Science and Technology Programs. March 23, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-146—Subcommittees on Air and Land Forces and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces joint hearing on Department of the Navy and Air Force Combat Aviation Programs. March 24, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-147—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Requests from the U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea. March 25, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-148—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of Energy Atomic Energy Defense Activities. March 25, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-149—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Department of Defense Medical Centers of Excellence. April 13, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-150—Full Committee hearing on The United States Nuclear Weapons Policy and Force Structure. April 14, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-151—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program and Counterproliferation Initiatives. April 14, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-152—Full Committee hearing on the Independent Panel's Assessment of the Quadrennial Defense Review. April 15, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-153—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Report on the Ballistic Missile Defense Review and the Fiscal Year 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. April 15, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-154—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Supporting the Reserve Components as an Operational Reserve and Key Reserve Personnel Legislative Initiatives. April 15, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-155—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Implementation of the Requirement to Provide a Medical Examination Before Separating Members Diagnosed with Post-Trauma

matic Stress Disorder (PTSD) or Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) and the Capacity of the Department of Defense to Provide Care to PTSD Cases. April 20, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-156—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Defense Health Program. April 21, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-157—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Space Posture Review and the Fiscal Year 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. April 21, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-158—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on Army and Air Force National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Posture. April 22, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-159—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Army Reserve, Army National Guard, and Air National Guard Training and Operations. April 27, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-160—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Simplifying Defense Travel: Reviewing Progress on Improving the Defense Travel System for the User. April 27, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-161—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Closing the Gap: Addressing Critical Rotary Wing Shortfalls for U.S. Special Operations Forces in Fiscal Year 2011 and Beyond. April 27, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-162—Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces hearing on Air Mobility Programs. April 28, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-163—Full Committee hearing on Security and Stability in Pakistan: Developments in U.S. Policy and Funding. April 29, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-164—Full Committee hearing on Developments in Security and Stability in Afghanistan. May 5, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-165—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Interagency National Security Reform: Pragmatic Steps Towards a More Integrated Future. June 9, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-166—Full Committee hearing on Developments in Afghanistan. June 16, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-167—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Wind Farms: Compatible with Military Readiness? June 29, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-168—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Beyond the Defense Language Transformation Roadmap: Bearing the Burden for Today's Educational Shortcomings. June 29, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-169—Full Committee hearing on Review of Army Investigation of Arlington National Cemetery. June 30, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-170—Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Oversight of the Activities of the Maritime Administration. July 14, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-171—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Modeling and Simulation: Enhancing Military Readiness. July 20, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-172—Full Committee hearing on Managing the Department of Defense in a Time of Tight Budgets. July 22, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-173—Full Committee hearing on Japan: Recent Security Developments. July 27, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-174—Subcommittees on Readiness and Seapower and Expeditionary Forces joint hearing on Surface Fleet Subcommittee on Readiness. July 28, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-175—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Transformation in Progress: The Services' Enlisted Professional Military Education Programs. July 28, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-176—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Harnessing Small Business Innovation for National Security Cyber Needs. July 28, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-177—Full Committee hearing on Final Report of the Independent Panel's Assessment of the Quadrennial Defense Review. July 29, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-178—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on A Question of Quality and Value: Department of Defense Oversight of Tuition Assistance Used for Distance Learning and For-Profit Colleges. September 22, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-179—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Cyber Command: Organizing for Cyberspace Operations. September 23, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-180—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Operating in the Digital Domain: Organizing the Military Departments for Cyber Operations. September 23, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-181—Full Committee hearing on The Department of Defense's Efficiency Initiative. September 29, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-182—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Fighting Superbugs: DOD's Response to Multidrug-Resistant Infections in Military Treatment Facilities. September 29, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-183—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on Small Business' Role and Opportunities in Restoring Affordability to the Department of Defense. September 29, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-184—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Continued Engagement: Department of Defense Responses to the House Armed Services Committee April 2010 Report on Professional Military Education. November 30, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-185—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities hearing on the Crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Implications for U.S. National Security. November 30, 2010.

H.A.S.C. 111-186—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on the Status of the Phased Adaptive Approach. December 1, 2010.

HOUSE REPORTS

Report number	Date filed	Bill number	Title
111-124	May 20, 2009	S. 454 Conf. Rept. (H.R. 2101)	To improve the organization and procedures of the Department of Defense for the acquisition of major weapon systems, and for other purposes.
111-166 Parts I and II	June 18, 2009	H.R. 2647	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths fiscal year 2010, and for other purposes.
111-167	June 19, 2009	H. Res. 477	Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year shipbuilding plan relating to the long-term shipbuilding strategy of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231 of title 10, United States Code.
111-168	June 19, 2009	H. Res. 478	Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives the fiscal year 2010 30-year aviation plan relating to the long-term aviation plans of the Department of Defense, as required by section 231a of title 10, United States Code.
111-221	July 23, 2009	H. Res. 602	Requesting that the President and directing that the Secretary of Defense transmit to the House of Representatives all information in their possession relating to specific communications regarding detainees and foreign persons suspected of terrorism.
111-383	Dec. 17, 2009	H. Res. 924	Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to the trial or detention of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, Walid Muhammad Salih Mubarek Bin Attash, Ramzi Binalshibh, Ali Abdul Aziz Ali, or Mustafa Ahmed Adam al Hawsawi.
111-465	Apr. 23, 2010	H. R. 5013	To amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for performance management of the defense acquisition system, and for other purposes.

HOUSE REPORTS—Continued

Report number	Date filed	Bill number	Title
111-491 Parts I and II	May 28, 2010	H. R. 5136	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

PUBLIC LAWS

Public Law number	Date enacted	Bill number	Title
111-23	May 22, 2009	S. 454 (H.R. 2101)	To improve the organization and procedures of the Department of Defense for the acquisition of major weapon systems, and for other purposes.
111-61	August 19, 2009	H. J. Res. 44	Recognizing the service, sacrifice, honor, and professionalism of the Noncommissioned Officers of the United States Army.
111-84	October 28, 2009	H.R. 2647	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.
111-238	September 27, 2010	H.R. 6102	To amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to enter into multiyear contracts for F/A-18E, F/A-18F, and EA-18G aircraft.

## PRESS RELEASES

### FIRST SESSION

January 7, 2009—Skelton Welcomes New Democratic Members to House Armed Services Committee

January 9, 2009—Skelton Statement on H. Res. 34 and the Situation in Gaza

January 9, 2009—Skelton, McHugh Announce House Armed Services Committee Membership

January 14, 2009—House Armed Services Committee Holds 111th Congress Organizational Meeting

January 14, 2009—Skelton Announces House Armed Services Committee Democratic Subcommittee Assignments

January 22, 2009—Skelton on Executive Orders Concerning Guantanamo and Detainees

January 29, 2009—Skelton on the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review Report

January 30, 2009—Skelton Troubled by Inspector General's Findings on Reconstruction Efforts in Afghanistan

February 2, 2009—Skelton Concerned by Disturbing Trends in Afghanistan

February 5, 2009—Taylor Statement on Future of U.S. Naval Shipbuilding

February 6, 2009—Davis "Deeply Troubled" Over Increasing Numbers of Suicides in the Army

February 13, 2009—Skelton, Ortiz Call for Halt to NSPS Conversions Pending Review

February 17, 2009—Skelton Praises Announcement to Increase U.S. Troop Commitment in Afghanistan

February 23, 2009—Skelton Leads Congressional Delegation to Hawaii, Guam, South Korea, and Japan

February 24, 2009—Skelton Visits Iwo Jima

February 25, 2009—Skelton Introduces "Year of the Military Family" Resolution

February 26, 2009—Skelton Statement on President's FY2010 Budget Outline

February 27, 2009—Skelton Statement on President's Iraq Redeployment Plan

March 3, 2009—Skelton on the Role of the U.S. Navy

March 6, 2009—Skelton, McHugh Announce Formation of Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform

March 6, 2009—Snyder and Wittman Statement on Defense Travel System

March 9, 2009—Skelton, Snyder Commend President for Presidential Memorandum on Signing Statements

March 16, 2009—Skelton, Ortiz Commend DOD Decision to Review NSPS

- March 17, 2009—Skelton on the Security Challenges Arising From the Global Economic Crisis
- March 18, 2009—Skelton Praises DOD Announcement to End Stop Loss
- March 18, 2009—Skelton on Nomination of Admiral James Stavridis to U.S. European Command
- March 18, 2009—Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform Release Organizational Plan
- March 19, 2009—Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee Hears Recommendations for National Security Reform
- March 25, 2009—Skelton Statement on Annual Report to Congress on China’s Military Power
- March 27, 2009—Skelton Statement on President’s Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan
- March 27, 2009—Skelton, Ortiz Call for Halt to All DOD A-76 Competitions
- March 27, 2009—Skelton Meets With President Calderon of Mexico and Supports Counter-Drug Fight
- April 1, 2009—Skelton Commends President for Working Towards Nuclear Reduction
- April 1, 2009—House Passes Towns-Skelton Bill to Reduce “Widow’s Tax” for Surviving Military Spouses
- April 1, 2009—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on FY08 NDAA Battlefield Contracting Provision
- April 1, 2009—Skelton Statement on U.S.-China Military-to-Military Relations and Security Cooperation
- April 2, 2009—Skelton Says Budget Resolution Supports Defense
- April 5, 2009—Skelton, Tauscher Statement on North Korea Missile Launch
- April 8, 2009—Skelton Says Recent Hijacking Highlights Need for Increased International Effort Against Piracy
- April 13, 2009—Skelton Praises Rescue of Captain Phillips, Calls for International Action to End Pirate Threat
- April 15, 2009—Skelton Urges President to Fight Piracy by Denying Safe Haven in Somalia
- April 22, 2009—Skelton Statement on H. Res. 339, Praising the Actions of Captain Phillips, the U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Navy SEALs
- April 23, 2009—Skelton, McHugh Introduce Weapons Acquisition Reform Legislation
- April 28, 2009—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on NDAA Acquisition Workforce Provisions
- May 7, 2009—Opening Statement of Chairman Ike Skelton (D-MO) Mark-up of H.R. 2101, the WASTE TKO Act
- May 7, 2009—Skelton Statement on FY10 Defense Budget Proposal
- May 13, 2009—Skelton Floor Statement on H.R. 2101, the WASTE TKO Act
- May 15, 2009—House Approves WASTE TKO Act, Skelton-McHugh Bill Reforms Weapons Acquisition Process
- May 19, 2009—Skelton, McHugh Announce Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act Conference Agreement
- May 20, 2009—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on Professional Military Education

May 21, 2009—Skelton on President Obama’s National Security Speech

May 21, 2009—House Unanimously Approves Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Conference Report

May 22, 2009—President Signs Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act

June 2, 2009—Skelton Commends McHugh Nomination as Secretary of the Army

June 2, 2009—Skelton Pays Tribute to D-Day Veterans on 65th Anniversary

June 4, 2009—How Well Do Senior Professional Military Schools Produce Strategists?

June 16, 2009—Committee Improves Defense Cybersecurity Efforts

June 16, 2009—Committee Focuses Resources on Effective Missile Defense System for Today’s Threats, HASC Democrats Lead by Passing Legislation that Keeps Americans Safe

June 16, 2009—Skelton Congratulates Congressman McKeon, New HASC Ranking Member

June 16, 2009—Committee Protects Ability of National Security Personnel to Focus on Supporting Commanders during Time of War

June 16, 2009—Committee Strengthens the Stockpile Stewardship Program

June 16, 2009—Democrats Support Veterans with Action, Not Lip Service

June 16, 2009—Committee Restricts Transfer of Detainees until President has Plan to Mitigate Risk

June 16, 2009—Missile Defense Fact Sheet—H.R. 2647, the FY10 NDAA

June 16, 2009—Committee Supports National Security Personnel Democrats Lead by Passing Legislation that Prevents Increased NSPS Roles Until Task Force Review is Complete

June 17, 2009—House Armed Services Committee Approves Fiscal year 2010 Defense Authorization Bill

June 19, 2009—Skelton Speaks at U.S. Naval War College Graduation

June 23, 2009—Skelton Bill Offers Relief From Disabled Veterans Tax

June 23, 2009—Skelton and Smith Praise Creation of Cyber Command

June 24, 2009—House Approves Disabled Military Retiree Relief Act

June 24, 2009—Skelton Remarks on H.R. 2647, The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010

June 25, 2009—House Approves FY10 Defense Authorization Bill

June 25, 2009—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Third PME Hearing

July 9, 2009—HASC Democrats Elect New Subcommittee Chair

July 15, 2009—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Fourth PME Hearing

July 20, 2009—Skelton Says Larger Army Will Reduce Strain on the Force

July 22, 2009—Skelton: DOD faces Challenges as U.S. Forces Redeploy From Iraq

July 24, 2009—Skelton Says Need for National Guard Equipment At Home Should Be Considered During Iraq Redeployment Planning

August 3, 2009—Skelton-Berman-Davis-Harman Express Concern About Security of Election Monitors in Afghanistan

August 7, 2009—Skelton Statement on Reported Death of Taliban Leader in Pakistan

August 10, 2009—Skelton: Fort Leavenworth Not an Appropriate Option for Guantanamo Detainees

August 14, 2009—Skelton Calls on Americans to Honor U.S. and NATO Forces in Afghanistan

August 20, 2009—Skelton Statement on Afghanistan's Election

September 9, 2009—Skelton Speaks on 9/11 Resolution

September 9, 2009—Video of Skelton's Floor Speech on 9/11

September 10, 2009—Skelton: Americans Must Not Forget Why We Are in Afghanistan

September 16, 2009—Skelton Statement on Afghanistan

September 17, 2009—Skelton Says New Strategy Focuses on Immediate Threats

September 22, 2009—Skelton: Best Approach in Afghanistan is a Properly Resourced Counter-Insurgency Strategy

September 25, 2009—Skelton Statement on Iran's Covert Nuclear Facility

October 7, 2009—House-Senate Committee Agreement Reached on Fiscal Year 2010 Defense Authorization Bill

October 8, 2009—House Approves FY 2010 Defense Authorization Conference

October 21, 2009—Opening Statement of Chairman Ike Skelton, Hearing on U.S. Military Redeployment from Iraq: Issues and Challenges

October 22, 2009—Skelton Praises Senate Passage of Defense Authorization Conference Report

October 28, 2009—President Signs Defense Authorization Bill

November 2, 2009—Skelton Statement on Afghanistan Election Outcome

November 5, 2009—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on U.S. Strategy Options for Afghanistan and Iraq

November 5, 2009—Skelton-McKeon Statement on Fort Hood Shooting

November 6, 2009—Skelton Floor Speech on Resolution on Tragic Shooting at Fort Hood

November 10, 2009—Skelton Statement on Fort Hood Investigation

November 10, 2009—Skelton Praises Nomination of Erin Conaton as Under Secretary of the Air Force

November 17, 2009—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Third Hearing on U.S. Strategy Options for Afghanistan and Iraq

November 19, 2009—Langevin-Turner Statement on JASON Report

November 20, 2009—Skelton Concerned About Decision to Prosecute Detainees in Federal Criminal Court

November 20, 2009—Skelton Praises Nomination of Paul Oostburg Sanz as General Counsel of the Navy  
 November 20, 2009—Skelton Welcomes Congressman Bill Owens to House Armed Services Committee  
 November 28, 2009—Skelton and McKeon Commend Medical Professionals at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center  
 November 28, 2009—Skelton, McKeon Pay Tribute to World War II Veterans at American Cemetery in Luxembourg  
 December 8, 2009—Skelton Discusses Afghanistan with Top General and Diplomat  
 December 14, 2009—Skelton Appoints Members to Independent Panel to Assess the Quadrennial Defense Review  
 December 16, 2009—Skelton on Oversight Plans Regarding Fort Hood Shooting Investigations  
 December 31, 2009—Skelton Letter to Obama Regarding Dec. 25th Attempted Terrorist Attack

#### SECOND SESSION

January 14, 2010—Skelton Statement on President's FY 2011 Defense Budget  
 January 15, 2010—Skelton on DOD's Independent Review Relating to Fort Hood  
 January 21, 2010—HASC Democrats Elect New Subcommittee Chairs  
 January 22, 2010—Skelton Praises Navy-USDA Cooperation on Renewable Energy  
 February 1, 2010—Skelton Statement on President's FY 2011 Budget  
 February 8, 2010—Skelton: Murtha a "First Class Marine and Member of Congress"  
 February 16, 2010—Skelton Encouraged by Recent Events in Afghanistan and Pakistan  
 February 18, 2010—Skelton Statement on Reports of Additional Taliban Captures  
 February 23, 2010—Skelton Praises U.S. Armed Forces on Haiti Earthquake Relief Effort  
 February 24, 2010—Skelton Statement on New KC-X Tanker Request for Proposal  
 February 25, 2010—Skelton Statement on Joint Strike Fighter/F-35 Competitive Engine  
 March 4, 2010—Skelton Calls for Review of Military Medical Officers' Records  
 March 5, 2010—Skelton Announces Committee Staff Appointments  
 March 9, 2010—Skelton Statement on KC-X Tanker Program  
 March 10, 2010—Skelton Statement on Earmark Changes  
 March 18, 2010—Skelton Statement on Anniversary of Iraq Invasion  
 March 18, 2010—Skelton to Introduce Legislation to Protect TRICARE  
 March 20, 2010—Video of Skelton's Floor Speech on TRICARE Affirmation Act  
 March 20, 2010—Skelton Introduces Legislation to Protect TRICARE

March 20, 2010—House Approves Legislation to Protect TRICARE

March 23, 2010—Defense Acquisition Reform Panel Approves Final Report

March 23, 2010— Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on Interagency Coordination of U.S. Contracts and Grants in Iraq and Afghanistan

March 26, 2010—Skelton Statement on New START Treaty

April 5, 2010—Skelton on Recent Remarks by Afghan President Karzai

April 6, 2010—Skelton-Langevin Statement on Nuclear Posture Review

April 8, 2010—Skelton-Langevin Statement on Signing of the New START Treaty

April 12, 2010—Skelton Statement on the Nuclear Security Statement

April 13, 2010—Skelton Praises Senate Passage of TRICARE Affirmation Act

April 14, 2010—Skelton, McKeon, Andrews, Conaway Introduce Bill to Overhaul DOD Acquisition

April 19, 2010—Skelton: Al Qaeda Capture Signals Continued Progress

April 19, 2010—Skelton on Military Power of Iran Report

April 20, 2010—Skelton: Export Control Reform Will “Better Protect Americans”

April 21, 2010—HASC Approves DOD Acquisition Reform Bill

April 26, 2010—Skelton’s TRICARE Affirmation Act Signed into Law

April 27, 2010—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on Simplifying the \$10B Defense Travel System

April 28, 2010—Skelton Floor Statement on H.R. 5013, the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010

April 28, 2010—House Approves Legislation to Overhaul Defense Acquisition Spending

May 3, 2010—Langevin Applauds Transparency, Leadership with Nuclear Weapons Program

May 5, 2010—Skelton Applauds Success in Afghanistan Under Obama

May 6, 2010—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Releases First Comprehensive Congressional Review of Professional Military Education System in 20 Years

May 6, 2010—Skelton Praises Success in Combating Terrorism

May 7, 2010—Skelton Welcomes New Democratic Members to House Armed Services Committee

May 19, 2010—Armed Services Committee Democrats Block Irresponsible Republican Legislation; Forbes Amendment to NDAA Would Have Jeopardized National Security

May 19, 2010—House Armed Services Committee Approves Fiscal Year 2011 Defense Authorization Bill

May 20, 2010—Skelton on the Sinking of the Republic of Korea Navy Ship

May 25, 2010—Skelton on the FY11 Defense Authorization and “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”

May 25, 2010—Skelton-McKeon Resolution Honors Armed Forces and Veterans

May 26, 2010—Skelton Welcomes Congressman Mark Critz to House Armed Services Committee

May 27, 2010—Skelton Remarks on H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011

May 28, 2010—Skelton Pleased by Progress on U.S.-Japan Security Issues

May 28, 2010—Skelton Praises Bill Providing Relief for Disabled Military Retirees

May 28, 2010—House Approves FY11 Defense Authorization Bill

June 9, 2010—Agency Stovepipes Leading to National Security Vulnerabilities: Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on Interagency National Security Reform

June 10, 2010—Skelton Says Committee Will Investigate Problems at Arlington National Cemetery

June 17, 2010—Skelton Announces June 30 Hearing on Arlington National Cemetery

June 21, 2010—Langevin and Turner Call for Improved Accounting of Total Nuclear Weapons Complex Costs

June 22, 2010—Skelton Statement on General McChrystal Profile

June 23, 2010—Skelton Statement on President's Decision to Change Commanders in Afghanistan

June 24, 2010—Skelton Supports Iran Sanctions Act Conference Report

June 29, 2010—Skelton on SIGAR Report Identifying Flaws in Assessing Capabilities of the Afghan National Security Forces

June 29, 2010—Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on Building Foreign Language and Cultural Skills in Our Military: Improving but Still Work To Do

July 1, 2010—Skelton Calls for Vote to Support Troops in Afghanistan and Iraq

July 21, 2010—Skelton Honors WWII and Current Service Members

July 26, 2010—Skelton Statement on WikiLeaks

July 27, 2010—Skelton Statement on the Vote on the War Supplemental

July 29, 2010—Skelton on Army Health Promotion, Risk Reduction, and Suicide Prevention Report

July 31, 2010—Skelton Delivers Keynote Address at USS Missouri Commissioning Ceremony

August 9, 2010—Skelton Statement on Gates Announcement to Improve Efficiency of DOD

August 16, 2010—Skelton Statement on Annual China Report

August 20, 2010—Skelton Statement on Final Ft. Hood Review

August 31, 2010—Skelton Salutes U.S. Troops As Combat Forces Leave Iraq

September 3, 2010—Langevin and Turner Thank General Kevin P. Chilton for his Lifetime of Public Service and Leadership

September 8, 2010—Skelton and Colleagues Applaud DOD Intent to Sign David's Sling Weapon System Project Agreement

September 9, 2010—Skelton Statement on ROK Sanctions Against Iran

- September 10, 2010—Skelton Statement on 9/11 Anniversary
- September 14, 2010—Skelton Urges Colleagues to Pass \$600 Billion in Taxpayer Savings
- September 15, 2010—Andrews and Conaway Praise DOD's Plans for Acquisition Reform, Call on Senate to Pass IMPROVE Acquisition Act
- September 22, 2010—A Quality Education for All: Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds Hearing on Military's Efforts to Oversee Distance Learning and For-Profit Colleges
- September 30, 2010—Fighting Superbugs: Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee Holds hearing on Military's Efforts to Prevent Outbreaks of Multidrug-Resistant Infections in Military Hospitals
- September 30, 2010—Skelton, Davis Introduce Groundbreaking Interagency Reform Legislation
- October 8, 2010—Skelton on National Security Advisor General James L. Jones
- October 29, 2010—Skelton Offers Tribute to Heightened Vigilance of National Security Community
- November 23, 2010—Skelton on North Korean Shelling of South Korean Island
- December 1, 2010—Skelton Delivers Farewell Speech to Colleagues
- December 15, 2010—Skelton Reintroduces Defense Authorization Bill
- December 16, 2010—Skelton Statement on NSC Af/Pak Review
- December 17, 2010—Skelton Congratulates Congressman Adam Smith, new HASC Ranking Member
- December 17, 2010—House Approves FY11 National Defense Authorization Act
- December 22, 2010—Skelton Praises House-Senate Approval of FY11 Defense Authorization
- December 22, 2010—Langevin Applauds Senate Adoption of New START Treaty