112TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
112–???

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

---

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 1540

together with

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 17, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

112TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
112–???

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 1540

together with

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 17, 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

??–???

WASHINGTON : 2011

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

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

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
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN C. FLEMING, M.D., Louisiana
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
TOM ROONEY, Florida
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia
CHRIS GIBSON, New York
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri
JOE HECK, Nevada
BOBBY SCHILLING, Illinois
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas
STEVEN PALAZZO, Mississippi
ALLEN B. WEST, Florida
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
MO BROOKS, Alabama
TODD YOUNG, Indiana

ADAM SMITH, Washington
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
DAVE LOEBSACK, Iowa
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
BILL OWENS, New York
JOHN R. GARAMENDI, California
MARK S. CRITZ, Pennsylvania
TIM RYAN, Ohio
C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia
KATHY CASTOR, Florida
BETTY SUTTON, Ohio
COLLEEN HANABUSA, Hawaii

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Purpose of the Legislation | 00 |
| Rationale for the Committee Bill | 00 |
| Hearings | 00 |
| Committee Position | 00 |
| Explanation of the Committee Amendments | 00 |
| Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations | 00 |
| Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill | 00 |
| Budget Authority Implication | 00 |
| DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS | 00 |
| TITLE I—PROCUREMENT | 00 |
| OVERVIEW | 00 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 00 |
| Overview | 00 |
| Items of Special Interest | 00 |
| Aerial Common Sensor | 00 |
| Airborne Reconnaissance Low | 00 |
| Air filters for National Guard helicopters | 00 |
| CH–47F Chinook helicopter | 00 |
| UH–72A Lakota helicopter aircraft survivability equipment | 00 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 00 |
| Overview | 00 |
| Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 00 |
| Overview | 00 |
| Items of Special Interest | 00 |
| Abrams tank program National Guard modernization | 00 |
| Bradley fighting vehicle program | 00 |
| M4 carbine product improvement program | 00 |
| Stryker vehicles | 00 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 00 |
| Overview | 00 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 00 |
| Overview | 00 |
| Items of Special Interest | 00 |
| Body armor investment strategy | 00 |
| Body armor requirements generation and weight reduction initiatives | 00 |
| Information management system for the National Guard | 00 |
| Joint Tactical Radio System | 00 |
| Light tactical vehicle investment strategy | 00 |
| M915 line haul tractor trailer acquisition strategy | 00 |
| Tactical wheeled vehicle acquisition strategy | 00 |
| Weapon light upgrades | 00 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 00 |
| Overview | 00 |
| Items of Special Interest | 00 |
| Efforts to mitigate the improvised explosive device threat to dismounted operations | 00 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization | 00 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 00 |
| Overview | 00 |
| Items of Special Interest | 00 |
| V–22 | 00 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 00 |

Page
Overview ..... 00
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
Laser guided air-launched rockets ..... 00
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
Amphibious Assault Ship ..... 00
Navy Shipbuilding Program ..... 00
Other Procurement, Navy ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Procurement, Marine Corps ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
B–1 bomber aircraft force structure ..... 00
Common vertical lift support platform ..... 00
Global Hawk ..... 00
Intra-theater and inter-theater airlift programs ..... 00
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Missile Procurement, Air Force ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Other Procurement, Air Force ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Procurement, Defense-Wide ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
Innovative titanium manufacturing processes ..... 00
Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal Defense ..... 00
Special operations combatant craft systems ..... 00
Special operations communications equipment and tactical radio systems ..... 00
Standard missile-3 interceptors ..... 00
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense ..... 00
Transition of non-lethal weapons ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
Subtitle B—Army Programs ..... 00
Section 111—Limitation on Retirement of C–23 Aircraft ..... 00
Section 112—Limitation on Procurement of Stryker Combat Vehicles ..... 00
Section 113—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Airframes for Army UH–60M/HH–60M Helicopters and Navy MH–60R/MH–60S Helicopters ..... 00
Subtitle C—Navy Programs ..... 00
Section 121—Multiyear Funding for Detail Design and Construction of LHA Replacement Ship Designated LHA–7 ..... 00
Section 122—Multiyear Funding for Procurement of Arleigh Burke-Class Destroyers ..... 00
Section 123—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Mission Avionics and Common Cockpits for Navy MH–60R/S Helicopters ..... 00
Section 124—Separate Procurement Line Item for Certain Littoral Combat Ship Mission Modules ..... 00
Section 125—Life-Cycle Cost-Benefit Analysis on Alternative Maintenance and Sustainability Plans for the Littoral Combat Ship Program ..... 00
Section 126—Limitation on Availability of Funds for F/A–18 Service Life Extension Program ..... 00
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs ..... 00
Section 131—B–1 Bomber Force Structure ..... 00
Section 132—Procurement of Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellites ..... 00
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters ..... 00
Section 141—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund ..... 00

Page

Section 142—Contracts for Commercial Imaging Satellite Capacities ..... 00
Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Acquisition of Joint Tactical Radio System ..... 00
Section 144—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program ..... 00
Section 145—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Commercial Satellite Procurement ..... 00
Section 146—Separate Procurement Line Item for Non-Lethal Weapons Funding ..... 00
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
Active protection systems technology development ..... 00
Armed Deployable Helicopter ..... 00
Army science and technology management ..... 00
Bioinformatics initiative ..... 00
Development of personnel protection equipment for female soldiers ..... 00
Ground Combat Vehicle ..... 00
Improved Turbine Engine Program ..... 00
Joint Light Tactical Vehicle ..... 00
Medium Extended Air Defense System ..... 00
Nett Warrior ..... 00
Precision artillery munitions acquisition strategy ..... 00
Status of Future Combat Systems contract actions ..... 00
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
Defense University Research Instrumentation Program ..... 00
Expeditionary Fire Support System Precision Extended Range Munition ..... 00
Joint Expeditionary Fires Analysis of Alternatives ..... 00
Naval gunfire support ..... 00
Navy remotely piloted demonstration and strike aircraft programs ..... 00
Over-the-horizon vessel tracking ..... 00
Study on LHD Class steam plants and propulsion systems ..... 00
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
Air Force advanced materials research ..... 00
Air Force missile field monitoring technology ..... 00
Army and Air Force test, evaluation, range, and facility support ..... 00
Common propulsion technology development ..... 00
Deep Space Climate Observatory Launch Service ..... 00
Electronic, Scheduling and Dissemination Upgrade ..... 00
F–35 aircraft ..... 00
F–35 alternative ejection seat ..... 00
Hosted payloads ..... 00
KC–46A aerial refueling aircraft program ..... 00
Lead-free electronic components ..... 00
Military satellite communications technology development ..... 00
Next generation long-range strike bomber program ..... 00
Operationally responsive space ..... 00
Space-Based Infrared System ..... 00
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Items of Special Interest ..... 00
3–D advanced integrated circuit capabilities ..... 00
Airborne Infrared ..... 00
Basic research international cooperation ..... 00
Capabilities to support humanitarian assistance and disaster relief ..... 00
Composite technology for use in missile defense interceptors ..... 00
Conventional prompt global strike ..... 00
Cyber test and evaluation ..... 00
Defense laboratory survey ..... 00
Directed energy research ..... 00

Page

Engineer and Scientist Exchange Program ..... 00
Fabrication of micro-air vehicles ..... 00
Ground-based midcourse defense ..... 00
High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System ..... 00
Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions ..... 00
Industrial research and development activities ..... 00
Israeli cooperative missile defense ..... 00
Medical Countermeasures Initiative and the Chemical and Biological Defense Program ..... 00
Meeting airspace needs for defense-related Unmanned Aerial Systems research ..... 00
Missile defense adjunct sensor capabilities ..... 00
Mitochondrial disease research ..... 00
Mobile applications development ..... 00
Multidisciplinary research in cyber-related fields ..... 00
Nanotechnology research ..... 00
National Research and Education Center for Corrosion ..... 00
Phased, adaptive approach ..... 00
Precision Tracking Space System ..... 00
Project Pelican ..... 00
Scientific and engineering fellowships ..... 00
Semiconductor development ..... 00
Social media tools for collaboration ..... 00
Standard Missile-3 Block IIA interceptor ..... 00
Study on possible establishment of a power and energy University Affiliated Research Center ..... 00
Technology transition and insertion ..... 00
University Affiliated Research Centers ..... 00
Vertical lift consortium ..... 00
Weaponization of rail-launched Unmanned Aerial Systems ..... 00
Weapons of Mass Destruction defeat technologies and capabilities ..... 00
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 00
Section 211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Ground Combat Vehicle Program ..... 00
Section 212—Limitation on the Individual Carbine Program ..... 00
Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Ohio-class Ballistic Missile Submarine Replacement Program ..... 00
Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Amphibious Assault Vehicles of the Marine Corps ..... 00
Section 215—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Propulsion System for the F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Program ..... 00
Section 216—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Joint Replacement Fuze Program ..... 00
Section 217—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Joint Space Operations Center Management System ..... 00
Section 218—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Wireless Innovation Fund ..... 00
Section 219—Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research and Development ..... 00
Section 220—Designation of Main Propulsion System of the Next-Generation Long-Range Strike Bomber Aircraft as Major Subprogram ..... 00
Section 221—Designation of Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System Development and Procurement Program as Major Subprogram ..... 00
Section 222—Prohibition on Delegation of Budgeting Authority for Certain Research and Educational Programs ..... 00
Section 223—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Future Unmanned Carrier-based Strike System ..... 00
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs ..... 00
Section 231—Acquisition Accountability Reports on the Ballistic Missile Defense System ..... 00
Section 232—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Medium Extended Air Defense System ..... 00

Page

Section 233—Homeland Defense Hedging Policy and Strategy ..... 00
Section 234—Ground-based Midcourse Defense System ..... 00
Section 235—Study on Space-based Interceptor Technology ..... 00
Subtitle D—Reports ..... 00
Section 241—Annual Comptroller General Report on the KC–46A Aircraft Acquisition Program ..... 00
Section 242—Independent Review and Assessment of Cryptographic Modernization Program ..... 00
Section 243—Report on Feasibility of Electromagnetic Rail Gun System ..... 00
Subtitle E—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 251—Repeal of Requirement for Technology Transition Initiative ..... 00
Section 252—Preservation and Storage of Certain Property Related to F136 Propulsion System ..... 00
Section 253—Extension of Authority for Mechanism to Provide Funds for Defense Laboratories for Research and Development of Technologies for Military Missions ..... 00
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Budget Request Adjustments ..... 00
Flight Simulator Training Hour Restoration ..... 00
Marine Corps Expeditionary Forward Operating Base ..... 00
Operational Energy Capability Improvement ..... 00
Strategic Environmental Research Program ..... 00
Energy Issues ..... 00
Energy-Efficient Tires ..... 00
Navy Green Fleet Initiative Including Harbor Tugs ..... 00
Support of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Operational Energy Plans and Programs ..... 00
Logistics and Sustainment Issues ..... 00
Aircraft Landing Gear Systems Sustainment ..... 00
Department-Wide Depot Workforce Development ..... 00
Improved Corrosion Prevention and Control Practices ..... 00
Increased Competition for the Operation and Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems ..... 00
Laser Peening Technologies ..... 00
Long-Term Corrosion Strategies of the Military Departments ..... 00
Parts Supply Recapitalization ..... 00
Study on Reducing Navy Small Boat Maintenance Costs ..... 00
Sustainment Planning ..... 00
Readiness Issues ..... 00
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Operational Considerations and Force Structure ..... 00
Army Unit Manning Effects on Readiness ..... 00
Distribution and Use of Bottled Water in Contingency Operations ..... 00
Federal Fire Protection ..... 00
Installation Emergency Management Programs ..... 00
Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Instrument Landing System Replacement ..... 00
Material Readiness of the Navy's Amphibious and Surface Combatant Ships ..... 00
Modified Tables of Equipment ..... 00
Naval Air Station North Island ..... 00
Review of Department of Defense's Mix of Live and Simulated Training ..... 00
Security Force Assistance ..... 00
U.S. Army Full Spectrum Training Mile ..... 00
Other Matters ..... 00
Air Force Environmental Cleanup ..... 00
Briefing on the Use of the Overseas Contingency Operations Budget for Military Equipment Reset ..... 00
Department of Defense Personnel Security Clearance Program ..... 00
Department of Defense Unexploded Ordnance Cleanup Report ..... 00
Disposal of Surplus Property ..... 00
Expedited Security Clearance Processing for Wounded Warriors ..... 00

Page

Federal Facility Agreement for Environmental Cleanup at Tyndall Air Force Base ..... 00
Joint Space Operations Center ..... 00
Key Enabler Explosive Ordnance Disposal Requirements ..... 00
Satellite Operations Efficiencies ..... 00
Wounded Warrior Service Dog Programs ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding ..... 00
Subtitle B—Energy and Environmental Provisions ..... 00
Section 311—Designation of Senior Official of Joint Chiefs of Staff for Operational Energy Plans and Programs and Operational Energy Budget Certification ..... 00
Section 312—Military Installation Implementation of Land Management Plans and Sustainability Studies ..... 00
Section 313—Improved Sikes Act Coverage of State-Owned Facilities Used for the National Defense ..... 00
Section 314—Discharge of Wastes at Sea Generated by Vessels of the Armed Forces ..... 00
Section 315—Designation of Department of Defense Executive Agent for Alternative Fuel Development ..... 00
Section 316—Favorable Consideration of Energy-Efficient Technologies in Contracts for Logistics Support of Contingency Operations ..... 00
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment ..... 00
Section 321—Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair ..... 00
Section 322—Core Logistics Capabilities ..... 00
Section 323—Designation of Military Industrial Facilities as Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence ..... 00
Section 324—Redesignation of Core Competencies as Core Logistics Capabilities for Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence ..... 00
Section 325—Permanent and Expanded Authority for Army Industrial Facilities to Enter into Certain Cooperative Arrangements with Non-Army Entities ..... 00
Section 326—Amendment to Requirement Relating To Consideration of Competition Throughout Operation and Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems ..... 00
Section 327—Implementation of Corrective Actions Resulting from Corrosion Study of the F–22 and F–35 Aircraft ..... 00
Subtitle D—Readiness ..... 00
Section 331—Modification of Department of Defense Authority to Accept Voluntary Contributions of Funds ..... 00
Section 332—Review of Proposed Structures Affecting Navigable Airspace ..... 00
Section 333—Sense of Congress Regarding Integration of Ballistic Missile Defense Training Across and Between Combatant Commands and Military Services ..... 00
Subtitle E—Reports ..... 00
Section 341—Annual Certification and Modifications of Annual Report on Prepositioned Materiel and Equipment ..... 00
Section 342—Modification of Report on Maintenance and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards ..... 00
Section 343—Additional Requirements for Annual Report on Military Working Dogs ..... 00
Section 344—Assessment and Reporting Requirements Regarding the Status of Compliance with Joint Military Training and Force Allocations ..... 00
Section 345—Study of United States Pacific Command Training Readiness ..... 00
Subtitle F—Limitations and Extensions of Authority ..... 00
Section 351—Adoption of Military Working Dog by Family of Deceased or Seriously Wounded Member of the Armed Forces Who Was the Dog's Handler ..... 00
Section 352—Prohibition on Expansion of the Air Force Food Transformation Initiative ..... 00
Section 353—Limitation on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for the Migration of Army Enterprise Email Services ..... 00

Page

Section 354—One-Year Extension of Pilot Program for Availability of Working-Capital Funds to Army for Certain Product Improvements .. 00
Subtitle G—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 361—Consideration of Foreclosure Circumstances in Adjudication of Security Clearances ..... 00
Section 362—Authority to Provide Information for Maritime Safety of Forces and Hydrographic Support ..... 00
Section 363—Deposit of Reimbursed Funds under Reciprocal Fire Protection Agreements ..... 00
Section 364—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized to Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Printing and Reproduction . 00
Section 365—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized to Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Studies, Analysis and Evaluations ..... 00
Section 366—Clarification of the Airlift Service Definitions Relative to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet ..... 00
Section 367—Ratemaking Procedures for Civil Reserve Air Fleet Contracts ..... 00
Section 368—Sense of Congress on Proposed Federal Aviation Administration Changes to Flight Crew Member Duty and Rest Requirements ..... 00
Section 369—Policy on Active Shooter Training for Certain Law Enforcement Personnel ..... 00
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Active Forces ..... 00
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces ..... 00
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels ..... 00
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces ..... 00
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve ..... 00
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves ..... 00
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) ..... 00
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2012 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians ..... 00
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support ..... 00
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
Section 421—Military Personnel ..... 00
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Community College of the Air Force ..... 00
Critical Language Training at Reserve Officer Training Programs and Senior Military Colleges ..... 00
Expanding the Use of On-Line Education in the Department of Defense Educational Activity ..... 00
Review for Hispanic American Service Cross Recipients ..... 00
Use of Electronic Media for Family Support Programs ..... 00
Wounded Warrior Implementation ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally ..... 00
Section 501—Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Officers on Active Duty in Grades of Major, Lieutenant Colonel, and Colonel ..... 00
Section 502—General Officer and Flag Officer Reform ..... 00
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management ..... 00
Section 511—Leadership of National Guard Bureau ..... 00
Section 512—Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Reserve Components ..... 00
Section 513—Clarification of Applicability of Authority for Deferral of Mandatory Separation of Military Technicians (Dual Status) until Age 60 ..... 00
Section 514—Modification of Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion for Reserve Officers Employed as Military Technicians (Dual Status) . 00

Page
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities ..... 00
Section 521—Findings regarding Unique Nature, Demands, and Hardships of Military Service ..... 00
Section 522—Policy Addressing Dwell Time and Measurement and Data Collection regarding Unit Operating Tempo and Personnel Tempo ..... 00
Section 523—Authorized Leave Available for Members of the Armed Forces Upon Birth or Adoption of a Child ..... 00
Section 524—Extension of Authority To Conduct Programs on Career Flexibility To Enhance Retention of Members of the Armed Forces ..... 00
Section 525—Policy on Military Recruitment and Enlistment of Graduates of Secondary Schools ..... 00
Section 526—Navy Recruiting and Advertising ..... 00
Subtitle D—Military Justice and Legal Matters ..... 00
Section 531—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel Decisions Relating To Correction of Military Records ..... 00
Section 532—Clarification of Application and Extent of Direct Acceptance of Gifts Authority ..... 00
Section 533—Additional Condition on Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy ..... 00
Section 534—Military Regulations Regarding Marriage ..... 00
Section 535—Use of Military Installations as Site for Marriage Ceremonies and Participation of Chaplains and Other Military and Civilian Personnel in Their Official Capacity ..... 00
Subtitle E—Member Education and Training Opportunities and Administration ..... 00
Section 541—Improved Access to Apprenticeship Programs for Members of the Armed Forces who Are Being Separated from Active Duty or Retired ..... 00
Section 542—Expansion of Reserve Health Professionals Stipend Program To Include Students in Mental Health Degree Programs in Critical Wartime Specialties ..... 00
Section 543—Administration of United States Air Force Institute of Technology ..... 00
Section 544—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by the Governor of Puerto Rico ..... 00
Section 545—Temporary Authority To Wave Maximum Age Limitation on Admission to United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Air Force Academy ..... 00
Section 546—Education and Employment Advocacy Program for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces ..... 00
Subtitle F—Army National Military Cemeteries ..... 00
Section 551—Army National Military Cemeteries ..... 00
Section 552—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Inspection of Military Cemeteries ..... 00
Subtitle G—Armed Forces Retirement Home ..... 00
Section 561—Control and Administration by Secretary of Defense ..... 00
Section 562—Senior Medical Advisor Oversight of Health Care Provided to Residents of Armed Forces Retirement Home ..... 00
Section 563—Establishment of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council and Resident Advisory Committees ..... 00
Section 564—Administrators, Ombudsmen, and Staff of Facilities ..... 00
Section 565—Revision of Fee Requirements ..... 00
Section 566—Revision of Inspection Requirements ..... 00
Section 567—Repeal of Obsolete Transitional Provisions and Technical, Conforming, and Clerical Amendments ..... 00
Subtitle H—Military Family Readiness Matters ..... 00
Section 571—Revision to Membership of Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council ..... 00
Section 572—Continuation of Authority To Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees ..... 00
Section 573—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents who Are Members of the Armed Forces ..... 00
Section 574—Center for Military Family and Community Outreach ..... 00
Section 575—Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families ..... 00

Page

Section 576—Report on Department of Defense Autism Pilot Projects ... 00
Subtitle I—Improved Sexual Assault Prevention and Response in the Armed Forces ... 00
Section 581—Director of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office ... 00
Section 582—Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates ... 00
Section 583—Sexual Assault Victims Access to Legal Counsel and Services of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates ... 00
Section 584—Privilege in Cases Arising Under Uniform Code of Military Justice Against Disclosure of Communications Between Sexual Assault Victims and Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, Victim Advocates and Certain Other Persons ... 00
Section 585—Maintenance of Records Prepared in Connection with Sexual Assaults Involving Members of the Armed Forces or Dependents of Members ... 00
Section 586—Expedited Consideration and Priority for Application for Consideration of a Permanent Change of Station or Unit Transfer Based on Humanitarian Conditions for Victim of Sexual Assault ... 00
Section 587—Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program ... 00
Subtitle J—Other Matters ... 00
Section 591—Limitations on Authority To Provide Support and Services for Certain Organizations and Activities outside Department of Defense ... 00
Section 592—Display of State, District of Columbia, and Territorial Flags by Armed Forces ... 00
Section 593—Military Adaptive Sports Program ... 00
Section 594—Wounded Warrior Careers Program ... 00
Section 595—Comptroller General Study of Military Necessity of Selective Service System and Alternatives ... 00
Section 596—Sense of Congress Regarding Playing of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps" at Military Funerals, Memorial Services and Wreath Laying Ceremonies ... 00
Section 597—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Yellow Ribbon Day ... 00
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS ... 00
OVERVIEW ... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 00
Commissary and Exchange Privileges for Non-Department of Defense Federal Employees Overseas ... 00
Consolidation of Disability Evaluation System ... 00
Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act ... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 00
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances ... 00
Section 601—Fiscal Year 2012 Increase in Military Basic Pay ... 00
Section 602—Resumption of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing under Certain Circumstances ... 00
Section 603—Lodging Accommodations for Members Assigned to Duty in Connection with Commissioning or Fitting Out of a Ship ... 00
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays ... 00
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces ... 00
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals ... 00
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers ... 00
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities ... 00
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays ... 00
Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses ... 00
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances Generally ... 00

Page

Section 621—One-Year Extension of Authority To Reimburse Travel Expenses for Inactive-Duty Training outside of Normal Commuting Distance ..... 00
Section 622—Mandatory Provision of Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Seriously Ill and Wounded Members of the Armed Forces ..... 00
Subtitle D—Consolidation and Reform of Travel and Transportation Authorities ..... 00
Section 631—Purpose ..... 00
Section 632—Consolidation and Reform of Travel and Transportation Authorities of the Uniformed Services ..... 00
Section 633—Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities Transition Expiration Date and Transfer of Current Sections ..... 00
Section 634—Addition of Sunset Provision to Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities ..... 00
Section 635—Technical and Clerical Amendments ..... 00
Section 636—Transition Provisions ..... 00
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations ..... 00
Section 641—Expansion of Use of Uniform Funding Authority To Include Permanent Change of Station and Temporary Duty Lodging Programs Operated through Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities ..... 00
Section 642—Contracting Authority for Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities To Provide and Obtain Goods and Services ..... 00
Section 643—Designation of Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base as a Fisher House ..... 00
Section 644—Discretion of the Secretary of the Navy To Select Categories of Merchandise To Be Sold by Ship Stores Afloat ..... 00
Section 645—Access of Military Exchange Stores System to Credit Available Through Federal Financing Bank ..... 00
Section 646—Enhanced Commissary Stores Pilot Program ..... 00
Subtitle F—Disability, Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits ..... 00
Section 651—Monthly Amount and Duration of Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Widows and Widowers of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces Affected by Required Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation ..... 00
Subtitle G—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 661—Reimbursement of American National Red Cross for Humanitarian Support and Other Services Provided to Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents ..... 00
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Automated Patient Management System for Air Evacuation ..... 00
Clarification on Competition for Medical Research Consultation and Education ..... 00
Clinical Social Workers ..... 00
Cost Share for Acute Care Prescriptions under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program ..... 00
Expansion of Spinal Cord Injury Research Program ..... 00
Mental Health and Traumatic Brain Injury ..... 00
Orthopedic Research for Extremity Injury ..... 00
Physical Rehabilitation of Wounded Warriors ..... 00
Recommendations for Cost Savings under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program ..... 00
Use of Simulation Technology in Medical Training ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Improvements to Health Benefits ..... 00
Section 701—Annual Enrollment Fees for Certain Retirees and Dependents ..... 00
Section 702—Provision of Food to Certain Members and Dependents Not Receiving Inpatient Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities ..... 00
Section 703—Behavioral Health Support for Members of the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces ..... 00

Page

Section 704—Transition Enrollment of Uniformed Services Family Health Plan Medicare-Eligible Retirees to TRICARE for Life ..... 00
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration ..... 00
Section 711—Unified Medical Command ..... 00
Section 712—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Future Electronic Health Records Program ..... 00
Subtitle C—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 721—Review of Women-Specific Health Services and Treatment for Female Members of the Armed Forces ..... 00
Section 722—Comptroller General Reviews of Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Project ..... 00
Section 723—Comptroller General Report on Contracted Health Care Staffing for Military Medical Treatment Facilities ..... 00
Section 724—Treatment of Wounded Warriors ..... 00
Section 725—Cooperative Health Care Agreements ..... 00
Section 726—Prostate Cancer Imaging Research Initiative ..... 00
Section 727—Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury ..... 00
Section 728—Collaborative Military-Civilian Trauma Training Programs ..... 00
Section 729—Traumatic Brain Injury ..... 00
Section 730—Competitive Programs for Alcohol and Substance Abuse Disorders ..... 00
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Acquisition Involving Federal Prison Industries ..... 00
Aircraft Specialty Metal Content ..... 00
Army Contract Bundling ..... 00
Beryllium Stockpile Modernization ..... 00
Common Database for Tracking Contracts and Contractor Personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan ..... 00
Competition in Construction Acquisition Programs ..... 00
Cost Escalators in Major Weapons Systems Life Cycle Cost Estimations ..... 00
Defense Contract Audit Agency Improvements ..... 00
Nunn-McCurdy Breach due to a Quantity Reduction ..... 00
Pilot Programs for Rapid Acquisition of Information Technology ..... 00
Small Business Subcontracting Goals ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management ..... 00
Section 801—Requirements Relating to Core Logistics Capabilities for Milestone A and Milestone B and Elimination of References to Key Decision Points A and B ..... 00
Section 802—Revision to Law Relating to Disclosures to Litigation Support Contractors ..... 00
Section 803—Extension of Applicability of the Senior Executive Benchmark Compensation Amount for Purposes of Allowable Cost Limitations under Defense Contracts ..... 00
Section 804—Supplier Risk Management ..... 00
Section 805—Extension of Availability of Funds in the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund ..... 00
Section 806—Defense Contract Audit Agency Annual Report ..... 00
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations ..... 00
Section 811—Calculation of Time Period Relating to Report on Critical Changes in Major Automated Information Systems ..... 00
Section 812—Change in Deadline for Submission of Selected Acquisition Reports from 60 to 45 days ..... 00
Section 813—Extension of Sunset Date for Certain Protests of Task and Deliver Order Contracts ..... 00
Section 814—Clarification of Department of Defense Authority To Purchase Right-hand Drive Passenger Sedans ..... 00
Section 815—Amendment Relating to Buying Tents, Tarpaulins, or Covers from American Sources ..... 00

Page

Section 816—Para-Aramid Fibers and Yarns ..... 00
Section 817—Repeal of Sunset of Authority to Procure Fire Resistant Rayon Fiber from Foreign Sources for the Production of Uniforms ..... 00
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan ..... 00
Section 821—Restrictions on Awarding Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan to Adverse Entities ..... 00
Section 822—Authority To Use Higher Thresholds for Procurements in Support of Contingency Operations ..... 00
Section 823—Authority To Examine Records of Foreign Contractors Performing Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan ..... 00
Section 824—Definitions ..... 00
Subtitle D—Defense Industrial Base Matters ..... 00
Section 831—Assessment of the Defense Industrial Base Pilot Program 00
Section 832—Department of Defense Assessment of Industrial Base for Potential Shortfalls ..... 00
Section 833—Comptroller General Assessment of Government Competition in the Department of Defense Industrial Base ..... 00
Section 834—Report on Impact of Foreign Boycotts on the Defense Industrial Base ..... 00
Section 835—Rare Earth Material Inventory Plan ..... 00
Subtitle E—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 841—Miscellaneous Amendments to Public Law 111–383 Relating to Acquisition ..... 00
Section 842—Procurement of Photovoltaic Devices ..... 00
Section 843—Clarification of Jurisdiction of the United States District Courts to Hear Bid Protest Disputes Involving Maritime Contracts ..... 00
Section 844—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement ..... 00
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Conduct of the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review ..... 00
Influence of Budget on Quadrennial Defense Review ..... 00
Information Operations and Strategic Communications ..... 00
Management of Information Technology ..... 00
NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence ..... 00
Office of Cyberthreat Analysis ..... 00
Protection of Sensitive Information ..... 00
Report on Contractors at the Defense Intelligence Agency ..... 00
Report on Increasing Competition for Space Launch ..... 00
Research and Development Assessments in Quadrennial Defense Review and the Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ..... 00
Total Force Management ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management ..... 00
Section 901—Revision of Defense Business System Requirements ..... 00
Section 902—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps ..... 00
Subtitle B—Space Activities ..... 00
Section 911—Notification Requirement for Harmful Interference to Department of Defense Global Positioning System ..... 00
Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related Matters ..... 00
Section 921—Report on Implementation of Recommendations by Comptroller General on Intelligence Information Sharing ..... 00
Section 922—Insider Threat Detection ..... 00
Subtitle D—Total Force Management ..... 00
Section 931—General Policy for Total Force Management ..... 00
Section 932—Revisions to Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Constraints ..... 00
Section 933—Additional Amendments Relating to Total Force Management ..... 00
Section 934—Amendments to Annual Defense Manpower Requirements Report ..... 00
Section 935—Revisions to Strategic Workforce Plan ..... 00

Page

Section 936—Technical Amendments to Requirement for Inventory of Contracts for Services ..... 00
Section 937—Modification of Temporary Suspension of Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Contractor Performance ..... 00
Section 938—Preliminary Planning for Department of Defense Public-Private Competitions ..... 00
Section 939—Conversion of Certain Functions from Contractor Performance to Performance by Department of Defense Civilian Employees ..... 00
Section 940—Assessment of Appropriate Department of Defense and Contractor Personnel for the Defense Medical Readiness Training Institute ..... 00
Subtitle E—Quadrennial Roles and Missions and Related Matters ..... 00
Section 951—Transfer of Provisions Relating to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review ..... 00
Section 952—Revisions to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review ..... 00
Section 953—Amendment to Presentation of Future-Years Budget and Comptroller General Report on Budget Justification Material ..... 00
Section 954—Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Assessment of Contingency Plans ..... 00
Section 955—Quadrennial Defense Review ..... 00
Subtitle F—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 961—Deadline Revision for Report on Foreign Language Proficiency ..... 00
Section 962—Military Activities in Cyberspace ..... 00
Section 963—Activities to Improve Multilateral, Bilateral, and Regional Cooperation regarding Cybersecurity ..... 00
Section 964—Report on U.S. Special Operations Command Structure ..... 00
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Counter-Drug Activities ..... 00
Interagency Coordination ..... 00
Whole-of-Government Approaches and the National Security Strategy ..... 00
Other Matters ..... 00
Analysis of Nuclear Force Structure Alternatives ..... 00
Annual Report on Missile Proliferation ..... 00
Audit Readiness of the Department of Defense ..... 00
Comptroller General Review of Security Requirements for Special Nuclear Material ..... 00
Countering Adversarial Narratives ..... 00
Countering Network-Based Threats ..... 00
Counterproliferation Improvements and Efficiencies ..... 00
Cyber Activity of the People's Republic of China ..... 00
Cyber Threats to Critical Infrastructure ..... 00
Economic Warfare ..... 00
Evaluation of the Alternative Methods for Titanium Production ..... 00
Global Posture Review Report ..... 00
Government Accountability Office Assessment of Reporting Cost Data Collection ..... 00
Management and Security of Nuclear Weapons ..... 00
Nuclear Command, Control and Communications ..... 00
Planning for Electromagnetic Pulse Events ..... 00
Reduction in Reporting Requirements ..... 00
Secure Telecommuting Centers ..... 00
Special Operations Aviation and Rotary Wing Support ..... 00
State Partnership Program ..... 00
The Role of Military Information Support Operations ..... 00
U.S. Special Operations Command Undersea Mobility Strategy ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ..... 00
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority ..... 00
Section 1002—Budgetary Effects of This Act ..... 00
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities ..... 00
Section 1011—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities ..... 00

Page

Section 1012—Extension of Authority of Department of Defense To Provide Additional Support for Counterdrug Activities of Other Governmental Agencies ..... 00
Section 1013—One-Year Extension of Authority To Provide Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments 00
Section 1014—Extension of Authority To Support Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia ..... 00
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards ..... 00
Section 1021—Budgeting for Construction of Naval Vessels ..... 00
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism ..... 00
Section 1031—Definition of Individual Detained at Guantanamo ..... 00
Section 1032—Extension of Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism ..... 00
Section 1033—Clarification of Right To Plead Guilty in Trial of Capital Offense by Military Commission ..... 00
Section 1034—Affirmation of Armed Conflict with Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Associated Forces ..... 00
Section 1035—Requirement for National Security Protocols Governing Detainee Communications ..... 00
Section 1036—Process for the Review of Necessity for Continued Detention of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba ..... 00
Section 1037—Prohibition on Use of Funds To Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States To House Detainees Transferred from Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba ..... 00
Section 1038—Prohibition on Family Member Visitation of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba ..... 00
Section 1039—Prohibition on the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within the United States ..... 00
Section 1040—Prohibitions Relating to the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within Foreign Countries ..... 00
Section 1041—Counterterrorism Operational Briefing Requirement ..... 00
Section 1042—Requirement for Department of Justice Consultation Regarding Prosecution of Terrorists ..... 00
Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces ..... 00
Section 1051—Annual Assessment and Report on the Delivery Platforms for Nuclear Weapons and the Nuclear Command and Control System ..... 00
Section 1052—Plan on Implementation of the New START Treaty ..... 00
Section 1053—Annual Report on the Plan for the Modernization of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile, Nuclear Weapons Complex, and Delivery Platforms ..... 00
Section 1054—Sense of Congress on Nuclear Force Reductions ..... 00
Section 1055—Limitation on Nuclear Force Reductions ..... 00
Section 1056—Nuclear Employment Strategy ..... 00
Section 1057—Comptroller General Report on Nuclear Weapon Capabilities and Force Structure Requirements ..... 00
Subtitle F—Financial Management ..... 00
Section 1061—Amendments Relating to Financial Management Workforce ..... 00
Section 1062—Reliability of Department of Defense Financial Statements ..... 00
Section 1063—Financial Management Personnel Competency Assessment ..... 00
Section 1064—Tracking Implementation of Department of Defense Efficiencies ..... 00
Section 1065—Business Case Analysis for Department of Defense Efficiencies ..... 00
Section 1066—Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan ..... 00
Section 1067—Corrective Action Plan Relating to Execution of Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan ..... 00
Subtitle G—Studies and Reports ..... 00
Section 1071—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements ..... 00
Section 1072—Biennial Review of Required Reports ..... 00
Section 1073—Transmission of Reports in Electronic Format ..... 00
Section 1074—Modifications to Annual Aircraft Procurement Plan ..... 00

Page

Section 1075—Change of Deadline for Annual Report to Congress on National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment ..... 00
Section 1076—Report on Homeland Defense Activities ..... 00
Section 1077—Report on Nuclear Aspirations of Non-State Entities, Nuclear Weapons, and Related Programs in Non-Nuclear Weapons States and Countries Not Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and Certain Foreign Persons ..... 00
Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations ..... 00
Section 1081—Exemption from Freedom of Information Act for Data Files of the Military Flight Operations Quality Assurance Systems of the Military Departments ..... 00
Section 1082—Limitation on Procurement and Fielding of Light Attack Armed Reconnaissance Aircraft ..... 00
Section 1083—Use of State Partnership Program Funds for Civilians and Non-Defense Agency Personnel ..... 00
Section 1084—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for Manufacturing Beyond Low Rate Initial Production at Certain Prototype Integration Facilities ..... 00
Subtitle I—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 1091—Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of Certain Department of Defense Critical Infrastructure Information ..... 00
Section 1092—Expansion of Scope of Humanitarian Demining Assistance Program to Include Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance ..... 00
Section 1093—Mandatory Implementation of the Standing Advisory Panel on Improving Coordination Among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development on Matters of National Security ..... 00
Section 1094—Number of Navy Carrier Air-Wings and Carrier Air-Wing Headquarters ..... 00
Section 1095—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment ..... 00
Section 1096—National Rocket Propulsion Strategy ..... 00
Section 1097—Inclusion of Religious Symbols as Part of Military Memorials ..... 00
Section 1098—Unmanned Aerial Systems and National Airspace ..... 00
Section 1099—Sense of Congress Regarding the Killing of Osama Bin Laden ..... 00
Section 1099A—Grants to Certain Regulated Companies for Specified Energy Property Not Subject to Normalization Rules ..... 00
Section 1099B—Submittal of Information Regarding Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba ..... 00
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Department of Defense Hiring Processes ..... 00
Pay Parity for Department of Defense Federal Wage System Employees Employed at Joint Military Institutions ..... 00
Performance Management Authorities for the Department of Defense ... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 1101—Amendments to Department of Defense Personnel Authorities ..... 00
Section 1102—Provisions Related to the Department of Defense Performance Management System ..... 00
Section 1103—Repeal of Sunset Provision Relating to Direct Hire Authority at Demonstration Laboratories ..... 00
Section 1104—Denial of Certain Pay Adjustments for Unacceptable Performance ..... 00
Section 1105—Revisions to Beneficiary Designation Provisions for Death Gratuity Payable Upon Death of a Government Employee ..... 00
Section 1106—Extension of Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas ..... 00
Section 1107—Waiver of Certain Pay Limitations ..... 00
Section 1108—Services of Post-Combat Case Coordinators ..... 00
Section 1109—Authority to Waive Recovery of Certain Payments Made under Civilian Employees Voluntary Separation Incentive Program ... 00
Section 1110—Extension of Continued Health Benefits ..... 00

Page

Section 1111—Authority to Waive Maximum Age Limit for Certain Appointments ..... 00
Section 1112—Sense of Congress Relating to Pay Parity for Federal Employees Serving at Certain Remote Military Installations ..... 00
Section 1113—Reports by Office of Special Counsel ..... 00
Section 1114—Disclosure of Senior Mentors ..... 00
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
African Security Sector Reform ..... 00
Closure of United States Military Installations and Alteration of Basing Arrangements in European Command Theater of Operations ..... 00
Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program ..... 00
Joint Military Exercises with Iraq ..... 00
Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China ..... 00
Military Power of Iran ..... 00
NATO Special Operations Headquarters ..... 00
Report on Deployment of Assets and Personnel to Libya ..... 00
Taxing Foreign Assistance in Afghanistan ..... 00
Transparency in NATO Arms Sales ..... 00
Unfunded Requirements of the Department of Defense ..... 00
United States Missile Defense Cooperation with Russia ..... 00
U.S. Africa Command and the Lord's Resistance Army ..... 00
Village Stability Operations and the Afghan Local Police Program in Afghanistan ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training ..... 00
Section 1201—Expansion of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism ..... 00
Section 1202—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program To Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces ..... 00
Section 1203—Five-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities ..... 00
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan ..... 00
Section 1211—Authority To Establish a Program To Develop and Carry Out Infrastructure Projects in Afghanistan ..... 00
Section 1212—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan ..... 00
Section 1213—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations ..... 00
Section 1214—Extension and Modification of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund ..... 00
Section 1215—Report on Extension of United States-Iraq Status of Forces Agreement ..... 00
Section 1216—Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq ..... 00
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters ..... 00
Section 1221—Review and Report on Iran's and China's Conventional and Anti-Access Capabilities ..... 00
Section 1222—Report and Consultation on Energy Security of NATO Alliance ..... 00
Section 1223—Extension of Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan ..... 00
Section 1224—Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea ..... 00
Section 1225—National Security Risk Assessment of the United States Federal Debt Owned by the People's Republic of China ..... 00
Section 1226—Congressional Notification Requirement before Permanent Relocation of Any United States Military Unit Stationed Outside the United States ..... 00
Section 1227—Annual Report on Military Power of the People's Republic of China ..... 00
Section 1228—Limitation on Funds to Provide the Russian Federation with Access to United States Missile Defense Technology ..... 00
Section 1229—International Agreements Relating to Missile Defense ..... 00

Page

Section 1230—Non-strategic Nuclear Weapon Reductions and Extended Deterrence Policy ..... 00
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Cooperative Threat Reduction Biological Surveillance Network ..... 00
Cooperative Threat Reduction of Biological Weapons ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds ..... 00
Section 1302—Funding Allocations ..... 00
Section 1303—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cooperative Biological Engagement Program ..... 00
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Military Programs ..... 00
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds ..... 00
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund ..... 00
Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense ..... 00
Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide ..... 00
Section 1405—Defense Inspector General ..... 00
Section 1406—Defense Health Program ..... 00
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile ..... 00
Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds ..... 00
Section 1412—Revision to Required Receipt Objectives for Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile ..... 00
Subtitle C—Chemical Demilitarization Matters ..... 00
Section 1421—Changes to Management Organization to the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative Program ..... 00
Subtitle D—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 1431—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home ..... 00
Section 1432—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois ..... 00
Section 1433—Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund ..... 00
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
CV–22 Combat Loss Replacement Funding ..... 00
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund ..... 00
MH–60 Combat Loss Replacement Funding ..... 00
National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations ..... 00
Section 1501—Purpose ..... 00
Section 1502—Procurement ..... 00
Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ..... 00
Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance ..... 00
Section 1505—Military Personnel ..... 00
Section 1506—Working Capital Funds ..... 00
Section 1507—Defense Health Program ..... 00
Section 1508—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide ..... 00
Section 1509—Defense Inspector General ..... 00
Subtitle B—Financial Matters ..... 00
Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations ..... 00
Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority ..... 00
Subtitle C—Limitations and Other Matters ..... 00
Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund ..... 00
Section 1532—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq ..... 00

Page

Section 1533—One-Year Extension of Project Authority and Related Requirements of Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan ..... 00
TITLE XVI—ADDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Procurement ..... 00
Section 1601—Budget Item Relating to Modification of Torpedoes and Related Equipment ..... 00
Section 1602—Budget Item Relating to Anti-Submarine Warfare Electronic Equipment ..... 00
Section 1603—Budget Item Relating to Shallow Water Mine Counter Measures ..... 00
Section 1604—Budget Item Relating to LHA–7 Ship Program ..... 00
Section 1605—Budget Item Relating to Mobility Aircraft Simulators ..... 00
Section 1606—Budget Item Relating to Modifications to Aircraft ..... 00
Section 1607—Budget Item Relating to SH–60 Crew and Passenger Survivability Upgrades ..... 00
Section 1608—Budget Item Relating to Modification of In-Service A–10 Aircraft ..... 00
Section 1609—Budget Item Relating to Radar Support ..... 00
Section 1610—Budget Item Relating to Electronic Equipment-Automation ..... 00
Section 1611—Budget Item Relating to Base Defense Systems ..... 00
Section 1612—Budget Item Relating to Sniper Rifle Modifications ..... 00
Section 1613—Budget Item Relating to Generators and Associated Equipment ..... 00
Section 1614—Budget Item Relating to National Guard and Reserve Equipment ..... 00
Subtitle B—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ..... 00
Section 1616—Budget Item Relating to New Design SSN ..... 00
Section 1617—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Submarine System Development ..... 00
Section 1618—Budget Item Relating to Surface Anti-Submarine Warfare ..... 00
Section 1619—Budget Item Relating to Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies ..... 00
Section 1620—Budget Item Relating to Industrial Preparedness ..... 00
Section 1621—Budget Item Relating to Mixed Conventional Load Capability for Bomber Aircraft ..... 00
Section 1622—Budget Item Relating to TACAIR-launched UAS Capability Development ..... 00
Section 1623—Budget Item Relating to Electro-photonic Component Capability Development ..... 00
Section 1624—Budget Item Relating to Airborne Reconnaissance Systems ..... 00
Section 1625—Budget Item Relating to Small Business Innovative Research ..... 00
Section 1626—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences ..... 00
Section 1627—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences ..... 00
Section 1628—Budget Item Relating to Communications Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1629—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology ..... 00
Section 1630—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology ..... 00
Section 1631—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1632—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1633—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1634—Budget Item Relating to Rotary Wing Surfaces ..... 00
Section 1635—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Technology ..... 00
Section 1636—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1637—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1638—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology ..... 00

Page
Section 1639—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology ..... 00
Section 1640—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology ..... 00
Section 1641—Budget Item Relating to Lightweight Body Armor ..... 00
Section 1642—Budget Item Relating to Industrial Preparedness Manufacturing Technology ..... 00
Section 1643—Budget Item Relating to Secure Microelectronics ..... 00
Section 1644—Budget Item Relating to Army Tactical Command and Control Hardware and Software ..... 00
Section 1645—Budget Item Relating to Battlespace Knowledge Development and Demonstration ..... 00
Section 1646—Budget Item Relating to Technology Transfer ..... 00
Section 1647—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives 00
Section 1648—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives 00
Section 1649—Budget Item Relating to Clinical Care and Research ..... 00
Section 1650—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology ..... 00
Section 1651—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology ..... 00
Section 1652—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology ..... 00
Section 1653—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology ..... 00
Section 1654—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 00
Section 1655—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 00
Section 1656—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 00
Section 1657—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 00
Section 1658—Budget Item Relating to Chemical and Biological Defense Program ..... 00
Section 1659—Budget Item Relating to Special Operations Advanced Technology Development ..... 00
Section 1660—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support ..... 00
Section 1661—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support ..... 00
Section 1662—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support ..... 00
Section 1663—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support ..... 00
Section 1664—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology ..... 00
Section 1665—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology ..... 00
Section 1666—Budget Item Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction Defeat Technologies ..... 00
Section 1667—Budget Item Relating to Countermine Systems ..... 00
Section 1668—Budget Item Relating to Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research ..... 00
Section 1669—Budget Item Relating to Special Applications for Contingencies ..... 00
Section 1670—Budget Item Relating to Microelectronics Technology Development and Support ..... 00
Section 1671—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research ..... 00
Section 1672—Budget Item Relating to Marine Corps Landing Force Technology ..... 00
Section 1673—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Concepts and Simulation ..... 00
Section 1674—Budget Item Relating to Human Effectiveness Applied Research ..... 00
Section 1675—Budget Item Relating to Aerospace Propulsion ..... 00
Section 1676—Budget Item Relating to End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities ..... 00
Section 1677—Budget Item Relating to Sensors and Electronic Survivability ..... 00
Section 1678—Budget Item Relating to Military Engineering Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1679—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 00
Section 1680—Budget Item Relating to Establishment of Protocols for Joint Strike Fighter Lead-Free Electronics Components ..... 00
Section 1681—Budget Item Relating to Portable Helicopter Oxygen Delivery Systems ..... 00

Page

Section 1682—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research ..... 00
Section 1683—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1684—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1685—Budget Item Relating to Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs ..... 00
Section 1686—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Advanced Technology ..... 00
Section 1687—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 00
Section 1688—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 00
Section 1689—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 00
Section 1690—Budget Item Relating to Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness, and Safety ..... 00
Section 1691—Budget Item Relating to Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense . 00
Section 1692—Budget Item Relating to Operationally Responsive Space ..... 00
Section 1693—Budget Item Relating to Space Technology ..... 00
Section 1694—Budget Item Relating to Army Net Zero Programs ..... 00
Section 1695—Budget Item Relating to Offshore Range Environmental Baseline Assessment ..... 00
Section 1696—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects ..... 00
Section 1697—Budget Item Relating to Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Applications in the Pacific Region ..... 00
Section 1698—Budget Item Relating to Alternative Energy for Mobile Power Applications ..... 00
Section 1699—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Battery Technologies 00
Section 1699A—Budget Item Relating to Operational Energy Improvement Pilot Project ..... 00
Section 1699B—Budget Item Relating to Microgrid Pilot Program ..... 00
Section 1699C—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Surface Machinery Systems ..... 00
Section 1699D—Budget Item Relating to Base Camp Fuel Cells ..... 00
Section 1699E—Budget Item Relating to Defense Alternative Energy .... 00
Section 1699F—Budget Item Relating to Radiological Contamination Research ..... 00
Subtitle C—Operation and Maintenance ..... 00
Section 1699G—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention Program ..... 00
Section 1699H—Budget Item Relating to Navy Emergency Management and Preparedness ..... 00
Section 1699I—Budget Item Relating to Army Simulation Training Systems ..... 00
Section 1699J—Budget Item Relating to Army Industrial Facility Energy Monitoring ..... 00
Section 1699K—Budget Item Relating to Army National Guard Simulation Training Systems ..... 00
Section 1699L—Budget Item Relating to Army Arsenals ..... 00
Section 1699M—Budget Item Relating to Cold Weather Protective Equipment ..... 00
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 00
PURPOSE ..... 00
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW ..... 00
Section 2001—Short Title ..... 00
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to Be Specified by Law ..... 00
Section 2003—Limitation on Implementation of Projects Designated as Various Locations ..... 00
Section 2004—Effective Date ..... 00
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ..... 00
SUMMARY ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2102—Family Housing ..... 00

Page

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 00
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army ..... 00
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project ..... 00
Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects ..... 00
Section 2107—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project Using Prior-Year Unobligated Army Military Construction Funds ..... 00
Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects ..... 00
Section 2109—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects ..... 00
Section 2110—Technical Amendments to Correct Certain Project Specifications ..... 00
Section 2111—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ..... 00
SUMMARY ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2202—Family Housing ..... 00
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 00
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy ..... 00
Section 2205—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project ..... 00
Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects ..... 00
Section 2207—Additional Budget Items Relating to Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ..... 00
SUMMARY ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2302—Family Housing ..... 00
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 00
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force ..... 00
Section 2305—Modification of Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project ..... 00
Section 2306—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project ..... 00
Section 2307—Limitation on Implementation of Consolidation of Air and Space Operations Center of the Air Force ..... 00
Section 2308—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ..... 00
SUMMARY ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations ..... 00
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects ..... 00
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies ..... 00
Section 2404—Additional Budget Items Relating to Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations ..... 00
Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide ..... 00

Page

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM ..... 00
SUMMARY ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ..... 00
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ..... 00
SUMMARY ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Explanation of Funding Adjustment ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve ..... 00
Subtitle B—Additional Budget Items ..... 00
Section 2611—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2612—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Section 2613—Additional Budget Item Relating to Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 00
Subtitle C—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 2621—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project ..... 00
Section 2622—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects ..... 00
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES ..... 00
SUMMARY ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Base Realignment and Closure Community Recovery ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 ..... 00
Section 2702—Authorized Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 ..... 00
Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 ..... 00
Section 2704—Authority to Extend Deadline for Completion of Limited Number of Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations ..... 00
Section 2705—Increased Emphasis on Evaluation of Costs and Benefits in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment ..... 00
Section 2706—Special Considerations Related to Transportation Infrastructure in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment ..... 00
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Homeporting in Europe ..... 00
Africa Command Basing Alternatives ..... 00
Army Housing Shortfall at Growth Installations ..... 00
Assessment of Improvements in Construction Techniques to Achieve Life-Cycle Cost-Effective Facilities ..... 00
Castner Range Complex ..... 00
Collateral Support for Infrastructure and Real Property Programs ..... 00

Page

Comptroller General Report regarding Third-Party Financing for Renewable Energy Projects on Military Installations ..... 00
Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense's Report on the Arctic and Northwest Passage ..... 00
Construction Unit Costs ..... 00
Cooperative Agreements to Facilitate Defense Posture Review Initiatives ..... 00
Corrosion Evaluation for Facilities and Infrastructure ..... 00
Department of Defense Microgrid Activities ..... 00
Elementary and Secondary Schools on Military Installations ..... 00
Energy and Water Utilities Privatization ..... 00
Fort Bragg Parking Assessment ..... 00
Homeowners Assistance Program ..... 00
Leasing of Military Museums ..... 00
Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes ..... 00
Section 2801—Prohibition on Use of Any Cost-Plus System of Contracting for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Projects ..... 00
Section 2802—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction Projects ..... 00
Section 2803—Condition on Rental of Family Housing in Foreign Countries for General and Flag Officers ..... 00
Section 2804—Protections for Suppliers of Labor and Materials under Contracts for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects ..... 00
Section 2805—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects inside United States Central Command Area of Responsibility and Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa Areas of Responsibility and Interest ..... 00
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration ..... 00
Section 2811—Clarification of Authority to Use Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund for Minor Construction and Alteration Activities at Pentagon Reservation ..... 00
Section 2812—Removal of Discretion of Secretaries of the Military Departments Regarding Purposes for which Easements for Rights-of-Way May Be Granted ..... 00
Section 2813—Limitations on Use or Development of Property in Clear Zone Areas ..... 00
Section 2814—Defense Access Road Program Enhancements to Address Transportation Infrastructure in Vicinity of Military Installations ..... 00
Subtitle C—Energy Security ..... 00
Section 2821—Consolidation of Definitions Used in Energy Security Chapter ..... 00
Section 2822—Consideration of Energy Security in Developing Energy Projects on Military Installations Using Renewable Energy Sources ..... 00
Section 2823—Establishment of Interim Objective for Department of Defense 2025 Renewable Energy Goal ..... 00
Section 2824—Use of Centralized Purchasing Agents for Renewable Energy Certificates to Reduce Cost of Facility Energy Projects Using Renewable Energy Sources and Improve Efficiencies ..... 00
Section 2825—Identification of Energy-Efficient Products for Use in Construction, Repair, or Renovation of Department of Defense Facilities ..... 00
Section 2826—Core Curriculum and Certification Standards for Department of Defense Energy Managers ..... 00
Section 2827—Submission of Annual Department of Defense Energy Management Reports ..... 00
Section 2828—Continuous Commissioning of Department of Defense Facilities to Resolve Operating Problems, Improve Comfort, Optimize Energy Use, and Identify Retrofits ..... 00
Section 2829—Requirement for Department of Defense to Capture and Track Data Generated in Metering Department Facilities ..... 00
Section 2830—Metering of Navy Piers to Accurately Measure Energy Consumption ..... 00

Page

Section 2831—Report on Energy-Efficiency Standards and Prohibition on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Gold or Platinum Certification ..... 00
Subtitle D—Provisions Related to Guam Realignment ..... 00
Section 2841—Use of Operation and Maintenance Funding to Support Community Adjustments Related to Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam ..... 00
Section 2842—Medical Care Coverage for H–2B Temporary Workforce on Military Construction Projects on Guam ..... 00
Section 2843—Certification of Military Readiness Need for Firing Range on Guam as Condition on Establishment of Range ..... 00
Section 2844—Repeal of Condition on Use of Specific Utility Conveyance Authority regarding Guam Integrated Water and Wastewater Treatment System ..... 00
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances ..... 00
Section 2851—Land Exchange, Fort Bliss, Texas ..... 00
Subtitle F—Other Matters ..... 00
Section 2861—Change in Name of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces to the Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy ..... 00
Section 2862—Limitation on Reduction in Number of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Permanent Duty at a Military Installation to Effectuate Realignment of Installation ..... 00
Section 2863—Prohibition on Naming Department of Defense Real Property after a Member of Congress ..... 00
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 00
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Nuclear Modernization ..... 00
Weapons Activities ..... 00
Stockpile Stewardship ..... 00
Stockpile Management ..... 00
Directed Stockpile Work ..... 00
B61 Phase 6.3 Life Extension Program ..... 00
Science Campaign ..... 00
Engineering Campaign ..... 00
Readiness Campaign ..... 00
Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign ..... 00
Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign ..... 00
Exa-scale computing at the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration National Laboratories ..... 00
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities ..... 00
Report on project management for large-scale construction programs ..... 00
Secure Transportation Asset ..... 00
Comptroller General Evaluation of Study on Options for Nuclear Weapon Transportation ..... 00
Work for Others at the national nuclear laboratories ..... 00
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation ..... 00
Nuclear Centers of Excellence ..... 00
Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention ..... 00
Naval Reactors ..... 00
Office of the Administrator ..... 00
Environmental and Other Defense Activities ..... 00
Overview ..... 00
Defense Environmental Cleanup ..... 00
Other Defense Activities ..... 00
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ..... 00
Report on Mixed Oxide Fuel ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations ..... 00
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 00

Page

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup ..... 00
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities ..... 00
Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance ..... 00
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 00
Section 3111—Consolidated Reporting Requirements relating to Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship, Management, and Infrastructure ..... 00
Section 3112—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security ..... 00
Section 3113—Use of Savings from Pension Reimbursements for Budgetary Shortfalls ..... 00
Subtitle C—Reports ..... 00
Section 3121—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements ..... 00
Section 3122—Progress on Nuclear Nonproliferation ..... 00
Section 3123—Reports on Role of Nuclear Sites and Efficiencies ..... 00
Section 3124—Net Assessment of High-Performance Computing Capabilities of Foreign Countries ..... 00
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ..... 00
OVERVIEW ..... 00
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 00
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 3201—Authorization ..... 00
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 00
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2012 ..... 00
Section 3502—Use of National Defense Reserve Fleet and Ready Reserve Force Vessels ..... 00
Section 3503—Recruitment Authority ..... 00
Section 3504—Ship Scrapping Reporting Requirement ..... 00
DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES ..... 00
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 00
Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables ..... 00
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT ..... 00
Section 4101—Procurement ..... 00
Section 4102—Procurement for Overseas Contingency Operations ..... 00
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ..... 00
Section 4201—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ..... 00
Section 4202—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for Overseas Contingency Operations ..... 00
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ..... 00
Section 4301—Operation and Maintenance ..... 00
Section 4302—Operation and Maintenance for Overseas Contingency Operations ..... 00
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL ..... 00
Section 4401—Military Personnel ..... 00
Section 4402—Military Personnel for Overseas Contingency Operations ..... 00
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 00
Section 4501—Other Authorizations ..... 00
Section 4502—Other Authorizations for Overseas Contingency Operations ..... 00
TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ..... 00
Section 4601—Military Construction ..... 00
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ..... 00
Section 4701—Department of Energy National Security Programs ..... 00

Departmental Data ..... 00
Department of Defense Authorization Request ..... 00
Communications from Other Committees ..... 00
Fiscal Data ..... 00
Congressional Budget Office Estimate ..... 00
Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act ..... 00

Page

Committee Cost Estimate ..... 00
Advisory of Earmarks ..... 00
Oversight Findings ..... 00
General Performance Goals and Objectives ..... 00
Statement of Federal Mandates ..... 00
Federal Advisory Committee Statement ..... 00
Applicability to the Legislative Branch ..... 00
Committee Votes ..... 00
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported ..... 00
Additional Views ..... 00
  Additional Views of Representative Robert J. Wittman ..... 00
  Additional Views of Representative Mike Coffman ..... 00
  Additional Views of Representative Chris Gibson ..... 00

112TH CONGRESS 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT 112–

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

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

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

## R E P O R T

together with

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1540]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1540) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

F:\VHLC\051611\051611.037
May 16, 2011

## PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would, (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2012: (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 2012 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for the Maritime Administration.

## RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, is a key mechanism through which the Congress of the United States fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense (DOD) generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the House Committee on Armed Services. The committee bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence. The committee remains steadfast in its continued and unwavering support for the men and women of the armed forces, the civilian employees of the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration. The armed forces continue to be deeply engaged in a number of ongoing military operations around the world, most significantly, the wars in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq, and military operations in Libya. The committee is deeply committed to providing full authorization for the funding required to restore the readiness of our military; enhance the quality of life of military service members and their families; sustain and improve the armed forces; and properly safeguard the national security of the United States.

In addition to providing authorization of appropriations, the committee bill ensures our troops deployed in Afghanistan, Iraq and around the world have the equipment, resources, authorities, training, and time needed to successfully complete their missions and return home; provides our warfighters and their families with the resources and support they need, deserve, and have earned; invests in the capabilities and force structure needed to protect the United States from current and future threats; mandates fiscal responsibility, transparency and accountability within the Department of Defense; and incentivizes competition for every tax-payer dollar associated with funding Department of Defense requirements.

*Equipment, Resources, Authorities, Training, and Time to Accomplish Missions*

Focusing on victory in Afghanistan, the committee bill affirms that the United States is engaged in an armed conflict with Al Qaeda, the Taliban and associated forces pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force from 2001. Further, the committee bill validates that the President's authority, pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, includes the authority to detain certain belligerents until the termination of hostilities. The committee bill includes several additional provisions to strengthen detention policies and procedures.

With the nation at war, the committee further addresses Al Qaeda and affiliated groups' use of the internet as a new battlespace. The committee includes a provision that would provide authorization for the Defense Department to use cyberspace to confront that threat.

The committee bill includes a subtitle of new authorities targeting corrupt contracts in Afghanistan and Iraq. The committee is also concerned that the scheduled departure of U.S. forces from Iraq by December 31, 2011, will leave the Iraqi Security Forces with several critical capabilities gaps that may render it unable to achieve minimum combat readiness, thereby jeopardizing Iraq's stability and the United States hard fought gains in the region. Therefore, the committee bill includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report on any changes to the status of forces agreement between the United States and Iraq, as well as steps being taken to mitigate the Iraqi Security Forces capability gaps.

As in previous years, the committee bill continues to address the Department of Defense's global train and equip authorities, to ensure that the United States has willing and capable partners in the war against terrorism and radical extremism.

*Resources for Warfighters and Families*

Recognizing that the service and sacrifice of our military men and women is a down payment on future health care benefits, the committee bill takes a sensible approach to TRICARE. The bill includes a provision that would allow for a modest

fee increase, while protecting military families from steep fee increases in the future. The bill also provides a 1.6 percent increase in military basic pay.

In addition, the bill establishes requirements for the management and measurement of dwell time—the time service members spend at home station following a deployment; personnel tempo—the time, including training time, that a service member is unable to spend time in housing in which the service member lives due to work duties; and operating tempo—the time units are involved in operational and training requirements. Moreover, the committee remains deeply concerned about the impact proposed future force reductions for the Army and Marine Corps will have on individual dwell time as well as the overall health and welfare of the all volunteer force.

The committee bill provides additional services and protections for service members who have been the victim of sexual assault. The committee bill also includes language that would make mental health assessments available for members of the reserve components at the location of their unit during unit training and assemblies.

*Capabilities and Force Structure for Current and Future Threats*

The committee bill authorizes appropriations for aircraft, ground vehicles, shipbuilding, missile defense, military space assets, and force protection equipment. The committee also authorizes robust funding for defense research and development. The committee bill addresses vulnerabilities to information systems and proposes steps necessary to secure sensitive information.

Looking to the future, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recently noted that our rising debt is one of the greatest threats to our national security. Moreover, a Chinese defense official recently stated that Beijing was "preparing for war in all directions." As such, the committee bill includes a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to conduct a national security risk assessment of U.S. federal debt held by China. The legislation also includes a number of provisions related to the military strength of China and Iran, especially as it relates to anti-access and area denial capabilities.

The committee is increasingly concerned about instability on the Korean peninsula, particularly given anticipated leadership changes within the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). Therefore, the committee includes a requirement for a detailed report on the military and security developments involving the DPRK in order to more accurately assess the U.S. capabilities required in the western Pacific.

The ballistic missile threat continues to increase both quantitatively and quantitatively. The committee bill would provide additional resources for development, test and fielding of missile defenses to protect the U.S. homeland and support the implementation of the Administration's phased adaptive approach for regional missile defense.

A credible and reliable nuclear deterrent has been fundamental to U.S. security for decades and will continue to be for the foreseeable future. As such, the committee fully funds the Administration's requested funding increase for nuclear modernization in order to reverse what the bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States called a "pattern of underinvestment over the last two decades." The committee seeks to further ensure that the Administration is held accountable to its modernization promises and recommends prudent measures to limit further nuclear force reductions without first ensuring our deterrent is modernized and our commitments to our allies can be met.

*Fiscal Responsibility, Transparency, and Accountability*

The committee scrutinized the Department of Defense's budget and identified inefficiencies to invest those savings into higher national security priorities. The committee bill reflects the fact that as a nation, we must make tough choices in order to provide for America's common defense by examining every aspect of the defense enterprise to find ways that we can accomplish the mission of providing for the common defense more effectively. In addition, the legislation reduces costly reporting requirements and sets new standards for DOD financial management, including standards for financial management personnel, reporting, and budgeting for financial auditing.

*Incentivizing Competition*

The committee continues to believe that competition reduces costs, increases quality, and improves vendor performance. For this reason, the committee recommends several provisions to foster competition in defense acquisitions. The committee includes a provision that would mandate competition throughout the life cycle of major weapon system at the component and subcomponent levels. The committee also includes a provision that requires a competitive acquisition strategy for the propulsion system of the next-generation bomber. In addition, the committee takes steps to incentivize competition for next-generation military satellite communications (MILSATCOM) technology development by transferring funding for this effort out of the legacy satellite program and into a program element for next-generation MILSATCOM technology development. Furthermore, the committee takes steps to ensure preservation of property related to the F136 propulsion system and requires the Secretary of Defense to provide support and allow access to such property to enable the contractor to continue development and testing of the system at no cost to the government. The committee applauds the contractor for continuing development and testing of the F136 propulsion system despite the steps taken by the Department of Defense to cancel the program. The committee remains steadfast in its belief that a competitive alternative to the currently-planned F136 is critical to the success of the Joint Strike Fighter

program, and such competition will result in better engine performance, improved contractor responsiveness, a more robust industrial base, increased engine reliability, and improved operational readiness.

## HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 results from hearings that began on January 26, 2011, and that were completed on April 14, 2011. The full committee conducted 14 sessions. In addition, a total of 26 sessions were conducted by 6 different subcommittees.

## COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 11, 2011, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 1540, as amended, by a vote of 60-1.

## EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 1540. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

## RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

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

## SUMMARY OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE BILL

The President requested discretionary budget authority of $689.0 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee for fiscal year 2012. Of this amount, $553.0 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $117.8 billion was requested for the overseas contingency operations requirements covering the entire fiscal year, and $18.1 billion was requested for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of $690.1 billion in fiscal year 2012, including $117.8 billion for overseas contingency operations. The base committee authorization of $571.1 billion is a $5.2 billion increase above the levels provided for in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

The following table summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2012 and compares these amounts to the President's request.

# Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **National Defense Function (050) Funding, Base Budget Request** | | | |
| **Function 051, Department of Defense-Military** | | | |
| **Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations** | | | |
| **Title I - Procurement** | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 7,061,381 | -513,900 | 6,547,481 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 1,478,718 | -14,495 | 1,464,223 |
| Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 1,933,512 | 427,506 | 2,361,018 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 1,992,625 | | 1,992,625 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 9,682,592 | -170,763 | 9,511,829 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 220,634 | | 220,634 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 18,587,033 | 4,500 | 18,591,533 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 3,408,478 | 5,000 | 3,413,478 |
| Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy | 14,928,921 | -50,000 | 14,878,921 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps | 719,952 | | 719,952 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 6,285,451 | 7,575 | 6,293,026 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,391,602 | 1,000 | 1,392,602 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 14,082,527 | 43,500 | 14,126,027 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 539,065 | | 539,065 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 6,074,017 | 416,000 | 6,490,017 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 17,602,036 | -5,982 | 17,596,054 |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 5,365,248 | -218,200 | 5,147,048 |
| Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund | 100,000 | -100,000 | 0 |
| National Guard & Reserve Equipment | 0 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| **Subtotal, Title I - Procurement** | **111,453,792** | **-68,259** | **111,385,533** |
| **Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation** | | | |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army | 9,683,980 | 82,022 | 9,766,002 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy | 17,956,431 | 51,700 | 18,008,131 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force | 27,737,701 | 11,966 | 27,749,667 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide | 19,755,678 | 109,209 | 19,864,887 |
| Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense | 191,292 | | 191,292 |
| **Subtotal, Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation** | **75,325,082** | **254,897** | **75,579,979** |
| **Title III - Operation and Maintenance** | | | |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army | 34,735,216 | 95,780 | 34,830,996 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy | 39,364,688 | 373,483 | 39,738,171 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps | 5,960,437 | 15,500 | 5,975,937 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force | 36,195,133 | 55,242 | 36,250,375 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide | 30,940,409 | -414,369 | 30,526,040 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve | 3,109,176 | 31,300 | 3,140,476 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 1,323,134 | 2,500 | 1,325,634 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 271,443 | | 271,443 |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 3,274,359 | 50,900 | 3,325,259 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard | 7,041,432 | 80,720 | 7,122,152 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard | 6,136,280 | 97,100 | 6,233,380 |
| US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense | 13,861 | | 13,861 |
| Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid | 107,662 | | 107,662 |
| Cooperative Threat Reduction | 508,219 | | 508,219 |
| Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund | 305,501 | | 305,501 |
| Environmental Restoration, Army | 346,031 | | 346,031 |
| Environmental Restoration, Navy | 308,668 | | 308,668 |
| Environmental Restoration, Air Force | 525,453 | -22,000 | 503,453 |
| Environmental Restoration, Defense | 10,716 | | 10,716 |
| Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites | 276,495 | | 276,495 |
| Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund | 5,000 | -5,000 | 0 |
| **Subtotal, Title III - Operation and Maintenance** | **170,759,313** | **361,156** | **171,120,469** |
| **Title IV - Military Personnel** | | | |
| Military Personnel Appropriations | 142,828,848 | -664,690 | 142,164,158 |
| **Subtotal, Title IV - Military Personnel** | **142,828,848** | **-664,690** | **142,164,158** |
| **Title XIV - Other Authorizations** | | | |
| Working Capital Fund, Army | 101,194 | | 101,194 |
| Working Capital Fund, Air Force | 65,372 | | 65,372 |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide | 31,614 | | 31,614 |
| Working Capital Fund, DECA | 1,376,830 | 2,000 | 1,378,830 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,126,384 | | 1,126,384 |
| Defense Health Program | 32,198,770 | -236,010 | 31,962,760 |
| Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction | 1,554,422 | | 1,554,422 |
| Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities | 1,156,282 | | 1,156,282 |
| Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund | 0 | 348,256 | 348,256 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 289,519 | 1,000 | 290,519 |
| **Subtotal, Title XIV - Other Authorizations** | **37,900,387** | **115,246** | **38,015,633** |
| **Subtotal, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations** | **538,267,422** | **-1,650** | **538,265,772** |
| **Division B: Military Construction Authorizations** | | | |
| **Military Construction** | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 3,235,991 | 70,000 | 3,305,991 |
| Military Construction, Navy | 2,461,547 | 30,000 | 2,491,547 |
| Military Construction, Air Force | 1,364,858 | -34,000 | 1,330,858 |
| Milcon,Def-Wide | 3,848,757 | -143,300 | 3,705,457 |
| Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense | 75,312 | | 75,312 |
| NATO Security Investment Program | 272,611 | | 272,611 |
| Military Construction, Army National Guard | 773,592 | 50,000 | 823,592 |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve | 280,549 | | 280,549 |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Military Construction, Naval Reserve | 26,299 | | 26,299 |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard | 116,246 | 17,279 | 133,525 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve | 33,620 | 10,000 | 43,620 |
| **Subtotal, Military Construction** | **12,489,382** | **-21** | **12,489,361** |
| **Family Housing** | | | |
| Fam Hsg Const,A | 186,897 | | 186,897 |
| Fam Hsg Op&Dt,A | 494,858 | | 494,858 |
| Fam Hsg Const,N | 100,972 | | 100,972 |
| Fam Hsg Op&Dt,N | 367,863 | | 367,863 |
| Fam Hs Op&Dt,AF | 404,761 | | 404,761 |
| Fam Hsg Con,AF | 84,804 | | 84,804 |
| Fam Hsg Op&Dt,D-W | 50,723 | | 50,723 |
| Homeowners Assistance Fund | 1,284 | | 1,284 |
| DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund | 2,184 | | 2,184 |
| **Subtotal, Family Housing** | **1,694,346** | | **1,694,346** |
| **Base Realignment and Closure** | | | |
| Base Realignment and Closure Account 1990 | 323,543 | | 323,543 |
| Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005 | 258,776 | | 258,776 |
| **Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure** | **582,319** | | **582,319** |
| **Undistributed Adjustments** | | | |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| General Reduction | 0 | | 0 |
| Prior Year Savings | 0 | | 0 |
| **Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments** | **0** | | **0** |
| **Subtotal, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations** | **14,766,047** | **-21** | **14,766,026** |
| **Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military** | **553,033,469** | **-1,671** | **553,031,798** |
| **Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | | | |
| **Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations** | | | |
| **Environmental and Other Defense Activities** | | | |
| Energy Security and Assurance | 6,187 | | 6,187 |
| Weapons Activities | 7,629,716 | | 7,629,716 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 2,549,492 | | 2,549,492 |
| Naval Reactors | 1,153,662 | | 1,153,662 |
| Office of the Administrator | 450,060 | | 450,060 |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup | 5,406,781 | | 5,406,781 |
| Other Defense Activities | 859,952 | | 859,952 |
| **Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities** | **18,055,850** | | **18,055,850** |
| **Independent Federal Agency Authorization** | | | |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 29,130 | | 29,130 |
| **Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization** | **29,130** | | **29,130** |
| **Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authori** | **18,084,980** | | **18,084,980** |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | **18,084,980** | | **18,084,980** |
| **Total, National Defense Function (050) Funding, Base Budget Request** | **571,118,449** | **-1,671** | **571,116,778** |
| **National Defense Function (050) Funding, OCO Budget Request** | | | |
| **Function 051, Department of Defense-Military** | | | |
| **Overseas Contingency Operations** | | | |
| **Procurement** | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 423,400 | -35,500 | 387,900 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 126,556 | | 126,556 |
| Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 37,117 | | 37,117 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 208,381 | | 208,381 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 1,398,195 | | 1,398,195 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 2,577,500 | | 2,577,500 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 730,960 | | 730,960 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 41,070 | | 41,070 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps | 317,100 | | 317,100 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 281,975 | | 281,975 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,260,996 | -50,000 | 1,210,996 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 527,865 | -70,000 | 457,865 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 92,510 | | 92,510 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 28,420 | | 28,420 |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 3,204,641 | | 3,204,641 |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 469,968 | -22,800 | 447,168 |
| Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund | 100,000 | -50,000 | 50,000 |
| Mine Resistant Ambush Protection Vehicle Fund | 3,195,170 | | 3,195,170 |
| National Guard & Reserve Equipment | 0 | 225,000 | 225,000 |
| **Subtotal, Procurement** | **15,021,824** | **-3,300** | **15,018,524** |
| **Research, Development, Test and Evaluation** | | | |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army | 8,513 | | 8,513 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy | 53,884 | | 53,884 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force | 142,000 | | 142,000 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide | 192,361 | | 192,361 |
| **Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation** | **396,758** | | **396,758** |
| **Operation and Maintenance** | | | |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army | 44,302,280 | | 44,302,280 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy | 7,006,567 | | 7,006,567 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps | 3,571,210 | | 3,571,210 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force | 10,719,187 | | 10,719,187 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide | 9,269,411 | | 9,269,411 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve | 217,500 | | 217,500 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 74,148 | | 74,148 |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 36,084 | | 36,084 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 142,050 | | 142,050 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard | 387,544 | | 387,544 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard | 34,050 | | 34,050 |
| Afghanistan Security Forces Fund | 12,800,000 | | 12,800,000 |
| Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund | 475,000 | | 475,000 |
| Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund | 0 | 1,100,000 | 1,100,000 |
| **Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance** | **89,035,031** | **1,100,000** | **90,135,031** |
| **Military Personnel** | | | |
| Military Personnel Appropriations | 11,228,566 | | 11,228,566 |
| **Subtotal, Military Personnel** | **11,228,566** | | **11,228,566** |
| **Other Authorizations** | | | |
| Working Capital Fund, Army | 54,000 | | 54,000 |
| Working Capital Fund, Air Force | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide | 369,013 | | 369,013 |
| Defense Health Program | 1,228,288 | | 1,228,288 |
| Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities | 486,458 | | 486,458 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 11,055 | | 11,055 |
| **Subtotal, Other Authorizations** | **2,160,814** | | **2,160,814** |
| **Subtotal, Overseas Contingency Operations** | **117,842,993** | **1,096,700** | **118,939,693** |

## Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military** | **117,842,993** | **1,096,700** | **118,939,693** |
| **Total, National Defense Function (050) Funding, OCO Budget Request** | **117,842,993** | **1,096,700** | **118,939,693** |
| **Total, National Defense** | **688,961,442** | **1,095,029** | **690,056,471** |
| | | | |
| **MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS** | | | |
| Title XIV - Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600) | 67,700 | | 67,700 |
| Title XXXIV - Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270) | 14,909 | | 14,909 |
| Title XXXV - Maritime Administration (Function 400) | 161,539 | | 161,539 |
| | | | |
| **MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)** | | | |
| Title X - General Transfer Authority | [4,000,000] | | [4,000,000] |
| Title XV - Special Transfer Authority | [3,000,000] | | [3,000,000] |
| | | | |
| **MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)** | | | |
| Defense Production Act | [19,964] | | [19,964] |

## BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2012 is $702.9 billion, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. In addition to funding for programs addressed in this bill, the total 050 request includes discretionary funding for national defense programs not in the committee's jurisdiction, discretionary funding for programs that do not require additional authorization in fiscal year 2012, and mandatory programs.

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

## NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053** | **39,000** | | **39,000** |
| | | | |
| Other Discretionary Programs | 6,960,000 | -2,405,767 | 4,554,233 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054** | **6,960,000** | **-2,405,767** | **4,554,233** |
| **Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)** | **7,078,989** | **-2,405,767** | **4,673,222** |
| | | | |
| **Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary** | | | |
| Department of Defense--Military (051) | 670,956,451 | 1,095,029 | 672,051,480 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) | 18,123,980 | | 18,123,980 |
| Defense-Related Activities (054) | 6,960,000 | -2,405,767 | 4,554,233 |
| **Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary** | **696,040,431** | **-1,310,738** | **694,729,693** |
| | | | |
| **National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Estimates)** | | | |
| Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund | 5,408,000 | | 5,408,000 |
| Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory | 1,326,000 | | 1,326,000 |
| Offsetting receipts | -1,801,000 | | -1,801,000 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051** | **4,933,000** | | **4,933,000** |
| Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other | 1,344,000 | | 1,344,000 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053** | **1,344,000** | | **1,344,000** |
| Radiation exposure compensation trust fund | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| Payment to CIA retirement fund and other | 514,000 | | 514,000 |

## NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054** | **559,000** | | **559,000** |
| **Total National Defense Mandatory (050)** | **6,836,000** | | **6,836,000** |
| | | | |
| **Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory** | | | |
| Department of Defense--Military (051) | 675,889,451 | 1,095,029 | 676,984,480 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) | 19,467,980 | | 19,467,980 |
| Defense-Related Activities (054) | 7,519,000 | -2,405,767 | 5,113,233 |
| **Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory** | **702,876,431** | **-1,310,738** | **701,565,693** |

# DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

## TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

### OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $111.5 billion for procurement. This represents a $300.0 million increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommends authorization of $111.5 billion, a decrease of $68.3 million from the fiscal year 2012 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 procurement program are identified in division D of this Act.

### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

#### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $7.1 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $6.5 billion, a decrease of $513.9 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

#### Items of Special Interest

*Aerial Common Sensor*

The budget request contained $539.6 million for 18 C-12 aircraft to provide manned airborne intelligence, collection, processing, and targeting support.

The Army had planned to award a low-rate initial production contract for 50 percent of the total projected procurement in late fiscal year 2012. The program has experienced significant delays due to a number of factors, including development contract award protests, shortcomings in the award process, which the Army has taken responsibility for, and a subsequent delay in the development contract award.

The committee recommends $15.7 million, a decrease of $523.9 million, for the Aerial Common Sensor to provide manned airborne intelligence, collection, processing, and targeting support

*Airborne Reconnaissance Low*

The Airborne Reconnaissance Low (ARL) is a multifunction, day/night, all weather DHC-7 fixed-wing reconnaissance aircraft. The Army is evaluating options to modernize the ARL fleet. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to

provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on the current state of the ARL fleet, including reliability and maintainability within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report should also include a review of the options currently under consideration for major ARL modernization programs.

*Air filters for National Guard helicopters*

The committee notes that Inlet Barrier Filtration (IBF) and Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) filtration systems capture 99 percent of air particles, including grit and other abrasives that degrade and destroy the internal components of rotorcraft engines. The substantial cost savings in engine repair, overhaul, class 9 replacement parts, and maintenance labor have been well documented throughout the Army and Army National Guard (ARNG). The committee believes that installing IBF and APU filtration systems on these aircraft could reduce maintenance costs and increase readiness rates. The committee encourages the ARNG to fund IBF and APU filtration systems in the future.

*CH-47F Chinook helicopter*

The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the CH-47F Chinook helicopter includes funding for the fifth year of a 5-year multiyear procurement contract. The committee notes that this contract has provided stability to the program and savings to the taxpayer of over $450.0 million. In view of the continuing need for sustained procurement of the CH-47F, the Army's acquisition strategy calls for a second 5-year multiyear contract beginning in fiscal year 2013. The committee agrees with the Army strategy to continue procurement with substantial cost savings for the CH-47F, and encourages the Department of Defense to include a request for authority for a new multiyear contract in the fiscal year 2013 budget submission.

*UH-72A Lakota helicopter aircraft survivability equipment*

The budget request contained $250.4 million for procurement of 39 UH-72A Lakota helicopters.

The committee remains supportive of the UH-72A helicopter program. The committee notes that with over 150 aircraft now delivered to the Army on cost and within schedule, the UH-72A has proven to be a robust and efficient multirole platform. The committee understands that the UH-72A has a documented requirement for 210 helicopters to support domestic missions in “permissive” environments. The committee believes that there may be opportunities to leverage this aircraft to meet additional operational needs for the warfighter. However,

before this happens, the committee needs to understand how the Army defines "permissive" versus "non-permissive" environments. In addition the committee needs to understand what the associated survivability modifications would be required and if such modifications would be feasible, given size, weight, and power limitations, if the mission envelope of the UH-72A was expanded beyond "permissive" environments.

The committee recommends $250.4 million, the full amount requested, for procurement of 39 UH-72A Lakota helicopters.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $1.5 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.5 billion, a decrease of $14.5 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

## WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $1.9 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.4 billion, an increase of $427.5 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Abrams tank program National Guard modernization*

The budget request contained $181.3 million for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

The committee notes that the National Guard currently has six Heavy Brigade Combat Teams (HBCT) that consist of the Abrams M1A1 tank which is an analog based system and active duty HBCTs operate the more modern M1A2 tank which uses a digital system. The committee also notes that there are significant differences in capability, particularly for growth and survivability between the M1A1 and M1A2 SEP (version 2) that now is being produced under the current Multi-Year Procurement contract. The committee understands that under the

original Future Combat Systems (FCS) strategy, the Army planned to cascade the M1A2 tanks to the National Guard. However, as a result of the termination of the FCS program, the Army has yet to develop a plan to modernize the National Guard HBCT in the near term. Given the Army's top development project is currently the tactical "network," which requires a digital capability, the committee believes the National Guard needs the M1A2 tank in order to stay aligned with the Army's tactical network strategy.

The committee further notes that the Army must maintain the ability for its Heavy Brigade Combat Teams to overmatch any possible threat in the future. The committee is concerned that even with the funds requested for fiscal year 2012, the Abrams tank production would shut down in fiscal year 2013, and the Army is unsure that the production line and supporting industrial base would be available when it starts future upgrades to Abrams tanks in fiscal year 2016. The committee believes that the Army must rapidly accelerate future Abrams tank upgrades, or it must continue production of the most capable version of the M1 Abrams until the upgrade program begins. The committee believes that the most prudent course of action is to bridge the planned production gap with production of the most capable version of the M1 tank, the M1A2 system enhancement program version 2 (M1A2 SEPv2), at the most economical rate possible. The committee also believes that the cost of shutting down and then restarting the Abrams production line would be significant and may cost as much as it would to "pure fleet" the National Guard with the most modern version of Abrams tanks.

The committee recommends $453.3 million, an increase of $272.0 million, for the Abrams tank upgrade program to procure additional M1A2 SEPv2 tanks using the current multi-year contract, with the additional tanks being used to replace less capable versions of the M1 tank in the Army National Guard or prepositioned equipment sets.

*Bradley fighting vehicle program*

The budget request contained $250.7 million for the Bradley fighting vehicle (BFV) program.

The committee is concerned that despite these funds, Bradley fighting vehicle production will effectively shut down for as long as 2 years, and that the Army cannot be sure that the production line and supporting industrial base will be available when it plans to restart production of upgraded Bradley vehicles in the future. The committee notes that second-tier suppliers of key components are already shutting down or planning to do so in the near future. The committee believes that a more prudent course of action is to bridge the production gap with continued production of the most capable version of the Bradley fighting vehicle, the M2A3, or pursuit of an interim upgrade program for the existing M2A3 fleet. Should the Army choose to produce more M2A3's, the committee believes that the Army could provide these vehicles to the Army National Guard, elements of the

active Army not yet equipped with M2A3's, or prepositioned equipment sets. If the Army instead pursues an interim upgrade program for the current fleet of M2A3's, the committee encourages the Army to consider technology insertions to address vehicle power and survivability requirements.

The committee recommends, $403.7 million, an increase of $153.0 million, for the Bradley fighting vehicle program.

*M4 carbine product improvement program*

The budget request contained $25.1 million for M4 carbine modifications, of which $14.6 million was for the M4 carbine product improvement program (PIP).

The committee understands the M4/M4A1 carbine product improvement program is a multi-phased incremental program to enhance its reliability, durability, maintainability, sustained rate of fire, and ergonomics. The committee notes the M4 carbine PIP consists of two phases, composed of multiple increments within each phase. The committee is aware the program is not fully resourced to meet operational needs and has significant unfunded requirements across the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee supports this M4/M4A1 PIP effort and encourages the Army to pursue best value, full and open competition for each phase and increment to include commercial-off-the-shelf solutions. The committee also encourages the Secretary of the Army to adequately resource this effort.

The committee recommends $14.6 million, the full amount of the request, for the M4/M4A1 PIP effort.

*Stryker vehicles*

The budget request contained $685.8 million for procurement of 100 Stryker nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) reconnaissance vehicles and modifications to existing Stryker vehicles.

The committee is concerned about the unstable requirements and continually changing production plans for Stryker vehicles and modifications. The committee notes that in addition to the 100 vehicles requested in fiscal year 2012, the Army has validated unfunded requirements for 513 additional Stryker vehicles of various models. However, the committee notes that the Army now has in its inventory more than 400 Stryker vehicles in its ready-to-fight or depot repair cycle float fleets. The committee believes that increasing the size of the Stryker vehicle fleet beyond those vehicles that are resident in Stryker brigades is excessive. The Army should distribute or modify those Stryker vehicles to fulfill unmet validated requirements before increasing production of new Stryker vehicles beyond the 100 NBC reconnaissance variants requested in fiscal year 2012. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would limit the use of fiscal year 2012

procurement funds until the Secretary of the Army provides information clarifying the Army's future Stryker vehicle production plans.

The committee recommends $685.8 million, the full amount requested, for procurement of 100 additional Stryker NBC reconnaissance vehicles and modifications to existing Stryker vehicles.

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $2.0 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.0 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $9.7 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $9.5 billion, a decrease of $170.8 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Body armor investment strategy*

The committee notes that section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111- 84) required the Secretary of Defense to establish procurement line items and research and development program elements for body armor programs. The committee notes the Secretary of Defense has failed to establish procurement line items and as a result, the committee is concerned about the long term investment strategy for body armor. The committee understands that under the Department's existing budgetary policy, funding to procure body armor, clothing, and other personal protective gear is typically included in the Operation and Maintenance appropriations account and is categorized as an "expendable" item. The committee is aware that the O&M appropriation accounts allow for greater flexibility in funding based on dynamic annual program requirements. The committee also notes that establishing a separate, procurement line item would not prevent the Department from continuing to use the O&M appropriation for sustainment purposes or limit the military

departments' ability to use rapid acquisition authorities to ensure the fastest possible exploitation of body armor material improvements, production, or fielding.

The committee believes that establishing 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. Further, a long term investment strategy based on future requirement estimates could better position the body armor industrial base to rapidly respond to new threats or requirements as well as accelerate the amount of industry investment to further advancements in survivability and weight reduction.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to notify the congressional defense committees in writing beginning 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the actions being taken by the Department to comply with the creation of a procurement line item required by section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 or provide justification for having not complied with the requirement. The committee further directs the Under Secretary to review the current definition of "expendable items" and determine whether body armor should still be considered an expendable item rather than a program system and to report the findings to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

*Body armor requirements generation and weight reduction initiatives*

The committee believes body armor requirements for the military services should be coordinated through the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System process. The committee encourages the Joint Requirements Oversight Council to review and, if required, update the current body armor requirements document through capabilities based assessments that would clearly define current and future force requirements, particularly in the area of weight reduction versus protection. The committee notes that the tradeoff between protection capabilities and weight is a major cost driver in body armor procurements. The committee is aware that available technology has not been able to keep the body armor system within the users' desired weight without sacrificing performance.

The committee continues to recognize the critical importance of reducing the warfighters carrying combat load for current operations, specifically Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), and considers this a high priority issue. The committee notes that body armor, along with water and ammunition, make up most of an individual's equipment weight, and that most operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan are dismounted operations. The committee believes there should be greater urgency in providing appropriate levels of equipment to warfighters in OEF that would allow small unit commanders to better tailor mission equipment to effectively meet operational requirements. The committee believes the Department should incentivize the industrial base to achieve greater advancements in weight

reduction technology that could reduce the individual carrying combat load, most notably in body armor.

*Information management system for the National Guard*

The committee believes that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD CST) play an important role in support to civil authorities at a domestic Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High Explosive (CBRNE) incident site. The committee is aware that a tactical information management system has been fielded to the CST's to provide crucial command, control, and communications capabilities. The committee is also aware that in the event of such an incident, National Guard assets such as the CBRNE Enhanced Response Force Package and Homeland Defense Response Force units could deploy to support the CST's. Therefore, to ensure connectivity and unity of effort of all deployed National Guard assets, the committee encourages the National Guard Bureau to expand the CST information management system to these follow-on forces.

*Joint Tactical Radio System*

The budget request contained $775.8 million for the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) program. Of this amount, $204.8 million was for Ground Mobile Radio (GMR), $426.2 million was for Handheld, Manpack and Small Form Fit (HMS) radio, and $144.8 million was for Airborne and Maritime/Fixed (AMF) station radio.

The committee remains supportive of the JTRS program and understands that the Army has made progress in its tactical network strategy, of which JTRS is a key component. The committee supports the Army's plan to pursue non-proprietary waveforms, and its plan to conduct full and open competition during full- rate production.

The committee encourages the Army to pursue full and open competition of the HMS radios prior to full rate production, if feasible, to ensure the best product is available to the warfighter at the best price. Such acquisition and contracting must fit within the competition focused elements of the Secretary of Defense's efficiency initiatives.

The committee understands that the Army is likely to lower its current basis of issue of GMR radios for Brigade Combat Teams (BCT). In addition, when factoring in the fiscal year 2011 and 2012 requests the Army has requested procurement of almost 10 brigade sets of GMR radios. Therefore, elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would restrict the use of fiscal year 2012 procurement funds until the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees written certification that the acquisition strategy for full-rate production includes full and open competition. In addition, the

committee recommends a reduction in funds for GMR procurement due to a lack of clarity regarding the Army's overall requirements for GMR radios.

The committee recommends $716.0 million, a decrease of $35.8 million, for the JTRS GMR program, and a decrease of $24.0 million for the Maritime/Fixed station program.

*Light tactical vehicle investment strategy*

The budget request contained $161.6 million to recapitalize 1,362 high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWVs).

The committee understands the military services, in coordination with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, are continuing to update and refine their investment strategies for their respective light tactical wheeled vehicles (LTV) and continue to seek a balance of affordable capabilities across their light tactical vehicle (LTV) fleets. The committee notes the military services' LTV fleets consist primarily of unarmored and armored HMMWVs and will also include the future Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program. The committee understands that due to affordability concerns, the Army and the Marine Corps are planning to reduce their LTV fleets by approximately 15 percent and 25 percent, respectively, over the next five years. The committee understands the Army has acknowledged that a significant risk to their strategy is the availability of expected TWV procurement funds and as a result the committee has concerns over adequately maintaining the LTV industrial base.

The committee also understands that the Army and the Marine Corps both plan to competitively recapitalize their respective Up-Armor HMMWV (UAH) fleets with improvements to automotive performance and survivability in order to improve overall capability and extend life cycles. The committee is aware that the Army and the Marine Corps plan on retaining HMMWVs and UAHs in their inventories over the next 20 years and will use them extensively. The committee notes the competitive approach to improving the Army and the Marine Corps UAH fleets would be based on a best value, full and open competition beginning in fiscal year 2013 among public, private, and/or public-private partnerships. The committee supports this plan and encourages the Army and the Marine Corps to accelerate this program as a means to stabilize the LTV industrial base and provide a bridge to the JLTV program. The committee also expects the Army and the Marine Corps to coordinate on establishing joint requirements and resources for this program.

Further, the committee is aware of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's (DARPA) recent initiatives, in partnership with the Army and the Marine Corps, aimed at enhancing HMMWV survivability for the warfighter through the integration of "structural blast chimney" technology on original equipment manufacturer-produced HMMWVs. The committee understands DARPA is conducting ballistic, mobility, and reliability tests and that initial ballistic test results have indicated improvements to vehicle and warfighter survivability without increasing overall vehicle weight. The committee supports this effort and expects this technology would be considered, pending favorable test results, as part of the UAH competitive recapitalization program and would encourage the acceleration of this program.

The committee recommends $161.6 million, the full amount of the request, for the current HMMWV recapitalization program and encourages the Army and the Marine Corps to adequately resource and accelerate the UAH competitive recapitalization program.

*M915 line haul tractor trailer acquisition strategy*

The budget request contained $1.4 million for procurement of six M915 and M916 line haul tractor trailer trucks.

The committee notes the current $51.0 million funding profile for fiscal years 2011-16 would only procure 115 M915A5s. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to consider a full and open competition for any new future procurement should the M915 requirement increase. The committee also understands the Army Reserve has significant unfunded requirements for its M915 truck fleet and encourages the Secretary of the Army to develop courses of action that would accelerate meeting these requirements in a timely manner.

The committee recommends $1.4 million, the full amount of the request, for the procurement of six M915 and M916 line haul tractor trailer trucks.

*Tactical wheeled vehicle acquisition strategy*

The committee believes the sustainment of the tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) industrial base could be affected by many operational and affordability challenges across the Future Years Defense Program. The Army's current TWV acquisition strategy employs a near-term investment plan of just over $1.0 billion per year, slowly rising to approximately $2.5 billion per year through fiscal year 2025. The Secretary of the Army has indicated that these projected funding levels will not support continuation of the prior pace of TWV modernization, replacement, and recapitalization. In light of current budget constraints, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with industry, to jointly consider requesting multi-year contracting authority as a means to generate potential cost savings and sustain an efficient and cost effective TWV industrial base.

*Weapon light upgrades*

The budget request contained $156.2 million for Night Vision Devices. Of this amount, no funds were requested for upgrade kits for Millennium Universal (MU) series weapon lights.

The committee notes that the current Army inventory of approximately 100,000 MU series weapon lights incurs substantial cost to the Army due to battery replacement rates. The committee understands that retrofitting these weapon lights using the V-series KM4 upgrade kit, or other upgrade kits, may significantly reduce battery replacement demand, resulting in substantial annual savings to the Government. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to review

options for weapon light upgrade kits in order to determine if any meet requirements and could produce the substantial savings due to lower battery usage.

The committee recommends $156.2 million, the full amount of the request, for Night Vision Devices.

## JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $220.6 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The committee recommends authorization of $220.6 million, no change in the budget request, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Efforts to mitigate the improvised explosive device threat to dismounted operations*

The committee understands that the number of dismounted operations conducted by U.S. and coalition forces continue to rise in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee notes that although overall enemy improvised explosive device (IED) efficacy has decreased since October 2010, primarily due to early detection from dismounted forces, the severity of casualties increase when a dismounted IED effective attack occurs. The committee believes that efforts to mitigate the IED threat to dismounted forces should be a top priority for the Department of Defense.

The committee recognizes that many mitigation efforts are currently being developed and procured by the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) to counter the IED threat to dismounted forces. The committee also recognizes that a holistic approach is required that entails improved pre-deployment training, tactics, procedures, and availability of equipment to readily address capability gaps. The committee notes that JIEDDO is actively pursuing unmanned ground vehicles (UGVs) as a counter-IED solution to the IED threat to dismounted forces. The committee understands that JIEDDO has engaged industry and other Department of Defense agencies for potential UGV solutions that could be rapidly developed and fielded and encourages the aggressive pursuit to rapidly field a solution. The committee believes potential interim solutions would be operationally effective and should be considered for fielding, concurrent to pursuing a solution that meets and addresses all requirements as a means to mitigate the IED threat to dismounted forces.

*Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization*

The budget request contains $2.8 billion for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO).

The committee understands JIEDDO was established in February 2006 to "lead, advocate, and coordinate all DOD actions…to defeat IEDs as weapons of strategic influence." The committee expects improvised explosive devices (IEDs) to remain an enduring threat to U.S. forces. The committee notes that Congress has provided approximately $19.7 billion to JIEDDO to counter the IED threat and that JIEDDO has reported significant progress in the counter-IED (C-IED) fight in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and in the Republic of Iraq. For instance, the committee understands enemy IED efficacy in Afghanistan has decreased since October 2010. The committee commends JIEDDO's efforts to rapidly develop, procure, and field programs to mitigate the IED threat in response to urgent operational needs. To build on the considerable progress made, the committee, in collaboration with the Government Accountability Office, will continue to conduct oversight of JIEDDO's capability to effectively manage and evaluate C-IED programs.

The committee recommends $2.8 billion, the full amount of the request, for JIEDDO.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $18.6 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $18.6 billion, an increase of $4.5 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*V-22*

The budget request contained $2.2 billion for the procurement of V-22 aircraft.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is considering a follow-on multi-year procurement strategy for the V-22 program starting in fiscal year 2013. The multi-year procurement contract for fiscal years 2008-2012 provided stability to the program and savings of over $420.0 million compared to single-year contracts.

The committee notes that since 2007, the V-22 has performed 14 overseas deployments for the Marine Corps and Air Force Special Operations Forces in demanding environments under war time operational tempo, and understands that improvements in mission capable readiness rates across the fleet and decreases in costs per flight hour have been made as the aircraft has achieved its first 100,000 flight hours. The committee expects the Department of Defense to continue its focus on supply chain efficiency, maintenance best practices, and high reliability of select components in order to continue improvements to mission capable rates and decreased costs per flight hour. In view of the continuing need for sustained procurement of the V-22, the committee urges the Department of Defense to consider a request for authorization of a new multi-year procurement contract beginning in fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends $2.2 billion for the procurement of V-22 aircraft.

## WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $3.4 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.4 billion, an increase of $5.0 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $720.0 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $720.0 million, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Laser guided air-launched rockets*

The budget request contained $118.4 million for airborne rockets, all types. Of this amount, no funds were requested for upgrading 5-inch diameter unguided rockets into 5-inch precision laser guided rockets.

The committee is aware that the Marine Corps has requested through the universal urgent need statement process a laser guided 5-inch precision rocket to strike both fixed and moving targets effectively from tactical aircraft and rotorcraft. The committee is aware the Department of the Navy has performed successful test firings of 5-inch diameter laser guided rockets against both fixed and moving targets. The committee supports the Secretary of the Navy's actions to rapidly address this urgent operational need for the warfighter. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to continue to move aggressively to adequately fund, procure, and field a 5-inch precision laser-guided rocket through the rapid acquisition process in order to meet this urgent operational need.

The committee recommends $118.4 million for airborne rockets, all types.

## SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $14.9 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $14.9 billion, a decrease of $50.0 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.
Items of Special Interest

### Items of Special Interest

*Amphibious Assault Ship*

The budget request contained $2.0 billion for the detail design and construction of the amphibious assault ship designated LHA-7.

The delivery of the first ship of the America-class, LHA-6, has been significantly delayed. According to the Department of Defense "Selected Acquisition Report" of December 31, 2010, the delays are "due to changing conditions in the shipyard portfolio which are driving labor demands in various trades". These delays have had a cascading effect on LHA-7, which was scheduled to go on contract for detail design and construction in November 2010, but now the Navy estimates the contract will be delayed until the end of fiscal year 2011. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would authorize the Navy to conclude funding for LHA-7 in fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends $2.0 billion, a decrease of $50.0 million, for LHA-7.

*Navy Shipbuilding Program*

The budget request contained $14.9 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.

The committee is pleased that the Navy has turned around the downward spiral in battle force ship quantities, and the plan to achieve the floor of 313 ships appears to be achievable. To obtain the required capability and to provide the required stability to the fragile shipbuilding industrial base, the committee believes the following programs are crucial.

CVN-78 is the lead ship of the *Ford*-class of aircraft carriers. The committee was critical when the Navy changed construction starts of these carriers from 4-year to 5-year centers. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to keep these aircraft carriers on 5-year centers at the most, with fiscal year 2013 being the first year of detail design and construction funding for CVN-79. The committee believes one key to success in this program will be to minimize changes from ship to ship in the class.

The *Virginia*-class submarine program has proven itself to be a model shipbuilding program. Cost reduction efforts and ever-decreasing span time for construction and delivery allowed the Navy to fund two ships a year starting in fiscal year 2011, 1 year earlier than previously planned. The committee believes that modularity of payloads and open interfaces for its weapons systems, including electronic warfare, will improve capability while being more affordable. To continue to get the most efficiency from this program, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that advance procurement for the next block of *Virginia*-class submarines is funded to required levels.

Perhaps the most worrisome aspect of the shipbuilding program is that it will be difficult to fund and maintain the current plan once the Navy begins to acquire

replacements for the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine fleet. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, Navy officials suggested that there may be options to fund these boats outside of the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy account. The committee believes that the industrial teaming arrangement has been successful on the *Virginia*-class submarine program and would encourage the Secretary of the Navy to use the capabilities of both submarine shipbuilders in crafting an affordable acquisition strategy for the *Ohio*-class Replacement Program.

The re-start of the DDG-51 *Arleigh Burke*-class of destroyers is an important step in maintaining highly capable surface combatants in sufficient quantities, especially given the increased reliance on these ships to provide additional ballistic missile defense capabilities. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would grant multi-year procurement contract authority for these ships. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to continue pursuing an open architecture, data sharing approach to the maintenance and sustainability of existing weapons systems. This approach will allow for more competition and affordable upgrades.

The committee received testimony that the Marine Corps' requirement for amphibious ships is 38 ships, but that the number of ships that are absolutely necessary with acceptable risk is 33. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to continue pursuing a minimum of 33 amphibious ships.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $6.3 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $6.3 billion, an increase of $7.6 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

## PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $1.4 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.4 billion, an increase of $1.0 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $14.1 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $14.1 billion, an increase of $43.5 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*B-1 bomber aircraft force structure*

The committee understands that in fiscal year 2012 the Air Force plans to retire 6 B-1 bomber aircraft and reduce the current combat-coded force structure from 36 B-1 bomber aircraft down to 30. The committee supports the Air Force's plan to retire 6 B-1 bomber aircraft but does not support the plan to reduce the combat-coded force structure of B-1 bomber aircraft.

In a report titled "2007 Long-Range Strike White Paper" required by the committee report (S. Rept. 109-254) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the Air Force stated that 96 combat-coded bomber aircraft total (36 B-1s, 16 B-2s, and 44 B-52s) were required to meet combatant commander requirements until a next-generation long-range strike aircraft is fielded. Furthermore, the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review validated the requirement to maintain up to 96 combat-coded bomber aircraft.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would permit the Secretary of the Air Force to retire 6 B-1 bomber aircraft but would require the Secretary to maintain a combat-coded inventory of 36 B-1bomber aircraft. The committee is concerned that retirement of any B-1 aircraft is premature prior to a replacement long-range strike bomber aircraft reaching initial operational capability status.

*Common vertical lift support platform*

The budget request contained $52.8 million for procurement of two common vertical lift support platform (CVLSP) helicopters. The budget request also contained $5.4 million in title II of this Act for research, development, test, and evaluation activities associated with the CVLSP program.

The CVLSP program is a new start for fiscal year 2012 that would eventually procure 93 non-developmental helicopters to provide vertical lift support for nuclear weapons convoy escort, emergency security response, National Capitol Region transport, and other Air Force missions with improved speed, range, capacity, and survivability.

The committee notes that the Air Force plans to procure an in-production, non-developmental, government off-the-shelf, or commercial off-the-shelf aircraft for this purpose, and that the total development cost throughout the Future Years Defense Program is budgeted for $29.4 million. The committee expects the Department of the Air Force to adhere to this strategy to minimize development and procurement costs.

The committee recommends $52.8 million for procurement of two CVLSP helicopters and $5.4 million for research, development, test, and evaluation activities associated with the CVSLP program.

*Global Hawk*

The budget request contained $607.8 million for procurement of RQ-4 Global Hawk unmanned aerial systems (UAS).

The committee is aware this platform is a critical high-demand, low-density intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) asset that is being used extensively and effectively to perform critical missions in Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee also notes that this platform is being used effectively in global humanitarian and recovery operations. The committee supports the Global Hawk UAS program and should the Secretary of Defense determine that additional Global Hawk UAS are required, then the committee encourages using funds contained within this Act for the purposes of addressing those requirements.

The committee recommends $607.8 million, the full amount of the request, for Global Hawk UAS.

*Intra-theater and inter-theater airlift programs*

The budget request contained $396.8 million for C-17 modernization, $1.1 billion for the C-5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-engineering program, $141.3 million for procurement of 1 C-130H/J aircraft, $1.1 billion for procurement of 10 HC/MC/AC-130 aircraft, and $571.6 million for 9 C-27J aircraft.

The committee notes in regards to inter-theater airlift aircraft programs, the Secretary of the Air Force requested to repeal section 8062(g) of title 10, United States Code, which provides that the Secretary of the Air Force maintain a minimum inventory of 316 strategic inter-theater airlift aircraft. The committee does not support repeal and believes that a minimum inventory of 316 airlift aircraft provides a prudent balance of operational risk, affordability and sufficient organic capabilities in meeting the ever-increasing mobility requirements in support of the National Military Strategy and combat operations. The committee's rationale stems from concerns regarding the future viability of the Civil Reserve Airlift Fleet, the reliance of transporting oversize and outsize cargo using foreign aircraft leasing arrangements, the unforeseen over-utilization rates of the current

fleet of inter-theater airlift aircraft, the consistent under-estimation of deploying units Time-Phased Force and Deployment Data regarding the amount of equipment to support combat operations, and the Mobility Capability and Requirements Study does not address or characterize the operational risk in meeting combatant commander warfighting requirements or timelines.

The committee notes in regards to intra-theater airlift aircraft programs, that the Department of Defense continues to struggle with sufficiently, and comprehensively, analyzing and defining intra-theater airlift mobility requirements for active and reserve components, as well as National Guard units supporting both title 10 and title 32, United States Code, airlift mobility operations. The committee continues to believe that a reduction in the C-130H/J inventory from 395 to 335 aircraft, a reduction in the inventory of C-27J aircraft from 78 to 38, and a wholesale inventory reduction by the Army of 42 C-23 aircraft is unjustified, premature and based on insufficient analytics, and moreover, executed for budgetary reasons. Furthermore, the committee understands that neither the 2006 Mobility Capability Study or the 2010 Mobility Capability and Requirements Study did not comprehensively analyze all aspects of intra-theater airlift requirements in the mission areas of time sensitive-direct support, homeland security, Air Force and Army National Guard domestic airlift operations in support of contingencies resulting from natural disasters, humanitarian crises, emergencies, and combatant commander warfighting requirements. Unless the Department has analysis that indicates the original requirement for 78 C-27J aircraft is no longer valid, the committee supports the procurement of 9 C-27J aircraft in fiscal year 2012 and the acquisition of C-27Js in fiscal year 2013 and beyond to meet the requirements of the National Guard. Without a comprehensive analysis of the aforementioned mission areas, it is impossible to justify such a decrease in intra-theater airlift capabilities.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110-652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed concerns regarding theC-27J program. On April 29, 2011, the Secretary of the Air Force notified the committee that the program unit cost of the aircraft had grown from the April 2008 program baseline by $8.7 million per aircraft and the estimated operations and sustainment costs of the aircraft had grown by $1.5 billion, resulting in a significant Nunn-McCurdy breach. An aircraft quantity decrease of 78 to 38 total aircraft and an immature sustainment plan from the original program of record were primary contributing factors to the Nunn-McCurdy breach.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from retiring C-23 aircraft until one year after the Director of the National Guard, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commander, U.S. Northern Command, Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency submits an intra-theater airlift study to the

congressional defense committees that incorporates a comprehensive review of intra-theater airlift requirements for both title 10, United States Code, and title 32, United States Code operations. Lastly, if the intra-theater airlift requirements of the study are not sufficiently supported by the currently planned intra-theater airlift force structure of the Department of Defense, the committee encourages the Department to procure the most cost-effective and mission-effective airlift aircraft to meet requirements.

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $539.1 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $539.1 million, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2012

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $6.1 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $6.5 billion, an increase of $416.0 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $17.6 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $17.6 billion, a decrease of $6.0 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

## PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2012 contained $5.4 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $5.1 billion, a decrease of $218.2 million, for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Innovative titanium manufacturing processes*

The budget request contained $19.9 million for Defense Production Act purchases. Of this amount, no funds were requested for innovative titanium and titanium alloy manufacturing processes.

The committee notes a high strength-to-weight ratio and resistance to corrosion make titanium and titanium alloys a critical component of many military platforms. However, the conventional, highly energy intensive process for producing titanium can be costly and often require long lead times. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to invest in innovative titanium and titanium alloy manufacturing processes capable of producing high-quality, lower cost titanium products.

The committee recommends $19.9 million, the full amount of the request, for the Defense Production Act.

*Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal Defense*

The budget request contained $272.6 million for Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal Defense, and $8.5 million for Overseas Contingency Operations for a total of $281.1 million.

The committee notes that of this request, $110.0 million will support new procurements and program growth for aviation foreign internal defense.

The committee recommends $231.1 million, a decrease of $50.0 million, for Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal Defense.

*Special operations combatant craft systems*

The budget request contained $6.9 million for special operations combatant craft systems.

The committee notes that U.S. Special Operation Command's fleet of Naval Special Warfare Rigid Inflatable Boats (NSW RIB) will be drawn down through fiscal year 2017. The committee also notes that the Mk V platform will leave

service beginning in fiscal year 2012, and that the Combatant Craft Medium Mk1 (CCM Mk1) platform is projected to fill this important capability requirement for maritime special operations forces. However, the committee understands that delays in the CCM Mk1 program have created a capability gap in combatant craft that would potentially result in the number of available combatant craft falling below operational requirements, thus requiring a bridging strategy until the CCM Mk1 is fully fielded by fiscal year 2020. The committee believes this potential gap represents a serious national security concern as special operations forces are increasingly called upon to operate in a maritime environment.

Therefore the committee recommends $66.9 million, an increase of $60.0 million, for special operations combatant craft systems to satisfy critical maritime requirements and address the capability gap created as the NSW RIB and Mk V Special Operations Craft fleets retire.

*Special operations communications equipment and tactical radio systems*

The budget request contained $87.5 million for special operations communications equipment and electronics. The budget request also contained $76.5 million for special operations tactical radio systems.

The committee notes that military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and elsewhere are increasingly distributed and heavily reliant upon a robust communications infrastructure and capability. The communications requirements for special operations forces continue to grow at a rapid pace, reflecting the remote locations from which these forces operate, the close work with local security forces, and the expansion of the U.S. footprint in key areas throughout the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee recognizes the critical importance communications systems will have in supporting a successful military strategy and protecting U.S. forces.

Therefore, the committee recommends $150.3 million, an increase of $62.8 million, for special operations communications equipment and electronics to meet increased communications requirements for special operations forces. In addition, the committee recommends $101.5 million, an increase of $25.0 million for special operations tactical radio systems to meet increased tactical communications requirements for special operations forces.

*Standard missile-3 interceptors*

The budget request contained $565.4 million for procurement of Aegis ballistic missile defense (BMD) for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The request would support the production of 46 standard missile-3 (SM-3) Block IB interceptors for delivery in fiscal year 2014. The fiscal year 2011 budget request included plans by MDA to procure 66 SM-3 Block IB interceptors in fiscal

year 2012. However, the budget request procures 20 less SM-3 Block IB interceptors than previously planned.

The SM-3 Block IB is a fundamental element of the President's phased, adaptive approach (PAA) to missile defense in Europe and in other geographic regions. In particular, sufficient inventories of SM-3 Block IB interceptors are necessary by 2015 to meet the President's planned deployment of phase 2 of the European PAA, to include a planned inventory of 36 Aegis BMD ships and an Aegis Ashore site in Romania. However, as noted in the February 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review "demand for U.S. BMD assets is likely to exceed supply for some years to come."

The committee is concerned that the current procurement plan for SM-3 interceptors is insufficient to meet the deployment plans of the PAA. At the same time, the committee seeks to ensure the SM-3 Block IB interceptor is sufficiently tested prior to MDA's planned ramp-up in interceptor production.

MDA has delayed the first SM-3 Block IB flight test until August 2011 to allow the Aegis BMD program office to resolve ongoing technical issues with the divert and attitude control system in the interceptor kill vehicle. In March 2010, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the "Aegis BMD program is putting the SM-3 Block IB at risk for cost growth and schedule delays by planning to begin manufacturing in 2010 before its critical technologies have been demonstrated in a realistic environment." In March 2011, GAO reported that MDA agreed to delay the start of SM-3 Block IB manufacturing until the Block IB had been successfully flight tested, consistent with its recommendations.

The committee expects that MDA will only allocate additional funding for SM-3 Block IB production in fiscal year 2012 if the first flight test is successful. Should the planned SM-3 Block IB flight testing be further delayed or technical issues remain unresolved, the committee would consider a reallocation of these funds to procure additional SM-3 Block IA interceptors.

The committee recommends $615.4 million, an increase of $50.0 million, for Aegis ballistic missile defense to procure additional SM-3 Block IB interceptors.

*Terminal High Altitude Area Defense*

The budget request contained $833.2 million for procurement of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) procurement for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The budget request would support the procurement of 68 interceptors, a fifth THAAD battery consisting of 6 launchers, and one Tactical Station Group. The fiscal year 2011 budget request of $858.9 million included plans by MDA to procure 67 THAAD interceptors, a fourth THAAD battery consisting of 6 launchers, and additional launchers for batteries 1-3. However, technical issues associated with a safety component in the interceptor resulted in a production stop and delayed contract award. As a result, the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing

Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) decreased THAAD procurement by $272.0 million, and only 22 of the planned 67 interceptors were procured. Additionally, MDA expects to procure fewer launchers in fiscal year 2011 than initially planned.

The THAAD missile defense system is a fundamental element of the President's phased, adaptive approach (PAA) to missile defense in Europe and a regional missile defense capability required by several combatant commanders. However, as noted in the February 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, "demand for U.S. BMD assets is likely to exceed supply for some years to come." According to MDA, the Army has requested that each THAAD battery comprise 6 launchers per battery rather than the currently funded configuration of three launchers per battery. Additionally, the total procurement objective of 503 THAAD interceptors, which is consistent with the recommendations from the 2007 Joint Capability Mix-II study, has been deferred beyond the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee is concerned that the reduction in THAAD launcher and interceptor procurement funds in fiscal year 2011 will create a ripple effect in future years of fewer quantity procurements and delayed deliveries. MDA plans to ramp-up THAAD interceptor production from 22 in fiscal year 2011, to 68 in fiscal year 2012, to near 68 interceptors per year in fiscal years 2013-2016. However, the committee understands that this increase is limited by a current manufacturing capacity of four interceptors per month. A manufacturing capacity of six interceptors per month would support MDA's planned production increase, but would require additional tooling and test equipment.

The committee recommends $883.2 million, an increase of $50.0 million, for Terminal High Altitude Area Defense procurement to procure additional launchers and tooling and test equipment to support the Missile Defense Agency's planned ramp-up in interceptor production.

*Transition of non-lethal weapons*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee noted the increasing importance of non-lethal weapons (NLW) use in reducing non-combatant casualties and in meeting escalation of force requirements. Additionally, the Department has affirmed the need for NLW and the useful contributions NLW make to meeting military objectives across the operational spectrum.

Despite the Department's statements supporting the development and employment of NLWs, the committee remains concerned that the Department has not taken adequate steps to transition NLW research and development efforts of the Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Program and the individual service NLW programs to specific procurement lines within the services. The committee believes the inadequate linkage between the development of NLW capabilities and the

procurement and subsequent fielding of NLWs negatively impacts warfighter training with and use of NLWs.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military departments to clearly identify a procurement account for NLW line items in their future year budget submissions. The committee's oversight of the Department's NLW investments is limited due to the lack of clear data on NLW budgets and programs, as programs are often grouped in multiple categories and are often contained in multiple service line items.

The committee encourages the Department to continue its efforts to improve the development and fielding of NLWs, and to address the concerns raised in the April 2009 Government Accountability Office report 09-344 titled, "DOD Needs to Improve Program Management, Policy, and Testing to Enhance Ability to Field Operationally Useful Non-Lethal Weapons."

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations

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

### SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

#### Section 111—Limitation on Retirement of C-23 Aircraft

This section would limit the Secretary of the Army from retiring C-23 aircraft until 1 year after the Director of the National Guard, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commander, U.S. Northern Command, Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency submits an intra-theater airlift study to the congressional defense committees that incorporates a comprehensive review of intra-theater airlift requirements for both title 10, United States Code, and title 32, United States Code, operations. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the report.

#### Section 112—Limitation on Procurement of Stryker Combat Vehicles

This section would limit the procurement of Stryker Combat Vehicles to not more than 100 vehicles unless the Secretary of the Army submits a waiver.

#### Section 113—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Airframes for Army UH-60M/HH-60M Helicopters and Navy MH-60R/MH-60S Helicopters

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter a multiyear procurement contract in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, for up to 5 years for UH-60M/HH-60M helicopter airframes and, acting as the executive agent for the Department of the Navy, for MH-60R/S airframes.

## SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

### Section 121—Multiyear Funding for Detail Design and Construction of LHA Replacement Ship Designated LHA-7

This section would amend section 111 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) by adding a third year of multiyear authority to fully fund the LHA-7. Instead of just fiscal years 2011-12, this section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to also fund the ship in fiscal year 2013.

### Section 122—Multiyear Funding for Procurement of Arleigh Burke-Class Destroyers

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement of *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers beginning with the fiscal year 2012 program year. The Secretary is required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, 30 days prior to contract award, containing the findings required by subsection (a) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

### Section 123—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Mission Avionics and Common Cockpits for Navy MH-60R/S Helicopters

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into one or more multiyear procurement contracts in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, for up to 5 years for MH-60R/S mission avionics and common cockpits.

### Section 124—Separate Procurement Line Item for Certain Littoral Combat Ship Mission Modules

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a separate, dedicated procurement line for each of the primary three mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) commencing with the budget request for fiscal year 2013. Currently, LCS mission modules are in one procurement line in Other Procurement, Navy. The three primary mission modules are for Surface Warfare, Mine Countermeasures, and Anti-Submarine Warfare. Three distinct lines would allow the committee to have visibility into the quantity of each type of module and the cost of each type of module that is being requested each year. This section also

would require that any classified mission modules or components of the modules be included in the classified annex to the budget request.

### Section 125—Life-Cycle Cost-Benefit Analysis on Alternative Maintenance and Sustainability Plans for the Littoral Combat Ship Program

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a life-cycle cost-benefit analysis comparing alternative maintenance and sustainability plans for the Littoral Combat Ship program in accordance with the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-94, to be delivered to the congressional defense committees with the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2013.

With the commissioning of the USS *Freedom* and USS *Independence*, the Navy is now in a position to develop a maintenance and sustainability concept for these ships, which will eventually comprise a large percentage of the fleet.

### Section 126—Limitation on Availability of Funds for F/A-18 Service Life Extension Program

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2012 or any fiscal year thereafter for a program to extend the life of F/A-18 aircraft beyond 8,600 hours until a date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Navy submits to the congressional defense committees the report under section 114(a)(2) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

## SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

### Section 131—B-1 Bomber Force Structure

This section would allow the Secretary of the Air Force to retire 6 B-1 bomber aircraft, but would require the Secretary to maintain a combat-coded inventory of 36 B-1 bomber aircraft and requisite number of training and testing aircraft to support 36 combat-coded aircraft.

### Section 132—Procurement of Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellites

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a fixed price contract to procure two Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellites, authorize incremental funding of the two AEHF satellites over a period not to exceed five years, and establish a limitation on the total funds to be obligated and expended for the procurement. This section would also require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on contract

details, cost savings, and plans for reinvesting the cost savings into capability improvements for future blocks of AEHF satellites.

The Air Force proposes to procure two AEHF satellites over seven years using advanced appropriations authority as part of its new Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency (EASE) approach to space acquisition. The Air Force believes a block buy of two satellites can drive down costs, improve stability in the space industrial base, and allow for investments in technology that will lower risk for future programs. However, such an approach, if fully funded in a single fiscal year, would consume a large portion of the overall space budget and negatively impact other mission-critical programs.

While the committee supports the objectives of EASE, it has reservations about its implementation. The committee does not support the request for advanced appropriations authority and notes that such authority has not been provided to the Department in the past and would limit the oversight ability of future Congresses. The committee is aware of Air Force plans to begin advanced procurement of additional AEHF satellites starting in fiscal year 2016, and the committee believes incremental funding for one block of satellites should be completed before procurement of additional satellites. Therefore, the committee recommends incremental funding authority over a period not to exceed five years for the procurement of the two AEHF satellites.

The committee expects the Air Force to realize substantial savings from the EASE block buy approach, enabled by a fixed-price contract and fixed requirements. The committee also expects the Air Force to reinvest any savings into a capability insertion program, which is addressed in another section of the report, where research and development activities are competitively awarded and new technologies are matured for insertion into future blocks of AEHF satellites or other military communications satellites. Further, the committee believes that the EASE approach must be viewed as a longer-term strategy for space acquisition to fully realize the benefits of the capability insertion program and to provide longer-term stability in the industrial base.

The committee understands that the Air Force intends to apply the EASE approach to the procurement of Space-Based Infrared satellites in the fiscal year 2013 budget request. The committee discourages the use of advanced appropriations in future budget requests.

## SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

### Section 141—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would require the Director, Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization to continue to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund that details the monthly commitments, obligations, and expenditures by lines of operation.

Section 142—Contracts for Commercial Imaging Satellite Capacities

This section would repeal section 127 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

While the committee believes that commercial imagery satellites are becoming a key part of the overhead imagery architecture, it does not believe Congress should prescribe a specific minimum telescope aperture size for commercial imagery satellites that the U.S. Government does not own or operate. Rather, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to work with commercial imagery providers to communicate its capability requirements and allow the commercial providers to offer their technical proposals on how best to meet the requirements.

Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Acquisition of Joint Tactical Radio System

This section would limit the obligation of funds of the Joint Tactical Radio System to not more than 70 percent of the requested amount until the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees written certification that the acquisition strategy for full rate production includes full and open competition.

Section 144—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program

This section would require a report outlining U.S. Special Operations Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal Defense programs and strategies. This section would also prohibit U.S. Special Operations Command from obligating more than 50 percent of the funds available for fiscal year 2012 for procurement of fixed wing non-standard aviation platforms until the required report has been submitted to the congressional defense committees.

Section 145—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Commercial Satellite Procurement

This section would prohibit the Defense Information Systems Agency and the Air Force from obligating more than 20 percent of the funds available for fiscal year 2012 for commercial satellite procurement until the Secretary of Defense provides an independent assessment of the acquisition strategy.

Section 146—Separate Procurement Line Item for Non-Lethal Weapons Funding

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a dedicated procurement line item in future defense budget submissions for non-lethal weapons (NLW). The committee expects that each line item description will identify the

specific programs for which funds are being requested; provide summary justification for the program; identify whether the program is a joint or service-specific initiative; and the amount of funding provided during the past fiscal year. The committee also expects the Department to provide similar information for all budget requests for research, development, test and evaluation for NLWs.

# TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $75.3 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation.

The committee recommends $75.6 billion, an increase of $255.9 million to the budget request.

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request contained $9.7 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army. The committee recommends $9.8 billion, an increase of $82.0 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 research, development, test, and evaluation, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Active protection systems technology development*

The committee continues to believe that active protection systems (APS) will be a critical component of all future Army and Marine Corps combat vehicles including both tracked and wheeled platforms, due to the anticipated advances in threats, such as missiles, mines, improvised explosive devices, and rocket-propelled grenades. The committee notes that section 216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), required the Department of Defense to conduct a series of tests of available APS systems, to inform future APS research or procurement decisions. The committee understands that the last of these systems will complete testing in the summer of 2011. The committee notes that several of the systems tested were developed, in part, using Department of Defense research and development funds from the Future Combat Systems program. The other systems tested were foreign or commercially-developed.

The committee believes that the investments in sensor and interception APS technologies to-date should not wasted. The committee notes that future upgrades of Abrams tanks, Bradley Fighting Vehicles, Amphibious Assault Vehicles, as well as new vehicles such as the Ground Combat Vehicle, will likely require the incorporation of APS technology in order to achieve future survivability requirements. For those and other vehicles, the committee encourages the leveraging of effective APS technologies that were developed with past Department

of Defense funding, if they meet requirements and are affordable. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2012, that describes the results of the APS testing conducted under section 216 of Public Law 110-181. The report should also identify government-developed APS technologies that could be used to equip combat vehicles and all funds that have been allocated in fiscal year 2013 and beyond to further develop and field these technologies.

*Armed Deployable Helicopter*

The budget request contained $166.1 million in PE 64220A for the Armed Deployable Helicopter program. Of this amount, $87.4 million was requested for the Kiowa Warrior program and $78.7 million was requested for the Armed Scout Helicopter (ASH) program.

The committee notes that the phase II analysis of alternatives for the follow-on effort to the terminated Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter program has not been completed and that this program does not yet have firm requirements or an approved acquisition strategy.

The committee recommends $43.2 million, a decrease of $35.5 million, in PE 64220A for the ASH program.

*Army science and technology management*

The committee recognizes the critical contributions the science and technology community makes to providing the military with technological capabilities needed to address future military challenges. Innovative technology, weapon systems, and other equipment are critical for the Nation to meet challenges presented by 21st Century asymmetrical conflict. The committee believes that Department of Defense systems are more integrated now than 10-years ago, but these defense systems must maintain a high level of jointness to comply with a common operating environment and ensure interoperability.

The committee is concerned that the recent Army decision to disestablish the Research Development and Engineering Command (RDECOM) on the basis of efficiency neglects the effectiveness of the organization to protect longer term science and technology (S&T) investments and to ensure integrated and interoperable technology systems. Without a unified voice and high level advocate on behalf of Army S&T, the committee is concerned that the contributions of the S&T community will largely be overlooked or ignored.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to deliver a report to the congressional defense committee within 150 days after enactment of this Act. This report should include an analysis of the efficiencies to be gained through the disestablishment of RDECOM compared to the status quo, as well as a description

of how the new management structure will maintain oversight, coordination and integration of Army S&T planning and execution.

*Bioinformatics initiative*

The committee remains committed to military medical research directed to pressing needs validated by the Surgeons General. The committee is aware that the Army is developing advanced medical information systems in conjunction with established university research partners. The committee supports the Army's efforts to develop further and expand the utility of bioinformatics tools for Department of Defense missions.

Among the goals for Army bioinformatics research are the creation of an information hub for all Army medical genomic and proteomic partners that will allow collaboration among the funded sites to promote sharing of clinical data, bio-specimens and research data; the development of a systems biology analytical team to identify therapeutic and diagnostic targets for both preventative and predictive medicine as well as key areas of bio-surveillance and bioterrorism threat detection; a fully developed capability that will integrate semantically standardized electronic medical record data to generate datasets of longitudinal clinical information from diverse sources with personally identifiable information removed; the capability to support advanced predictive modeling and comparative effectiveness research on therapy for diseases of military importance; and, bioinformatics and bio-statistical support for advanced analysis of the large data sets produced by Government and university research partners.

*Development of personnel protection equipment for female soldiers*

The budget request contained $19.5 million for soldier systems-advanced development. Of this amount, $1.8 million was requested for soldier protective equipment efforts to evaluate integrated technologies that help expedite individual soldier ballistic protection.

The committee understands that the Army is comprised of 14 percent women. The committee has heard concerns from a number of service women who are deployed in Operation New Dawn (OND) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) that due to the physical differences between service men and women the current interceptor body armor system's design may not be as ergonomically effective for the female body type. The female soldiers in communication with the committee noted issues of restriction and discomfort and suggested this could impact their operational effectiveness. The committee notes that the current counter-insurgency and dismounted operations in OND and OEF place service women in direct combat action with the enemy. The committee believes there is merit in conducting an evaluation as to whether there is an operational need to

tailor interceptor body armor (IBA) systems fielded to service women specifically for the physical requirements of women.

The committee understands the Army's Natick Soldier Systems Center (NSSC) is currently pursuing several programs to improve upon organizational clothing and individual equipment for soldiers to include female soldiers. The committee notes the NSSC is evaluating the operational benefit for developing a separate, female combat uniform for female soldiers to include body armor. The committee understands the NSSC is conducting a female sizing study for improved outer tactical vests and should finalize patterns and deliver prototypes by the conclusion of fiscal year 2012. Further, the committee is aware that the NSSC has a science and technology program called "Improved Geometry and Sizing for Ballistic Plates" that includes efforts to ergonomically improve the current IBA for female soldiers. The committee commends the Army for acknowledging this issue and encourages the acceleration of these efforts to help determine the most effective organizational clothing and individual equipment, to include body armor and associated components, for military service women.

The committee recommends $19.5 million, the full amount of the request, for soldier systems-advanced development.

*Ground Combat Vehicle*

The budget request contained $884.4 million in PE 65625A for the Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) program.

The committee understands that in order to capture lessons learned from the terminated Future Combat Systems (FCS) program the Army established a red team to solicit recommendations that would benefit the GCV program. The red team questioned the urgency of the need for the GCV within the 7-year schedule. The red team reported that the funds that migrated from the terminated FCS program were driving the urgency of the 7-year schedule, rather than a true capabilities gap. The committee understands that the red team concluded that the Army should either moderately improve an existing vehicle within the 7-year timeframe or spend the time necessary to develop a new vehicle. Because the red team's analysis was performed before the Army revised its requirements for the current GCV program, the committee believes that another red team assessment should be conducted to examine whether the changes to the GCV requirements are sufficient to place it on a path to success within a 7-year timeframe.

In addition, the committee notes that the Army's initial analysis of alternatives compared the GCV design to a broad set of alternatives, including the current and upgraded Bradley Fighting Vehicle. The analysis was based on combat modeling and other quantitative evaluations that found the original GCV design to be more advantageous than the alternatives in various categories, including lethality and survivability, but it presented a high-affordability risk at a cost of over $18.0 million per vehicle. Consequently, the Army updated its analysis and

reconsidered the design, making substantial trades to achieve a lower cost vehicle. The revised GCV design eliminated immature technologies and reduced the estimated cost to $10.5 million per vehicle. The Army's updated analysis was based in large part on qualitative assessments conducted by subject matter experts, rather than the more rigorous methodology used in the original analysis. In addition, the updated analysis did not compare the new GCV design with the original range of alternatives, but only with the unimproved Bradley. The committee believes the new design has substantial changes that may impact survivability and lethality and should be compared to the full range of alternatives and evaluated using the same methodology as the original design.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would restrict the use funds fiscal year 2012 until the Secretary of the Army provides an updated analysis of alternatives to the congressional defense committees that includes a quantitative comparison of the current upgraded Bradley Fighting Vehicle and other alternatives, against the revised GCV design concept. In addition, the committee encourages the Army to establish another red team prior to the milestone B review to assess the cost, schedule, and technical risks of the GCV acquisition strategy.

The committee recommends $884.4 million, the full amount requested in PE 65625A for the GCV program.

*Improved Turbine Engine Program*

The budget request contained $62.1 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology.

The committee supports the Army's Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP). The investment in ITEP would provide a more fuel efficient and powerful engine for the current Black Hawk and Apache helicopter fleets. The committee notes that ITEP has been identified by the Army to power the next-generation Joint Multi-Role aircraft. The committee believes it is important that the Army's ITEP acquisition strategy include full and open competition. The committee also believes it is important that the ITEP program baseline establishes a competitive acquisition strategy into Engineering Manufacturing and Development and validates operational performance with a flight demonstration prior to making a production decision. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to provide an update to the congressional defense committees on the acquisition strategy to maintain competition through flight demonstration.

The committee recommends $62.1 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology.

*Joint Light Tactical Vehicle*

The budget request contained $251.1 million in PE 64804A for Logistics and Engineer Equipment-SDD. Of this amount, $172.1 million was requested for the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program. The budget request also contained $79.8 million in PE 63635M for Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support System. Of this amount, $71.8 million was requested for the JLTV program.

The committee understands the JLTV program is expected to replace at least one-third of the Army and Marine Corps light tactical vehicle fleet beginning in calendar year 2016. The committee understands the Army and Marine Corps have taken a knowledge-based approach to development of the JLTV by investing in the Technology Development phase, which includes a focus on early testing of prototypes. The committee understands that initial test results indicate that the JLTV program may face many operational and technical challenges. The committee notes that cost estimates are not yet available but base vehicle costs have recently been projected to be at least $350,000 per vehicle. Further, the committee understands that the JLTV program schedule has been delayed four months and notes the milestone B decision has slipped from October 2011 to January 2012 in order to refine the program's capabilities development document. In addition, the milestone C decision has already slipped 17 months as a result of potential increased development engineering efforts and is now expected in January 2016. The committee believes that there must be a clear match between the JLTV program's requirements and resources, and believes that this will be a challenge given fiscally constrained budget environments.

The committee recommends $147.1 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, in PE 64804A, and $46.8 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, in PE 63635M for the JLTV program.

*Medium Extended Air Defense System*

The budget request contained $406.6 million in PE 64869A for the Patriot/Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Combined Aggregate Program.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee explains its concerns about the MEADS program and includes a provision that would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds made available for MEADS in fiscal year 2012 until the Secretary of Defense either negotiates a multilateral termination of the MEADS contract or restructures the MEADS program. The limitation would also require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees written notification on several elements.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) provides the program with the full fiscal year 2011 budget request of $467.1 million. The committee would support the use of these funds, in addition to any funds made available in fiscal year 2012, for costs associated with multilateral termination of the MEADS

contract. Should the Secretary further restructure the MEADS program, the committee encourages the Secretary to immediately identify and harvest promising MEADS technologies, whether U.S. or partner-developed, transition those technologies into a Patriot air and missile defense system upgrade effort or other viable program of record, and adequately resource that approach.

The committee recommends this reduction on the premise that the Department is able to negotiate a multilateral contract termination where the U.S. cost share is approximately 58 percent, consistent with the cost share agreement in the 2004 MEADS memorandum of understanding, or further restructure the program.

The committee recommends $257.1 million, a decrease of $149.5 million, in PE 64869A for the MEADS program.

*Nett Warrior*

The budget request contained $48.3 million in PE 64827A for Soldier Systems development. Of this amount, $25.5 million was requested for the Nett Warrior, Increment 1 development program.

The committee understands the Nett Warrior, Increment 1 program is intended to provide an integrated dismounted leader situational awareness system for use during combat operations. The system would also provide information and data to the dismounted leader, allowing for faster and more accurate decisions in the tactical fight, while simultaneously reducing fratricide. The committee notes that Increment 1 will use technically mature systems, including radios and communication software, with program risk limited to the integration of the systems. The committee is aware the program is already 3 months behind schedule because of integration and weight challenges and that the current program requirements are not stable.

Therefore, the committee recommends $17.9 million, a decrease of $7.6 million, in PE 64827A for the Nett Warrior, Increment 1 program.

*Precision artillery munitions acquisition strategy*

The budget request contained $42.6 million in PE 64814A for continued Excalibur development and $13.8 million in PE 64802A for continued Precision Guidance Kit (PGK) test and evaluation. The budget request also contained $69.1 million for procurement of M982 Excalibur artillery munitions but contained no funding for the PGK program.

The committee is aware the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army conducted a Capability Portfolio Review (CPR) for Precision Fires in 2010 which resulted in a significant decrease in the quantity of Excalibur rounds in favor of investment in the PGK program. The committee recognizes that the Excalibur 1B round, scheduled to begin procurement in fiscal year 2012, is more expensive than the

projected cost of the PGK. However, the committee notes that there appears to be significant differences in the accuracy performance between the precision Excalibur round and the near-precision PGK system in that the Excalibur system significantly outperforms the PGK system.

The committee understands that since the Army concluded its CPR, the Excalibur round has continued to be successfully fired in Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom against multiple targets. The Excalibur program was also recertified as essential to national security following a Nunn-McCurdy review triggered by the decrease in procurement quantity from the CPR. The committee notes the PGK program has encountered continued reliability problems with a greater than 3-year delay, prompting the Army to delay PGK full-rate production from October 2010 to November 2012. The committee is concerned about these developments and believes the Army should revisit its mix of artillery munitions that could include an increase in the requirement for Excalibur precision guided rounds.

Therefore, the committee recommends $3.8 million, a decrease of $10.0 million, in PE 64802A, for the PGK program.

*Status of Future Combat Systems contract actions*

The committee notes that the Army has terminated the Future Combat Systems (FCS) and Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team (EIBCT) development activities after spending approximately $20.0 billion since 2003. The committee understands that the Army has chosen to continue development of multiple legacy FCS systems and capabilities within various funding lines, although precisely which efforts the Army is continuing is still unclear. The committee understands that the termination of these two major programs has resulted in extensive contract termination negotiations with the prime contractor and its subcontractors, which has an associated cost and timeframe. The committee believes that in order for Congress to make informed funding decisions, the Army must provide an accounting of the FCS legacy efforts that it expects to continue, as well as cost and schedule projections for closing out the original FCS and EIBCT development contracts. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2012 that shows all current and projected funding in regards to FCS legacy efforts. The report should include the status of all terminated and pending contract actions resulting from the termination of the FCS and EIBCT programs.

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request contained $18.0 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy. The committee recommends $18.0 billion, an increase of $51.7 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Defense University Research Instrumentation Program*

The budget request contained $18.9 million in PE 61103N for the Defense University Research Instrumentation Program.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense and the military services execute a program known as the Defense University Research Instrumentation Program (DURIP). DURIP funds are used for the acquisition of major equipment to augment current or develop new research capabilities in support of defense relevant research.

The committee understands that DURIP proposals are typically limited to $50,000 to $1.0 million, but that waivers may be granted for larger awards. The committee believes that these award levels have remained static for more than 15 years, without regard to inflation and the increasing costs associated with technologically sophisticated equipment. As it is vital for cutting edge research to be supported by cutting edge instrumentation, the committee encourages the Department and the military services to make greater use of waivers to ensure that there are adequate resources available to support the instrumentation needs of the research community.

The committee recommends $28.9 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 61103N to provide for additional competitive DURIP awards.

*Expeditionary Fire Support System Precision Extended Range Munition*

The budget request contained $209.4 million in PE 26623M for Marine Corps ground combat support research and development. Of this amount, $12.2 million was requested for the Expeditionary Fire Support System (EFSS) Precision Extended Range Munition (PERM) program.

The committee understands the EFSS PERM program is part of the EFSS mortar system program. The EFSS PERM was originally intended as a sole source development effort, but is now being transitioned to full and open competition for demonstration, qualification and production and that a request for proposals is expected to be released in fiscal year 2012. The committee notes that the EFSS

120mm mortar system could be capable of firing the Army Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative (APMI) round, which would offer dismounted infantrymen and Marines similar performance to the proposed EFSS PERM round. The committee also notes that the PERM round will not achieve low-rate initial production until fiscal year 2015 and that the Army APMI round has already begun fielding. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Marine Corps conduct a comprehensive Cost and Operational Effectiveness Analysis prior to beginning a new development program for the EFSS PERM round.

The committee recommends $12.2 million for the EFSS PERM program.

*Joint Expeditionary Fires Analysis of Alternatives*

In March 2010, the Secretary of the Navy submitted a report to Congress on Naval Surface Fire Support as directed by the conference report (H. Rept. 111-288) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. This report includes comments and recommendations from both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. In the report, the Commandant states that the Marine Corps concurs with the findings of the Joint Expeditionary Fires Analysis of Alternatives (AOA). In the report to Congress, however, the Secretary of the Navy did not address the results of this AOA.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit the Joint Expeditionary Fires Analysis of Alternatives to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

*Naval gunfire support*

The committee is concerned about the Department of the Navy's lack of progress in developing Naval Surface Fires in support of Marine Corps operating forces. While the committee is aware of the Navy's earlier efforts in this area that ended in terminated programs, the requirement still exists and the Navy's own Fire Support Analysis of Alternatives recommends the development of a 5-inch guided projectile. The committee expects the establishment of a program to develop this capability. In testimony before the committee in recent years, the Marine Corps has repeated the immediate need to fill the requirement for Naval Surface Fires. The current security environment, the truncation of the DDG-1000 program to three ships, and the proposed termination of the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle program add urgency to the need for this capability. The committee encourages the Navy to address this long neglected capability deficit by assessing, through a competitive demonstration, the capabilities of existing technology to meet the Navy and Marine Corps requirements in the fiscal year 2013 timeframe.

*Navy remotely piloted demonstration and strike aircraft programs*

The budget request contained $198.3 million in PE 64402N for the Unmanned Combat Air System (UCAS) technology demonstration program, and $121.2 million in PE 64404N for the Future Unmanned Carrier-based Strike System (FUCSS) program.

The committee supports the Chief of Naval Operations' stated desire to investigate the feasibility of sea-basing unmanned, low-observable aircraft on aircraft carriers to potentially provide intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and limited strike capabilities. However, the committee is concerned with the Navy's current execution strategy for both programs.

In fiscal year 2011, the UCAS program experienced an over-target baseline breach because the original schedule was too aggressive and the level of effort required to demonstrate UCAS goals was underestimated by Navy officials. Furthermore, the UCAS program is not planning to demonstrate an aircraft carrier landing until late in fiscal year 2013 and is not planning to demonstrate autonomous aerial-refueling until late in fiscal year 2014. Both are critical capabilities and necessary precursors for informing subsequent FUCSS feasibility and development.

The committee's concerns include: the Navy plans not to accomplish a thorough FUCSS analysis of alternatives; the desired aircraft fielding date of fiscal year 2018 was randomly selected and not derived through a threat-based analysis; and the current engineering and technology development strategy is considered high-risk by Navy officials to meet the fiscal year 2018 date. Lastly, the Navy has been unable to articulate to the committee the required capabilities and performance characteristics of FUCSS, but plans to award multiple development contracts in fiscal year 2012 prior to having been fully informed by the UCAS program. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to develop a fair, open, transparent, competitive acquisition strategy that is medium or less risk, and incorporates critical knowledge points demonstrated by the UCAS program into the FUCSS acquisition strategy.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would limit obligation of fiscal year 2012 FUCSS funds to no more than 15 percent until 60 days after the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition submit certain certifications regarding the acquisition of FUCSS to the congressional defense committees. This provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide the congressional defense committees a briefing, subsequent to a review of the Navy's FUCSS acquisition strategy, not later than 90 days after the date on which the aforementioned Department of Defense officials submit the certain certifications to the congressional defense committees.

*Over-the-horizon vessel tracking*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has been conducting research to transition existing high frequency radar for monitoring the health of coastal waters to over-the-horizon vessel tracking. This effort tests new technology to detect approaching vessels by filling the gap between microwave radar, which works in harbors and near shore at close-in-scale, and satellites, which track ships at the global ocean scale to strengthen maritime domain awareness. The committee encourages the Department to continue research into this area and integrate promising technology and concepts into broader maritime domain awareness initiatives.

*Study on LHD Class steam plants and propulsion systems*

The committee is concerned about management of future lifecycle costs of WASP-class amphibious assault ships (LHD). The first seven ships of the LHD-class were constructed using steam propulsion, which requires extensive crew training to safely operate and is more expensive to repair than gas turbine or diesel propulsion. Further, LHD 1-7 steam propulsion plants are inefficient at higher speeds, exacerbating well known Navy fossil fuel dependence.

The committee notes that the Military Sealift Command has installed machinery monitoring technologies in diesel-powered ships to improve safety and reduce total ownership cost, and that the technology is available for real-time monitoring of steam plant systems. To this end, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a study that examines the feasibility of using a software-based monitoring system that would provide LHD 1-7 steam plant operators real-time machinery monitoring diagnostic and prognostic, predictive analytics for mission critical systems, including main propulsion steam turbines, electrical power generators, and auxiliary systems. This study, to be submitted within 180 days of enactment, should focus on options for monitoring systems that could include:

(1) Providing plant operators early warning or prognostic recognition of impending failures and recommended remedial actions;
(2) Providing real-time recommended operator actions to improve plant efficiency;
(3) Reducing fuel consumption;
(4) Minimizing component and sensor wear to enable LHD 1-7 to meet full design service life; and
(5) Enabling more efficient maintenance planning by automatic generation of maintenance work orders, and immediate delivery of equipment health information to both shipboard crews and shore-side support staff.

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request contained $27.7 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force. The committee recommends $27.7 billion, an increase of $12.0 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*Air Force advanced materials research*

The budget request contained $39.7 million in PE 63112F for the development of advanced materials for weapon systems.

Congress has historically supported the Metals Affordability Initiative (MAI) with budgetary increases to ensure adequate funding is provided to this important initiative, a peer review process to provide science and technology funding for promising aerospace projects in the Air Force advanced materials program. MAI, a joint government and industry consortium, uses a process to improve the manufacturing of specialty metals and consequently provides the warfighter with metals of improved strength and durability, often at a reduced cost.

The committee notes that the Air Force has increased the level of funding it has dedicated to the cost-sharing partnership with the consortium and encourages the Air Force to continue budgeting for this initiative. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to expand the scope of this initiative beyond the Air Force to fully leverage the collaborative technology development and transition opportunities available to better meet the requirements for specialty metals across the Department.

The committee recommends $49.7 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63112F to support the Metals Affordability Initiative.

*Air Force missile field monitoring technology*

In October 2010, an incident occurred at a Minuteman-III intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) missile field at F.E. Warren Air Force Base whereby for approximately one hour, the ability of the Air Force to monitor the status of one squadron's ICBMs was interrupted. In subsequent briefings to the committee, the Air Force described its corrective measures as being largely based on human-in-the-loop checklists and procedure improvements. The committee believes the Air Force should also consider improvements that leverage modern technology, including

modern automated systems and remote sensing technologies, to monitor the status of Air Force ICBMs.

The committee therefore directs the commander of Air Force Global Strike Command to provide a briefing by September 6, 2011, to the congressional defense committees on the current capabilities to monitor the status of Air Force ICBMs; a summary of potential technologies to improve the status monitoring of ICBMs; the benefits, risks, technical maturity costs, and schedules to implement such technologies; and any recommendations for specific technologies the Air Force plans to pursue.

*Army and Air Force test, evaluation, range, and facility support*

The budget request contained $270.9 million in PE 65601A for Army test range and facility support. The budget request also contained $654.4 million in PE 65807F for Air Force test and evaluation support.

The committee notes that the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) requires the Department of Defense to rebuild its systems engineering and developmental testing organizations to ensure that design problems are understood and addressed early in the acquisition process. The committee is concerned that the budget request would make deep cuts to the test and evaluation workforce and undermines the requirement in Public Law 111-23.

Therefore, the committee recommends $370.9 million, an increase of $100.0 million, in PE 65601A for Army test range and facility support. The committee also recommends $763.4 million, an increase of $109.0 million, in PE 65807F for Air Force test and evaluation support.

*Common propulsion technology development*

The budget request contained $67.2 million in PE 63851F for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) Demonstration/Validation program. Of this amount, $40.1 million was requested for common propulsion technology development.

The committee remains concerned about the health and long-term viability of the solid rocket motor industrial base. The committee notes that the demand for large solid rocket motors (SRMs) has decreased significantly, particularly with the decision by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to retire the Space Shuttle and terminate the Constellation program. The Air Force Minuteman III ICBM program and Navy Trident II/D5 submarine-launched ballistic missile program rely on this industrial base and are likely to bear the increasing cost of SRMs as demand decreases and infrastructure costs get passed to the Department of Defense (DOD).

The committee believes the sustainment of the SRM industrial base is a national challenge that spans multiple departments and agencies of the U.S.

Government. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that recommends the President develop a national rocket propulsion strategy.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee stated that "the Department should invest in a substantive defense-wide research and development (R&D) activity" for SRMs that could be leveraged for future strategic strike, missile defense, and space launch systems. In a March 2011 report to Congress on the SRM industrial base sustainment and implementation plan, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics stated that the Department will consider "expanding current research and development (R&D) programs" whose intent would be for "the Air Force and Navy to pursue development and maturation of common technologies for future strategic missile system designs… [and] maintaining design and engineering expertise in the large-SRM industry." The report further states that the Department would recommend starting such a program no later than 2014. The committee supports such an expanded SRM research and development program. The committee is concerned about further erosion of the SRM industrial base and encourages the Department to immediately start a competitive R&D program rather than wait until 2014.

The committee therefore recommends $87.2 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 63851F for common propulsion technology development.

*Deep Space Climate Observatory Launch Service*

The budget request contained $158.1 million in PE 65860F for the Rocket System Launch Program. Of this amount, $134.5 million was requested for launch support services for the Deep Space Climate Observatory (DSCOVR) mission.

The committee understands the Air Force would provide launch services for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) DSCOVR mission upon its refurbishment in fiscal year 2014. The committee is also aware of commercial data purchase solutions that could meet the Government's space weather data needs by fiscal year 2014 and preclude the need for the Air Force to fund launch services. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to work with the NOAA to consider a competitively acquired commercial solution.

The committee recommends $33.6 million, a decrease of $124.5 million, in PE 65860F for launch support services for the DSCOVR mission.

*Electronic, Scheduling and Dissemination Upgrade*

The committee is aware that the current electronic, scheduling and dissemination (ESD) system for the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) faces several sustainment challenges. The ESD system allows satellite operators at 40 geographically separated locations to request contact time on 16 shared AFSCN antennas and allows schedulers to de-conflict overlapping requests to create and

publish a schedule. The ESD system must accommodate some 1,300 different vehicle configurations for over 160 supported satellites to manage an average 410 satellite contacts per day, to include up to 120 real-time mission changes per day. The ESD hardware is largely commercial-off-the-shelf technology based on 1980's era technology including the disk operating system and 286-equivalent computers. For example, a majority of these items are not available through either government supply systems or commercial vendors, as the components and software are technologically obsolete. The committee understands, based on information provided by the Air Force, that the current ESD system will only be fully sustainable through 2014. The committee has learned from the Air Force that sufficient funding is available to continue development of the ESD upgrade through fiscal year 2011 and that the Air Force will seek approval of a $20.7 million reprogramming request in fiscal year 2011 to continue development though fiscal year 2012.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report that details the remaining ESD program costs and associated fiscal year funding profile as well as an updated integrated master schedule to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2011.

*F-35 aircraft*

The budget request contained $2.7 billion in PEs 64800F, 64800N, and 64800M for development of the F-35 aircraft, but contained no funds for development of a competitive F-35 propulsion system. The F-35 is also known as the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF).

The competitive F-35 propulsion system program has been developing the F136 engine, which would have provided a competitive alternative to the currently-planned F135 engine. For the past 5 years, the committee recommended increases for the F-35 competitive propulsion system, and notes funds have been appropriated by Congress for this purpose through the first half of fiscal year 2011. Despite section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), which required the Secretary of Defense to obligate and expend sufficient annual amounts for the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the F-35, the committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense (DOD) has, for the sixth consecutive year, chosen not to comply with both the spirit and intent of this law, by opting not to include funds for this purpose in the budget request. According to the Department of Defense, the life-cycle cost of the F-35 engine program is $110.0 billion. A January 10, 2011, report by the Congressional Research Service notes that there has never been a separate engine competition for F-35 engines. The committee notes that the Department of Defense terminated the F136 contract on April 25, 2011.

On February 23, 2010, the Deputy Secretary of Defense submitted to the committee an update of the 2007 Department of Defense report, "Joint Strike

Fighter Alternate Engine Acquisition and Independent Cost Analysis" for the competitive engine program, which noted that an investment of $2.9 billion over 6 years in additional cost would be required to finish F136 engine development and to conduct directed buys to prepare the F136 for competitive procurement of F-35 engines in 2017. This report also projected that long-term costs for either a one-engine or two-engine competitive acquisition strategy would be the same, on a net present value basis. Last September, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that this estimate was based on two key assumptions made by the Department of Defense in developing the $2.9 billion funding projection that have significant impact on the estimated amount of upfront investment needed. These assumptions were: (1) four years of noncompetitive procurements of both engines would be needed to allow the alternate engine contractor sufficient time to gain production experience and complete developmental qualification of the engine, and (2) the Government would need to fund quality and reliability improvements for engine components. GAO notes that past studies and historical data it examined indicate that it may take less than 4 years of noncompetitive procurements and that competition may obviate the need for the Government to fund component improvement programs. GAO concludes that if these conditions hold true for the alternate engine, the funding projection for the alternate engine could be lower than DOD's projection.

The committee notes that reports on the F-35 alternate engine program completed in 2007 by the Institute for Defense Analyses, GAO, and the Department of Defense all agree that non-financial benefits of a competitive engine program include improved contractor responsiveness, a more robust industrial base, improved operational readiness, better engine performance, and technological innovation. The committee further notes that the 2007 study by the Institute for Defense Analyses on the JSF engine cost analysis noted that, "In 2035, the JSF would comprise 95 percent of the fighter attack force structure." Among other reasons, the committee remains concerned about proceeding with a $110.0 billion, sole-source engine program for that percentage of the Department of Defense's future tactical fighter fleets.

The committee is also concerned about the operational risk of having a one engine program for the F-35 fleet, and notes that a former F-35 Program Executive Officer has stated, "The Pentagon needs to carefully consider the operational risk of having just one engine for the F-35 fighter jet. Competition could bring faster technology development and lower costs. A single engine could be worrisome if an engine problem ever grounded the fighters. In the past, having a variety of fighters meant the Pentagon could use other planes to offset any groundings, like an 11-month engine-related halt in Harriers in 2000. I simply think that we've focused too much on the discussion about cost benefit and not the operational risk benefit."

The committee also notes that section 3, titled "Scope of Work", of the 2006 memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed by all JSF partner nation senior

defense officials regarding the production, sustainment, and follow-on development of the Joint Strike Fighter states that "the production work will include, but will not be limited to, the following: Production of the JSF air vehicle, including propulsion systems, both F135 and F136." The committee understands that this MOU is still current.

The committee further notes that, "The Final Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel" published on July 29, 2010, states: "History has shown that the only reliable source of price reduction through the life of a program is competition between dual sources." Consistent with that view, the committee strongly supports the December 2010 announcement by the Department of Defense that the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program would award a contract to 2 contractors for 10 ships each. The budget request contained $1.9 billion through fiscal year 2016 for continued LCS development. Like the LCS program, the F-35 competitive engine program would also require development funding in the Future Years Defense Program, and the committee is perplexed why the Department would implement a dual-source acquisition strategy for the LCS program and not for the F-35 competitive engine program.

The committee believes that the F-35 competitive engine program has its roots in the F-16 alternate engine program which began in the early 1980s. Often called, "The Great Engine War" the committee notes that Robert Drewes, in his 1987 book, "The Air Force and The Great Engine War," wrote: "Competition is the only sure way to get the best effort. Competition did yield…some substantial initial benefits to the Air Force…engine improvements [were offered] to the Air Force earlier than the Air Force had been led to expect without the competition. Furthermore, unit prices were lower than…had previously been offer[ed]. Since the initial split buy in February 1984, competition further induced [the contractor] to grant even more concessions to the Air Force. Warranty prices have been reduced significantly and arrangements with the European Participating Governments have improved."

The committee believes it is too early to have terminated the F136 development contract because it was 2 years after initial operational capability for the F-15 that problems first became apparent with the F-15 and F-16 F100 engine that resulted in the first alternate engine program, an equivalent point in time for the F-35, 7 years from now. The F-35 primary engine has 1,000 flight hours. The Department of Defense standard to achieve maturity on an engine requires 200,000 flight hours. In response to section 211 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), on March 15, 2007, the GAO presented to the committee, "Analysis of Costs for the Joint Strike Fighter Program," which stated that experience suggests that competition between the F135 and F136 can generate savings and benefits up to 20 percent if:

(1) Contractors are incentivized to achieve more aggressive production learning curves;

(2) Annual completion for procurement is kept in place over an extended period;
(3) Contactors produce more reliable engine, resulting in lower maintenance costs; and
(4) Contractors invest additional corporate money to remain competitive.

For these reasons, the committee remains steadfast in its belief that continuing the F-35 competitive propulsion system program would be the right course of action for the F-35 propulsion system.

The committee understands that the F136 contractor intends to provide its own funds to continue F136 development for fiscal year 2012. Accordingly, elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would preserve and store property related to the F136 contract, and would ensure that the Secretary of Defense, at no cost to the Federal Government, provides support and allows for the use of such property by the contractor under a contract to conduct research, development, test, and evaluation of the F136 engine, if such activities are self-funded by the contractor.

*F-35 alternative ejection seat*

The budget request contained $11.2 million in PE 64706F for Life Support Systems. Of this amount, no funding was requested for an F-35A alternative ejection seat.

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has benefited from a common family of ejection seats in its tactical aircraft fleet since the late 1970s. The committee understands that preliminary internal Air Force studies have determined that the potential exists for significant cost savings and increased pilot safety with an alternative ejection seat system for the F-35A. The committee also notes that the Department of Commerce has expressed concern about risks to national security if the United States becomes totally reliant on foreign sources for ejection seat technology. Accordingly, the committee believes the Department of Defense should be particularly mindful of these issues in evaluating competitive options for F-35A ejection seat program.

The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force is conducting a business-case analysis to determine whether an alternative F-35A ejection seat offers substantial F-35A life-cycle cost savings and commonality benefits to the Department of the Air Force tactical fighter fleets, while also considering the impacts on the Department of the Navy F-35B and F-35C programs as well as the F-35 program's international partners. The committee believes that the F-35 program's ejection seat requirement should be reviewed in the context of this analysis. If a decision to change the F-35A's ejection seat requirement is warranted by the business-case analysis, the committee urges the qualification and integration of an alternative ejection seat in the F-35A.

The committee recommends $11.2 million in PE 64706F for Life Support Systems.

*Hosted payloads*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force, to "conduct a study of the options for hosting defense payloads on commercial satellites" which would "identify feasible options that offer potential savings and the specific actions required to take advantage of these opportunities," and submit the report by March 1, 2011. The committee is disappointed that it has not yet received the report and that the study has only recently begun.

The committee notes that the January 2011 National Security Space Strategy concluded that "hosting payloads on a mix of platforms in various orbits" can help achieve greater resiliency in space. The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense has not devoted adequate attention and focus on evaluating opportunities for hosting defense payloads on commercial satellites. Such an approach may provide augmentation or gap-filler capabilities for the warfighter, and may be available sooner and at a lower cost than current major space acquisition programs.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to expedite the completion of this report and submit it to the congressional defense committees in a timely manner. The committee continues to support opportunities to host defense payloads on commercial satellites, including communications, space situational awareness, space weather, and classified payloads. Specifically, the committee looks forward to assessing potential cost savings, identifying funding opportunities for hosted payloads, and identifying legal or regulatory barriers that may hamper the government's flexibility to take advantage of hosted payload opportunities.

*KC-46A aerial refueling aircraft program*

The budget request contained $877.1 million in PE 65221F for the next generation aerial refueling aircraft, KC-46A.

The committee supports the attributes and benefits regarding the KC-46A competition and acknowledges that the source-selection process was conducted fairly amongst all competitors. According to Department of Defense acquisition officials, the competition resulted in at least a twenty percent savings for the unit cost of the aircraft and a savings of $3.0 to $4.0 billion as compared to the source-selection competition held for the tanker in 2008.

The committee plans to closely monitor the KC-46A engineering, manufacturing and development program to ensure that the taxpayer dollars are wisely invested and that the platform will result in a capability that enhances the warfighter's global reach capabilities. The committee also understands that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD, AT&L) will conduct quarterly reviews of the Air Force's KC-46A program.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an annual review of the KC-46A program and to provide the results to the congressional defense committees beginning on March 1, 2012. Furthermore, the committee directs USD, AT&L to provide to the congressional defense committees the results of each quarterly review of the KC-46A program within 30 days after the date of completion of each review. At each quarterly review briefing, USD, AT&L is directed to provide notice of a major engineering, design, capability or configuration change to the KC-46A, and cost for that change when it becomes known, that is different from the baseline aircraft offered in the final proposal related to Air Force contract #FA8625-11-C600.

The committee recommends $849.9 million, a decrease of $27.2 million, in PE 65221F for the next generation aerial refueling aircraft because that funding is in excess to the $818.0 million obligation authority limited by USD, AT&L for the program for fiscal years 2010 and 2011.

*Lead-free electronic components*

The committee understands that international efforts to produce lead-free electronic components may lead to the widespread use of tin-based solder products and finishes in commercial electronic components. The committee further understands that the Secretary of the Air Force may use lead-free electronic components in the future through purchases of commercial-off-the-shelf items. The committee notes, however, that lead-free or tin-based solder products and finishes may result in an increased failure rate for military systems due to weaker solder finishes and tin whiskers. The committee believes that the Air Force needs to establish protocols to assess the risk and reliability of such components, including determination of potential failure mechanisms, development of test methodologies and models, and establishing reliability rates. The committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force to move rapidly to develop protocols for lead-free electronic components.

*Military satellite communications technology development*

The budget request contained $421.7 million in PE 63430F for the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellite program. Of this amount, $142.2 million was requested for Evolved AEHF military satellite communications (MILSATCOM).

The budget request for Evolved AEHF MILSATCOM reflected the cost savings the Air Force expects to achieve in fiscal year 2012 as a result of its new Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency (EASE) approach to space acquisition. The EASE approach reinvests cost savings from satellite block buys into a steady research and development program called the, "capability and affordability insertion program" (CAIP). Such an approach is envisioned to lower the cost and

risk of follow-on systems, by placing the risk of new technology development and capability improvements outside of the critical path for satellite procurement until such technologies and capabilities are sufficiently mature for insertion into future satellite block upgrades.

While the committee supports CAIP, it is concerned that CAIP funds contained in the larger AEHF program element (PE) may be more susceptible to use as an offset source within the AEHF program than funds contained in a separate PE. The committee is also concerned that CAIP funds may be directed to specific contractors should they remain in a PE associated with a legacy satellite program and its associated contractors.

The committee believes that CAIP funds should be applied to a broad range of MILSATCOM technology development activities and competitively awarded. The committee also expects the Air Force to develop a spend plan for the funds, identify objectives for each activity, and establish a process for determining how each activity might transition to an existing program or be established as a new program, as would be required in a provision included elsewhere in this Act.

The committee therefore recommends the transfer of $142.2 million from PE 63430F for the Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite program to PE 64436F for next-generation MILSATCOM technology development.

The committee recommends $279.5 million, a decrease of $142.2 million, in PE 63430F for the AEHF satellite program.

*Next generation long-range strike bomber program*

The committee supports the decision to restart the development of a new bomber aircraft. The committee acknowledges that the current fleet of bomber aircraft are still effective and relevant in meeting the combatant commanders' warfighting requirements but believes that the long-range strike requirements have been sufficiently analyzed on numerous occasions over the last 18 years against forecasted threats and that a recapitalization program must begin.

The committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to monitor critical aspects of the new bomber program and to keep the committee informed of the program's progress in a timely manner. The committee remains concerned with the workload being levied on the Air Force Rapid Capabilities Office (AFRCO) and will monitor the acquisition governance structure to ensure that AFRCO is staffed with acquisition officials that represent an appropriate and sufficient cross-section of recent operational experience, major defense acquisition program management, requirements development, technology integration, and cost estimation to effectively execute the bomber program.

The committee remains concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has not performed a comprehensive life-cycle cost analysis comparing the development of one bomber platform, integrating all long-range strike capabilities, to a "family of

long-range strike systems" to determine the affordability of the Department of Defense's long-range strike portfolio strategy.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to designate the main propulsion system of the bomber aircraft as a major subprogram, as well as require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a competitive acquisition strategy for the propulsion system.

*Operationally responsive space*

The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) established the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Office to respond to the needs of the joint force commander and to build an enabling infrastructure to support the rapid deployment of space capabilities. ORS capabilities have the potential to reduce the fragility of the space architecture through rapid reconstitution, provide augmentation or surge capabilities, and offer a pathway for demonstrating new technology or operational concepts. While ORS satellites would not have the performance of those from larger, traditional space acquisition programs, they are envisioned to be a quicker, lower cost way to get "good enough" capabilities on-orbit.

The committee is aware of two key ORS launches: ORS-1 is a small electro-optical and infrared satellite developed in response to a U.S. Central Command urgent need and planned for launch in May 2011; and TacSat-4 is planned for launch in July 2011. The committee understands the ORS Office is also pursuing a rapid response space works capability, as well as modular plug-and-play mission kits to enable a reconfigurable architecture and ultimately to demonstrate end-to-end solutions to support the U.S. Strategic Command vision of achieving a 6-day call up to launch.

The committee continues to support these ORS activities. However, the committee notes that funding for the ORS program has decreased over the past few fiscal years, from $133.8 million in fiscal year 2010, to $94.0 million in fiscal year 2011, to $86.5 million requested in fiscal year 2012. The committee believes a steady level of effort and funds are necessary to advance ORS capabilities so they become sufficiently mature to provide rapid support to the warfighter.

*Space-Based Infrared System*

The budget request contained $621.6 million in PE 64441F for the Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS), but contained no funds for data exploitation.

Two SBIRS highly elliptical orbit satellites are currently on orbit and the first SBIR geosynchronous earth orbit (GEO) satellite is expected to launch in May 2011, followed by a second GEO satellite launch in April 2012. Each satellite carries a scanning and staring sensor that provides missile warning, and supports missile defense, technical intelligence, and battlespace awareness missions.

The committee is concerned that the Air Force has not provided funds for the exploitation of SBIRS data, particularly the staring sensor, and notes previous congressional efforts to include funds for such purpose.

The committee believes the Air Force and the broader defense and intelligence communities have not fully utilized the overhead persistent infrared (OPIR) data available from SBIRS. In particular, the committee believes SBIRS data could be further exploited to provide increased support to missile defense, and encourages the Missile Defense Agency to work with the Air Force and other OPIR experts, such as Sandia National Laboratory, to explore the extent to which SBIRS can provide some of the capability planned for the Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS). The committee also believes SBIRS data could be further exploited to provide new technical intelligence and battlespace awareness capabilities.

The committee understands that a joint OPIR ground effort has been established to focus on the longer-term needs of the OPIR community. The committee anticipates such effort will shape future budget requests for data exploitation capabilities from SBIRS and other OPIR sensors.

The committee recommends $641.6 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 64441F, to be competitively awarded by the Secretary of the Air Force for the development of SBIRS data exploitation capabilities.

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

### Overview

The budget request contained $19.8 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends $19.9 billion, an increase of $109.2 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

*3-D advanced integrated circuit capabilities*

The committee is concerned about the domestic capacity to produce 3-D advanced integrated circuits in the United States. The committee is aware that much of the commercial capacity has been moved offshore, making the global supplier base for defense microelectronics increasingly insecure and susceptible to compromise through counterfeit or maliciously-altered circuits.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive assessment regarding 3-D integrated circuits manufacturing capacity to serve the U.S. military and other national security interests and to provide a report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report should include the following:

(1) An assessment of the military requirements for 3-D integrated circuits in future microelectronic systems as a critical enabling technology for military applications;

(2) An assessment of the current domestic commercial capability to securely develop and manufacture 3-D integrated circuits for use in military systems and;

(3) An assessment of the feasibility, as well as planning and design requirements, for the development of a domestic manufacturing capability for 3-D integrated circuits at a number of locations within the United States, including Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

*Airborne Infrared*

The budget request contained $46.9 million in PE 64884C for the Airborne Infrared (ABIR) program for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

According to MDA budget materials, ABIR is planned to provide early precision tracking of ballistic missiles, discrimination, and fire control quality data to enable early intercepts. ABIR is also expected to increase the missile raid

handling capacity of the ballistic missile defense system. The committee understands that ABIR technical feasibility has been demonstrated in several recent flight tests and experiments.

The committee is aware, based on an April 2011 briefing by Joint Staff officials on the Joint Capabilities Mix-III (JCM-III) study, that ABIR provides a significant contribution to the ballistic missile defense system. The JCM-III study further recommended accelerating ABIR capability development.

The committee understands that no less than 12 Government and contractor organizations participate in the ABIR program, including several Government research laboratories. The committee further understands that MDA issued a request for information in fiscal year 2011 and plans to issue a request for proposals in fiscal year 2012 for ABIR technology development.

Therefore, the committee recommends $66.9 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 64884C, to be allocated at the discretion of the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, to accelerate ABIR development and experimentation.

*Basic research international cooperation*

The committee recognizes the importance of basic research to the Department of Defense and is encouraged by the Department's continued emphasis in supporting funding increases in the budget request. Basic research is a key long-term strategic investment by the Department that has a track record of supporting the development of important technological capabilities, many of which were not clearly foreseen at the time. The committee is encouraged that basic research investments continue to grow at a rate of 2 percent above inflation, when most other areas of the President's budget request are flat or declining.

The committee is also aware that the current basic research strategic plan places significant emphasis on cyber capabilities, including enabling capabilities such as quantum information science. The committee encourages the Department to utilize the basic research program to increase cooperation and collaboration with our foreign allies and partners in the area of cyber security. The committee believes that this could serve as an important component in supporting the development of critical future capabilities for our Armed Forces, as well as boosting the capacity of our foreign partners.

*Capabilities to support humanitarian assistance and disaster relief*

The committee recognizes the value that Department of Defense science and technology (S&T) efforts provide in addressing the full range of military missions. S&T investments are critical in providing technological options to address known requirements, as well as hedge against uncertainty. The committee notes that the preponderance of S&T investments are in traditional areas like weapons systems,

platforms, and sensors. The committee is concerned that the current investment strategy leaves gaps in areas of unconventional or irregular threats.

Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HA/DR) represents one mission area that has not been a traditional focus of S&T investment. The committee notes that HA/DR missions are particularly prominent as part of a broader strategy of international engagement and show U.S. commitment to the global commons. Recent examples include Operation Unified Response in which the U.S. provided emergency disaster relief in the wake of the earthquake in the Republic of Haiti in 2010 and providing recent support following the earthquake and tsunami in Japan in 2011.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should develop a strategy to focus more of its S&T investments on HA/DR. The committee is aware of existing work that could be accelerated and transitioned more widely, such as the Sustainable Technologies Accelerated Research Transformative Innovation for Development and Emergency Support initiative. The committee also recognizes that there are other areas where the Department of Defense has not traditionally focused many resources, such as the development of thermostable vaccines, where there are opportunities to collaborate with outside entities that offer expertise in developing global health technologies that could be pursued and better leveraged. The committee believes that the Department's increasing role in HA/DR missions will require greater technological options than are currently available and should be addressed through S&T development opportunities.

*Composite technology for use in missile defense interceptors*

The committee notes efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) to develop and test carbon fiber composite materials for use in missile defense interceptors to improve performance and withstand the operational environment experienced by such interceptors.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue efforts to increase the performance of high thermally conductive composites, such as carbon fiber composites, to improve the performance of missile defense interceptors.

*Conventional prompt global strike*

The budget request contained $204.8 million in PE 64165D8Z for conventional prompt global strike (CPGS) capability development. The request would fund hypersonic boost-glide experiments, concept development and demonstration, alternate payload development and test, test-range development, and studies and analysis.

The committee notes that the first hypersonic technology vehicle (HTV-2) flight test in April 2010 was unsuccessful. According to the Department of Defense, a second HTV-2 flight test is planned for August 2011 and the first flight test of an

alternative design, the advanced hypersonic weapon (AHW), is planned for fiscal year 2012. The committee understands that hypersonic technology is cutting-edge. The committee further recognizes that designing a vehicle to glide through the Earth's atmosphere at Mach 20, and developing the associated thermal management and guidance and control technology, is a significant scientific and engineering challenge.

While the committee values such innovation and scientific discovery, it is also concerned about pursuing a weaponized missile system, or any material development decision, before demonstrating that the technology is feasible. The committee believes a critical design review in fiscal year 2012 for an operational demonstration of a conventional strike missile (CSM) is premature.

The committee also questions the Department's apparent focus on one specific system solution. As stated in the President's February 2, 2011, report to Congress on conventional prompt global strike, in response to Condition 6 of the New START Treaty resolution of ratification, "preliminary discussions [regarding any specific acquisition programs for CPGS weapon systems]… is informed by one plausible configuration: the Air Force CSM utilizing the boost-glide approach." The committee is concerned about the affordability of CPGS given the current budgetary environment.

Based on briefings by the Department, the committee is aware of other potential conventional long-range strike capabilities that may be lower cost, carry less technical risk, and provide a capability sooner than CSM. The committee encourages a broader examination of the tradespace of CPGS capabilities and concepts to meet warfighter requirements.

The committee recommends $179.8 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, in PE 64165D8Z for CPGS capability development. The committee encourages the Department to focus on basic technology feasibility and believes its recommended reduction can be partially offset by expected fiscal year 2011 unobligated funds.

*Cyber test and evaluation*

The committee recognizes the importance of information technology (IT) and cyber security-related technologies in providing critical capabilities to Armed Forces in the future. The Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) and the report "Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform Findings and Recommendations" places significant importance on conducting rigorous testing and evaluation in order to improve defense acquisition outcomes. While the "2010 Test and Evaluation Strategic Plan" addresses numerous capability gaps in cyber testing, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not providing sufficient resources to address rapidly increasing demands to conduct developmental and operational test and evaluation (T&E) for future IT systems.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Secretaries of the

military departments, to conduct an analysis of T&E resources needed to address the capability gaps outlined by the "2010 Test and Evaluation Strategic Plan." The analysis should examine the following:

(1) Whether the Department of Defense is sufficiently funding T&E at the level necessary to address cyber and IT capability needs over the Future Years Defense Program;
(2) Whether the Department of Defense has sufficient numbers of technical personnel with the expertise in IT disciplines to conduct T&E for cyber and IT systems over the Future Years Defense Program; and
(3) Whether the Department of Defense has adequate infrastructure to conduct T&E for cyber and IT systems over the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee further directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of this analysis within 180 days after date of the enactment of this Act.

*Defense laboratory survey*

The committee recognizes the key role that Department of Defense (DOD) laboratories play in technology development, scientific innovation, and acquisition excellence. DOD laboratories are critical to maintaining the technological superiority and competency of the military, and to monitor global technology developments to prevent surprise and mitigate adversarial developments. The committee remains committed to ensuring that the Department of Defense laboratory system has the resources and authority to support the scientific and technological management of the military.

The committee is concerned, however, that there may be certain regulations, instructions, policies and practices instituted by the Department and the military services that may lessen the laboratories effectiveness and efficiency, hindering the innovative spirit that drives the laboratories. The committee believes that an assessment of the possible constraints on the mission of the various laboratories would be beneficial to ensuring their long-term viability as leaders in the pursuit of technological advancement.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to survey directors of the Department of Defense laboratories to determine how to streamline DOD regulations, instructions and policies impacting the laboratories and to make recommendations to improve the Department of Defense laboratory system. The committee further directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to provide a briefing on the results of this survey to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Armed Services Committee within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

*Directed energy research*

The budget request contained $96.3 million in PE 63901C for directed energy research programs for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The budget request supports the maintenance of the Airborne Laser Test Bed (ALTB) as a science and technology test bed, additional beam propagation and lethality testing, and further maturation of Diode Pumped Alkaline-gas Laser System technology.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee directed the Director, Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) to submit a report on the Department's review of directed energy technologies to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2010. The committee is disappointed that it has not received this report.

The committee notes that the ALTB is the only megawatt-class laser currently within the Department of Defense and understands that it is providing risk reduction for future airborne systems by performing wide-ranging laser science and technology. However, the committee notes a March 2011 Government Accountability Office report on ballistic missile defense that found, "technical issues continued to affect the test bed's experiments throughout fiscal year 2010 and into early fiscal year 2011." The committee is concerned that these technical issues, combined with recent ALTB flight test failures, may delay important laser technology risk reduction activities.

The committee supports the promising technologies and technology demonstration activities currently being reviewed which may warrant additional resources, and understands that the review of these technologies and research activities is to be included in the aforementioned DDR&E report. However, the committee is concerned that the budget request does not include sufficient funds to maintain the ALTB platform, support further testing, continue technology development, and retain a uniquely skilled workforce.

The committee recommends $146.3 million, an increase of $50.0 million, in PE 63901C for directed energy research programs for MDA, to be allocated at the discretion of the Director, Missile Defense Agency, in consultation with the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, to support increased research, development, and testing of directed energy technologies, including the use of the ALTB platform.

*Engineer and Scientist Exchange Program*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense executes a program known as the Engineer and Scientist Exchange Program (ESEP). Its purpose is to promote international cooperation in military research, development, and acquisition through the exchange of defense scientists and engineers. The primary goals of ESEP are as follows:

(1) Broaden perspectives in research and development techniques and methods;

(2) Form a cadre of professionals with international experience to enhance research and development programs;
(3) Gain insight into foreign research and development methods, organizational structures, procedures, production, logistics, testing, and management systems;
(4) Cultivate future international cooperative endeavors; and
(5) Avoid duplication of research efforts among allied nations.

The committee supports the goals of this program and encourages the Department to make greater use of this program to facilitate cooperation and collaboration with our foreign allies and partners in the area of computer network operations. The committee believes that this could help our foreign partners build their own cyber operations capabilities, as well as boost U.S. capacity in this area.

*Fabrication of micro-air vehicles*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is developing an array of micro-air vehicles to provide small-unit oriented sensing capabilities for tactical reconnaissance, hazardous materials sensing and clandestine surveillance. Many of the designs for these micro-air vehicles are based on biomimetic constructions that leverage the unique characteristics inherent in birds and insects. The committee is aware that these biomimetic designs pose unique fabrication challenges at the micro scale, particularly with regards to robustness and maintainability. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue research and development in the area of fabrication for micro-air vehicles, which the committee believes represents an underappreciated challenge to the widespread adoption and deployment of micro-air vehicles for defense applications.

*Ground-based midcourse defense*

The budget request contained $1.2 billion in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense midcourse segment for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The request supports the continued development, testing, operations, and sustainment of the ground-based midcourse (GMD) system, including the acquisition of 5 ground-based interceptors (GBI); completion of the new 14-silo Missile Field 2 at Fort Greely, Alaska; placement of the six-silo Missile Field 1 in Fort Greely, Alaska, in a mothball status; and beginning preliminary design work to locate an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System (IFICS) Data Terminal (IDT) at an East Coast site by 2015.

The last two intercept flight tests of the GMD system, FTG-06 in January 2010 and FTG-06a in December 2010, failed to achieve intercept. The committee understands that the FTG-06 failure was principally due to a quality control issue associated with a component in the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle (EKV). The FTG-

06a failure is still under investigation but is also centered on technical issues involving the EKV.

The committee is troubled by these back-to-back flight test failures and, when viewed in the context of the entire GMD flight test history, questions whether there are more systemic issues within the GMD program. The committee remains concerned about the reliability of the GMD system and its overall operational effectiveness. The committee notes that the GMD system is currently the only missile defense system that protects the United States homeland from long-range ballistic missile attacks. The committee believes the Department must prioritize the GMD system and allocate sufficient resources to sustain, test, and evolve it. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would establish the sense of Congress and require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan by the Director, Missile Defense Agency to address the GMD flight-test failures, including the schedule and additional resources necessary to implement the plan.

The committee is also concerned about the budget trends in the GMD program and its potential impact on the reliability and effectiveness of the system. In the fiscal year 2010 budget, the GMD program was reduced by $445.3 million. The fiscal year 2011 budget request restored $324.2 million of this amount, but the fiscal year 2012 request would reduce the program by $185.2 million. Furthermore, the Future Years Defense Program spending profile for GMD is approximately $1.0 billion less than was projected 1-year ago.

Furthermore, the committee has learned that the combination of flight-test failures and MDA operations under reduced spending limits resulting from continuing resolutions during fiscal year 2011, before the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) was enacted, has resulted in several schedule delays within the GMD program. In information provided to the committee, MDA indicates that it plans to delay GBI manufacturing and fleet upgrades; Stockpile Reliability Program component testing; new capability development, modeling, testing, and fielding; and missile defense complex communications upgrades at Fort Greely. In testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services in April 2011, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency noted that MDA also plans to delay flight testing of the two-stage GBI to harvest its funds to fix the EKV.

The committee supports the need to investigate and resolve the problems that plagued the EKV in the FTG-06a test, and believes this should be done prior to conducting additional intercept flight tests. However, the committee questions plans by MDA to wait over 2 years to repeat the FTG-06a intercept flight test given recent testimony by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency that MDA's top priority is to resolve the problem and successfully repeat FTG-06a.

Additionally, in testimony before the committee in March 2011, the Director, Missile Defense Agency acknowledged that procurement of additional GBIs will be

necessary in light of recent flight-test results and that the Department should reassess the number of GBIs it should procure.

The committee understands, based on information provided by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), that MDA has halted deliveries of completed EKVs until the root cause is determined and resolved, but has allowed the contractor to continue work on components of the EKV that were deemed not part of the December 2010 failure in order to keep the production line moving and to allow a rapid recovery of deliveries once changes or mitigations are implemented. The committee supports such an approach and further believes MDA should begin acquiring long-lead components, deemed not part of the December 2010 failure, for additional GBIs. The committee further expects that MDA would procure additional GBIs in fiscal year 2013. The committee notes a GAO observation, contained it its October 2010 interim briefing to the congressional defense committees on the GMD program, that GBI purchases after fiscal year 2013 may incur manufacturing line restart costs for third and fourth tier suppliers, which might be higher than expected. The committee notes that MDA plans to award a new development and sustainment contract for the GMD system in June 2011, and urges MDA to closely manage any contractor transition to minimize mission impact during this critical period in the GMD program.

The committee recommends $1.3 billion, an increase of $100.0 million, in PE 63882C for the ground-based midcourse defense system to accelerate resolution of the EKV failure, restore delays in testing, restore other program delays described above, and begin acquisition of long-lead components, deemed not part of the December 2010 failure, for additional GBIs.

*High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System*

The committee commends the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for its work in directed energy technology, and in particular the High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System (HELLADS) program. The committee believes that advancing the development of directed energy weapons will provide the Department with valuable technical capabilities to counter a range of perceived future threats. The committee recognizes that DARPA's innovative approach employed in the HELLADS program offers a valuable technological alternative that complements the approaches being pursued by the military departments. The size, weight, and power reductions expected from HELLADS are necessary steps if the Department wishes to find suitable tactical applications for directed energy weapons.

*Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions*

The budget request contained no funds in PE 62228D8Z for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions (HBCU/MI) program.

The committee is aware that the HBCU/MI program serves a number of objectives for the Department of Defense (DOD), including:

(1) Enhancing research programs and capabilities in scientific and engineering disciplines critical to the national security functions of the Department;
(2) Encouraging greater participation in DOD programs and activities;
(3) Increasing the number of graduates, including underrepresented minorities in science, technical engineering and mathematics fields; and
(4) Encouraging research and educational collaboration with other colleges and universities.

The committee continues to support the objectives of the HBCU/MI program, and the role it plays in expanding the breadth and diversity of the scientific workforce. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Department to explore ways to leverage the participation of not-for-profit institutions to enhance the goals of the HBCU/MI program.

The committee recommends $10.0 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 62228D8Z to support additional competitive awards through the HBCU/MI program.

*Industrial research and development activities*

The committee continues to support the Department of Defense's research and development enterprise, including the key role played by the Department of Defense laboratories, product centers, and other engineering facilities. The committee believes that these facilities are critical to maintaining the military's technological superiority, as well as contributing to the economic health and scientific competitiveness of the United States.

The committee also recognizes that the defense industrial base makes significant investments that complement and sometimes supplant government funding in order to promote technological development. These industrial research and development (IR&D) investments are important components to creating a sustainable foundation for economic growth and technological advancement. In an era of shrinking budgets and fiscal constraint, the committee encourages the Department and the defense industrial base to create additional information sharing mechanisms that will increase visibility into these IR&D investments and better leverage limited resources, reduce the potential for duplication and waste, and improve government to industry collaboration on research.

*Israeli cooperative missile defense*

The budget request contained $106.1 million in PE 63913C for Israeli cooperative programs for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA). Of this amount, $11.8 million was requested for improvements to the Arrow Weapon System (AWS), $53.2 million for continued development of the Arrow-3 interceptor, and $41.1 million for continued development of the David's Sling Weapon System (DSWS).

The fiscal year 2012 request represents a decrease of $103.8 million from the fiscal year 2011 appropriated level.

Since 1986, the United States and the State of Israel have cooperated on missile defense. MDA has four major initiatives with Israel to develop and improve the Israelis' indigenous capabilities to defend against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles: (1) AWS for defense against medium-range missile threats; (2) the Arrow-3 interceptor, an upper tier follow-on to AWS; (3) DSWS for defense against short-range systems; and (4) Iron Dome for defense against long-range rockets and short-range missiles. The United States and Israel also participate in joint missile defense exercises and tests, to enhance the interoperability and integration of U.S. and Israeli missile defense systems.

The committee commends Israel for its rapid development and deployment of the Iron Dome short-range rocket and missile defense system. In April 2011, the Iron Dome system shot down several rockets fired from the Gaza Strip aimed at Israeli cities. The committee believes such attacks are a reminder of the immediacy of the missile threat to Israel and the need for supporting accelerated efforts to cooperatively develop, test, and field missile defense capabilities for Israel.

However, the budget request does not support full-scale development of the DSWS to ensure that a first battery will be delivered in 2012. The budget request also fails to provide for completion of development and testing of AWS enhancements and acceleration of Arrow-3 interceptor development. The committee is aware that steady progress continues to be made in meeting the agreed Arrow-3 knowledge points.

The committee therefore recommends $216.1 million, an increase of $110.0 million, in PE 63913C for Israeli cooperative programs, to be allocated at the discretion of the Director, Missile Defense Agency.

*Medical Countermeasures Initiative and the Chemical and Biological Defense Program*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is pursuing a new Medical Countermeasure Initiative (MCMI) within the Chemical and Biological Defense Program designed to enable rapid delivery of new medical countermeasures to dangerous pathogens through a strategic partnership between the U.S. Government and industry. The committee is also aware that MCMI is designed to enhance force protection for military personnel against emerging threats and infectious diseases and fill a capability gap, which was underscored by the inability to rapidly produce vaccine for the 2009 H1N1 influenza virus pandemic.

The committee is also aware that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently reported in GAO-11-318SP "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue" that most Federal efforts and programs within the bio-defense enterprise are fragmented and that the overarching enterprise lacks strategic oversight mechanisms. GAO also concludes that there is no broad, integrated national strategy that encompasses all stakeholders with bio-defense responsibilities that can be used to guide the systemic identification of risk, assessment of resources needed to address those risks, and the prioritization and allocation of investment across the entire Federal Government. As such, neither the Office of Management and Budget, nor the Federal agencies account for bio-defense spending across the entire Federal Government.

While the committee understands the need to ensure rapid delivery of advanced medical countermeasures to dangerous pathogens, the committee is concerned that the Department is initiating MCMI as a new-start program in a bio-defense sector already identified by GAO as fragmented and disjointed. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a detailed briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the efforts taken by the Department to ensure programmatic success in this area, including but not limited to: cost, schedule, and performance in the Future Years Defense Program; efforts to interface with and implement cost-sharing mechanisms across industry; efforts to enhance efficiencies and reduce fragmentation related to Department of Defense equities within the interagency bio-defense enterprise; and efforts taken to ensure interagency collaboration such as cross-cutting information management and communications, research and development, and acquisition efforts.

*Meeting airspace needs for defense-related Unmanned Aerial Systems research*

The committee notes that availability of special use airspace is important to research related to Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) and national defense needs. The proliferation of technology enabling the use of UAS represents a clear future threat to national security; however, lack of special use airspace to research detection techniques is a potential impediment to the Nation's ability to counter the threat. The committee encourages discussions between the Air Force Research Laboratory and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to explore ways for the FAA and the Department of Defense to work together on problems related to integrating UAS into the National Airspace System. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the FAA to place a high priority on meeting national defense needs for special use airspace related to UAS research, including addressing defense needs for special use airspace for research in "detect and destroy" technologies.

*Missile defense adjunct sensor capabilities*

The committee is aware of Department of Defense sensor capabilities that are not funded by the Missile Defense Agency but have the potential to contribute to the missile defense mission. Such adjunct sensor capabilities, including the radars on the Cobra Judy Replacement mobile maritime ship, could be integrated with ballistic missile defense software and linked with existing communications networks to provide additional detection, tracking, and discrimination of ballistic missiles, thereby improving sea- and land-based missile defense capabilities. The committee urges the Missile Defense Agency to work with the military services to identify such sensor capabilities and pursue opportunities to conduct simulations, experiments, and demonstrations to assess the feasibility and benefit of integrating adjunct sensors.

*Mitochondrial disease research*

The committee believes that mitochondrial disease and dysfunction is relevant to military medicine. In particular, the role of the mitochondria as the "power plant" of the cell implicates it in a whole range of questions pertaining to energy levels and fatigue, which is directly related to human performance. Therefore the committee encourages the Department of Defense to include mitochondrial disease and dysfunction as one of the types of diseases researched through the general "Peer-Reviewed Medical Research Program".

*Mobile applications development*

The committee is aware that the military departments and Defense agencies are pursuing future network strategies that would leverage developments in the commercial marketplace. These commercially-developed mobile devices, such as smart phones and tablet computers, are in high demand by the Armed Forces, and offer computational power, flexibility, and technology refresh rates not currently achievable in military-developed communications and computing devices.

The committee is also aware that some defense organizations, such as the Army, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), have begun experimenting with mobile computing devices to field relevant applications for military use. For example, the Army held a competition in 2010 to spur development of mobile device applications, and has established a small, dedicated effort within Training and Doctrine Command to focus on mobile applications development. DARPA has also begun examining how the Department might support applications development for mobile computing devices in the future.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not devoted sufficient attention to these efforts, and thus the necessary policy developments needed to

support these technology developments has been lagging. For example, the process for test, evaluation, certification and accreditation of these applications for network use has not been sufficiently clarified and takes significantly longer than similar processes in the commercial sector. This time lag and policy ambiguity has resulted in some users bypassing security procedures in order to get access to the capabilities these applications provide.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense (DOD) Chief Information Officer to develop and issue a Department of Defense Instruction within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act to clarify the process for developing and using mobile applications on DOD networks. The Instruction should address development, test, evaluation, certification, accreditation, and mechanisms for making these applications available to the user community. The development of the Instruction should also be coordinated through the working group process supporting the development of a rapid information technology acquisition process as part of section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

*Multidisciplinary research in cyber-related fields*

The committee is encouraged by the importance placed by the Department overall on research into cyber-related fields in the budget request. The committee is concerned that the current research emphasis has been on traditional computational and mathematical sciences and insufficient emphasis has been placed on the behavioral and economic aspects of cyber-related activities to develop a solid understanding of how decision-making and risk analysis are conducted. The committee encourages the Department to create more multidisciplinary research opportunities which combine traditional computational scientific fields with social science disciplines in order to provide a more quantitative scientific underpinning for understanding the behavioral aspects of cyber security.

*Nanotechnology research*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is pursuing research into a variety of nanotechnology applications for defense purposes. New capabilities enabled by the unique performance enhancements of nanostructure materials hold the potential of transforming the technology landscape. The committee encourages the Department to continue to make investments in nanotechnology research that is needed to create the next generation of sensors, electronics, weapons, and manufacturing processes.

However, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense lacks sufficient expertise in some emerging research disciplines related to nanotechnology to support a long-term research investment strategy. The committee is aware that a dedicated federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) could support

the Department in this effort, but that no such broad-based nanotechnology FFRDC exists.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on how the Department of Defense receives support from the research community on nanotechnology issues, including identifying where within the existing FFRDC community that expertise comes from, and assessing whether a dedicated FFRDC is needed.

*National Research and Education Center for Corrosion*

The committee recognizes the critical role that academia and university programs play in avoiding costly design and development errors and encourages the Department of Defense to strengthen its ties with researchers, service laboratories, and educators in the field of corrosion. The committee recommends that the Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight expand university-related initiatives in the Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention and Mitigation Strategic Plan, which could include bachelor of science programs in corrosion engineering; expansion of projects that address high-cost areas in the Cost of Corrosion Baseline Study; and outreach, communication, education, training, and policy activities that support the warfighter. The committee endorses the action of the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to establish a national research and education center for corrosion and recommends that the Secretary of Defense provide the necessary funding to support the faculty and associated resources at the center.

*Phased, adaptive approach*

The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) for the progress it has made over the past year in the implementation of the phased, adaptive approach (PAA) for missile defense in Europe. The committee also appreciates the Department's improved engagement with the committee on the European phased, adaptive approach (EPAA).

As announced by the President in September 2009, the EPAA is designed to: sustain U.S. homeland defense against long-range ballistic missile threats; speed protection of U.S. deployed forces, civilian personnel, and their accompanying families against the near-term missile threat from Iran; ensure and enhance the protection of the territory and populations of all North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, in concert with their missile defense capabilities, against the current and growing ballistic missile threat; deploy proven capabilities and technologies to meet current threats; and provide flexibility to upgrade and adjust the architecture, and to do so in a cost-effective manner, as the threat evolves.

The committee notes that NATO formally endorsed territorial missile defense at its November 2010 Lisbon Summit and in its new Strategic Concept, and welcomed the EPAA "as a valuable national contribution to the NATO missile defence architecture." The Lisbon Summit Declaration further stated that such a territorial missile defense capability would be "based on the principles of the indivisibility of Allied security and NATO solidarity."

The committee has observed a range of DOD activities, many in conjunction with the Department of State, to implement EPAA. These include the March 2011 deployment of the Aegis ballistic missile defense cruiser USS *Monterey* to the Mediterranean for a 6-month mission to provide some defensive coverage of south and southeastern Europe as part of EPAA phase one, and ongoing bilateral negotiations with Romania and the Republic of Poland for the hosting of a land-based Aegis Ashore site as part of phase two and phase three, respectively. The committee is concerned, however, about the Department's plans for forward-basing an AN/TPY-2 radar in southeastern Europe to meet the 2011 timeline for EPAA phase one, as a location has yet to be determined.

The committee expects continued engagement with the Department of Defense as the EPAA further evolves. The committee understands that specific command and control arrangements between the U.S. and other NATO members are still being developed. The committee believes contributions by U.S. allies are essential if EPAA is to be a NATO-wide capability and reflect the burden sharing commitment underpinning NATO.

Additionally, at the committee's request, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) evaluated the Department of Defense's plans for EPAA implementation. In its December 2010 report, GAO expressed concern that "DOD has not developed an overall investment cost or an acquisition decision schedule. The limited visibility into the costs and schedule for European PAA constrains independent assessments of progress as well as limits oversight." Furthermore, a September 2010 independent assessment of EPAA by the Institute for Defense Analyses, required by section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), estimated the 27-year total costs for the EPAA at $22.0 billion to $23.0 billion, which is significantly more than cost estimates provided to the committee by MDA. As the committee continues its oversight of EPAA, it expects MDA to further refine its cost estimates.

GAO further observed that system schedules are highly optimistic in technology development, testing, production, and integration, leaving little room for potential delays. To this point, the committee is concerned about the development of the standard missile (SM)-3 Block IIA and SM-3 Block IIB interceptors as well as the timeline for phase 4 of the EPAA, which is planned to provide additional protection of the United States. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes an increase in SM-3 Block IIA funds.

*Precision Tracking Space System*

The budget request contained $160.8 million in PE 64883C for the Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS) for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The request would support trade studies and alternative analyses, preliminary subsystem designs, and risk reduction activities. According to MDA budget materials, PTSS is planned to provide tracking, discrimination, and fire control quality data to enable earlier intercept opportunities. PTSS is also expected to increase the missile raid handling capacity of the ballistic missile defense system. The program was a new start in fiscal year 2011.

The committee is concerned about the acquisition approach for PTSS, which is planned to leverage mature technology, and be a less complex and lower-cost design than its predecessor, two Space Tracking and Surveillance System demonstration satellites launched in 2009 that are providing risk reduction for PTSS. However, MDA is leveraging Government and military laboratories to design and develop the first two PTSS satellites for launch in fiscal year 2016. The committee sees a dichotomy between MDA's plans for a technically mature, less complex system and an approach that leverages labs, which primarily focus on scientific research and advanced technology development. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the technical trades required to implement a less complex, lower-cost design would lead to performance trade-offs that may impact the ability of PTSS to provide sufficient ascent and midcourse tracking.

Based on MDA descriptions, both PTSS and the Airborne Infrared (ABIR) system are planned to provide larger raid size tracking and support early intercept opportunities. The committee is concerned about the affordability of continuing both PTSS and ABIR given the current budgetary environment and the committee's other missile defense priorities.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $160.8 million, in PE 64883C for the Precision Tracking Space System. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends additional funds to accelerate ABIR, based on recommendations contained in the Joint Capabilities Mix-III study, and to increase data exploitation from other overhead persistent infrared sensors to include the Space-Based Infrared System and a program discussed in the classified annex accompanying this report.

*Project Pelican*

The committee continues to support the efforts within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to pursue a technology demonstrator for a rigid-hull, variable-buoyancy hybrid air vehicle, known as "Project Pelican." As noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the proposed capabilities have the potential to revolutionize the future of intra-theater lift, as well as other areas of importance, such as intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and communications relay.

However, the committee is cautiously optimistic about the progress of the demonstrator vehicle, and cautions against scaling this vehicle up to an operational system before the technology is adequately validated. The committee is concerned that airship technology has a history of being hampered by a variety of operational constraints that the military has not adequately dealt with since the last military airships were retired more than 50-years ago. The committee believes the Department should pursue a parallel path that demonstrates robust concepts of operation as the technology is matured and validated. Part of the process of developing concepts of operation should include planning and analysis for addressing operational and logistical constraints of using large airships, such as basing, airspace management, and environmental issues.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to conduct a series of tabletop exercises, in conjunction with the service acquisition executives of the military departments and the combatant commanders, to develop concepts of operations for how rigid-hull, variable-buoyancy hybrid air vehicle technology might be employed in future platforms. The committee further directs the Assistant Secretary to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of the tabletop exercises within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

*Scientific and engineering fellowships*

The committee recognizes the importance of the various fellowship and scholarship programs operated by the Department of Defense and the intelligence agencies. The committee strongly encourages the Department and other agencies to aggressively examine ways to increase the participation of diverse graduate level students in the physical sciences in these programs. The committee also encourages the Department to complement existing programs by partnering with non-profit organizations for these purposes when doing so would be cost-effective and beneficial.

*Semiconductor development*

The committee recognizes the importance of the development of advanced integrated circuits by the semiconductor industry for defense applications. The committee is aware that the diminishing domestic semiconductor supply chain posses a critical challenge to U.S. national security interests, particularly with regard to the impact that counterfeit and maliciously altered electronics could potentially have on systems requiring a high-degree of trust. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue working with industry and academia to pursue development of new advanced domestic manufacturing technologies for semiconductors.

*Social media tools for collaboration*

The committee is aware that the Defense Information Systems Agency has been developing a range of collaboration tools as part of the Net Centric Enterprise Services (NCES) program. These collaboration tools are necessary for Department of Defense personnel to carry out their missions. However, it is unclear whether these tools can evolve rapidly enough to meet the growing capability demands of the user community.

The committee understands that emerging social media applications for the commercial marketplace have been developed in parallel at a much faster pace, and also provide significant capability for collaboration and information analysis. The committee urges the Defense Information Systems Agency to examine these social media tools to determine how they might be better integrated into future increments of NCES to complement traditional collaboration tools.

*Standard Missile-3 Block IIA interceptor*

The budget request contained $424.5 million in PE 64881C for Standard Missile (SM)-3 Block IIA Co-Development for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA).

The request would support the continued development and testing of the SM-3 Block IIA interceptor, which is being co-developed in cooperation with the Government of Japan. The SM-3 Block IIA is being designed with a larger diameter missile and more advanced kill vehicle technology than the SM-3 Block IA/IB interceptor. Upon planned deployment in 2018 as part of phase 3 of the President's phased, adaptive approach to missile defense in Europe, the SM-3 Block IIB is expected to provide expanded coverage of Europe against intermediate range ballistic missile threats, and may provide some limited intercontinental ballistic missile intercept capability.

The committee is concerned about schedule risk in the SM-3 Block IIA program. The system preliminary design review (PDR) is planned for fiscal year 2012, leading to a first flight test planned for the first quarter of fiscal year 2015. The committee understands, however, that technical issues surfaced during component-level PDRs involving the divert and attitude control system in the kill vehicle, nosecone weight, and third stage rocket motor. The committee understands the technology maturation process and appreciates MDA efforts to retire technology risk. However, the committee believes MDA will be challenged in holding to its current schedule and is concerned about the program's ability to meet its planned 2018 deployment date.

The committee requests MDA to provide an updated schedule and funding profile for the SM-3 Block IIA program should either change in the near-term. The committee also notes that arrangements for SM-3 Block IIA production have not been determined with the Government of Japan, and the committee encourages the Department of Defense to begin such discussions.

The committee recommends $464.5 million, an increase of $40.0 million, in PE 64881C for SM-3 Block IIA Co-Development to fund additional development and technology risk reduction efforts, at the discretion of the Director, Missile Defense Agency, to reduce schedule risk.

*Study on possible establishment of a power and energy University Affiliated Research Center*

The committee recognizes the national security imperative for diversifying fuel supply and reducing energy consumption. The Department of Defense has many Department goals and laws for reducing energy consumption including increasing the use of renewable technologies.

Establishing a University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) is one potential method for providing the Department of Defense with long-term continuity for essential research, development, and engineering capability enhancements in specific mission areas. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to assess the cost and feasibility of establishing a UARC that researches and develops power and energy technologies to reduce energy demand, improve energy-efficiency, and help achieve the overall mission requirements of the Department of Defense and military services. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 29, 2012. The report should include recommendations regarding the potential establishment of this UARC, the proposed funding required to establish the UARC, and an analysis of potential locations.

*Technology transition and insertion*

The committee understands that rapid acquisition programs are increasingly used in the place of dedicated technology transition programs and that the Department did not request any funds for fiscal year 2012 for the Defense Acquisition Challenge program. The committee is concerned about the effectiveness of technology transition within the Department and the opportunity to insert innovative and cost-saving technologies into Department of Defense acquisition programs.

The committee notes that technology transition is essential to fulfilling the mandate of section 202 of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23), which requires acquisition strategies to ensure competition throughout the lifecycle of major defense acquisition programs. The committee believes that program managers are risk averse and are not incentivized to pull new technologies into programs of record in order to foster competition and reduce program cost. Consequently, there is a need for mechanisms external to a program of record to identify promising new technologies and to reduce the risk of technology

transition for major defense acquisition programs. However, both the committee and the Government Accountability Office have observed that the Department's approach to funding transition is flawed and that multiple, small funding sources for specific transition activities offer a piecemeal solution to a more systemic problem.

Accordingly, section 253 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) required the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) to assess the feasibility of consolidating technology transition accounts into one account to be managed at the Department-level. Section 253 also required the USD (AT&L) to submit a report to Congress on the aforementioned assessment and include recommendations concerning the streamlining and improvement of technology transition activities throughout the Department. Unfortunately, the USD(AT&L) has failed to comply with this statutory requirement, which was required no later than October 1, 2009.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would repeal the Technology Transition Initiative, section 2359a of title 10, United States Code effective October 1, 2012. However, the repeal of that initiative is incumbent upon compliance with section 253 of Public Law 110-417. The committee expects the USD(AT&L) to comply with section 253 no later than August 31, 2011, so the congressional defense committees can understand the full ramifications of the repeal or modification of technology transition and insertion activities, such as the Technology Transition Initiative and the Defense Acquisition Challenge program.

*University Affiliated Research Centers*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense funds a number of University Affiliated Research Centers (UARC) to support its research needs. Although permitted by law to award research and development contracts non-competitively to universities and other non-profit organizations, the Department of Defense has chosen to limit the UARC program to universities. The committee is concerned that by barring non-profit research organizations from programs such as UARCs, the Department is depriving itself from utilizing specialized expertise that exists within non-profit research and development organizations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to review the Department of Defense's guidance pertaining to non-profit research institutions to participate in UARCs and other research and development contracting opportunities to ensure that these organizations are not being unfairly excluded from competitions. The committee further directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to provide a briefing on the results of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

*Vertical lift consortium*

The committee recognizes the essential role that vertical lift aircraft serve as a critical enabler for the Department's execution of time-sensitive and terrain-restricted combat and humanitarian missions around the world. The committee notes that the requirements of the combatant commanders for vertical lift capabilities continue to increase. The committee supports the Department's future vertical lift initiative to improve the long-term state of military vertical lift aircraft. The committee also supports the Department's efforts to promote the formation of, and its subsequent engagement with the Vertical Lift Consortium (VLC), a non-profit corporation with open membership made up of large, small, and non-traditional U.S. businesses and academia engaged in rotorcraft technology development. The Department established an Other Transaction Agreement with the VLC which provides a mechanism for it to receive direct feedback regarding the development of realistic and achievable requirements, and provides a simplified contract vehicle for the competitive award of contracts for the rapid and low-cost flight demonstration of vertical lift technologies responsive to warfighter needs.

The committee notes that despite encouraging the establishment of the VLC, the Department has yet to fund it. The committee encourages the Department to take action to either fund the VLC or to disestablish it in the near future. In addition, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2012, that states the Department's current and future plans for the VLC.

*Weaponization of rail-launched Unmanned Aerial Systems*

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's interest in weaponizing rail-launched Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) to respond to urgent requirements to protect U.S. and coalition forces. The committee further understands there is an urgent needs statement being staffed to meet requirements in U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility.

The committee recommends that the Department of Defense continue to pursue the conventional weaponization of rail-launched UAS, like the RQ-7B Shadow and similar systems to respond to urgent requirements to better defend U.S. and coalition forces.

*Weapons of Mass Destruction defeat technologies and capabilities*

The committee notes that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) continues a strong partnership with each of the services and U.S. Special Operations Command to develop and field innovative weapons of mass destruction (WMD) defeat technologies and solutions that reduce, eliminate and counter the

threat of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and high-yield explosive materials (CBRNE). In particular, the committee supports DTRA's ongoing activities to develop and demonstrate innovative munitions that incinerate and destroy chemical and biological agents without incidental target agent dispersal and area contamination. These technical capabilities remain an area of particular interest to the committee since the national intelligence community continues to assess credible threats posed by terrorist groups, states, and state-sponsored entities to acquire and weaponize CBRNE materials for use against the United States and its allies. The committee therefore encourages DTRA to continue development and demonstration of innovative and emerging agent and functional defeat technologies to ensure prompt transition of validated capabilities to address national security requirements.

## OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

### Overview

The budget request contained $191.3 million for operational test and evaluation, Defense. The committee recommends $191.3 million, the requested amount for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2012 operational test and evaluation, Defense program are identified in division D of this Act.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation at the levels identified in section 4201 of division D of this Act.

### SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

#### Section 211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Ground Combat Vehicle Program

This section would limit obligation or expenditure of funds to not more than 70 percent for the Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) program until the Secretary of the Army provides a report to the defense committees containing an updated analysis of alternatives that includes a quantitative comparison of the most current upgraded Bradley Fighting Vehicle and other alternatives against the revised GCV design concept.

The committee continues to support the Army's goal of pursuing a modernized combat vehicle. However, before the Army starts another major development program that could cost over $30.0 billion, the committee must be convinced that the GCV will be significantly more capable than an upgraded version of current fielded platforms. The committee understands that the Army wants the GCV to carry three additional soldiers, but the committee believes that should not be the primary attribute that drives the decision on continuing the project on its current path. The committee believes that the GCV program should not proceed beyond the technology development phase unless the committee's issues and concerns are addressed.

#### Section 212—Limitation on the Individual Carbine Program

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a robust and comprehensive analysis of alternatives (AOA) assessment, similar to a cost and operational effectiveness analysis for the Individual Carbine (IC) program. The section would also prohibit the IC program from moving beyond its milestone C decision point until such analysis has occurred and has been reported to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act.

The committee expects the AOA to evaluate the operational effectiveness and affordability of system alternatives that satisfy the Army's needs for a primary small arms weapon system, highlighting the relationship between cost, schedule, and performance. The committee believes this AOA should include commercial off-the-shelf solutions, solutions requiring minimal developmental efforts, and current programs of record. The committee expects that for each alternative, the analysis would detail implications for doctrine, organizations, training, leadership and education, personnel, and facilities.

The committee understands the objective of the IC program is to procure and field a carbine that can achieve greater accuracy, lethality, and reliability than the existing M4 carbine, while also providing better ergonomics, and use current accessory items or accessory items with like-capabilities. The committee notes that this program could potentially be worth over $1.0 billion and could replace all M4 carbines in the current inventory. Because of the value and significance of this program, the committee believes an analysis of alternatives is required before any production decision is made.

The committee is also aware that the Army is initiating a competitive product improvement program (PIP) as a near-term solution for system upgrades to the M4 carbine and encourages the Secretary of the Army to consider these product improvements as part of the required AOA. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to consider evaluating commercial-off-the-shelf solutions as part of any PIP solution.

### Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Ohio-class Ballistic Missile Submarine Replacement Program

This section would contain four findings concerning the number of submarine launched ballistic missile (SLBM) launchers (missile tubes) planned for the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) replacement, the composition of the deployed nuclear deterrent force of the United States planned under the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), and recent testimony by the commander of the United States Strategic Command.

This section would express a sense of Congress that:

(1) The long-term ability of the United States to maintain a nuclear force sufficient to address the range of mission requirements necessary to deter, dissuade, and defeat potential adversaries and assure allies and partners

must not be comprised solely on the basis of the promise of potential cost savings resulting from the Department's decision to reduce the planned number of missile tubes per *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine from 24 to 16; and

(2) The planned *Ohio*-class ballistic submarine replacement is expected to be in operations through 2080 and therefore near-term design decisions should take into consideration uncertainties in the future threat and strategic environment.

This section would also limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2012 for the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine replacement program to not more than 90 percent until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report summarizing the analysis that supported the Department's decision to reduce the planned number of missile tubes per submarine to 16. Reporting elements would include: a description of the assumed threat and strategic environment throughout the expected operational lifetime of the program; a description of any assumptions regarding changes in nuclear policy and strategy, and further nuclear reductions; an identification of any missions or requirements that may have increased risk; and a summary of the cost comparison between 16 and 20 missile tube designs, including the accuracy of the cost estimate.

Over the course of the last year, the committee has received inconsistent information on the number of missile tubes per hull planned for the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine replacement. In a May 13, 2010, report to Congress, required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), the President outlined his SSBN force structure plans: "The Secretary of Defense, based on recommendations from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has established a baseline nuclear force structure that fully supports U.S. security requirements and conforms to the New START limits… The United States will reduce the number of SLBM launchers (launch tubes) from 24 to 20 per SSBN, and deploy no more than 240 SLBMs at any time." These plans for 20 missile tubes per SSBN were reaffirmed in the joint Department of Energy and Department of Defense February 16, 2011, update to the report required by section 1251. However, on January 10, 2011, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics issued an acquisition decision memorandum for the *Ohio*-class submarine replacement program whereby the Navy received milestone A approval to proceed with a design based on 16 missile tubes.

The committee remains unclear as to the analysis and assumptions that informed the Department's decision to reduce the planned number of missile tubes per SSBN from 24 to 16, and the rationale for its deviation from the baseline force structure of 20 missile tubes per SSBN outlined in the report required by section 1251, other than the promise of potential cost savings. The committee seeks to hold the Department accountable to providing it with such information.

Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Amphibious Assault Vehicles of the Marine Corps

This section would limit the obligation of funds committed for the amphibious assault vehicle until the Secretary of Defense meets certain requirements.

The committee notes that the budget request contained no funds for the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV) and that the Department is terminating the program. The committee continues to be frustrated with the lack of transparency by the Department, and its failure to inform Congress prior to making major weapons systems decisions that have significant national security implications. The committee agrees with the June 5, 2007, Nunn-McCurdy recertification letter submitted to Congress, which stated there are no options other than a restructured EFV program that could provide equal or greater military capability at less cost. The recertification letter also stated that initiating a new start program would increase operational risk due to further delayed deliveries, and pursuing an upgraded Amphibious Assault Vehicle (AAV), while entailing lower cost, would provide less military capability due to the slow speed of the AAV. In addition, the recertification letter stated that the Joint Requirements Oversight Committee (JROC) affirmed the need for a high-speed amphibious assault capability. The EFV's ability to accelerate until the vehicle moves along the top of the water is what gave it the capability to reach speeds in excess of 25 knots.

The Department briefed the committee on its rationale for termination of the EFV program on April 7, 2011. The committee remains concerned that the Department failed to conduct the proper analysis prior to making the decision to terminate the EFV program. The committee has yet to see the detailed analysis that would show one way or the other whether or not other alternatives may have been a more efficient solution rather than terminating the EFV program. The committee questions the Department's assumptions behind the decision to change the deployment distance from 25 nautical miles to 12 nautical miles. In addition, the committee believes that the Marine's combat effectiveness will be negatively impacted as a result of potential motion sickness stemming from riding in an amphibious assault vehicle that is not up on plane for long periods of time. The current AAV is launched from approximately 2 nautical miles and can travel up to 6 knots in ideal sea state conditions. During the April 7 briefing, the committee was told that an upgraded AAV might be able to reach 10 knots and that the speed requirement for the follow-on effort to the EFV, the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (ACV), would be somewhere in the vicinity of 14 knots. The committee notes that a replacement vehicle to the EFV would have to go 16 or 17 knots in order to accelerate until the vehicle moves along the top of the water. The committee is concerned that although no analysis has yet to be completed, the Department has determined that it does not have a high-speed water requirement as validated by the JROC in 2007.

The committee is concerned by what it believes is the Department's current plan to spend approximately $3.0 billion to upgrade the current AAV for it to go from a max speed of 6 knots to 10 knots, travel and then spend an additional $6.0 to $7.0 billion on the ACV so that it can travel up to 14 knots. The committee is concerned that the Department may not be able afford both a comprehensive upgrade to the AAV, and a new start ACV program. The committee believes that a more affordable plan would be minor upgrades that are focused on survivability to the current AAV, which would allow the Department to focus its remaining resources on the ACV program. The committee encourages the Department to develop an acquisition strategy that would produce the ACV program within approximately 5 years upon new start approval.

Section 215—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Propulsion System for the F-35 Lightning II Aircraft Program

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds for performance improvements to the F-35 Lightning II propulsion system unless the Secretary of Defense ensures the competitive development and production of such propulsion system. This section would define the term "performance improvement," with respect to the propulsion system for the F-35 Lightning II aircraft program, as an increase in fan or core engine airflow volume or maximum thrust in military or afterburner setting for the primary purpose of improving the take-off performance or vertical load bring back of such aircraft, and would not include development or procurement improvements with respect to weight, acquisition cost, operations and support costs, durability, manufacturing efficiencies, observability requirements, or repair costs.

Section 216—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Joint Replacement Fuze Program

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2012 for the Air Force for the joint/common replacement fuze program for Air Force and Navy nuclear warheads to not more than 75 percent until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility of the program. The committee notes that an ongoing Air Force effort to modernize fuzes on the Mk21 reentry vehicle through a depot refurbishment program experienced significant schedule delays. A review of this refurbishment program indicates that the Air Force failed to conduct a feasibility study to determine whether the depot had the expertise and capability to perform the refurbishment.

The committee understands that the Air Force and Navy are pursuing a joint/common replacement fuze program for both intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missile reentry vehicles. The committee applauds their efforts to

seek efficiencies and share lessons learned through such a program. However, the committee seeks to ensure that all stakeholders have developed a full understanding of the feasibility of the proposed replacement program before full development proceeds, and avoid the pitfalls experienced in the Air Force refurbishment program.

### Section 217—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Joint Space Operations Center Management System

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2012 for release one of the Joint Space Operations Center Management System (JMS) until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Secretary of the Air Force jointly provide to the congressional defense committees the acquisition strategy for JMS, to include a description of the acquisition policies and procedures applicable to JMS and any additional acquisition authorities that may be necessary.

This section would also express a sense of Congress that improvements to U.S. space situational awareness and space command and control capabilities are necessary, and the traditional defense acquisition process is not optimal for developing the services oriented architecture and net-centric environment planned for JMS.

### Section 218—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Wireless Innovation Fund

This section would prohibit the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency from obligating more than 10 percent of the funds available for fiscal year 2012 for the Wireless Innovation Fund until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics provides a report on how the fund will be managed and executed.

### Section 219—Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research and Development

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a program for flight research and demonstration of advanced helicopter technology in accordance with section 2226(f)(3) of title 10, United States Code.

### Section 220—Designation of Main Propulsion System of the Next-Generation Long-Range Strike Bomber Aircraft as Major Subprogram

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate the main propulsion system of the next-generation long-range strike bomber aircraft as a major subprogram and would require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a competitive acquisition strategy for the propulsion system.

### Section 221—Designation of Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System Development and Procurement Program as Major Subprogram

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to designate the Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System (EMALS) as a major subprogram of the CVN-78 *Ford*-class aircraft carrier major defense acquisition program within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act. A major subprogram is defined in section 2430a of title 10, United States Code.

The committee is aware that EMALS is progressing through its land-based testing. However, earlier problems in development have reduced almost all schedule margin in order to make the date the equipment must be in the shipyard for installation in the first ship of the class. The committee acknowledges elevating EMALS to a major subprogram will provide the proper oversight to this critical system as it continues its development and production.

### Section 222—Prohibition on Delegation of Budgeting Authority for Certain Research and Educational Programs

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from delegating the authority for programming or budgeting of the Office of the Secretary of Defense Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions program to an individual outside the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

### Section 223—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Future Unmanned Carrier-based Strike System

This section would limit obligation of fiscal year 2012 FUCSS funds to no more than 15 percent until 60 days after the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition submit certain certifications regarding the acquisition of FUCSS to the congressional defense committees. This provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide the congressional defense committees a briefing, subsequent to a review of the Navy's FUCSS acquisition strategy, no later than 90 days after the date on which the aforementioned Department of Defense officials submit the certain certifications to the congressional defense committees.

## SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

### Section 231—Acquisition Accountability Reports on the Ballistic Missile Defense System

This section would amend chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section 225 that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain an acquisition baseline for each program element and designated subprogram element of the ballistic missile defense system before the program or subprogram enters engineering and manufacturing development, and production and deployment.

This section would incorporate and expand upon annual reporting requirements established in section 225 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), to include reporting on schedules and milestones, acquisition quantities, requirements, technical capabilities, cost estimates, and test plans. Additionally, this section would repeal section 225 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, section 223(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), and section 221 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), to reduce duplication in missile defense reporting requirements.

Section 232—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Medium Extended Air Defense System

This section would express the sense of Congress on the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS). This section would also provide a limitation that no funds made available in fiscal year 2012 for MEADS may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense either negotiates a multilateral termination of the MEADS contract or restructures the MEADS program, and ensures that specific deliverables will be transitioned to a program of record by September 30, 2013.

This limitation would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit written notification to the congressional defense committees on several elements, including: MEADS termination costs or program restructure costs; the program schedule and specific deliverables; the specific technologies to be harvested and the plans for transitioning such technologies to a current program of record; and how the Secretary plans to address the Department's air and missile defense requirements in the absence of a fielded MEADS capability, including a summary of the activities, and cost estimate and funding profile, necessary to sustain and upgrade the Patriot air and missile defense system.

In a Department of Defense MEADS fact sheet, dated February 14, 2011, and subsequent Medium Extended Air Defense System Report to Congress, dated March 18, 2011, the Department concluded that the completion of MEADS design and development (D&D) would require an additional $2.0 billion, of which the U.S. Government's share would be $1.2 billion, and extend the schedule by 30 months at a minimum. The Department of Defense estimated that an additional $800.0 million would be required to complete U.S.-unique certification, test, and evaluation requirements, and integration. Therefore, the Department of Defense concluded

that, "The U.S. cannot afford to purchase MEADS and make required upgrades to Patriot concurrently over the next two decades," and decided to complete a proof of concept effort, which is scheduled to be completed by 2014, using the remaining D&D funds agreed to in a 2004 memorandum of understanding. The Department argues that this effort would put the D&D program on stable footing should the Italian Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany wish to continue MEADS development and production, although the U.S. has decided not to pursue MEADS procurement and production. The budget request contained $804.0 million across fiscal years 2012-13 for the U.S. share of the proof of concept effort.

The committee is concerned about authorizing significant funds for a program that the Department does not intend to procure, and whose record of performance, according to the February 14, 2011 Department of Defense fact sheet, "might ordinarily make it a candidate for cancellation." Additionally, the committee lacks confidence that the proof of concept would result in viable prototypes and demonstrated capabilities. The Chief of Staff of the Army testified before the committee in March 2011 that he is "not convinced" the MEADS proof of concept is viable.

Rather than focus on a proof of concept effort, the committee believes the Department should immediately identify and harvest promising MEADS technologies, whether U.S. or partner-developed, and transition those technologies into a Patriot air and missile defense system upgrade effort or other viable program of record. The committee understands that the Department must now sustain the Patriot system longer than previously planned and expects the Department to provide its plans for sustaining and upgrading the system. Several countries in the Middle East, Europe, and East Asia operate Patriot systems. The committee believes a Patriot system upgrade effort that includes promising MEADS technologies may benefit not only the U.S., but many other countries with Patriot systems.

In conjunction with the Department's Patriot sustainment and upgrade plans, the committee expects the Department to develop a cost estimate and funding profile for such plans and to include those funds in the fiscal year 2013 budget request.

The committee is aware that the Department's maximum termination liability is approximately $846.0 million should it unilaterally terminate the MEADS contract. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to pursue multilateral termination options to lower the contract termination liability belonging to the United States.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends a reduction to the fiscal year 2012 budget request for MEADS on the premise that the Department is able to negotiate a multilateral contract termination or further restructure the program.

Lastly, the committee wants to make clear its support for international missile defense cooperation, and encourages the Department to continue to pursue

cooperative missile defense activities that are affordable and benefit the security of all parties.

Section 233—Homeland Defense Hedging Policy and Strategy

This section would make it the policy of the United States to develop and maintain a hedging strategy to provide protection of the United States:

(1) If the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) threat from the Middle East materializes earlier than 2020, or technical challenges or schedule delays affect the availability of the Standard Missile-3 Block IIB interceptor planned for fielding in Europe by 2020 to protect the United States as part of phase 4 of the President's phased, adaptive approach;
(2) If the ICBM threat from East Asia materializes more rapidly than expected;
(3) That improves or enhances the protection of the United States beyond the ground-based midcourse defense capabilities currently deployed for the defense of the United States; and
(4) That includes plans for ensuring that hedging capabilities are suitable to perform the assigned mission, operationally effective, and use technologies that are sufficiently matured and tested prior to fielding.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees the Department of Defense's homeland defense hedging strategy by December 5, 2011, or the date on which the Secretary completes the development of such strategy, whichever comes earlier.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is currently developing a hedging strategy for the protection of the U.S. homeland, to include continued development and assessment of a two-stage ground-based interceptor as noted in the February 2010 Department of Defense Ballistic Missile Defense Review. The committee notes that during testimony before the committee on October 1, 2009, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy stated, "we keep the development of the two-stage [ground-based interceptor] on the books as a hedge in case things come earlier, in case there's any kind of technological challenge with the later models of the [Standard Missile-3]." This section would clarify and expand such policy.

Section 234—Ground-based Midcourse Defense System

This section contains five findings concerning the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system, including recent intercept flight test failures, its role in protecting the U.S. homeland, reductions in the President's budget request for GMD, schedule delays resulting from the flight-test failures and Missile Defense Agency operations before the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing

Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) was enacted, and additional ground-based interceptors (GBI).

Additionally, this section would express the sense of Congress that the GMD system is currently the only missile defense system that protects the U.S. homeland from long-range ballistic missile threats.

This section would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan by the Director, Missile Defense Agency to address the GMD flight-test failures, including the schedule and additional resources necessary to implement the plan. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide written certification that the Director of the Missile Defense Agency has thoroughly investigated the root cause of the flight-test failures, and that the plan, schedule, resources, and prioritization for implementation of corrective measures are sufficient.

### Section 235—Study on Space-based Interceptor Technology

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study examining the technical and operational considerations associated with developing and operating a limited space-based interceptor (SBI) capability and submit a report on such study to the congressional defense committees within one year of enactment of the Act. The study would be required to include an identification of the technical risks, gaps, and constraints associated with developing and operating such a capability; an assessment of the maturity levels of various related technologies; the key knowledge, research, and testing that would needed for any nation to develop and operate an effective SBI capability; and the estimated effectiveness and cost of potential options for developing and operating an SBI capability, including their effectiveness in conjunction with existing and planned terrestrially-based missile defense systems. Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by the Act for ballistic missile defense technology, this section would require the Secretary to obligate or expend $8.0 million on the study and report. The report submitted to Congress would be required to be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

## SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

### Section 241—Annual Comptroller General Report on the KC-46A Aircraft Acquisition Program

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an annual review of the KC-46A aircraft acquisition program and provide the results of that review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2012, and annually thereafter through 2017.

Section 242—Independent Review and Assessment of Cryptographic Modernization Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an independent assessment of the cryptographic modernization program for the Department of Defense and submit a report to Congress by March 1, 2012.

Section 243—Report on Feasibility of Electromagnetic Rail Gun System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committee within 180 days after the enactment of this Act in the feasibility of developing and deploying the electromagnetic rail gun system to be used for either land- or ship-based force protection.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 251—Repeal of Requirement for Technology Transition Initiative

This section would repeal section 2359a of title 10, United States Code effective October 1, 2012.

Section 252—Preservation and Storage of Certain Property Related to F136 Propulsion System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and carry out a plan for the preservation and storage of property owned by the Federal Government that was acquired under the F136 propulsion system development contract that would: ensure that the Secretary preserves and stores such property in a manner that would allow the development of the F136 propulsion system to be restarted after a period of idleness, provide for the long-term sustainment and repair of such property, and allow for such preservation and storage to be conducted at either the facilities of the Federal Government or a contractor under such contract; identify supplier base costs of restarting development; ensure that the Secretary, at no cost to the Federal Government, provides support and allows for the use of such property by the contractor under such contract to conduct research, development, test, and evaluation of the F136 engine, if such activities are self-funded by the contractor; and identify any contract modifications, additional facilities or funding that the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the plan. This section would also prohibit the obligation or expenditure of amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise make available for fiscal year 2012 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, or research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force, for the F-35 Lightning II program for activities related to destroying or disposing of the property acquired under the F136 propulsion system development contract. Additionally, this section would require

the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committee, not later than 45 days after the enactment of the Act, on the Secretary's plan for the preservation and storage of such property.

Section 253—Extension of Authority for Mechanism to Provide Funds for Defense Laboratories for Research and Development of Technologies for Military Missions

This section would amend Section 219 of the of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-317; 122 Stat. 4389; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note), as amended by subsection 2801(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2660) by striking "October 1, 2013" and inserting "September 30, 2016".

# TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $259.8 billion in operation and maintenance (O&M) funds to provide for the training, deployment, and sustainment of U.S. military forces. The fiscal year 2012 O&M request includes $170.8 million in the base budget; approximately 34 percent of the total request is for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). This is an 8 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2011 request, with reductions in funding for the operations in the Republic of Iraq accounting for the majority of the decrease.

While deployed Army forces have, in most cases, the equipment, personnel, and training they require for their missions, this deployed readiness has come at the continued expense of non-deployed Army units. The committee remains concerned about the number of non-deployed units reporting that they are not ready for combat operations, or would need additional time and equipment to prepare for deployment. Restoring equipment readiness is a key element of the Army reset process. The fiscal year 2012 budget request moves an increasing share of the enduring depot maintenance requirements back to the base budget, providing funds for the restoration of equipment, damaged or worn out nearly 10 years of constant operations, back to a level of combat readiness. The Army has increased funding for home-station full spectrum training, reflecting anticipated increases in training tempo as the Army commits fewer units to combat operations. However, the Army has transitioned its methodology for identifying training requirements and resource allocations and is using the term "Full Spectrum Training Mile" as a metric. The committee is concerned that this metric may not be the best tool for gauging operations tempo and content of training.

In Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn, the Air Force has committed more than 370 aircraft to support combat operations and has been flying more than 410 sorties per day in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility. Detrimental effects on equipment as a result of high operations tempo include engine and structural fatigue, deterioration, corrosion, and increased rates of component failures. The increased tempo also delays routine maintenance. Of the 5,500 aircraft inventory, 2.1 percent are either grounded or restricted. As a result, the committee is concerned that the Air Force has experienced significant shortfalls in depot maintenance in its baseline program for Active and Reserve forces which have been made up only through Overseas Contingency Operations funding. Like the Army, the Air Force's next-to-deploy forces are reporting high levels of readiness, but this comes at the increasing expense of the non-deployed forces that experience fewer opportunities to train with a full complement of personnel and equipment. In addition, even with the ongoing drawdown in the Republic of Iraq, the Air Force intends to continue assigning

airmen to joint expeditionary tasks because of mission requirements in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Despite the drawdown in Iraq, naval operations tempo is expected to remain high, as demand for the Navy's services is up, including anti-piracy and ballistic missile defense operations, as well as operations in support of U.S. Africa Command, U.S. Pacific Command, individual augmentees in Afghanistan and Iraq, and in the Arctic region. The budget request for naval flight operations provides increased funds to support operations in Iraq and Afghanistan including significant increases to a realignment of funding for Fleet Replacement Squadrons and Chief of Naval Air Training to consolidate all Navy and Marine Corps flight training and tactical resources into a single budget activity. However, the Navy's flying hour program only funds the Fleet Replacement Squadrons at 88 percent of the requirement. The Navy's base budget also funds 45 underway days per quarter for deployed forces and 20 underway days per quarter for non-deployed forces, as it did in fiscal year 2011. These levels are below the Navy's peacetime readiness requirements based on the continuing assumption that overseas contingency operations will reduce training and routine deployment opportunities.

The Marine Corps recently concluded a Force Posture Review that emphasized "rebalancing" the Marine Corps to better "focus on future contingencies." As such, the fiscal year 2012 budget request reflects some initial investments in special skill sets needed to move the Marine Corps toward a force more fully attuned to the lessons learned during nine years of combat. The top line for Marine Corps O&M decreased slightly, mostly attributable to a reduction in equipment maintenance as a result of the shifting of equipment that was scheduled to return from Iraq for depot-level repair to Afghanistan in support of combat operations. The committee is concerned about the level and composition of prepositioned stocks and the Navy's proposal to retrograde two prepositioned Maritime Support Program vessels to Jacksonville, Florida, in a reduced status.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for increasing its emphasis and resources regarding energy security requirements. Diversification of the energy supply is a national security imperative and the Department is leading change as the consumer of approximately 80 percent of the total Federal energy usage. The Department has made great strides to become more energy efficient, reduce its energy consumption, and supplement with alternative energy technology both on installations and in contingency operations. Through multiple fiscal year 2012 investments such as the Energy Conservation Investment Program, the Installation Energy Test Bed, and the Operational Energy Capability Improvement program, the Department is focusing on energy security for assured access to power for the military services. The committee has taken great strides in this year's bill to ensure energy projects provide an appropriate return on investment.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

#### Flight Simulator Training Hour Restoration

As part of the Department of Defense's efficiencies initiative, the budget request cut the Army Guard and Air Force Active and Reserve Components flying hours program for training with the intent that simulators would be used to backfill the training requirements.

The committee recommends restoring the reduction to the flying hours program for the training of the Army Guard and Air Force Reserve Components. The committee is concerned that the reduction was levied on the Reserve Components without considering their lack of access to the high-fidelity, networked simulators that are resident in the active Army and Air Force.

#### Marine Corps Expeditionary Forward Operating Base

The budget request included no funds for the Marine Corps Expeditionary Forward Operating Base (ExFOB). Due to its demonstrated success in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee recommends $9.0 million specifically for the ExFOB to fund future phases of the program. The committee recommends $414.4 million, an increase of $9.0 million, for Operations and Maintenance Marine Corps, specifically for the Marine Corps ExFOB.

#### Operational Energy Capability Improvement

The budget request contained $20.4 million for Operational Energy Capability Improvement. The committee recognizes the significant contribution this program will make in demonstrating energy reduction technologies and process in contingency operations. The committee recommends $30.4 million, an increase of $10.0 million, for Operational Energy Capability Improvement.

#### Strategic Environmental Research Program

The budget request contained $15.0 million for the Strategic Environmental Research Program. The committee recognizes that the Installation Energy Test Bed invests in innovative technologies that will benefit most Department of Defense installations and result in increased energy security and decreased energy consumption. The committee recommends $45.0 million, an increase of $15.0 million, for the Installation Energy Test Bed in the Strategic Environmental Research Program.

## ENERGY ISSUES

### Energy-Efficient Tires

The Department of Defense is taking significant action to reduce energy consumption. As tires get replaced in the Department of Defense's fleet vehicles, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consider replacement tires with a low rolling resistance as one method of reducing fuel consumption.

### Navy Green Fleet Initiative Including Harbor Tugs

The committee recognizes the advancements the Navy is making to reduce energy consumption. The Secretary of the Navy set a goal to deploy a "Great Green Fleet" of vessels powered entirely by alternative fuels by 2016. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Navy's plan to include the Service Craft fleet as part of the Navy's "Great Green Fleet" and include plans to test and certify alternative fuels on this fleet, specifically on the Yard Tug class vessels, by December 31, 2011.

### Support of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Operational Energy Plans and Programs

The committee is encouraged by the good work accomplished to date in the newly established Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs (OEPP). Approximately 75 percent of the Department of Defense's energy use is operational energy, and the OEPP has been the driving force behind reducing defense spending in this area. While the Department of Defense continues its efficiency reviews, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to give special consideration to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs to ensure it is able to continue necessary hiring actions and to support its critical missions.

## LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT ISSUES

### Aircraft Landing Gear Systems Sustainment

The committee is aware that aircraft landing gear systems are one of the more critical and complex subsystems on an aircraft. The system consists of complex structures, actuators, wheels, brakes, tires, steering, and anti-skid systems. The structural components are non-redundant flight safety critical items designed for the absolute minimum weight and size necessary to perform their critical functions. The committee notes that it is not unusual to have critical crack sizes that are below the threshold necessary for detection and mitigation techniques used for other aircraft structures. As a result of these unique and challenging

design constraints, aircraft landing gear systems are typically leading drivers of aircraft accidents and mishaps. The committee recognizes that many landing gear technical issues are common for heavyweight or lightweight aircraft, and the U.S. Air Force Landing Gear Engineering Group has excellent engineering insight into festering problems before they result in catastrophic mishaps. The committee encourages the U.S. Air Force to ensure that best practices are in place, including any recommendations from the Landing Gear Engineering Group, and that the service is proactive, not reactive, in the prevention of catastrophic failures.

### Department-Wide Depot Workforce Development

The committee has been made aware that the maintenance depots supporting the military services are no longer able to sustain certain cooperative training programs designed to develop the future depot workforce. The committee is concerned that maintenance depots are not being properly funded for these cooperative training programs which are intended to enable the maintenance depots to meet future workforce requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military departments to develop and begin executing integrated workforce development plans for their respective maintenance depots, and to submit to the congressional defense committees copies of their respective plans within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. Specifically, the plans should emphasize apprenticeship opportunities, encourage flexibility in hiring to allow the new trainees to shift across the maintenance depots to better structure the workforce to meet future reset and depot maintenance workloads, and provide adequate resources to sustain essential training activities.

### Improved Corrosion Prevention and Control Practices

In its report, "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars and Enhance Revenue" (GAO-11-318SP) the Government Accountability Office (GAO) stated that, "The Department of Defense estimates that corrosion costs the department over $23 billion each year." To target funding toward corrosion prevention and control, the Department established a separate program element and line item in the budget request. The Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight uses much of the funds for projects designed by the military departments to develop and test new technologies, currently costing up to $0.5 million per project. During the 6 years that the Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight has been funding corrosion projects, the average estimated return on investment for those projects has been 50-to-1. GAO reported that the Department of Defense is currently asking the military departments to validate the actual return on investment for the projects funded in fiscal year 2005 compared to the original estimates. To date,

validations have been completed for 10 of the 28 corrosion projects funded in fiscal year 2005.

If the corrosion prevention and control projects accepted from fiscal year 2005 through fiscal year 2010 had been fully funded, GAO reported that the Department potentially could have avoided $3.6 billion in corrosion-related costs, assuming those projects achieved the same level of cost-effectiveness as was estimated for all accepted projects in those years. In April 2010, GAO reported that the corrosion requirements for the fiscal year 2011 budget request identified $12.0 million for projects, leaving an unfunded requirement of about $35.0 million. If fully funded, that $35.0 million could result in a potential cost avoidance of $418.0 million. Similarly, by underfunding all of its estimated corrosion prevention and control requirements, GAO stated that the Department may be missing an opportunity for additional cost avoidance totaling $1.4 billion.

GAO noted that these calculations are highly contingent on the accuracy of estimated return on investment data provided by the Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight, and most of these calculations have not been validated by the military departments or an independent entity. Therefore, the committee encourages the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to fund the Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight sufficiently to ensure that return on investment estimates for funded corrosion prevention and control projects are validated. Additionally, in order to maximize available resources, the committee encourages the Department to take full advantage of corrosion analysis networks that provide the best available data and expertise for researching, understanding, controlling, preventing, predicting, and solving corrosion-related problems.

### Increased Competition for the Operation and Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems

The committee continues to support competition throughout the lifecycle of a weapon system and is concerned that although the Weapon Systems Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) calls for increased competition in the sustainment of major weapon systems, the military departments are not aggressively pursuing opportunities to foster and promote competition. Congressional guidance has been unambiguous on the need for increasing competition to reduce costs and improve contractor efficiency, yet high aggregate percentages of sustainment workload and parts continue to be contracted through sole-source arrangements.

Furthermore, the committee has repeatedly called for fostering competition in life-cycle sustainment to include competition for new parts, repair parts, and touch labor associated with overhauls and maintenance. Section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) requires the Secretary of Defense to implement product support strategies for major weapon systems and to leverage both industry and Department of Defense Centers

of Industrial and Technical Excellence to achieve competition, performance, and cost savings. Section 805 further stipulates that product support managers should maximize competition at the system, subsystem, and component levels. Despite this guidance, the committee is aware that the military departments continue sole-source relationships with original equipment manufacturers even when other qualified suppliers exist, foregoing potential savings that could total in the billions of dollars.

In one such case, the Air Force persists in maintaining a sole-source relationship for sustainment of C-17 engines, which are 91 percent common with commercial variants that have many certified parts suppliers and sustainment contractors. According to Air Force Materiel Command documents, the engine-related portion of aircraft sustainment falls between 25 and 35 percent of the total sustainment cost of the aircraft. By introducing competition for sustainment of commercial-derivative engines, the committee believes the Air Force could see estimated cost savings of as much as 30 percent. This would equate to more than $2.0 billion in annual savings if applied across the Air Force's inventory of commercial derivative engines. In the current budget-constrained fiscal environment, the committee believes the military departments should not pass up any opportunity to reap the benefits of competition at the system, subsystem and component levels. Therefore, the committee has included a provision elsewhere in this title that would amend section 202 of Public Law 111-23 to clarify the requirement for competition during life-cycle sustainment also shall include the subsystem and component levels.

### Laser Peening Technologies

The committee is aware that laser peening technology, a surface enhancement processing treatment for metals, has achieved considerable success in commercial aerospace and power generation applications, reducing costs by enabling improvements in the metal structure and mitigating high-cycle fatigue failures of a system, thus extending the system's lifetime. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to examine the potential cost savings that may be derived from adopting this technology broadly across the military services, particularly for use on engines, aircraft structures, land vehicles and weapon systems. The committee notes that this technology could reduce costs associated with problems of fatigue failure, stress corrosion cracking, and component shape corrections. The committee further notes that the cost savings derived from the use of laser peening technology could fund a wider deployment of the technology, with the goal of slowing the rate of replacement of highly stressed components and parts.

### Long-Term Corrosion Strategies of the Military Departments

The committee is concerned that the military departments, by not aligning their corrosion control and prevention efforts with the Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention and Mitigation Strategic Plan, are incurring higher-than-necessary life-cycle costs for military equipment sustainment. Therefore, the committee directs the corrosion control and prevention executive (CCPE) of each military department to develop a long-term strategy for addressing corrosion prevention and control within the military departments by April 1, 2012. The military department's strategy should support the existing Department of Defense-level strategy published by the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight.

The military department's strategy should include all areas of responsibility for the CCPE as described in section 2228 of title 10, United States Code. The military department's CCPE should coordinate the long-term strategy with the Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to assure consistency with overarching Department of Defense strategies and conformity to Department of Defense Instruction 5000.67. The committee further directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the long-term strategies developed by the military departments' CCPEs for adherence to section 2228 of title 10, United States Code, for consistency with overarching Department of Defense strategies, and for conformity to Department of Defense Instruction 5000.67, and report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services by July 1, 2012.

Parts Supply Recapitalization

The committee recognizes the need for the Department of Defense's supply chain to respond rapidly to changing threat environments with parts that are trusted, assured, reliable, and interoperable and ensure maximum logistics support of the warfighter. The committee is aware of commercial efforts involving precision manufacturing in conjunction with platform-based engineering and system design and believes the Department could leverage commercial production technologies to improve supply chain management, streamline production, and ensure faster delivery of parts.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to consider the establishment of pilot programs, in partnership with industry, to demonstrate rapid, adaptable parts production systems with the following capabilities:

(1) Surge capacity and the flexibility to respond quickly to increased demand;
(2) Increased speed to market and cost savings in the procurement of machined parts;
(3) Rapid adaptability to changing machine and production environments; and
(4) Cyber capabilities that mitigate overproduction and counterfeiting.

## Study on Reducing Navy Small Boat Maintenance Costs

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy is not taking advantage of the prospective return on investment and reduced life-cycle sustainment costs that could be achieved through greater investment in corrosion control and prevention measures for the Navy's small boats. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a study on strategies to reduce maintenance and repair costs associated with small boat storage and harboring and submit a report on the results to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 31, 2011. At a minimum, the study shall investigate the potential for reduced maintenance and repair costs of the Navy's small boat fleet through the use of advanced boat lift as well as storage and harboring equipment, including an evaluation and business case analysis of the impact of these strategies for potential improvements to small boat acquisition costs and life-cycle sustainment. In the report to the committee, the Secretary should include recommendations regarding the potential establishment of improved boat corrosion control and prevention as:

(1) A key performance parameter for the selection of boat maintenance and storage equipment;
(2) A key performance parameter for sustainment;
(3) A requirement for the Naval Sea Systems Command to incorporate into its acquisition strategies prior to issuing a solicitation for procurement contracts.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the report submitted by the Secretary of the Navy for completeness, including the methodology used in the Navy's analysis. The Comptroller General should submit a report of the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 60 days after the date the Secretary of the Navy delivers the study report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

## Sustainment Planning

The committee is aware of the Department of the Navy's successful use of modeling and cost-benefit analysis to support efficient logistics and sustainment and manage total life-cycle product support costs of the Navy's T-6, T-34, and T-45 training aircraft. The committee notes that these efforts are in keeping with the goals of section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) regarding life-cycle management and product support strategies for major weapon systems. Such tools apply a strategic decision analysis approach to the evaluation of multiple alternatives and quantitatively assess the impact of uncertainty to provide relevant insight into decision-making. The

committee is particularly interested in the application of these predictive analytical tools to assist the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program office in sustainment planning.

In light of this proven modeling and analytical capability, the committee directs the assistant secretary of each military department with the responsibility for weapon system sustainment planning to review, using predictive analytical tools, current contractor logistics support (CLS) contracts to ensure that the appropriate source of repair is being used and is providing a cost savings to the taxpayer. The committee also directs the assistant secretaries concerned to require that future CLS contracts be assessed with the same tools prior to contract award.

## READINESS ISSUES

### Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Operational Considerations and Force Structure

The committee recognizes the progress made by the Department of Defense to develop and field Aegis ballistic missile defense (BMD) capabilities. The committee, however, remains concerned about the force structure and inventory demands for Aegis ships resulting from the Phased Adaptive Approach (PAA) to missile defense in Europe, announced in September 2009, and the Department's plans to tailor the PAA to other geographic regions such as East Asia and the Middle East. As noted in the 2010 "Ballistic Missile Defense Review," "the demand for missile defense assets within each region over the next decade will exceed supply."

In particular, the committee would like to further understand the concept of operations for Aegis BMD capabilities and how operational considerations affect Aegis BMD force structure. The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff previously testified before the committee on October 1, 2009 that when an Aegis ship is in missile defense mode, it "consumes all of the radar's activity," and a second ship is required for ship protection. Aegis BMD ships also support multiple missions such as maritime security, anti-submarine warfare, and surface warfare. While this multi-mission functionality provides flexibility and mobility, it may also place further force structure demands on the Aegis fleet and creates operational and performance tradeoffs for each ship. Additionally, as reported in June 2010, a Navy Fleet Review Panel assessment observed that Aegis SPY radar "manpower, parts, training and performance are in decline" and the decline in Aegis radar readiness may affect the Navy's ability to meet its missile defense mission requirements.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by December 5, 2011, that assesses how operational requirements and considerations, such as force protection, other mission requirements, geographic trade-offs, and readiness and availability, affect the Aegis BMD concept of operations and the implications of such operational requirements and considerations on force structure required to support combatant commanders' missile defense missions. Similarly, such assessment should also address how the

Navy balances its various mission requirements and the impact of missile defense requirements on its force structure demands and operational tempo. The assessment should also describe any recent Aegis BMD deployments, for example, to support the July 2009 Democratic People's Republic of Korea missile launches, and how operational requirements and considerations influenced the Aegis BMD force structure and concepts of operation to address the combatant commanders' mission requirements.

### Army Unit Manning Effects on Readiness

The committee recognizes the Army has struggled to maintain the readiness of its forces over the past decade and that personnel issues have continuously been one of the most important drivers of readiness.

The committee is concerned about the Army's current shortage of warrant officers, certain enlisted specialties, and the growing burden of filling units as combat-related medical issues have increased the number of non-deployable personnel. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of Army personnel readiness and submit a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2012. At a minimum, the report should include:

(1) A list of Army units that are reporting degraded readiness;
(2) An analysis of the extent to which the personnel component of readiness is affecting overall readiness;
(3) Army personnel strengths and how they are matched to requirements;
(4) Army policies and established business rules for calculating personnel readiness;
(5) The Army's processes for meeting manning goals throughout the Army's force generation cycle; and
(6) The extent to which the Army has developed plans to address actual or projected unit manning shortages for specific occupational specialties or pay grades.

### Distribution and Use of Bottled Water in Contingency Operations

The committee is concerned that logistics convoys continue to be vulnerable to attack in contingency operations. Logistics convoys in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan provide delivery of fuel, bottled water, and other supplies to forward operating bases. According to the Marine Corps Energy Assessment Team in 2009, hauling bottled water made up 51 percent of the logistical burden in Afghanistan. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the impact of the distribution of and alternatives to bottled water in contingency operations and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 29, 2012, that includes the following:

(1) The total quantity of bottled water that is distributed by convoys in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and the associated cost with the purchase and distribution of bottled water;
(2) An assessment of the current water filtration technologies including reverse osmosis systems available, as well as those systems being developed to support clean, filtered water with the necessary minerals for forward operating bases;
(3) An assessment of how the Department of Defense will reduce its demand for bottled water while ensuring access to clean, safe water for service members in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;
(4) An assessment of how plastic waste is being minimized and discarded, and what precautions are being taken to prevent exposure to toxic fumes on forward operating bases in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan as a result of the destruction of plastic waste;
(5) A cost assessment of the Fully Burdened Cost of Water in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; and
(6) An assessment of water purification plants available for use by the United States military in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan

Federal Fire Protection

The committee notes that a Department of Defense (DOD) Inspector General Report "Fire Emergency and Services Program," (D-2003-121) found that staffing and apparatus shortfalls could adversely impact firefighter safety and installation missions. The committee is concerned that since that report was issued, conditions have not improved, and fire houses, personnel, and other fire suppression resources at military bases may be below minimal safety standards. In addition, the committee is concerned that not all the military departments may be fully compliant with the DOD Fire and Emergency Services Program (DOD Instruction 6055.06) which outlines policy and criteria for the allocation, assignment, operation, and administration of DOD fire departments and related fire prevention functions and establishes the DOD Fire and Emergency Services Quality Working Group. The committee believes it is imperative that military base commanders operate base fire departments at or above National Fire Protection Association standards as they apply to staffing, equipment, and other readiness capabilities.

Installation Emergency Management Programs

The committee is aware that Department of Defense Instruction 6055.17 establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and prescribes procedures for developing, implementing, and sustaining Installation Emergency Management (IEM) programs at Department of Defense installations worldwide. The committee understands that the intent of the IEM program is to provide a fully integrated

emergency management capability to address "all hazards" including manmade or natural disasters, as well as the ability to interoperate with regional civilian emergency responders but is concerned that funding in the budget request for fiscal year 2012 is fragmented distributed in multiple budget elements. To prevent a funding approach that is potentially inadequate, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the respective Secretaries of the military departments to consider centrally funding Installation Emergency Management under a single defense-wide funding line in future years.

Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Instrument Landing System Replacement

The committee is concerned that the Instrument Landing System (ILS) at Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar, California, is an outdated MK-1F model that is no longer logistically supportable and is operating at its extreme tolerance for certification for usage within the National Air Space (NAS). The ILS is a critical safety of flight capability, without which MCAS Miramar could potentially lose its ability to operate as a designated aerial port of debarkation and embarkation for the military service and commercial aircraft traffic. A 2009 Marine Corps study found that, even with significant upgrades, the current ILS is no longer able to meet current Federal Aviation Administration ILS flight inspection requirements for NAS usage. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to identify funding options for a replacement ILS to mitigate the impacts to future air operations and to ensure aircrew safety.

Material Readiness of the Navy's Amphibious and Surface Combatant Ships

In the 1990s, the Navy began implementing a number of initiatives that were designed to reduce costs associated with operating and manning its surface fleet. These initiatives included a shift from engineering maintenance cycles to condition-based maintenance cycles, reducing crew sizes, and moving to more computer-based training. However, over the past decade the Navy has increased its operational tempo as it has called upon its surface fleet to support overseas contingency operations while still retaining its traditional forward presence mission. The net effect of the increased pace of operations and decreased depot, intermediate, and organizational maintenance has been a decline in the material condition of some ships. This decline has been documented through periodic readiness reporting and other reports, such as the Board of Inspection and Survey (INSURV). INSURV inspection results are a key indicator that the Navy uses to judge ship material readiness and offer an independent assessment.

Based on the results of all these reports, the Navy launched a number of initiatives designed to better maintain the material conditions of its surface ships. Given the cost of new ships, and size of the current fleet relative to current and projected requirements, it is critical that the Navy's efforts to maintain its ships

succeed and help its ships to meet or exceed their expected lifespan. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Navy's initiatives to improve the material condition of its surface ship fleet and report the results to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This review should focus on the Navy's amphibious ships, cruisers, destroyers, and frigates. For each of these types/classes of ships, the Comptroller General should compare data on the actual material condition compared to the projected condition, considering information such as the following:

(1) The projected service life when the first ship of the class was designed or delivered;
(2) The current age of the class;
(3) The age at which any ships of the class were decommissioned;
(4) Any changes in maintenance policy for the class; and
(5) Any deferments of major availabilities.

In addition, for a 2-year period starting March 2009, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) should assess the reported readiness of ships prior to and after undergoing INSURV inspections, as well as the INSURV results to identify any factors affecting the ships' ability to meet inspection requirements and to sustain the material condition of the ship following the INSURV. Finally, GAO should evaluate the extent to which the Navy's initiatives, including those stemming from the Department of Defense's efficiency initiative, address any of these underlying factors, and determine whether the Navy has established metrics to gauge improvements in the material condition of the ship types identified for this report.

## Modified Tables of Equipment

The committee is concerned that current modified tables of equipment (MTOE) may not fully encompass the equipment required for future missions and may not entirely account for equipment used in recent and current contingencies. In order to help the committee more completely assess future needs, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to examine the Army and Marine Corps' modified tables of equipment, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2012.

At a minimum, the review should examine:

(1) What equipment used in operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation New Dawn should be added to MTOEs;
(2) The process by which equipment is nominated for inclusion in MTOEs;
(3) Items that should be removed from MTOEs; and
(4) The military services' respective strategies for future sustainment of MTOEs outside of Overseas Contingency Operations funds.

## Naval Air Station North Island

The committee is aware of the Department of the Navy's plan to increase the number of MH-60 Seahawk helicopters stationed at Naval Air Station North Island, California and understands the important mission of these aircraft. The committee urges the Navy to continue working with the City of Imperial Beach and the City of Coronado to identify mitigation measures, develop a noise reduction strategy, and communicate in advance with the local communities, whenever practical, the potential impact of increased flight activities at Naval Air Station North Island and Naval Outlying Field Imperial Beach.

## Review of Department of Defense's Mix of Live and Simulated Training

The Department of Defense prepares U.S. forces to conduct military operations by providing personnel with live training and through the use of technology, such as simulators and other virtual training devices. These virtual training devices allow military personnel to replicate many of the interactions and procedures they may encounter on the battlefield with fewer constraints, such as the high costs of live training and timely access to training ranges. In an effort to achieve greater efficiency, maximize training opportunities, and potentially reduce training costs, each military service is in various stages of developing concepts and training programs that integrate live and simulated training. In announcing the results of the Department's recent efficiency initiative, the Secretary of Defense identified various efficiencies and potential savings related to modifying training programs or concepts in support of flying hour requirements, including the use of simulators.

In order to better understand the potential benefits of the military services' efforts, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the status of military services' programs, including factors that were considered in determining the appropriate mix of live and simulated training, actual or planned adjustments to existing training approaches, and the impact on their ability to achieve training objectives, related funding plans as well as the basis for any projected cost savings, and metrics they intend to use to evaluate the impact of any increased use of simulators and other virtual training devices on their ability to train the force. The review also should include training for the Reserve Components and whether the Reserve Components have the necessary access to simulated training to supplement any reductions in live training. In reporting on each of the military services, the Comptroller General may take a phased approach to undertaking its review and reporting results to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

## Security Force Assistance

The committee understands that while the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has traditionally been the proponent for security force assistance, the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review identified the need to strengthen and institutionalize general-purpose force capabilities for security force assistance. Moreover, the committee understands that the Secretary of Defense has proposed USSOCOM divestiture of the security force assistance mission as part of the Department's efficiency initiative.

The committee is concerned about USSOCOM's divestiture of the security force assistance mission and the growing use of general-purpose forces to carry out the security force assistance mission in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom without any formal institutionalization of the mission within the conventional force.

In order to better understand the current and future security force assistance mission, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the Department's plans to institutionalize security force assistance in the general-purpose force and to report the results of this review to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2012. At a minimum, this review should evaluate:

(1) The extent to which the Department has defined and differentiated intended roles, missions, and required capabilities for security force assistance for both general purpose forces and special operations forces;
(2) The extent to which the Department has incorporated lessons learned from current operations; and
(3) The extent to which the Army has developed its concept for regionally aligned brigades and has identified costs associated with implementing the concept.

U.S. Army Full Spectrum Training Mile

The committee is aware that the Army has transitioned its methodology for identifying training requirements and resource allocations and is using the term "Full Spectrum Training Mile" (FSTM) as a metric. The committee is concerned that this metric may not be the best tool for gauging operations tempo and content of training.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Army's transition to FSTM as a readiness metric and to submit a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2012. At a minimum, the review should examine:

(1) The methodology behind the new metric, to include vehicles covered;
(2) Cost estimates and assumptions; and
(3) The model suitability for budgeting, forecasting, and training.

## OTHER MATTERS

### Air Force Environmental Cleanup

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has a robust environmental cleanup program with significant resources dedicated to it. The committee is concerned that the Department of the Air Force has been too focused on process and studies in its environmental restoration program and is behind the other services in completing its cleanup activities. The committee encourages the Air Force to expedite its process and make significant progress in its cleanup activities.

### Briefing on the Use of the Overseas Contingency Operations Budget for Military Equipment Reset

The committee is concerned that current Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance regarding the use of Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) reset funds to mitigate home station equipment shortfalls resulting from oversees contingency operations may be too restrictive. Further, the committee recognizes that current OMB interpretation may unnecessarily restrict cost-equivalent equipment modifications through the OCO budget. While the committee understands that base budgeting is a viable solution to these shortfalls over the long term, current policy fails to provide the more immediate readiness improvements that OCO funding can provide. Therefore, no later than August 31, 2011, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military departments to provide the congressional defense committees a briefing on current reset policy. At a minimum, this briefing should address:

(1) Operational equipment shortfalls attributable to current policy;
(2) Degradation in equipment readiness attributable to current policy; and
(3) Production inefficiencies caused by current policy.

### Department of Defense Personnel Security Clearance Program

In 2005, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) designated the Department of Defense Personnel Security Clearance Program as a high-risk area due to long-standing delays in the clearance process as well as concerns over clearance documentation. While the Department's security clearance program remained on GAO's high-risk list since 2005, several GAO reports highlighted the significant progress that the Department has made in timeliness, development of quality assessment tools and adjudicative guidance. Therefore, in 2011 the Department's security clearance program was removed from the GAO's high-risk list.

The committee notes that much of that progress is due to the Department's role in the Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team which was formed to transform and modernize the security clearance process across the Federal Government. The work of this team was cited in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. While the Department's security clearance program is no longer on GAO's high-risk list, the committee will continue to monitor the Department's efforts to ensure that the improvements are sustained.

Department of Defense Unexploded Ordnance Cleanup Report

The committee supports the Department of Defense's environmental cleanup activities. The committee recognizes that the Military Munitions Response Program includes more than 256 sites requiring investigations and cleanup activities. The committee is concerned that remedy in place and remedy complete timelines in some locations, such as Hawaii, are long. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is exploring new technologies for unexploded ordnance identification and cleanup that may result in significant savings and expedite cleanup efforts. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2012. At a minimum, the report should include:

(1) What new technologies the Department of Defense is developing for unexploded ordnance identification and cleanup;
(2) How those technologies may accelerate cleanup timelines for all installations, and specifically those in Hawaii;
(3) Estimated timeline for adopting new technologies; and
(4) Estimated savings anticipated as a result of these new technologies.

Disposal of Surplus Property

The committee is aware that the U.S. military has long-standing processes for disposing of property that has been declared excess to the needs of the Federal Government. With the redeployment of U.S. military forces from the Republic of Iraq, excess property that is not needed by the Government of the Republic of Iraq is then made available to State and local governments.

The committee commends the Department of the Army and the Office of the Secretary of Defense for developing procedures to assist State and local governments and their appointed representatives to have visibility on the excess property being made available in order to determine if the property is something they may be able to use and in sound enough condition to warrant the costs associated with transporting the property from the theater of operation to its final destination. The committee is aware that some of the excess items from Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan are being sent to the Sierra Army Depot,

California, where representatives of the State and local governments have access to screen the equipment. The committee encourages the Army to continue to improve these processes and to take such steps as necessary and reasonable to allow the State and local governments' representatives to screen property in a forward location such as the State of Kuwait, thereby improving visibility and access to available surplus property and reducing overseas transportation charges for undesirable equipment,

Additionally, while the Army has been proactive in this regard, the committee is unaware of similar procedures being established by the other military departments. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness to review the disposal processes of the other services and, if necessary, work with the military services to establish procedures to provide access to surplus property of those military services to State and local governments. Such review shall be completed by February 1, 2012.

Expedited Security Clearance Processing for Wounded Warriors

The committee notes that there is a strong demand by Federal Government agencies for individuals with high level security clearances which few military personnel possess. Expediting security clearance processing would facilitate the hiring of individuals who have had their military careers cut short due to a disability. Therefore, the committee included section 351 in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) that amended section 1564, title 10, United States Code, which provides for the use of expedited procedures for completing background investigations for the granting of security clearances in certain circumstances. Section 351 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to use this authority to assist the transition to a civilian career for military personnel who have been retired or separated for a physical disability pursuant to chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code; this authorization also includes the spouse of such military personnel. The Department is authorized to expend funds to conduct an expedited security clearance once the individual has applied for a Federal Government position for which he or she is qualified and for which a security clearance is required.

The committee is concerned that the Federal Government's internal human resources processes may not allow for timely consideration of the qualifications of an individual who has submitted an application but is awaiting processing of a security clearance in order to be considered for a Federal Government position. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy for Department of Defense hiring actions that ensures employment applications for these individuals are not disqualified in the initial human resources screening process on the basis of a lack of a clearance. Such policy should ensure that appropriate human resources offices proactively contact the eligible candidates to ensure that the expedited security clearance processing moves forward, even if

there is no guarantee of ultimate employment. In addition, the policy should ensure that if the eligible candidate is not offered employment under that particular hiring action, that the expedited clearance review is completed, which would facilitate the ability of the individual to apply for future Federal Government positions. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a copy of the policy to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 15, 2011.

Federal Facility Agreement for Environmental Cleanup at Tyndall Air Force Base

The committee is concerned that the Air Force has not signed a Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) with the Environmental Protection Agency to guide its environmental cleanup activities at Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida. FFAs provide the procedural framework for cleanup activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (Public Law 96-510). The Air Force and the Environmental Protection Agency have been negotiating this FFA for more than 2 years, and the committee is concerned that lack of consensus between the two agencies has had a detrimental effect on mitigating the potential exposure for individuals to environmental hazards. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to engage a third party arbiter, such as the Council for Environmental Quality, by July 31, 2011 to expedite conclusion of this agreement in order that environmental cleanup of the site can be achieved.

Joint Space Operations Center

The Joint Space Operations Center is responsible for the operational employment of worldwide joint space forces and maintains space data for all man-made objects orbiting the Earth. The committee wants to ensure the continuity of this important capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, Air Force Space Command to develop a continuity of operations (COOP) plan for the Joint Space Operations Center (JSpOC) and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 2, 2012 on the details of the COOP plan and any resources required to implement the plan.

Key Enabler Explosive Ordnance Disposal Requirements

The committee recognizes that the services have taken extraordinary efforts to revitalize the capability and increase the capacity of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) force. The committee recognizes that the EOD force is a key enabler for combatant commanders and will continue to be vital for the foreseeable future. However, the committee remains concerned that the services have not adequately rebalanced EOD force structure and maintained full-spectrum capabilities to ensure

success in a wide range of contingencies, as directed by the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a new consolidated budget justification display that fully identifies the services' baseline EOD budgets and encompasses all programs and activities of the EOD force for each of the following functions:

(1) Procurement;

(2) Operation and Maintenance; and

(3) Research, development, testing and evaluation.

In order to help the committee more fully assess future requirements, the committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on Explosive Ordnance Disposal force structure planning to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2012.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department's force structure plan and report the findings to the congressional defense committees within 120 days of completion of the secretary's report.

Satellite Operations Efficiencies

The Air Force Satellite Control Network consists of satellite control centers, tracking stations, and test facilities located around the world. For many Air Force satellite systems, mission control centers (MCC) are located at the Consolidated Space Operations Center at Schriever Air Force Base Colorado. For other satellite systems, including other Department of Defense (DOD) satellites, MCCs have been fielded in various geographic locations. These centers are staffed around the clock and are responsible for the operations and command and control of their assigned satellite systems.

Today, efforts are underway to modernize these various satellite operations centers from their initial point-to-point architectures using proprietary data-transfer protocols to interoperable network architectures using standard protocols. While the committee commends such efforts, it remains concerned that these operations centers require more resources than their commercial system counterparts. The committee recognizes the importance of the Department's satellite operations capabilities and understands that some DOD-unique requirements may preclude the adoption of certain commercial practices. However, the committee believes there is opportunity to improve satellite operations and create greater efficiencies by leveraging commercial best practices.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees by February 6, 2012, to include: an assessment of the Department's efforts to modernize its satellite operations capabilities, a comparison of the Department's satellite operations concepts with those in other Government entities and commercial

industry, and an identification of practices that the Department could adopt to improve its satellite operations, consistent with Department of Defense mission requirements.

### Wounded Warrior Service Dog Programs

The committee recognizes that over 32,000 soldiers have been severely wounded in combat in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom and that the majority of those wounded return with severe injuries such as amputations, traumatic brain injuries, or the loss of vision.

For many of these most severely wounded warriors, service dogs provide crucial therapy, assistance, and rehabilitation. Currently, there is a waiting list of more than 200 disabled veterans and active military personnel seeking assistance dogs provided to military agencies and hospitals by non-governmental organizations. Given the growing need for service dogs and their impact on the lives of wounded service members, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should expand its participation in non-governmental organization programs that facilitate the connection between service dogs and wounded warriors.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize appropriations for operation and maintenance activities at the levels identified in section 4301 of division D of this Act.

### SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

#### Section 311—Designation of Senior Official of Joint Chiefs of Staff for Operational Energy Plans and Programs and Operational Energy Budget Certification

This section would modify section 138(c) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Joint Chiefs of Staff to identify a senior operational energy official. This section would also change the date of the required operational energy budget certification.

#### Section 312—Military Installation Implementation of Land Management Plans and Sustainability Studies

This section would modify section 2694 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding on the Department of Defense's conservation activities.

## Section 313—Improved Sikes Act Coverage of State-Owned Facilities Used for the National Defense

This section would amend section The Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670) to include State-owned National Guard facilities, defines state as any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and would add a provision for funding integrated national resource management plans.

## Section 314—Discharge of Wastes at Sea Generated by Vessels of the Armed Forces

This section would amend section 1902(b)(2) of title 33, United States Code, to codify discharge practices in the sea for ships owned or operated by a branch of the Armed Forces. The committee recognizes the success the Navy has had with minimizing its trash and discharge at sea, both in open oceans and in special areas in accordance with existing regulatory frameworks. This section would codify the current Navy discharge practices in the open ocean and would create a reporting requirement for any exceptions necessary for the purpose of securing the safety of the ship, the health of the ship's personnel or saving life at sea.

## Section 315—Designation of Department of Defense Executive Agent for Alternative Fuel Development

This section would require the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Operational Energy Plans and Programs (OEPP) to recommend and the Secretary of Defense to designate a service secretary as the executive agent for alternative fuel development. The Assistant Secretary of Defense OEPP would direct the policy, and the executive agent would collaborate with the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Research and Engineering as well as the Department of Energy.

The committee is encouraged that the service secretaries have tested and certified their fleets to accept alternative fuels or blends. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has multiple investments and activities for the development of alternative fuels. This section would require the Department of Defense to streamline those investments and eliminate redundancies.

## Section 316—Favorable Consideration of Energy-Efficient Technologies in Contracts for Logistics Support of Contingency Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to give favorable consideration to defense logistics support contract proposals in support of contingency operations that include energy efficient or energy reduction technologies or processes. The committee continues to be concerned about the high

demand for fossil fuel in contingency operations and the security challenges it creates for logistics convoys.

## SUBTITLE C—LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT

### Section 321—Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair

This section would amend section 2460 of title 10, United States Code, to revise the definition of depot-level maintenance and repair. The study on the future capability of the Department of Defense (DOD) maintenance depots directed by section 322 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) found that the existing statutory definition was ambiguous and subject to interpretation by the individual military services. The committee is concerned that these ambiguities are directly impacting the development of core logistics capabilities and allocation of sustaining workloads. To resolve those ambiguities, this section would adopt the definition in DOD instruction 4151.2, which is the generally recognized and accepted definition currently used by the Department.

### Section 322—Core Logistics Capabilities

This section would eliminate the exclusion for special access programs from the core logistics capability requirements determination and would align the exemption for the nuclear refueling of aircraft carriers with the exemption in section 2460 of title 10, United Stated Code. The study on the future capability of the Department of Defense maintenance depots directed by section 322 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) found that the existing core determination process should be revised to ensure that it is visible and readily understood.

This section also would amend section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, to require an annual report on the core logistics capability requirements; the depot maintenance workload requirements to cost-effectively support core logistics capabilities; and the depot maintenance workload beyond the core requirement needed to ensure that no more than 50 percent of the non-exempt depot maintenance funding is expended for performance by non-Federal Government personnel in accordance with section 2466 of title 10, United States Code. The report also would include: the allocation of workload for the Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence as designated in accordance with section 2474 of title 10, United States Code; and the depot maintenance capital investments requirement to ensure that core logistics capabilities are established not later than four years after a non-exempted weapon system achieves initial operational capability as required by section 2464(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that an annual report on the core determination process and the workload outcomes

resulting from that process will enhance oversight, align capital investment to support current and emerging core capabilities, and better align sustainment planning with acquisition and development.

Section 323—Designation of Military Industrial Facilities as Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence

This section would amend section 2474, title 10, United States Code, to include military industrial facilities in the designation of Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence (CITE). Designation as a CITE would facilitate the ability of each of the military industrial facilities to enter into public-private partnerships while also improving their core competencies. The committee believes that this change could help further strengthen the Department of Defense's organic manufacturing and repair industrial base.

Section 324—Redesignation of Core Competencies as Core Logistics Capabilities for Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence

This section would amend section 2474 of title 10, United States Code, to change the designation of core competencies as core logistics capability in order to better align the depot maintenance workload allocation for each Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence, as designated by section 2474 of title 10, United States Code, with the recognized core logistics capabilities of the designee.

The study on the future capability of the Department of Defense maintenance depots directed by section 322 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) found that the Department's organic depot maintenance system may face substantial workload reductions in the near term as a result of reduced operations, anticipated changes to inventory and expected funding pressures. The committee is concerned that depot maintenance workload allocations for the Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence are not aligned with the core logistics determination process required by section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, resulting in inefficiencies, a lack of organizational integration, and an inability for public and private-sector depot maintenance providers to respond to workload uncertainties.

Section 325—Permanent and Expanded Authority for Army Industrial Facilities to Enter into Certain Cooperative Arrangements with Non-Army Entities

This section would amend section 4544 of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the cap on the number of cooperative arrangements that may be entered into and would make the authority permanent.

In addition, this section would amend the reporting requirement mandated in section 328 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public

Law 110-181) to assess the effective use of the authorities provided under section 4544, title 10, United States Code, and to make recommendations for improvement to each category of Army industrial facility to compete for contracts.

Section 326—Amendment to Requirement Relating To Consideration of Competition Throughout Operation and Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems

This section would amend section 202(d) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) to include a subsystem or component of a major weapons system in the requirement for consideration of competition throughout operation and sustainment of major weapon systems.

Section 327—Implementation of Corrective Actions Resulting from Corrosion Study of the F-22 and F-35 Aircraft

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to take corrective actions resulting from the corrosion study of the F-22 Raptor and F-35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft and implement the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office regarding the study.

The committee notes that despite a projected 38-to-1 return on investment from corrosion mitigation and control projects planned for implementation in fiscal year 2012 through the Office of the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight, the Department of Defense consistently underfunds corrosion efforts. With an estimated annual cost of corrosion of $22.0 billion, the committee urges the Department to give more serious consideration to the $37 avoided for every $1 invested for corrosion mitigation and control actions such as those recommended for the F-22 and F-35 aircraft.

SUBTITLE D—READINESS

Section 331—Modification of Department of Defense Authority to Accept Voluntary Contributions of Funds

This section would modify section 358(g) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) to permit the Secretary of Defense to accept voluntary contributions in amounts that shall remain available until expended for the purpose of offsetting the cost of mitigation measures. This section also would permit the Secretary of Defense to accept voluntary contributions to conduct studies of potential mitigation measures.

Section 332—Review of Proposed Structures Affecting Navigable Airspace

This section would modify section 44718 of title 49, United States Code, to permit the Federal Aviation Administration to develop procedures for the

Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security to review and comment on aeronautical studies.

### Section 333—Sense of Congress Regarding Integration of Ballistic Missile Defense Training Across and Between Combatant Commands and Military Services

This section would express the sense of Congress on improving the integration of ballistic missile defense training across and between combatant commands and military services, identifying and addressing training gaps in integrated missile defense training, and identifying the capabilities and funding needed to effectively and adequately integrate training.

## SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

### Section 341—Annual Certification and Modifications of Annual Report on Prepositioned Materiel and Equipment

This section would amend sections 2229 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to annually certify that U.S. military prepositioned stocks meet current operations plans. This section also requires the Secretary of Defense to provide additional information on the health, status, and composition of prepositioned stocks in the Secretary's annual report to the congressional defense committees.

The committee remains concerned that the Department's approach to establishing requirements, managing, and resourcing prepositioned stocks may be unnecessarily increasing strategic risk and contingency response times. The committee is also concerned that the Department has not sufficiently coordinated prepositioned stocks requirements, management, and planning with its strategic airlift and sealift planning and requirements.

### Section 342—Modification of Report on Maintenance and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards

This section would modify section 7310(c) of title 10, United States Code, to include vessels that are operated pursuant to a contract entered into by the Military Sealift Command, the Maritime Administration, or the U.S. Transportation Command.

### Section 343—Additional Requirements for Annual Report on Military Working Dogs

This section would amend section 358 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to require the Secretary of Defense to provide additional information on the use of military

working dogs on a contracted basis, the status of the Department's breeding programs, and the future military working dog force structure.

The committee remains concerned that the Department may rely too heavily on contracted military working dogs and may not be fully utilizing the Department's domestic breeding programs leading to increased costs to the taxpayer.

### Section 344—Assessment and Reporting Requirements Regarding the Status of Compliance with Joint Military Training and Force Allocations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a biennial assessment of the military departments compliance with the joint training, doctrine, and resource allocation recommendations that are promulgated by the Joint Staff. The assessment also would include the effectiveness of the Joint Staff in carrying out the missions of planning and experimentation formerly accomplished by U.S. Joint Forces Command. The results of the first assessment would be provided to the congressional defense committees by March 31 of 2012, and every even-numbered year thereafter.

### Section 345—Study of United States Pacific Command Training Readiness

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM), to complete a study by February 28, 2013, on current and future training requirements for the Armed Forces assigned to USPACOM's area of responsibility.

## SUBTITLE F—LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY

### Section 351—Adoption of Military Working Dog by Family of Deceased or Seriously Wounded Member of the Armed Forces Who Was the Dog's Handler

This section would amend section 2583(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the adoption of a military working dog by the family of a deceased or seriously wounded member of the Armed Forces who was the handler of the dog.

### Section 352—Prohibition on Expansion of the Air Force Food Transformation Initiative

This section would prohibit the Air Force from expanding its Food Transformation Initiative beyond the initial six bases in the pilot program until 270 days after the Secretary of the Air Force provides a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This report would include a description on the impact of the initiative on non-appropriated funded employees; a detailed information technology plan, including funding for implementation; and a description of performance metrics for measuring the

initiative. In addition, the report would include an estimate of cost savings; an explanation of the tracking of appropriated and non-appropriated funds; an explanation of any barriers encountered and recommended remedies; and a plan for addressing recommendations expected to be made by the Government Accountability Office following its review of the initiative.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee expressed its initial concern regarding the Air Force's Food Transformation Initiative. As a result, the committee required a review of the initiative by the Comptroller General of the United States, which is due in July 2011. While the Air Force was prohibited from moving forward with expansion of the initiative until 90 days after that review, the committee is concerned that the Air Force intends to continue expanding this initiative without fully assessing the full impact at the six initial bases, and addressing any problems encountered at these bases.

### Section 353—Limitation on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for the Migration of Army Enterprise Email Services

This section would prohibit the Army from obligating more than 2 percent of the funds available for fiscal year 2012 in procurement and operations and maintenance accounts for the migration of enterprise email services until the Secretary of the Army provides a business case analysis comparing the relative merits and cost-benefit analysis of transitioning to Defense Information Systems Agency enterprise email services.

### Section 354—One-Year Extension of Pilot Program for Availability of Working-Capital Funds to Army for Certain Product Improvements

This section would extend the Department of the Army Product Improvement Pilot Program authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), to October 1, 2014.

## SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 361—Consideration of Foreclosure Circumstances in Adjudication of Security Clearances

This section would allow special consideration during security clearance adjudications to be given to members of the Armed Forces who may have a housing foreclosure on his or her credit report. The committee notes that the recent housing crisis and resulting foreclosures are a potential problem for members of the Armed Forces since a foreclosure could jeopardize their ability to apply for or renew a security clearance.

### Section 362—Authority to Provide Information for Maritime Safety of Forces and Hydrographic Support

This section would amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, by inserting after chapter 667 a new chapter authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to maximize the safety and effectiveness of Navy, Joint, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and coalition forces by collecting marine weather and ocean data, modeling of that data, and forecasting potentially hazardous meteorological and oceanographic conditions.

### Section 363—Deposit of Reimbursed Funds under Reciprocal Fire Protection Agreements

This section would amend section 1856d(b) of title 42, United States Code, which allows the Department of Defense to allocate reimbursements for fire protection services to the appropriation fund or account from which the expenses were paid subject to the same provisions and restrictions as the original funding. This section would add flexibility to the reimbursement process beginning in fiscal year 2012 by permitting the Department to allocate reimbursements to the fund or account currently available for fire protection activities should the period of availability for obligation under which services were originally provided have expired.

### Section 364—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized to Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Printing and Reproduction

This section would reduce by 10 percent the printing and reproduction budgets for each of the military departments and the defense agencies.

The committee notes that the budget request contained $357.0 million for printing and reproduction services, Department-wide. While the committee recognizes that paper copies often are necessary to facilitate mission accomplishment, the committee believes that the Department should reduce spending on high-quality, glossy color prints (such as the ones accompanying the fiscal year 2012 budget rollout, and other reports and briefings to Congress). Utilizing double-sided, plain, black-and-white copies still accomplishes the goal, while achieving considerable savings. In addition, the committee urges the Department to consider technologies, such as electronic documentation and transmission, to process information without the use of paper printing and reproduction. This section would generate $35.7 million in savings in fiscal year 2012.

### Section 365—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized to Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Studies, Analysis and Evaluations

This section would reduce by 10 percent the budget request for studies, analyses, and evaluations performed by each military department and the defense agencies. The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense has emphasized the need to fund the core mission of the Department of Defense, realigning funds from non-essential cost areas to areas of direct mission support. The Secretary of Defense has implemented an initiative to eliminate unnecessary Department of Defense boards and study groups, and this section would support the Secretary's efforts to reduce unnecessary costs. This section would generate a savings of $24.0 million in fiscal year 2012.

Section 366—Clarification of the Airlift Service Definitions Relative to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet

This section would amend section 41106 of title 49, United States Code, to clarify that the application of current law is limited to contracts for airlift services using aircraft of a type the Department of Defense has determined are eligible for participation in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program.

Section 367—Ratemaking Procedures for Civil Reserve Air Fleet Contracts

This section would amend section 9511a of title 10, United States Code, to codify the authority of the Department of Defense to offer scheduled and expansion contract airlift business to Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) carriers according to the amount of airlift capability they commit for CRAF activation. Commercial air carriers in the CRAF program commit airlift capability to be activated for the Department's use during wartime. In exchange for such a commitment, the Department contracts with the participating carriers for its peacetime or routine airlift requirements. The committee is aware that competitive contracts for this activity are generally not feasible because oftentimes none of the air carriers have commercial operations in the needed locations and therefore have no basis for providing a reasonable offer. The committee notes that this type of entitlement-based contract is done in conjunction with statutorily mandated ratemaking procedures that have served as an effective means of determining fair and reasonable rates while furthering the objectives of the CRAF program.

Section 368—Sense of Congress on Proposed Federal Aviation Administration Changes to Flight Crew Member Duty and Rest Requirements

This section would express a sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) should make every effort to ensure that any changes to guidelines, regulations, and rules of the FAA, including changes to flight crew member duty and rest requirements, fully consider the impact of such changes

on the Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers, U.S. Transportation Command and the Department of Defense.

Section 369—Policy on Active Shooter Training for Certain Law Enforcement Personnel

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and promulgate guidelines to ensure civilian and military law enforcement responsible for force protection at U.S. military installations receive Active Shooter Training. The committee recognizes this training was a recommendation of the Department of Defense Independent Review Related to Fort Hood entitled "Protecting the Force: Lessons from Fort Hood."

# TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

## OVERVIEW

The committee supports the budget request for the authorized end strengths for the Armed Forces in fiscal year 2012. The budget request reduces the end strength of the Active Duty Army by 7,400 personnel to 562,000, which is a planned reduction of the temporary end strength increase authorized in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). Notwithstanding support for the Army's reduction, the committee remains concerned with the continued impact of the high number of non-deployable soldiers on Army readiness, individual dwell time, and the Army's ability to ensure deploying units are fully manned. Based on data provided to the committee by the Army during briefings, 17 percent, which is approximately 20,000 personnel, of soldiers in the Army's deploying combat units are not deployable, and this figure is growing at an unsustainable rate. In addition, there are approximately 9,000 soldiers processing through the Permanent Disability Evaluation System after being found medically unfit for service. The Army could potentially face a deployable inventory deficit of 30,000 soldiers for its mission requirements by fiscal year 2017 if these challenges are not addressed. While the Army could take measures to partially reduce the number of non-deployable personnel in its combat units, the committee believes that more dramatic measures will be required to reform the Permanent Disability Evaluation System, which still requires disabled soldiers to remain on Active Duty for 1 year or more as they are processed through the system.

The committee is also concerned with the Navy's request of a reduction in the active authorized end strength by 3,000 sailors. The Navy has been challenged over the past several years as sailors deployed as individual augmentees to overseas contingency operations to execute non-traditional Navy missions, which has drained needed manpower from the fleet. The Navy has undertaken an efficiency task to increase readiness in the fleet by eliminating approximately 7,200 shore billets and assigning those personnel to sea billets. The committee will closely monitor this process as well as the Navy's reduction of manpower and the impact on operations and requirements.

The Secretary of Defense, as part of an additional $78-billion efficiencies reduction in the Department budget top line, has proposed to significantly reduce the size of the active Army by 27,000 soldiers and the active Marine Corps by 15,300 Marines beginning in fiscal year 2015 through fiscal year 2016. The committee is concerned the impact this force reduction will have on individual dwell time on both services, especially for the Army since this reduction of 27,000 soldiers is in addition to a planned reduction of 22,000 temporary end strength by fiscal year 2013. The committee has heard repeatedly in hearings and briefings over the past several years that achieving an individual dwell time ratio of 1 to 3 is critical to

maintaining the health of the Active Component Army and Marine Corps and their families. In his statement for the record submitted to the committee during the fiscal year 2012 Department of Defense posture hearing, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that, "For our Army combat units, we do not expect to begin to reach our interim goal of 1:2 deploy-to-dwell ratios until 2012." This appears to be the best ratio that can be obtained for the foreseeable future; and the new standard. The projected force reductions are based on an assumption that the combat commitment in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan would be significantly reduced by the end of 2014. It remains unclear to the committee what the level of forces in Afghanistan would need to be reduced in order to allow the force reduction to begin without an adverse impact on troops and their families. More importantly, the manpower reductions appear to have no relationship to the requirements of overall national military strategy or to future war fighting requirements.

The committee is committed to working with the Department to ensure that the proper analysis of end strength requirements is completed prior to the proposed reductions beginning. It is imperative the military maintain sufficient manpower to support current and future requirements that have been generated by a Nation at war for almost 10 years.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

#### Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Active Duty personnel of the Armed Forces as of September 30, 2012:

| | **FY 2011** | **FY 2012** | | **Change from** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Service** | **Authorized** | **Request** | **Committee Recommendation** | **FY 2012 Request** | **FY 2011 Authorized** |
| | | | | | |
| Army | 569,400 | 562,000 | 562,000 | 0 | -7,400 |
| Navy | 328,700 | 325,700 | 325,739 | 39 | -2,961 |
| USMC | 202,100 | 202,100 | 202,100 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force | 332,200 | 332,800 | 332,800 | 0 | 600 |
| **DOD** | 1,432,400 | 1,422,600 | 1,422,639 | 39 | -9,761 |

#### Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum Active Duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2012. The committee recommends 562,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Army, 325,739 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Navy, 202,100 as the

minimum Active Duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 332,800 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Air Force.

## SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

### Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Selected Reserve personnel, including the end strength for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves, as of September 30, 2012:

| | **FY 2011** | **FY 2012** | | **Change from** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Service** | **Authorized** | **Request** | **Committee Recommendation** | **FY 2012 Request** | **FY 2011 Authorized** |
| | | | | | |
| Army National Guard | 358,200 | 358,200 | 358,200 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 205,000 | 205,000 | 205,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Navy Reserve | 65,500 | 66,200 | 66,200 | 0 | 700 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 39,600 | 39,600 | 39,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 106,700 | 106,700 | 106,700 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force Reserve | 71,200 | 71,400 | 71,400 | 0 | 200 |
| **DOD Total** | 846,200 | 847,100 | 847,100 | 0 | 900 |
| Coast Guard Reserve | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |

### Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves as of September 30, 2012:

| | **FY 2011** | **FY 2012** | | **Change from** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Service** | **Authorized** | **Request** | **Committee Recommendation** | **FY 2012 Request** | **FY 2011 Authorized** |
| | | | | | |
| Army National Guard | 32,060 | 32,060 | 32,060 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 16,261 | 16,261 | 16,261 | 0 | 0 |
| Naval Reserve | 10,688 | 10,337 | 10,337 | 0 | -351 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 2,261 | 2,261 | 2,261 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 14,584 | 14,833 | 14,833 | 0 | 249 |
| Air Force Reserve | 2,992 | 2,662 | 2,662 | 0 | -330 |
| **DOD Total** | 78,846 | 78,414 | 78,414 | 0 | -432 |

## Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2012:

| | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Service** | **Authorized** | **Request** | **Committee Recommendation** | **FY 2012 Request** | **FY 2011 Authorized** |
| Army Reserve | 8,395 | 8,395 | 8,395 | 0 | 0 |
| Army National Guard | 27,210 | 27,210 | 27,210 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force Reserve | 10,720 | 10,777 | 10,777 | 0 | 57 |
| Air National Guard | 22,394 | 22,509 | 22,509 | 0 | 115 |
| **DOD Total** | 68,719 | 68,891 | 68,891 | 0 | 172 |

## Section 414—Fiscal Year 2012 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the Reserve Components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2012:

| | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Service** | **Authorized** | **Request** | **Committee Recommendation** | **FY 2012 Request** | **FY 2011 Authorized** |
| | | | | | |
| Army National Guard | 1,600 | 1,600 | 1,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 350 | 350 | 350 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 595 | 595 | 595 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force Reserve | 90 | 90 | 90 | 0 | 0 |
| **DOD Total** | 2,635 | 2,635 | 2,635 | 0 | 0 |

## Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of Reserve Component personnel who may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty during fiscal year 2012 to provide

operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by section 401 or section 412 of this Act unless the duration on Active Duty exceeds the limitations in section 115(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

| | **FY 2011** | **FY 2012** | | **Change from** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Service** | **Authorized** | **Request** | **Committee Recommendation** | **FY 2012 Request** | **FY 2011 Authorized** |
| | | | | | |
| Army National Guard | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 13,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Naval Reserve | 6,200 | 6,200 | 6,200 | 0 | 0 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force Reserve | 14,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | 0 | 0 |
| DOD Total | 69,200 | 69,200 | 69,200 | 0 | 0 |

## SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in the funding table in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

# TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

## OVERVIEW

The committee recognizes that after almost 10 years of war, the Department of Defense must remain flexible and continue to adapt its policies to maintain a viable All-Volunteer Force. The committee continues its efforts to provide needed flexibility to the Department in order to manage the total force. For example, the committee has included several provisions which enhance the management of the Reserve Component and increase the flexibility of the Marine Corps to manage its field grade officers. The committee also supports the need to provide flexibility for individuals during their military career and has extended authorities for service members to pause their active service in order to meet personal or professional needs and then return to active service.

In addition, the committee has proposed reductions to the statutory authorizations in the numbers of general and flag officers on active duty, complementing the efforts of the Secretary of Defense to reduce such officers across the Department. Further, the committee has provided funds to support local educational agencies heavily impacted by military dependent enrollments.

The committee also recognizes the selfless sacrifices that our military men and women and their families are making on behalf of the Nation and has included provisions that would improve the overall well being and readiness of the force. Just as important as those still serving, the committee believes its commitment to our service members does not end once they are out of the military. The committee has included several provisions to improve the oversight and function of Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home. The Department of Defense and the military services have a history of partnering with local communities through community service projects, mentorship programs, and education programs to enhance the community and maintain a civic relationship with communities that support its installations. The committee commends the military services and the Department of Defense for their efforts and encourages the Department to continue to seek ways to expand these partnerships.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Community College of the Air Force

The Community College of the Air Force provides enlisted members of the U.S. Air Force the opportunity to earn their associate degree in variety of areas. The committee believes that program and funding efficiencies may be gained by allowing enlisted members from the other services to participate in this program. The committee requests the Secretary of Defense to review the feasibility and cost of allowing enlisted members from the other services, including the U.S.

Coast Guard, to participate in the Community College of the Air Force's associate degree program, and to provide a briefing on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Critical Language Training at Reserve Officer Training Programs and Senior Military Colleges

The committee believes foreign language skills are critical to national security and has provided the Department of Defense the flexibility to establish programs to ensure a viable pool of foreign language speaking service members and national security personnel. Section 529 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) authorized the Secretary of Defense to establish language training centers of excellence at universities, senior military colleges, and other institutions of higher learning to develop a foundation of expertise in critical and strategic languages and regional studies. The military is increasingly placed in roles where language skills are critical in day-to-day operations. Therefore, the committee recommends the Secretary of Defense to develop a program to establish language training centers, and also encourage the Secretary of Defense to include the Reserve Officer Training Corps and senior military college programs within the National Security Education Program.

### Expanding the Use of On-Line Education in the Department of Defense Educational Activity

The Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA) educates eligible Department of Defense military and civilian dependents from pre-kindergarten through 12th grade in schools located overseas and in the U.S. and its territories and possessions. The committee recognizes that the technology to support successful online education exists in the civilian education sector and is concerned that DODEA may be not be taking full advantage of online school programs that already exist and are successfully serving current military families. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the potential cost-savings and achievement benefits of introducing a K-12 online learning environment into the DODEA school system, and to report his findings to the committee by April 1, 2012. The report shall identify existing online educational opportunities for DODEA students, alternative online school opportunities currently used by military families, and recommendations, as appropriate, for enhancing and funding DODEA's expansion of the use of online education.

### Review for Hispanic American Service Cross Recipients

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee noted that it believes that the statutory authority to conduct a review for Hispanic American service cross recipients from World War I exists in underlying law, section 552 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107). In H. Rept. 111-491, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services notification of the reviews conducted within 180 days of the date of enactment of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). The committee anticipates receiving notification on this subject in June and looks forward to a full report on the actions that they have taken to ensure that the service of Hispanic American World War I veterans is properly recognized.

Use of Electronic Media for Family Support Programs

The committee continues to encourage the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to provide service members and their families a balance between work and family life and to promote quality of life programs. Given the high operations tempo experienced by many service members during the past nearly 10 years of war, the committee believes it is critical that widely dispersed military families far removed from military installations, particularly families of Reserve Component service members, have access to the tools necessary to effectively manage their lives during times of stress. Assistance in personal finance, stress management, grief counseling, and general morale and wellbeing management is a critical component of family support initiatives. The committee understands that these types of support services can be provided through a variety of cost-effective media options, to include audio books, compact disks, digital video disks, and other electronic media delivered through the Internet. Further, the committee believes that programs using such media options offer a flexible capability to target needed services to specific families on demand over a wide geographic area in a cost-effective manner. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, by March 31, 2012, on the current use of electronic media for delivering family support programs within the Department of Defense, the potential for greater use of commercially procured electronic media to support family programs, a survey of vendors capable of providing such services who are already sanctioned by the General Services Administration, and the Secretary's view of the propriety and cost-effectiveness of increasing the use of electronic media to support family programs.

Wounded Warrior Implementation

Section 511 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-181) provided the authority enabling military technicians (dual status) to continue to be employed as technicians when the loss of their military membership in the Selected Reserve is the result of a combat-related disability. The National Guard Bureau issued implementing instruction in June 2009 to the state-level National Guard Headquarters. Unfortunately, the implementation guidance may not have been distributed to all pertinent levels of personnel and dual-status technicians may not have been informed of this program. Therefore, the committee directs the National Guard Bureau to reissue the implementing instructions to the state and territory headquarters with additional guidance to ensure the information is disseminated to the lowest level possible.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

#### Section 501—Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Officers on Active Duty in Grades of Major, Lieutenant Colonel, and Colonel

This section would increase the grade table allowance for Marine Corps officers serving on active duty in grades major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel. For example, with an officer strength of 17,500, the Marine Corps could promote 485 additional officers to the grade of major, 286 additional officers to the grade of lieutenant colonel, and 37 additional officers to the grade of colonel.

#### Section 502—General Officer and Flag Officer Reform

This section would eliminate 14 authorizations for general and flag officers in joint duty assignments and add up to 7 officers serving in intelligence positions to count against the joint duty assignment limit. This section would also eliminate 11 Air Force general officer authorizations and would require that the superintendents of the service academies be counted against their respective service's general and flag officer limits. This section would require that the directed changes take place between January 1, 2012, and October 1, 2013. The committee applauds the efforts of the Secretary of Defense to reduce the number of general and flag officers on active duty, which numbered 967 as of July 2010, by 102 over the next 2 years. However, the committee was disappointed that the Secretary made no substantial proposal in the budget request to reduce the statutory limits imposed not only on the number of general and flag officers on active duty, but also on the statutory limits on the number of general and flag officers serving in each grade. For example, at present, the military services are statutorily authorized to have as many as 658 general and flag officers on active duty to meet in-service requirements, as well as up to another 324 general and flag officers for joint duty

assignments. In addition, the numbers of general and flag officers actually on active duty are increased because several are excluded from counting against the statutory limits. Such exemptions include the superintendents of the military service academies, the general and flag officers assigned to the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the Attending Physician to Congress. The effect of allowing the statutory limits and exemptions to remain in place would be to create what the committee believes is excessive room for the military services and the joint commands to generate future increases in the number of general and flag officers on active duty, notwithstanding the policy controls that the Secretary of Defense intends to impose to limit future growth.

## SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

### Section 511—Leadership of National Guard Bureau

This section would establish the position of and criteria for the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau, with the officer holding that position, following appointment by the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve in the grade of lieutenant general. This section would require that both the Chief and Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau be designated by the Secretary of Defense as general officers to be counted against the pool of general and flag officers in joint duty assignments established by section 526(b) of title 10, United States Code. This section would also establish a chain of succession for both the Chief and Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau should either or both be absent or disabled. Finally, this section would authorize the incumbent holding the position of Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau to continue to serve in the current grade of major general as the acting vice chief until the appointment of an officer to be the vice chief.

### Section 512—Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Reserve Components

This section would amend section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, to require individual preseparation counseling be made available to members of the Reserve Component. This service is currently available for service members whose discharge from active duty is anticipated as of a specific date. This section would also clarify the 90-day requirement for preseparation counseling for Reserve Component members who have less than 90-days before release from active duty due to operational requirements. This allows preseparation counseling to begin as soon as possible within the remaining period of service.

### Section 513—Clarification of Applicability of Authority for Deferral of Mandatory Separation of Military Technicians (Dual Status) until Age 60

This section would amend section 10216(f) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force may each implement policies to allow military technicians (dual status) who reach their mandatory separation date before age 60 the ability to apply for continued service. This section would also amend section 10218(a)(3)(A)(i) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that if a military technician (dual status) is given the opportunity to apply for continued service and is found to be qualified, the Secretary concerned may appoint the technician to another position as a military technician (dual status).

### Section 514—Modification of Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion for Reserve Officers Employed as Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would remove from promotion eligibility those Reserve officers of the Army and Air Force employed as dual status military technicians who had been retained on the Reserve Active-status list beyond the mandatory removal date normally required after reaching their maximum number of years of service.

## SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

### Section 521—Findings regarding Unique Nature, Demands, and Hardships of Military Service

This section would state the findings of Congress with regard to the nature, demands, and hardships of military service. This section would state that there is no constitutional right to serve in the military; military operations often require extraordinary sacrifices, to include the ultimate sacrifice; successful units are characterized by high morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion; military living and working conditions are often Spartan and primitive characterized by forced intimacy and little privacy; and the Armed Forces must maintain policies that allow for recruiting of persons who can be expected to maintain the high standards for morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion.

### Section 522—Policy Addressing Dwell Time and Measurement and Data Collection regarding Unit Operating Tempo and Personnel Tempo

This section would amend section 991 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy that addresses dwell time for members of the Armed Forces. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish a system for tracking and recording the number of days each member of the Armed Forces is deployed, prescribe policies and procedures for measuring operating tempo and personnel tempo, and maintain a central data collection repository to provide information for research, analysis, interagency

reporting, and evaluation of programs and policies. This section would define the term "dwell time".

Section 523—Authorized Leave Available for Members of the Armed Forces Upon Birth or Adoption of a Child

This section would increase the number of days of non-chargeable leave from 21 to 42 that a service member may be granted following adoption of a child, if the service member is the primary caregiver of the child. The section would also provide that the other service member of a dual military couple may also be awarded 10 days of non-chargeable leave that may be taken at the same time as the primary caregiver is on adoption leave. This section would bring the adoption leave authority in line with the non-chargeable leave provided to service members who delivered a newborn child and dual military couples who were able to conceive a child naturally.

Section 524—Extension of Authority To Conduct Programs on Career Flexibility To Enhance Retention of Members of the Armed Forces

This section would extend from December 31, 2012, to December 31, 2015, the authority for the Secretaries of the military departments to inactivate service members from active duty in order to allow them to meet personal or professional needs and return them to active duty following the period of inactivation.

Section 525—Policy on Military Recruitment and Enlistment of Graduates of Secondary Schools

This section would require a secretary of the military department to treat persons who receive a diploma from a legally operating secondary school or otherwise completes a program of secondary education in compliance with the education laws of the State in which the person resides the same as a person who receives a diploma from a secondary school, as defined by section 7801 of title 20, United States Code. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy on recruitment and enlistment that incorporates following: (1) Means for identifying qualified persons to enlist; (2) Means for assessing how qualified persons fulfill their enlistment obligation; and (3) Means for maintaining data by each diploma source which can be used to analyze attrition rates. As a part of the policy, this section would require the Secretary of each military department to develop a recruitment plan that includes a marketing strategy for potential recruits with all types of secondary educations credentials, and to develop a communication plan to ensure the policy and recruitment plan are understood by military recruiters.

The committee understands the Department of Defense's current recruiting policy is based on attrition data rather than secondary education diploma source.

The committee believes the current policy needs to be revised to account for both the increasing numbers and the quality of alternative delivery methods of secondary education content, such as charter schools, online high schools, homeschooling, and hybrid schools. The committee also recognizes and encourages the Department of Defense, as well as the military services to continue to develop assessments and tools to better predict performance, behaviors, and attitudes in order to minimize attrition.

### Section 526—Navy Recruiting and Advertising

This section would add $983,000 to Operations and Maintenance, Navy, Line 440 for Recruiting and Advertising for the professional development of youths, ages 11 to 17, to promote interest and skill in seamanship and aviation while instilling qualities that mold strong moral character.

## SUBTITLE D—MILITARY JUSTICE AND LEGAL MATTERS

### Section 531—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel Decisions Relating To Correction of Military Records

This section would establish guidelines for judicial review of decisions by the boards for correction of military records operated by the Secretaries of the military departments. The guidelines would ensure that boards for correction of military records issue concise written statements that consist of the factual and legal basis for decisions that deny requested actions, along with a statement of the procedures and timing associated with seeking a judicial review. Further, the guidelines would require that judicial review be pursued within 1 year of a final decision by a board for correction of military records. The guidelines would also ensure that service members seek review of their issues in the most efficient manner possible that reduces costs for both the individual and the Government.

### Section 532—Clarification of Application and Extent of Direct Acceptance of Gifts Authority

This section would expand the eligibility of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense to receive gifts from non-profit organizations, private parties, and other sources outside the Department of Defense. The expansion would make eligible all members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat operation or a combat zone designated by the Secretary of Defense. Under current law, only those persons with a combat-related injury are eligible. This section would also require that the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense would apply retroactively to injuries and illnesses incurred on or after September 11, 2001.

### Section 533—Additional Condition on Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy

This section would amend the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-321) to require the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees their written certification that repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell law specified in section 654 of title 10, United States Code, will not degrade the readiness, effectiveness, cohesion, and morale of combat arms units and personnel of their respective armed force that are engaged in combat, deployed to a combat theater, or preparing for deployment to a combat theater.

Section 534—Military Regulations Regarding Marriage

This section would affirm the policy of section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (1 U.S.C. 7) that the word "marriage" included in any ruling, regulation, or interpretation of the Department of Defense applicable to a service member or civilian employee of the Department of Defense shall mean only a legal union between one man and one woman.

Section 535—Use of Military Installations as Site for Marriage Ceremonies and Participation of Chaplains and Other Military and Civilian Personnel in Their Official Capacity

This section would establish that marriages performed on DOD installations or marriages involving the participation of DOD military or civilian personnel in an official capacity, to include chaplains, must comply with the Defense of Marriage Act (1 U.S.C. 7), which defines marriage as only the legal union between one man and one woman.

SUBTITLE E—MEMBER EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 541—Improved Access to Apprenticeship Programs for Members of the Armed Forces who Are Being Separated from Active Duty or Retired

This section would amend section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the secretary concerned to permit a member of the Armed Forces to participate in an apprenticeship program that provides employment skills training and assists them in transitioning into new careers in civilian life.

Section 542—Expansion of Reserve Health Professionals Stipend Program To Include Students in Mental Health Degree Programs in Critical Wartime Specialties

This section would expand the categories of health professional students eligible to receive a stipend to include students enrolled in an institution in a course of study that results in a degree in clinical psychology or social work.

Section 543—Administration of United States Air Force Institute of Technology

This section would amend chapter 901 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section establishing a position of commandant of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology who is either an active duty officer of the Air Force in a grade not below the grade of colonel or a civilian who was retired from the Air Force in the grade not below the grade of brigadier general. This section would also establish a position of Provost and Academic Dean at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

Section 544—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by the Governor of Puerto Rico

This section would amend section 4342(a)(7) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of nominations to the military service academies by the Governor of Puerto Rico from 1 to 3.

Section 545—Temporary Authority To Wave Maximum Age Limitation on Admission to United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Air Force Academy

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to waive the maximum age limitation for admission to a military service academy from 23 to 26 for an otherwise qualified candidate. The candidate must be either (a) an enlisted member of the Armed Forces who was prevented from being admitted to a military service academy before they reached the maximum age as a result of service in a theater of operation for Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, or Operation New Dawn; or (b) a candidate who possess an exceptional record that sets them apart from other candidates, as determined by the secretary concerned. This section would limit the number of candidates admitted to each academy under this waiver authority to five per academic year. The Secretary of each military department shall track the number of graduates using this waiver authority who remain in the Armed Forces beyond the active duty service obligation. This section would require the secretary concerned is required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2016, that displays the number of applications for waivers, the number of waivers granted by the secretary, the number admitted to the academy utilizing the waiver, and the number of graduates who were enlisted prior to admission to an academy that have remained

in the service past their active duty service obligation, beginning with the class of 2009.

### Section 546—Education and Employment Advocacy Program for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces

This section would add $15,000,000 to Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Line 260 for the purpose of an Education and Employment Advocacy pilot program to engage Wounded Warriors early in their recovery.

## SUBTITLE F—ARMY NATIONAL MILITARY CEMETERIES

### Section 551—Army National Military Cemeteries

This section would establish the general authority of the Secretary of the Army to develop, operate, manage, administer, oversee, and fund the Army National Military Cemeteries, consisting of Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, and the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, District of Columbia, in a manner and to standards that fully honor the service and sacrifices of the deceased members of the Armed Forces whose last resting places are in the respective cemeteries. This section would require the Secretary to promulgate regulations and policies for the Army National Military Cemeteries, to include eligibility for interment and inurnment, and mandate that annual budget requests for the cemeteries be provided to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. In promulgating eligibility regulations for interments and inurnments, the Secretary should ensure that they are consistent with the relevant provisions of title 38, United States Code. This section would place the cemeteries under the direct jurisdiction of Headquarters, Department of the Army, and authorize the position and set forth the responsibilities of the Executive Director of the cemeteries, who would report directly to the Secretary of the Army. This section would also require that by 1 June 2012 there be an operational electronic database at Arlington National Cemetery for recordkeeping and full accounting of all records of each specific gravesite and niche location at that cemetery and the identification of the individual interred or inurned at each specific gravesite and niche location. This section would also specify the qualifications, duties, and supervisory chain for the superintendents of the respective cemeteries. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of the Army to appoint an Advisory Committee on Arlington National Cemetery to provide periodic consultation and advice on the administration of Arlington National Cemetery, as well as on the erection of memorials and master planning for the cemetery. The committee urges the Secretary to include a representative from the National Cemetery Administration,

Department of Veterans Affairs, as a member of the Advisory Committee to facilitate consistency and enable best practices to be interchanged. Finally, this section would require not only the Secretary of the Army to periodically inspect the cemeteries, but would also direct the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to inspect the cemeteries during fiscal years 2012 and 2014. The Secretary would be required to provide the congressional defense committees a plan for corrective actions not later than 120 days following any inspection directed by the Secretary or conducted by the Inspector General.

Section 552—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Inspection of Military Cemeteries

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to inspect the cemeteries at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy to determine: the adequacy of and adherence to the statutes, policies, and regulations governing those cemeteries; the adequacy of the system employed to fully account for and accurately identify the remains interred or inurned in each; the history and adequacy of the oversight efforts of the Secretaries of the military departments who have jurisdiction for these cemeteries; and other matters. This section would also require the Inspector General to follow-up on that part of the 2010 report of the special inspection of Arlington National Cemetery pertaining to the Soldiers' and Airmen's National Cemetery. The follow-up inspection would be to determine whether the Secretary of the Army has fully and completely addressed the issues raised and the recommendations made in the 2010 report. This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2012, on the findings and recommendations of the inspection of their respective cemeteries, together with a plan for corrective action. Finally, this section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to inspect a statistically valid sample of the other cemeteries, both inside and outside the United States, that are under the jurisdiction of the Secretaries of the military departments. The purpose would be to assess the adequacy of and adherence to the statutes, policies, and regulations governing the management, oversight, operations, and interments and inurnments by those cemeteries. This section would also require the Inspector General to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2012, on the findings of these inspections, and then the Secretaries of the military services would be required to submit a plan for corrective actions to the same committees by April 1, 2013.

## SUBTITLE G—ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

### Section 561—Control and Administration by Secretary of Defense

This section would establish that the administration of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, to include the provision of health care and medical care for the residents, is a responsibility of the Secretary of Defense.

### Section 562—Senior Medical Advisor Oversight of Health Care Provided to Residents of Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would clarify the oversight responsibilities and reporting requirements of the Senior Medical Advisor with regard to the health care provided to the residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

### Section 563—Establishment of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council and Resident Advisory Committees

This section would establish one Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council, replacing the local boards established for each of the two facilities of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. This section would specify the required expertise of the members of the advisory council and require the Secretary of Defense to designate a member to be the chairperson of the advisory council, who would be responsible for the operation of the council. This section also would require resident advisory committees at each facility of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. These committees, consisting of residents elected by the residents of each facility, would serve as a forum for ideas, recommendations, and issues to be discussed with the management of each facility.

### Section 564—Administrators, Ombudsmen, and Staff of Facilities

This section would eliminate the positions of deputy director and associate director in each facility and establish the position of ombudsman. The ombudsman of each facility would have the authority to communicate with the administrator of the facility, the Chief Operating Officer of the Retirement Home, the Senior Medical Advisor, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. This section also would make a technical change in the title of the person responsible for the operations of each facility of the Armed Forces Retirement Home from “Director” to “Administrator”.

### Section 565—Revision of Fee Requirements

This section would repeal the obsolete transitional fee requirements for the Armed Forces Retirement Home and establish permanent fee requirements.

Section 566—Revision of Inspection Requirements

This section would revise the interval of inspections that the Inspector General of the Department of Defense would be required to make of each facility of the Armed Forces Retirement Home from annually to not less often than every 3 years. This section also would clarify requirements for reporting and corrective actions.

Section 567—Repeal of Obsolete Transitional Provisions and Technical, Conforming, and Clerical Amendments

This section would clarify that former members of the Coast Guard are eligible to be residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home and that senior personnel officer and senior enlisted members of the Coast Guard are eligible to serve on the Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council. This section also would repeal obsolete transitional provisions enacted as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107), and make technical, conforming and clerical amendments.

SUBTITLE H—MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

Section 571—Revision to Membership of Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council

This section would clarify the appointment options for family member representatives serving on the Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council to include parents of members of the military services and would further designate Reserve Component representation on the council.

Section 572—Continuation of Authority To Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $30.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that have military dependent students comprising at least 20 percent of the students in average daily attendance per year. The section would also provide $10.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that experience significant increases and decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to the military force structure changes, the relocation of military forces from one base to another, and from base closures and realignments.

Section 573—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents who Are Members of the Armed Forces

This section would amend title 2 of the Service Members Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 521) to require a court that issued a temporary custody order based solely on a service member being deployed or anticipating deployment to reinstate the custody order that was in effect immediately preceding the temporary order unless the court finds reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child. This section would also prohibit courts from using deployment or the possibility of deployment against a service member when determining the best interest of a child.

Section 574—Center for Military Family and Community Outreach

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a Center for Military Family and Community Outreach in cooperation with an historically black university to train social work students, social work faculty members and social workers to understand military life and enhance their competencies in providing services to military families.

This section would also add $1,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Army to establish a Center for Military Family and Community Outreach.

Section 575—Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families

This section would add $3,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps for a collaborative program to train active duty military personnel to recognize combat stress disorder, suicide risk, substance addiction, risk-taking behaviors and family violence.

Section 576—Report on Department of Defense Autism Pilot Projects

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on any pilot projects that the Department of Defense is conducting on autism services to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SUBTITLE I—IMPROVED SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Section 581—Director of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office

This section would require that the director of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office be a general or flag officer or an employee of the Department of Defense in a comparable senior executive service position.

Section 582—Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates

This section would require a full time Sexual Assault Response Coordinator and a full time Sexual Assault Victim Advocate be assigned to each brigade or equivalent unit level of the armed forces. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish a training and certification program for Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates.

This section would also add $45,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance for Defense Wide Activities for Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates and sexual assault prevention training and education, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 583—Sexual Assault Victims Access to Legal Counsel and Services of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates

This section would entitle a member of the Armed Forces who is the victim of a sexual assault to legal assistance provided by a military legal assistance counsel who is certified as competent to provide such duties and assistance provided by a qualified Sexual Assault Victim Advocate. This section would also entitle a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces who is the victim of a sexual assault and resides on or in the vicinity of a military installation, to the extent practicable, legal assistance provided by a military legal assistance counsel who is certified as competent to provide such duties as well as assistance provided by a qualified Sexual Assault Victim Advocate. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to implement a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator-led process by which a member or dependent who is the victim of a sexual assault may decline to participate in the investigation of the sexual assault.

Section 584—Privilege in Cases Arising Under Uniform Code of Military Justice Against Disclosure of Communications Between Sexual Assault Victims and Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, Victim Advocates and Certain Other Persons

This section would create a confidentiality privilege in military tribunals for communication between sexual assault victims and Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, Sexual Assault Victims Advocates, and DOD SAFE Help line personnel.

Section 585—Maintenance of Records Prepared in Connection with Sexual Assaults Involving Members of the Armed Forces or Dependents of Members

This section would require the Department of Defense to maintain records relating to sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces or their dependents for not less than 100 years and provide the victim permanent access to the records maintained by the Department. In addition, this section would require

that the victim be provided a copy of the court-martial proceedings in certain circumstances.

### Section 586—Expedited Consideration and Priority for Application for Consideration of a Permanent Change of Station or Unit Transfer Based on Humanitarian Conditions for Victim of Sexual Assault

This section would require the secretary concerned to expedite the consideration and approval of an application for a permanent change of station or unit transfer submitted by a member of the Armed Forces who is a victim of sexual assault.

### Section 587—Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program

This section would require the Secretary of each military department to provide sexual assault training and education for members of the armed forces at each level of professional military education. This section would also require sexual assault training and education for civilian employees.

This section would also add $45,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance for Defense Wide Activities for Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates and sexual assault prevention training and education, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

## SUBTITLE J—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 591—Limitations on Authority To Provide Support and Services for Certain Organizations and Activities outside Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, to require the service secretary concerned to request funds for projects under this authority in the annual budget submission to Congress. This section also would limit the annual obligation of funds to $10.0 million, beginning in fiscal year 2012. The heavy reliance on the Reserve Component over the past 10 years has reduced the need for sustainment training requirements of the Reserve Component.

### Section 592—Display of State, District of Columbia, and Territorial Flags by Armed Forces

This section would amend section 2249b of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new subsection requiring the Secretary of Defense to ensure that whenever the official flags of all 50 states are displayed by the armed forces, the

flags of the District of Columbia and the territories of the United States shall also be displayed.

Section 593—Military Adaptive Sports Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a military adaptive sports program to provide adaptive sports programs to eligible wounded and injured members of the Armed Forces.

Section 594—Wounded Warrior Careers Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a career-development program with the Education and Employment Initiative for severely wounded warriors of the armed forces and their spouses. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees plans for a cost-benefit analysis of the results of the services provided to severely wounded warriors and their families.

This section would add $1,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide to carry out a career program for severely wounded warriors and their families.

Section 595—Comptroller General Study of Military Necessity of Selective Service System and Alternatives

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to study the criticality of the Selective Service System to the Department of Defense in meeting future manpower needs of the Armed Forces that are in excess of the ability of an all-volunteer force to provide and to determine the fiscal and national security impacts of disestablishing the Selective Service System. In addition, the section would require the study to assess alternatives to disestablishing the Selective Service System, as well as alternatives to registration for Selective Service. The Comptroller General's report of the study would be due not later than March 31, 2012, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Section 596—Sense of Congress Regarding Playing of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps" at Military Funerals, Memorial Services and Wreath Laying Ceremonies

This section expresses the sense of Congress that the bulge call known as Taps should be sounded by a live solo bugler at a military funeral, memorial service or wreath laying ceremonies.

Section 597—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Yellow Ribbon Day

This section would provide a sense of Congress supporting the goals and ideals of Yellow Ribbon Day in honor of members of the Armed Forces who are serving overseas apart from their families and loved ones.

# TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

## OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that robust and flexible compensation programs are central to maintaining a high quality, combat ready force. Accordingly, the committee recommends an across-the-board pay raise of 1.6 percent to ensure that military pay rates keep pace with pay raise levels in the private sector, as measured by the Employment Cost Index. The committee recommends that the authorities for a wide array of bonuses, special and incentive pays, and other compensation benefits set to expire on December 31, 2011, be extended for an additional year.

The committee also recommends a series of provisions that would consolidate and simplify travel and transportation authorities to enhance the utility, flexibility, efficiency, and relevancy of the law in response to a complex and changing travel and transportation environment.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Commissary and Exchange Privileges for Non-Department of Defense Federal Employees Overseas

The committee is aware of interest in extending shopping privileges at military commissaries and exchanges to non-Department of Defense (DOD) government agency employees serving at locations outside the United States, and particularly those serving in U.S. territories and possessions (the territory of Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, the territory of American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). The committee recognizes that current policies generally restrict the access of non-DOD employees serving outside the United States. The committee understands that the limited exceptions to the rule are confined to employees serving at the location outside the United States on transportation agreements as defined in 41 CFR 302-2.12. The committee believes that it may be cost efficient and in the best interests of U.S. missions outside the United States for all Federal employees to have access to available military commissaries and exchanges when the employee's agency reimburses the cost of extending such privileges to the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2012, on the feasibility, propriety, and cost of a proposal for non-DOD Federal agencies to reimburse the Department of Defense for the cost of extending commissary and exchange privileges to employees of the agency serving outside the United States on transportation agreements.

## Consolidation of Disability Evaluation System

The committee is encouraged by the initial feedback that the Department of Defense Integrated Disability Evaluation System has reduced the time required to deliver benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs to wounded warriors. However, the committee remains concerned that service members with similar disabilities are receiving disparate disability ratings because of different standards, policies, and procedures used by the Physical Evaluation Boards operated by the military departments. The committee believes that achieving consistent disability ratings regardless of service is an important objective that will ensure service members are treated equitably. The committee believes that one method for ensuring such consistent outcomes is to operate a consolidated disability evaluation system within the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2012, on the feasibility, propriety, cost, and recommended legislation to implement such a consolidated disability evaluation system, if the Secretary determines that recommended legislation is appropriate and necessary.

## Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act

The committee recognizes that the members of the Armed Forces and their families endure many financial hardships as a result of the intense operations tempo required to support ongoing military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee believes that one of the most important benefits military families receive is the savings provided by the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA), the military exchanges, and other nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces. The committee notes that the implementation of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-222) requires a 3-percent withholding tax to be collected from contractors doing business with the Government. The committee understands that one of the major consequences of the implementation of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 will be higher prices that manufacturers will charge for goods sold to all nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces to help offset the 3-percent withholding tax.

The committee remains convinced that the Secretary of the Treasury, through the resources of the Internal Revenue Service, has the ability to certify that the limited number of manufacturers that customarily contract with nonappropriated fund instrumentalities are not delinquent in paying taxes. The committee believes that the judicious use of the Internal Revenue Service's capability to determine the tax status of manufacturers can be used to exempt DeCA, the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, the Navy Exchange Service Command, the Marine Corps Exchange, the Veterans Canteen Service, the Coast Guard Exchange Service, and all morale, welfare, and recreation nonappropriated

fund instrumentalities from the requirement to implement the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 without a loss of revenue to the U.S. Government.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

#### Section 601—Fiscal Year 2012 Increase in Military Basic Pay

This section would increase basic pay for members of the uniform services by 1.6 percent, effective January 1, 2012. This raise would match the pay raise rate in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index.

#### Section 602—Resumption of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing under Certain Circumstances

This section would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the basic allowance for housing rates in an area where the housing market has been disrupted by one or more bases experiencing significant growth in assigned military personnel or a major disaster until December 31, 2012.

#### Section 603—Lodging Accommodations for Members Assigned to Duty in Connection with Commissioning or Fitting Out of a Ship

This section would expand the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to provide lodging or compensation for housing to enlisted service members when such members are deprived of their quarters onboard ships that are under construction or repair. This section would provide the Secretary special authority for compensation of service members deprived of their quarters onboard a ship under construction at shipyards affected by the Base Realignment and Closure 2005 activities, specifying the shipyard at Pascagoula, Mississippi, and Bath, Maine.

### SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

#### Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, and income

replacement payments for Reserve Component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service until December 31, 2012.

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, the accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, the special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties until December 31, 2012.

Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending a period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2012.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the authority for the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health professions incentive pay and bonus authorities, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units until December 31, 2012.

Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates until December 31, 2012.

### Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses

This section would extend the authority for the health professions referral bonus and the Army referral bonus until December 31, 2012.

## SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES GENERALLY

### Section 621—One-Year Extension of Authority To Reimburse Travel Expenses for Inactive-Duty Training outside of Normal Commuting Distance

This section would extend the authority for the secretary concerned to reimburse members of the Selected Reserve for travel expenses resulting from inactive-duty training when the location of the training is outside normal commuting distance from the member's permanent residence until December 31, 2012.

### Section 622—Mandatory Provision of Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Seriously Ill and Wounded Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretaries concerned to provide non-medical attendants a per diem allowance or reimbursement for the actual and necessary expenses of the travel, or a combination of the two, to support their travel when performing non-medical attendant duties. This section would result in the addition of a new budget item to section 4401 of division D relating to military personnel accounts for non-medical attendant per diem in the amount of $20,000,000.

## SUBTITLE D—CONSOLIDATION AND REFORM OF TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITIES

### Section 631—Purpose

This section would define the purpose of this subtitle is to consolidate and reform travel and transportation authorities in chapter 8 of title 37, United States Code, as required to address the complexities and changing nature of travel. This section would state that this initiative would meet mission needs and the needs of the members of the uniformed services by providing the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries concerned the authority to prescribe and implement travel and transportation policy that is simple, efficient, relevant, and flexible.

### Section 632—Consolidation and Reform of Travel and Transportation Authorities of the Uniformed Services

This section would provide the definitions, the general authorities, and, where required, more specific authorities that would be the guidelines used by the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries concerned to prescribe travel and transportation programs. This section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct pilot programs to test alternative methods for performing and reimbursing travel, for limiting the need for travel, and for reducing the environmental impact of travel. This section would also provide administrative guidelines for implementing the reform initiative, to include the need to issue regulations.

Section 633—Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities Transition Expiration Date and Transfer of Current Sections

This section would transfer 32 existing travel and transportation authorities from chapter 7 of Title 37, United States Code, to chapter 8 of title 37, and redesignate each section with a new number.

Section 634—Addition of Sunset Provision to Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities

This section would amend each of the redesignated sections that would be installed in chapter 8 of title 37, United States Code, to reflect the existence of a transition expiration date by which the Secretary of Defense would be required to terminate use of the authorities provided within those sections.

Section 635—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make the technical and clerical amendments necessary to facilitate the transfer of the redesignated sections from chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code to chapter 8 of title 37.

Section 636—Transition Provisions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to transition all travel and transportation programs to operate under the authorities provided in the consolidation and reform authorities provided in subchapter I and subchapter II of chapter 8 of title 37, United States Code. This section would also provide the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries concerned the authority to modify current law to facilitate the transition process. Finally, this section would establish a transition period termination date as the end of a 10-year period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

## SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

### Section 641—Expansion of Use of Uniform Funding Authority To Include Permanent Change of Station and Temporary Duty Lodging Programs Operated through Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

This section would expand the use of the uniform funding authority authorized for morale, welfare, and recreation programs operated through nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to include permanent change of station and temporary duty lodging programs. This would allow the lodging facilities to consolidate and simplify their business practices and accounting systems by managing appropriated funds in accordance with the procedures, policy, and laws applicable to the expenditure of nonappropriated funds.

### Section 642—Contracting Authority for Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities To Provide and Obtain Goods and Services

This section would clarify that nonappropriated fund instrumentalities may enter into single-year or multi-year contracts with another element of the Department of Defense, another Federal agency, or a private-sector agency to provide or obtain goods and services beneficial to the military community and the effective management of such instrumentalities. This section also would authorize nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to participate in partnerships with private entities to provide programs at no cost to the Government on military installations using Government facilities and other Government support resources.

### Section 643—Designation of Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base as a Fisher House

This section would deem that the Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, shall be considered a Fisher House for all other purposes established in law with regard to Fisher Houses and Fisher Suites.

### Section 644—Discretion of the Secretary of the Navy To Select Categories of Merchandise To Be Sold by Ship Stores Afloat

This section would grant the Secretary of the Navy the authority to use his discretion in determining what products will be sold by Navy ship stores.

### Section 645—Access of Military Exchange Stores System to Credit Available Through Federal Financing Bank

This section would authorize the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, Navy Exchange Service Command, and Marine Corps exchanges to borrow funding for business operations from the Federal Financing Bank.

### Section 646—Enhanced Commissary Stores Pilot Program

This section would authorize the Defense Commissary Service to operate an enhanced commissary store at a military installation designated for closure or adverse realignment under a base closure law. Such stores would be empowered to sell alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, and other products to be determined at prices at least 10 percent below the local community prices. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to retain profits from the sale of such goods to offset the cost of operating the enhanced commissary store. Such enhanced commissary stores would be authorized to operate between October 1, 2011 and December 31, 2013. This section would result in the addition of a new budget item to section 4501 of division D relating to Working Capital Fund for Defense Commissary Agency to support the operation of an enhanced commissary store in the amount of $2,000,000.

## SUBTITLE F—DISABILITY, RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

### Section 651—Monthly Amount and Duration of Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Widows and Widowers of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces Affected by Required Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation

This section would increase existing monthly amounts and establish additional monthly amounts paid under the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance to surviving spouses or former spouses of deceased service members who are denied the full amount of their annuity under the Survivor Benefit Program (SBP) due to the offset required by the receipt of Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) from the Department of Veterans Affairs. The section would also extend the termination date for the Special Survivor Annuity Allowance authority from October 1, 2017 to October 1, 2021.

This "widows' tax" has long denied surviving family members the payment of their SBP benefits earned by the service of their spouses and paid for through premium reductions to retired pay. This section would provide an incremental step in the continuing effort to eliminate the DIC offset against SBP annuities. This section would provide the following monthly amounts for the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance, to include increases through fiscal year 2017 and newly established amounts for fiscal years 2018-2021:

Fiscal year 2013 from $90 to $163;

Fiscal year 2014 from $150 to $200;

Fiscal year 2015 from $200 to $215;
Fiscal year 2016 from $275 to $282;
Fiscal year 2017 from $310 to $314;
Fiscal year 2018 set at $9;
Fiscal year 2019 set at $15;
Fiscal year 2020 set at $20; and
Fiscal year 2021 set at $27.

## SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 661—Reimbursement of American National Red Cross for Humanitarian Support and Other Services Provided to Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to reimburse the American National Red Cross for humanitarian support or other services approved by the Secretary that are provided to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and their dependents. This section would result in the addition of a new budget item to section 4301 of division D relating to operation and maintenance for Defense–wide activities for reimbursement of the American

# TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

## OVERVIEW

The committee remains committed to ensuring that members of the Armed Forces, retirees, survivors, and their families have access to quality health care. The committee understands the challenge facing the Department of Defense as the cost of health care continues to grow. The committee recognizes that there are several factors that contribute to the cost growth of the Defense Health Program including the increased cost of health care in general, the increased number of wounded and injured service members as a result of the unprecedented survival rate from wounds on the battlefield, and the congressionally mandated expansion of health care benefits that are commensurate with the service of all components of the military services. However, the committee believes that even in the face of the growing cost of military health care, the military health system must provide for medical readiness and force health protection for our men and women in uniform and ensure that all other beneficiaries receive health care services. It is imperative that as the Nation continues to fight the global war on terrorism, the Department of Defense provides world-class health care for our wounded service members regardless of whether their wounds are physical or emotional.

Sadly, the committee notes that members of the Armed Forces, particularly in the Reserve Components, continue to struggle with mental health issues that can ultimately result in suicide. Members of the Reserve Components often reside in rural communities and may not have access to mental health care. The committee recommends legislation to expand the capacity of the military health system to provide mental health care to members of the Reserve Components at the location of the unit during scheduled unit training and to provide training on suicide prevention and response. In addition, the committee recommends that the Department undertake several projects that would further advance the knowledge and understanding of traumatic brain injury and combat related mental health issues to enhance the care provided to members of the Armed Forces.

The committee is concerned that when the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs pursue joint or combined health care operations, an insufficient amount of joint strategic analysis and planning is done. The committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress addressing architecture to guide the transition for future projects among other information regarding the Department of Defense process before funds may be expended for future electronic health records.

Finally, for the past few years, Congress has encouraged the Department of Defense to improve the health status of the beneficiary population and improve the cost-effectiveness of the care provided to beneficiaries by adopting proven practices. The committee notes that the designated providers, a series of health plans that have been part of the Military Health System for 30 years, have a proven

record of excellence in disease management and prevention initiatives that improve health outcomes and satisfaction for military beneficiaries. The committee urges the Department to use this program as a model for strengthening and improving the heath status of military beneficiaries.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Automated Patient Management System for Air Evacuation

The Committee remains committed to military medical research to further enhance the survivability of wounded and injured servicemembers during transport from a combat theater to definitive medical care. The Committee is aware that the Department of Defense has gained enormous experience in providing a seamless continuum of critical care to injured warfighters, creating a model used worldwide for damage control and intensive care. This care may begin on the battlefield, extend through air transport to intermediate care centers such as Landstuhl Army Medical Center in Germany, and culminate in the continental United States. The Committee understands the challenges encountered while ensuring optimal resuscitation are numerous, particularly in regard to curtailing the progression of shock and providing timely countermeasures to minimize further complications. The Committee urges the Department of Defense to continue efforts to develop an automated feedback loop resuscitation platform with the end goal of providing automated, optimal resuscitation during medical air evacuation.

### Clarification on Competition for Medical Research Consultation and Education

The committee is aware of concern regarding section 178 of title 10, United States Code, which provides a special status relationship between a non-profit organization and the Department of Defense. The committee understands that this special status only applies to cooperative agreements with the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. Other military health system medical research, consultation, and education activities should be conducted under competitive procedures. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the current processes and procedures of the various military health systems to ensure that fair and open competition for medical research, consultation, and education are being conducted, and submit a report on the results of the review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2012.

### Clinical Social Workers

The committee remains concerned about the increasing number of service members and their families who require mental health services. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense and the military services employ several

methods to recruit, retain, and train mental health professionals to provide the necessary mental health care. In particular, the committee understands that clinically-trained social workers are uniquely qualified to address the mental health needs of individuals and families. The committee encourages the Department and the military services to continue to explore strategies to rapidly increase the number of mental health professionals, including clinically-trained social workers. The committee further encourages the Department and the military services to explore the possibility of collaborative programs with educational institutions to train mental health professionals.

Cost Share for Acute Care Prescriptions under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Defense proposal to increase the cost share for prescriptions at retail pharmacies will affect the ability of TRICARE beneficiaries, particularly those who live in areas distant from a military treatment facility, to receive prescriptions needed for acute medical conditions in the medically necessary timeframe. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of maintaining the same cost share for the initial dispensing of acute care medications filled outside of a military treatment facility as if it were dispensed through the TRICARE Mail Order Pharmacy. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the findings and recommendations by March 30, 2012.

Expansion of Spinal Cord Injury Research Program

The committee recognizes spinal cord injuries are a serious combat-related condition affecting our servicemembers in Iraq and Afghanistan. Congress established the Spinal Cord Injury Research Program in 2009 (Public Law 110-329) to support research into regenerating and repairing damaged spinal cords and improving rehabilitation therapies. Much of this research has focused on the acute-phase of spinal cord injuries, but more work must be done on the regeneration of chronic spinal cord injuries.

The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to foster research relating to developing treatments that could be applied during the chronic post-injury period of a spinal cord injury event, in addition to research currently being conducted on acute injuries.

Mental Health and Traumatic Brain Injury

The committee continues to support the national effort to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury occurring in members of the Armed Forces as a result of combat. The committee is aware of the challenges the Department of Defense continues to face in providing mental health care to

service members and their families, as well as diagnosing and treating traumatic brain injury. The committee notes the diverse range of evolving concepts and technologies from the Nation's academic, scientific, and public health base that directly relate to mental health and traumatic brain injury. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to complete within 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act the following:

(1) A 5-year pilot program under which the Secretary of Defense should establish a process to provide payment for any treatments demonstrated to be effective, including diagnostic testing of traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder received by members of the Armed Forces in health care facilities other than military treatment facilities.
(2) A neurophotonics program to develop tools for understanding, diagnosing, and treating traumatic brain injury and chronic traumatic encephalopathy.
(3) A program to use mindfulness-based cognitive skills training to help service members cope with stress and provide greater cognitive resources to improve adaptive functioning during deployment.
(4) A program to train behavioral health professionals within the military health system to use biofeedback and other exposure therapies to treat service members with post-traumatic stress disorder and related anxiety disorders.

Orthopedic Research for Extremity Injury

The committee is aware of the increasing number and constantly evolving nature of blast injuries as a result of current military operations. The committee understands that technologies for treating blast-related battle injuries affecting the extremities continue to advance the care of these injuries. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to invest in orthopedic research to provide military medical providers with the cutting-edge tools and technologies needed to treat injured service members.

Physical Rehabilitation of Wounded Warriors

The committee commends the Department of Defense for continuing to advance the treatment and rehabilitation of wounded warriors. The committee notes that the Department has been a leader in identifying innovative devices and technologies that assist in rehabilitating wounded and injured service members and ultimately help improve their lives and the well being of the troops. Further, the committee is aware that treating wounded and injured service members with physical therapy is a critical component of a comprehensive medical treatment plan. As such, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to investigate new and emerging medical physical therapy devices and technologies that could be used to improve the rehabilitation of wounded warriors.

## Recommendations for Cost Savings under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program

The committee is committed to partnering with the Department of Defense to reduce the cost of prescription drugs under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program. The committee understands that increasing use of generic drugs will reduce cost due to the substantial difference in price between brand and generic drugs. For the same drug product, generic drugs on average cost 20 percent less than the price of brand drugs. Additionally, the committee notes that a number of high-use drugs are coming off patent in the next 2 years, increasing the opportunity for more cost-savings. Therefore, the committee urges the Department to raise its generic drug dispensing rate.

## Use of Simulation Technology in Medical Training

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense currently supplements combat trauma training with the use of live animals, known as "live tissue training", when no suitable simulation technology or alternative exists. The committee notes that this advanced training has contributed directly to the high survival rate for combat wounded service members, which has increased significantly compared to survival rates in past conflicts. According to the Department, simulators currently lack sufficient realism and the ability to replicate combat wounds and the associated emotional stressors combat medics face on the battlefield. In addition, simulators require rigorous verification and validation, which can only be achieved through empirical data collection. The committee also notes that the Department's use of live tissue training is strictly regulated by a number of Federal laws and policies, and is accredited by the Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, an international non-profit organization that promotes the humane use of animals in science.

On September 5, 2008, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics established the Use of Live Animals in Medical Education and Training Joint Analysis Team (ULAMET JAT) to address the use of live animals for DOD medical readiness training. ULAMET JAT, in its final report, found that several critical, high stakes medical procedures cannot be taught at present using simulation, including the treatment of certain penetrating chest wounds, amputation, and hemostasis. ULAMET JAT further noted in its final report that "live animal training is the singular opportunity to experience management of injuries in a living system prior to deployment to a combat zone. The next opportunity to use these skills very likely will be treating combat wounded." ULAMET JAT's final report also made nine recommendations related to the Department's policies on the use of animals in combat trauma training and plans to validate and adopt alternatives as they become viable, including simulation technologies.

The committee believes that the use of animals in combat trauma training remains appropriate for critical, high-risk medical procedures, until such time that alternatives are developed, to provide combat medics an equal or better training experience that more closely replicates the combat wounds and emotional stressors encountered on the battlefield. However, the committee believes that the Department should continue to aggressively pursue alternatives to the use of live animals in combat trauma training.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to finalize and implement a strategy for the development of future technology to further refine, reduce, and replace the use of live animals in medical education and training. This implementation strategy should leverage the Department's science and technology and research, development, testing, and evaluation organizations, as well as private industry, to develop additional advanced training simulators and training aids, including animal-alternative training, to offer the most realistic, practical, transferable, and cost-effective training to all medical personnel. The Secretary is further directed to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on this implementation strategy and the status of the recommendations contained within ULAMET JAT's final report.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—IMPROVEMENTS TO HEALTH BENEFITS

#### Section 701—Annual Enrollment Fees for Certain Retirees and Dependents

This section would express the sense of Congress that career members of the uniformed services and their families make extraordinary sacrifices to protect freedom for all Americans and that those sacrifices constitute pre-payment for health care during retirement. This section would also limit any annual increase in TRICARE Prime enrollment fees to the amount equal to the percentage by which retiree pay is increased beginning October 1, 2012.

#### Section 702—Provision of Food to Certain Members and Dependents Not Receiving Inpatient Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide food and beverages at no cost to certain individuals receiving outpatient medical care at a military treatment facility, or is a family member providing care to an infant receiving inpatient medical care at a military treatment facility.

#### Section 703—Behavioral Health Support for Members of the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide access to mental health assessments to members of the Reserve Components during scheduled unit training and assemblies. In addition, the Secretary would be required to provide psychological health programs and training on suicide prevention and post-suicide response.

### Section 704—Transition Enrollment of Uniformed Services Family Health Plan Medicare-Eligible Retirees to TRICARE for Life

This section would prohibit a Medicare eligible military retiree from enrolling in the managed care program of a designated provider after September 30, 2012.

## SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

### Section 711—Unified Medical Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a unified medical command to provide medical services to the Armed Forces and other health care beneficiaries of the Department of Defense as defined in chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code. This section would require also the Secretary to develop a comprehensive plan to establish a unified medical command.

### Section 712—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Future Electronic Health Records Program

This section would limit the amount of funds the Secretary of Defense may obligate or expend for future electronic health programs until 30 days after the date that the Secretary submits a report to the congressional defense committees that addresses: the architecture to guide the transition of the electronic health records of the Department of Defense to a future state that is cost-effective and interoperable; a process for selecting investments in information technology; the report required by section 715 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383); and the effectiveness of the Interagency Program Office.

## SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 721—Review of Women-Specific Health Services and Treatment for Female Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review on the availability, efficacy, and adequacy of health care services for female members of the Armed Forces. The results of the review shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2012.

Section 722—Comptroller General Reviews of Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Project

This section would reduce the frequency of reviews conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States as required by section 1701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

Section 723—Comptroller General Report on Contracted Health Care Staffing for Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the contracting practices used by the military departments to provide health care professional services to members of the Armed Forces, dependents, and retirees. The Comptroller General is required to submit the findings of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2013.

Section 724—Treatment of Wounded Warriors

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, for rapid clinical evaluation and deployment of novel treatment strategies for wounded service members with an emphasis on musculo-skeletal injuries.

Section 725—Cooperative Health Care Agreements

This section would add $500,000 to the Defense Health Program for cooperative health care agreements between military installations and local or regional health care systems.

Section 726—Prostate Cancer Imaging Research Initiative

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Health Program for prostate cancer imaging research.

Section 727—Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury

This section would add $2,000,000 to the Defense Health Program for the Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury to enhance efforts to disseminate post-deployment mental health information.

Section 728—Collaborative Military-Civilian Trauma Training Programs

This section would add $3,000,000 to the Defense Health Program for collaborative military-civilian trauma training programs between military installations and local or regional health care systems.

Section 729—Traumatic Brain Injury

This section would add $1,000,000 to the Defense Health Program to develop national medical guidelines regarding the post-acute rehabilitation of individuals with traumatic brain injury.

Section 730—Competitive Programs for Alcohol and Substance Abuse Disorders

This section would add $5,000,000 to the Defense Health Program to support a competitive program for translational research centers tasked with addressing alcohol and substance abuse issues.

# TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

## OVERVIEW

The committee continues its robust oversight of the acquisition system of the Department of Defense and closely monitors implementation of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) and the Improve Acquisition Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-383)). The committee recommends several authorities to assist the DOD in managing contracts in support of contingency operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. The committee also includes a provision to require sustainment planning earlier in the development of a weapon system with the intent to reduce total-ownership costs and improve system performance. The committee addresses a variety of other matters of acquisition policy, to include matters related to the industrial base and strategic materials.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Acquisition Involving Federal Prison Industries

The committee continues to be concerned that in implementing section 827 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) the Department of Defense (DOD) is not complying with the intent of the law. The committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 required the Secretary of Defense to: review the list of product categories used in complying with section 827 of Public Law 110-181 to ensure that these categories contain similar market participants and are consistent with the need to protect the Department's access to the commercial market; to establish consistent dates for the publication of an updated list; and to notify industry of such dates. In the same report, the committee also directed the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive review of contract awards made to Federal Prison Industries (FPI) to ensure that non-competitive awards are not being made to FPI inappropriately. The committee directs the Secretary to brief the congressional defense committee on the progress of the review and any changes made to DOD policy, regulation or processes determined to be necessary as a result of the review by July 30, 2011.

### Aircraft Specialty Metal Content

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, for each military unique aircraft and engine procured by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2012, to assess the extent to which such aircraft or engine includes specialty metal not

melted or produced in the United States. The Secretary of Defense should submit a report of the findings of the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 30, 2012. The assessment should include a description by aircraft or engine type of the average amount of specialty metal contained in such aircraft or engine that was not melted or produced in the United States, expressed as a percentage of the total specialty metal content of the aircraft or engine, and an itemized description of the use of specialty metal not melted or produced in the United States for each aircraft or engine type, including specific references to the exceptions provided by section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, per component or subsystem containing specialty metal not melted or produced in the United States.

Army Contract Bundling

The committee is concerned that Army contracting officers are consolidating contracts, particularly for base support functions, which have traditionally been provided by small businesses. The committee believes that providing business opportunities to small businesses, including those owned by veterans and service-disabled veterans, is critical to our national economy and to the local communities in which Army installations are located. The committee is concerned that consolidation of contracts currently awarded to small and disadvantaged businesses may be a result of a shortfall of Army contracting personnel and may result in negative effects in the long-term. The committee is aware that section 313 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-240) states that "the head of a federal agency may not carry out an acquisition strategy that includes a consolidation of contract requirements of the federal agency with a total value of more than $2,000,000, unless the senior procurement executive or Chief Acquisition Officer for the federal agency, before carrying out the acquisition strategy (A) conducts market research; (B) identifies any alternative contracting approaches that would involve a lesser degree of consolidation of contract requirements; (C) makes a written determination that the consolidation of contract requirements is necessary and justified; (D) identifies any negative impact by the acquisition strategy on contracting with small business concerns; and (E) certifies to the head of the federal agency that steps will be taken to include small business concerns in the acquisition strategy."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review Department of the Army contracting actions to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, and to brief the congressional defense committees on the findings of the review by December 1, 2011. The review shall include an assessment of the Army's processes to allow opportunities for small businesses to provide goods and services in response to Army requirements, and shall identify challenges facing the Army acquisition workforce, including any shortage of trained personnel to administer contracts.

## Beryllium Stockpile Modernization

Since 2005, the Department of Defense has supported a public-private partnership for the construction of a modern high purity beryllium refinery under title 3 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 81-774). High purity beryllium has been identified as "both a strategic and critical material" by the Department of Defense Strategic Materials Protection Board.

With the beryllium refinery currently starting production, the committee encourages the Department to reevaluate and modernize its beryllium inventory in the National Defense Stockpile. Much of the beryllium currently in the stockpile is either obsolete or in a non-economic form. The committee encourages the Department to consider upgrading its beryllium inventory, in accordance with the recommendation of the former National Materials Advisory Board, to a rotating buffer stockpile which will enable the forms of beryllium in the stockpile to be updated on a continual basis. Such an approach would ensure that the stockpile always contains the grades of beryllium needed to meet critical defense needs and does not become obsolete.

## Common Database for Tracking Contracts and Contractor Personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan

Section 861 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), as amended by section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) required the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding matters relating to contracts in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Among the matters to be addressed in this memorandum, section 861 of Public Law 110-181 required the agencies to identify and implement a common database for tracking contracts and contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan across the three agencies. In response, the agencies agreed through a series of memoranda of understanding to use the Department of Defense's Synchronized Predeployment Operational Tracker (SPOT) system as the common database.

The committee is concerned that, while progress has been made, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID have still not fully implemented the requirements of section 861 of Public Law 110-181. The committee is pleased to note that the SPOT database has been modified to accept aggregate-level data on the number of personnel employed by nongovernmental organizations (NGO), alleviating the concerns of the NGOs that providing the U.S. Government detailed personal information for their Iraqi and Afghan employees puts the neutrality of the NGOs at risk and endangers the safety and security of these local national employees. The committee emphasizes that the statute only

requires an accounting of total numbers of personnel, unless those personnel are performing private security functions. However, the committee remains concerned that 4 years after enactment of section 861 the SPOT database still does not include all of the information required, including basic financial information on contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan and the number of personnel killed or wounded while working on such contracts. The committee encourages the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID to work together to quickly resolve these outstanding statutory requirements.

The Government Accountability Office and the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction have stressed to the committee that a complete and fully functional common database would not only improve interagency coordination and management of contracts, but also improve transparency, oversight, and audits of Government spending. The committee agrees, and emphasizes that an accurate and complete common database is not only required by section 861 of Public Law 110-181, but is also in the best interest of the agencies, Congress, and the public.

Competition in Construction Acquisition Programs

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has inappropriately advocated a construction acquisition program that values speed in execution over savings. The committee notes that the Naval Facilities Engineering Command has awarded a global Multiple Award Task Order Contract, which may serve to expedite construction processes but also creates barriers to competition, increases the overall cost to construction, and may aggregate the overall risk to the project. While this contracting approach is appropriate in some emergency situations that require speed in execution, the committee believes that this approach is inappropriate for routine construction requirements.

The committee is concerned that construction contracts such as the Navy's global Multiple Award Task Order Contract impede the Department in receiving the best construction contract pricing because it does not allow consideration of locally based, task order type construction contracts. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the Department is not complying with the with congressional intent to foster the participation of small business concerns as prime contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers, and may not be in compliance with Federal Acquisition Regulations regarding small business concerns and contract bundling determination and justification.

The committee believes that the Department should minimize barriers to competition and ensure the widest participation of construction contractors to the military construction programs in order to ensure best value for the taxpayer. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of this issue and provide a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2011. The review shall include, as a minimum:

(1) A cost benefit analysis of the regional task order construction contracts compared with a locally based, task order contract or a single construction project acquisition process. Such an assessment should include a review of potential construction contractors that are eliminated from competition and the potential savings that would be expected by an expanded contractor field participating in the construction acquisition process;
(2) An assessment of the programs or policies to determine if there are statutory or regulatory barriers in providing a locally based construction contract;
(3) An assessment of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command's Multiple Award Task Order Contract to determine compliance with Federal Acquisition Regulations related to contract bundling and small business considerations; and
(4) An assessment on the construction contract bundling definitions to determine whether an expansion of the definition is appropriate to ensure small business equities are adequately protected.

Cost Escalators in Major Weapons Systems Life Cycle Cost Estimations

The committee is aware that cost escalators such as inflation, geopolitical risk, and market influences affect long-term cost considerations for major weapons systems. The committee believes that accurate appraisals of life cycle cost escalations, based on current and reliable economic indicators, are critical to effective programmatic evaluation and overall efficiency. The committee is concerned that methods currently employed by the Department of Defense to assess the costs of acquiring, developing, producing, operating, sustaining, and disposing of major weapons systems, their subsystems, and components are insufficient to produce realistic life cycle cost assessments. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the Department's methods for estimating the life cycle costs of major weapons programs, including its standards and procedures for assessing and maintaining currency of cost escalators, and to brief the congressional defense committees on the findings of that review on, or before, September 30, 2011.

Defense Contract Audit Agency Improvements

The committee is concerned over the continuing staffing shortages and audit backlogs experienced by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), which have resulted in significant delays in conducting audits and could negatively impact the acquisition process. Not only do delays hinder the Federal Government's ability to recoup any monies owed to it, the delays also potentially limit competition by limiting the ability of companies to participate in the Federal Government contracting process. The committee has heard from small, medium, and large contractors regarding the lack of timeliness of audits and the decreasing quality of

those audits. In particular, contractors have voiced concern over the elimination of "inadequate-in-part" findings in favor of the use of "pass-fail" audits which do not distinguish between minor and major violations. The committee is aware that unintended consequences may result from such actions. Contractors have informed the committee that it may take several months, or years, for DCAA to revalidate the corrections a contractor has taken to fix any inadequacies found in a contractor's business system; such delays affect the ability of contractors to receive payment on current contracts or to submit bids on future contracts, as they may be deemed non-responsive if their systems have not been approved.

The committee believes that improved communication is one step to addressing the problems that contractors have raised and commends DCAA for publishing a revised "rules of engagement" which encourages timely and meaningful communication with contractors regarding scope and any initial findings. In addition, the committee is aware that DCAA has undertaken other efforts aimed at improving the collaboration between DCAA and the Defense Contract Management Agency and to better realign the resources between the two agencies. While the committee commends DCAA for taking these steps to improve its audit capabilities, the committee is concerned that as part of the Secretary of Defense's efficiencies initiative, DCAA has been tasked to reduce administrative support staff and revalidate its requirement for additional auditors over the next 5 years. The committee cautions the Secretary that although short-term savings may be generated by a reduction in staff support, it may result in hampering efforts to improve DCAA performance and may actually result in an increase of costs to the Department.

The committee directs the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency to review the decision to eliminate the use of inadequate-in-part findings in favor of instituting a pass-fail standard, and to make recommendations for improvements in the timeliness of the evaluation and the re-evaluation of contractor business systems. In addition, the Director should provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by December 15, 2011 on the results of the evaluation as well as the recommendations to improve timeliness, reduce backlog, and improve audit quality.

### Nunn-McCurdy Breach due to a Quantity Reduction

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense submitted a legislative proposal to Congress for fiscal year 2012 that would amend section 2433a of title 10, United States Code, to reduce some of the requirements the Department must perform in the event it is determined that a critical cost threshold breach (referred to as a Nunn-McCurdy breach) was caused primarily by changes in the quantity of items to be procured. The proposal would eliminate the requirement for written certification by the Secretary of Defense to Congress that, among other things, continuation of the program is essential to national security, there are no

lower cost alternatives to the program which will provide acceptable capability to meet the requirement, and the new cost estimates for the program have been deemed reasonable by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE).

The committee is aware that in order to make the determination that the breach was caused primarily by changes in quantity of the items to be procured, the Director of Performance Assessments and Root Cause Analyses would still be required to conduct a root cause analysis. Additionally, the Director of CAPE would still be required to quantify the cost impact of the causal effects. Therefore, the committee believes that little efficiency would be gained by the Department's proposal and that the Secretary's certification and delivery of the root cause analysis and supporting reassessment documentation to Congress is not unduly burdensome and is necessary for congressional oversight. Moreover, in the event that a program's cost increases enough to trigger a Nunn-McCurdy breach, the committee believes that the Secretary is obligated to determine whether there are lower cost alternatives to the program which would provide acceptable capability, regardless of the underlying reason for the cost increase. Therefore, the committee has not included this proposed provision in this Act.

Pilot Programs for Rapid Acquisition of Information Technology

The committee is encouraged by Department of Defense efforts to develop a rapid acquisition process for information technology (IT) as required by section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). The committee understands that creating and implementing the processes and structures to manage complex IT systems is a deliberate process, but should nonetheless allow for the flexibility to experiment with various options before codifying the result. The committee is concerned that the current development process has limited the ability to conduct pilot projects that would provide real-world experience with different management options and has unnecessarily slowed down IT acquisition reform.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to expand the number and types of pilot projects it conducts to inform the current acquisition reform process. For example, pilot projects should be expanded beyond business systems to include other existing programs, such as the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System or the Navy's Next Generation Enterprise Network. The committee believes that this could provide information to show how rapid IT acquisition could function for command and control systems or enterprise data services.

Small Business Subcontracting Goals

The committee notes that while current statutes and regulations require set-asides for small business subcontracts, prime contractors are prohibited from

accounting for the total dollar amount flowing to small businesses. Currently, if a contractor that is not a small business is identified as the primary first-tier subcontractor, a prime contractor is prevented from reporting any of the other subcontract dollars that may flow to small businesses; this occurs regardless of whether small business subcontractors comprise either the remainder of the first tier or all other subcontracting tiers. The committee believes that allowing prime contractors to report small business subcontracting at all tiers would demonstrate the full extent of small business participation on Department of Defense contracts. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop procedures for fully accounting for small business participation at all tiers on a Department of Defense contract, and to publish such procedures in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation if the Secretary determines that to be necessary to fully implement such procedures. The Department shall ensure that the procedures fully account for small business participation, but do not permit duplicate reporting of small business participation. The Department shall provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a copy of the subcontracting accounting procedures and any proposed regulation by March 30, 2012.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

#### Section 801—Requirements Relating to Core Logistics Capabilities for Milestone A and Milestone B and Elimination of References to Key Decision Points A and B

This section would amend section 2366a and 2366b of title 10, United States Code, to require the Milestone Decision Authority to certify that a preliminary analysis of core logistics capabilities for each major weapons system has been performed as entrance criteria for entering the technology development phase of a major defense acquisition program (milestone A) and that the core logistics requirements and associated sustaining workloads for the weapons system have been determined as entrance criteria for entering the engineering and manufacturing development phase (milestone B). This section also would require certification that relevant sustainment criteria and alternatives were sufficiently evaluated and addressed in the initial capabilities document to support an analysis of alternatives and the development of key performance parameters for sustainment of the program throughout its projected life cycle. Furthermore, this section would require certification that life-cycle sustainment planning has identified and evaluated relevant sustainment costs through development, production, operation, sustainment, and disposal of the program, and any alternatives, and that such costs are reasonable and have been accurately estimated.

The committee is aware that the Secretary issued formal guidance on the operation of the defense acquisition system on October 18, 2010, which directed space systems to be subject to milestone A and milestone B requirements. Therefore, this section also would strike references to "key decisions points" in section 2366a and 2366b of title 10, United States Code.

Section 802—Revision to Law Relating to Disclosures to Litigation Support Contractors

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to include a new section relating to the disclosure of confidential commercial, financial or proprietary information, technical data, or other privileged information to a litigation support contractor for the sole purpose of providing litigation support. This section would require the litigation support contractor to execute a contract with the Government agreeing to or acknowledging that any information furnished will be used only for the purpose stated in the contract, that the litigation support contractor will take all precautions necessary to protect the sensitive information, that the sensitive information will not be used by the litigation support contractor to compete against the third party for contracts, and that a violation of any of the above would be basis for the Government to terminate the contract. This section would also repeal a superseded provision in section 2320 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 803—Extension of Applicability of the Senior Executive Benchmark Compensation Amount for Purposes of Allowable Cost Limitations under Defense Contracts

This section would amend section 2324 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding the existing executive compensation cap to apply to any individual performing on a contract rather than certain management employees. The committee is aware that the Defense Contract Audit Agency has shown that there are lower-level executives not subject to the cap and non-executive employees who receive compensation in excess of the benchmark compensation amount. The committee believes that this section would reduce the risk of excessive individual compensation charged to defense contracts.

Section 804—Supplier Risk Management

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to manage supplier risk by directing contracting personnel to use a business credit reporting bureau, or other objective sources of business information, to evaluate supplier risk on all Department of Defense (DOD) contract actions. This section also would require the use of automated, off-the-shelf products to identify suppliers by location and to

monitor suppliers for events that may affect their performance, such as a merger or acquisition, or bankruptcy filing.

The committee notes that while the Federal Acquisition Regulation requires that Federal contracting officials determine contractor responsibility prior to contract award, adherence within the Department to this requirement has been inconsistent, often varying both among, and within, individual contracting offices. In addition, the evaluation of supplier risk traditionally has been treated as a one-time event, rather than an ongoing responsibility. As a result, DOD contracting personnel frequently have limited or belated visibility into changes occurring after contract award that could impact a supplier's ability to meet their requirements.

The committee notes that commercial firms increasingly have sought solutions to manage supplier risk throughout the contract lifecycle. In addition, the committee is aware that the Department of Veterans Affairs has employed a business credit reporting system to assist its acquisition personnel with contractor responsibility determinations. The committee believes that such a supplier risk management initiative would benefit the Department of Defense through cost avoidance (by reducing its exposure to high-risk suppliers), increased efficiency, and a greater return on investment.

The committee also believes that such a tool could be implemented in a manner that focuses on those suppliers that are most likely to be a risk, and could also allow the Department of Defense to evaluate supplier risk with lower-tier suppliers.

### Section 805—Extension of Availability of Funds in the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund

This section would make technical amendments to section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (DAWDF). The committee notes that this section would enable all funds credited, transferred, appropriated, or deposited to the DAWDF to remain available for expenditure in the fiscal year for which it is credited and the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

### Section 806—Defense Contract Audit Agency Annual Report

This section would require the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency to submit an annual report that summarizes its audit activities during the previous fiscal year, including significant problems, abuses, and deficiencies, a statistical table showing the total number of audit reports, the length of time taken for each audit, and the questioned dollar value, as well as recommendations for corrective actions. The report also would include a summary of any backlog of pending contractor audits and a rationale for the cause of the backlog. This section would require the annual report to be provided to the congressional defense committees by

March 30 of each year and be made available on a public website within 60 days after receipt of the report by Congress. The committee believes that this section would increase transparency and accountability, and facilitate congressional oversight of the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

## SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 811—Calculation of Time Period Relating to Report on Critical Changes in Major Automated Information Systems

This section would amend the requirement for when a critical change report would be needed for a Major Automated Information System (MAIS). Currently, a report is required when a MAIS investment has failed to achieve a full deployment decision within 5 years after funds were first obligated for the program. This section would amend that to require a critical change report within 5 years after contract award. This section would also specify that any time under which the contract award is under protest would not be counted against this 5-year limit.

### Section 812—Change in Deadline for Submission of Selected Acquisition Reports from 60 to 45 days

This section would amend section 2432(f) of title10, United States Code, to require the comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Reports to be delivered to Congress not later than 45 days after the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year. The committee believes that this will enhance congressional oversight.

### Section 813—Extension of Sunset Date for Certain Protests of Task and Deliver Order Contracts

This section would amend section 4106(f) of title 41, United States Code, to extend the sunset date to September 20, 2016. The committee is aware that section 843 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) temporarily expanded the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) jurisdiction to hear bid protests by authorizing it to hear protests on task and delivery orders valued in excess of $10.0 million. The authority was provided with a sunset in 2011 in order to allow Congress to evaluate the effectiveness of the expanded jurisdiction and gauge the impact of increased workload on GAO. Section 825 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) extended the sunset date for bid protests on task and delivery orders for defense acquisitions until September 30, 2016. However, section 825 did not address civilian agency acquisitions.

### Section 814—Clarification of Department of Defense Authority to Purchase Right-hand Drive Passenger Sedans

This section would amend section 2253 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the cost threshold of $30,000 per vehicle applies specifically to right-hand drive passenger sedans and does not apply to right-hand drive vehicles such as ambulances, fire trucks, or buses.

### Section 815—Amendment Relating to Buying Tents, Tarpaulins, or Covers from American Sources

This section would amend section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the domestic source requirement for tents, tarpaulins, or covers includes the materials and components of tents, tarpaulins, or covers.

### Section 816—Para-Aramid Fibers and Yarns

This section would eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Defense to procure articles containing para-aramid fibers and yarns manufactured in certain foreign countries, by repealing section 807 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1999 (Public Law 105-261). This section also would prohibit the Department of Defense from issuing a solicitation requiring proposals submitted pursuant to such solicitation to include the use of para-aramid fibers and yarns.

### Section 817—Repeal of Sunset of Authority to Procure Fire Resistant Rayon Fiber from Foreign Sources for the Production of Uniforms

This section would make permanent the authority to procure fire resistant rayon fiber for the production of uniforms from foreign sources by striking subsection (f) of section 829 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), as amended by section 821 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

## SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONTRACTS IN SUPPORT OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ OR AFGHANISTAN

### Section 821—Restrictions on Awarding Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan to Adverse Entities

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to void a contract, or require the prime contractor to void a subcontract under a contract, in support of contingency operations in the Republic of Iraq or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, if the Secretary determines that a foreign entity or foreign individual

performing on the contract, or a task or delivery order, is directly engaged in hostilities or is substantially supporting forces that are engaged in hostilities against the U.S. or its coalition partners.

Section 822—Authority To Use Higher Thresholds for Procurements in Support of Contingency Operations

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to apply a simplified acquisition threshold of $1.0 million and micro-purchase threshold of $25,000 for contracting activities supporting contingency operations in the Republic of Iraq or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, regardless of the location of the contracting activity.

Section 823—Authority To Examine Records of Foreign Contractors Performing Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to examine the records of a foreign contractor, or a foreign subcontractor, performing a contract in support of contingency operations in the Republic of Iraq or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This authority would not apply if the contract was being performed by a contractor or a subcontractor that is a foreign government, or agency of a foreign government, or if precluded by applicable laws. This section also would required the Secretary to issue guidance, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to implement this section.

Section 824—Definitions

This section would define certain terms used in this subtitle.

SUBTITLE D—DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

Section 831—Assessment of the Defense Industrial Base Pilot Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees assessing the defense industrial base pilot program of the Department of Defense by March 1, 2012.

Section 832—Department of Defense Assessment of Industrial Base for Potential Shortfalls

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the U.S. industrial base to identify potential gaps that might affect military readiness. Such assessment would be required within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. In addition, the Comptroller General of the United States

would be required to review the Secretary of Defense's assessment, including completeness of the report and the reasonableness of the methodology and recommendations.

The Department of Defense relies on thousands of suppliers to ensure that it has the weapons, supporting equipment, and raw materials it needs to support current and future conflicts against conventional opponents. However, the committee is concerned that increasing globalization in the defense industry presents uncertainty in the ability of the United States to maintain a reliable and sufficient supplier base in the event of such conflicts. In addition, defense industry prime contractors are relying more on subcontractors, including commercial suppliers, which can limit the visibility into the lower tiers of the supplier base. The committee notes that studies by the Government Accountability Office have found that the Department lacks a framework and consistent approach for managing supplier base concerns such as counterfeit parts in the supply chain, and reliance on rare earth materials from the People's Republic of China in military equipment and systems. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the Department has not taken steps to identify supplier-base availability for defense needs beyond a 5-year time frame. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to address these deficiencies in the required report and to provide a specific assessment of the vulnerabilities posed to defense systems as a result of potential counterfeiting of sub-components manufactured in China.

Section 833—Comptroller General Assessment of Government Competition in the Department of Defense Industrial Base

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of government mandated and supported competition in the Department of Defense industrial base. This section also would require the Comptroller General to submit a report on the findings and recommendations of the assessment to the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2012.

Section 834—Report on Impact of Foreign Boycotts on the Defense Industrial Base

This section would require the Comptroller General of the Unites States to submit to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, not later than February 1, 2012, a report setting forth an assessment of the impact of foreign boycotts on the defense industrial base. The report shall include a summary of foreign boycotts that posed a material risk to the defense industrial base from January 2008 to the date of enactment of this Act; the apparent objectives of each such boycott; an assessment of the harm to the defense industrial base as a result of each such boycott; an assessment of the sufficiency of the efforts of the Department of Defense

and Department of State to mitigate the material risks of each such foreign boycott on the defense industrial base; and recommendations to reduce the material risks of foreign boycotts. This section also would prohibit the Comptroller General from publicly disclosing the names of any person, organization, or entity involved in, or affected by, such boycotts without express written permission.

### Section 835—Rare Earth Material Inventory Plan

This section would require the Administrator, Defense Logistics Agency Strategic Materials to develop a plan to establish an inventory of rare earth materials needed to ensure the long-term availability of such materials. Among other matters, the Administrator would be required to identify and describe the steps necessary to create an inventory of rare earth materials to support national defense requirements and ensure reliable sources, provide a detailed cost-benefit analysis of creating such an inventory, provide an analysis of the potential market effects associated with creating such an inventory, and identify and describe the steps necessary to develop and maintain a competitive multi-source supply chain for rare earth materials. This section would require the Administrator to submit the plan to the Secretary of Defense within 180 days following the date of enactment of this Act, and require the Secretary to determine whether to execute the plan. The Secretary would be required to submit that determination, along with the plan, to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of receiving the plan from the Administrator.

## SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 841—Miscellaneous Amendments to Public Law 111-383 Relating to Acquisition

This section would make three amendments to the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) relating to acquisition. This section would strike the requirement in section 804 that the acquisition process for rapid fielding of capabilities in response to urgent operational needs may only be applied for capabilities that can appropriately be acquired under fixed price contracts. This section also would strike the requirement in section 812 for the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance requiring the use of manufacturing readiness levels as a basis for measuring, assessing, reporting, and communicating manufacturing readiness and risk. This section also would amend section 1073 by allowing, rather than directing, the Secretary of Defense to establish a defense research and development rapid innovation program.

### Section 842—Procurement of Photovoltaic Devices

This section would amend section 846 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) to clarify that, for the purposes of that section, the Department of Defense is deemed to own a photovoltaic device if the device is installed on Department of Defense property or in a facility owned or leased by or for the Department of Defense. This section also would clarify the definition of photovoltaic devices.

Section 843—Clarification of Jurisdiction of the United States District Courts to Hear Bid Protest Disputes Involving Maritime Contracts

This section would amend section 1491(b) of title 28, United States Code, by establishing the U. S. Court of Federal Claims as the exclusive Federal court forum for bid protests.

Section 844—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement

This section would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (42 U.S.C. 17142) to exempt the Department of Defense from the requirements related to contracts for alternative or synthetic fuel in that section.

# TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Conduct of the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review

The committee found the completeness of the 2008 Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review (QRMR) lacking. In addition, the accompanying report delivered to Congress in January 2009 failed to comply with the requirements of section 118b of title 10, United States Code. Rather than using the QRMR as an opportunity to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the roles and missions of the Armed Forces with the intent to identify capability gaps and areas of unnecessary duplication, the 2008 review appeared to simply endorse the status quo. Furthermore, rather than conducting a complete review, the Secretary of Defense chose to only examine select areas of interest. The review only focused on the Department's planned investments to meet asymmetric challenges and did little to evaluate the conventional force structure or need for legacy hardware programs. The committee notes that many of the conclusions of the review have proven faulty, such as the determination that assigning the C-27J to both the Air Force and the Army provided the "most value to the joint force." The committee also notes that the Department has not complied with the requirement in section 222 of title 10, United States Code, to present the future-years budget by core mission areas. The committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the inclusion of budget justification materials associated with the core competencies of the military services, and would further require the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the sufficiency of the Department's budget justification materials.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to take a more comprehensive approach to the 2011 QRMR and to comply with congressional intent in conducting the review. The committee believes the QRMR, if conducted as intended, would provide a solid basis for reducing waste while also improving the joint warfighting capability of the Department.

### Influence of Budget on Quadrennial Defense Review

The committee has previously expressed concern regarding the influence of defense budgets on the "Quadrennial Defense Review" (QDR), conducted pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code. Section 118 requires this comprehensive examination of the national defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plans, and other elements of the defense program and policies be conducted every four years. Paragraph (b)(3) of section 118 requires that that the QDR identify the budget plan that would be

"required to provide sufficient resources to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in that national defense strategy at a low-to-moderate level of risk." Likewise, paragraph (b)(4) of section 118 requires that the QDR's recommendations, "are not constrained to comply with the budget submitted to Congress by the President…".

The committee notes that in the past representatives of the Department of Defense have indicated that the QDR is not budget constrained; rather, it is budget informed. While the committee acknowledges that ultimately resources must shape any strategy, the committee believes that the QDR should be based upon a process unconstrained by budgetary influences so that such influences do not determine or limit its outcome. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to brief the committee no later than September 30, 2012 on the steps the Department will take during conduct of the QDR in fiscal year 2013 to ensure that the next QDR fulfills all statutory requirements, including those related to budget plans, and in particular the steps that the Department will take to ensure the QDR is not constrained to comply with the budget submitted by the President pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

## Information Operations and Strategic Communications

The committee continues to support information operations (IO) and strategic communications (SC) as important tools for countering enemy narratives, as well as engaging with the global community. The committee is aware that the January 2011 Secretary of Defense memo on IO and SC has contributed significantly to improving the management structure and budgeting process for IO and SC functions within the Department of Defense.

The committee believes that the realignment of IO and SC responsibilities to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy is critical for breaking down the traditional organizational stovepipes of IO and bridging those elements with the emerging instruments of influence under SC. The committee also recognizes the improvement of the budget justification material related to IO and SC, which greatly improves the oversight and management of those activities.

The committee also encourages the Department of Defense to continue to pursue workforce development opportunities that bring together diverse skill sets and career specialties. For example, the Department should do more to integrate social science skills, cultural intelligence, and human terrain understanding to the IO and SC field. The committee also believes that as the Joint Chiefs of Staff evaluate joint SC and IO training and education curricula, it ensures that it maintains and sustains existing centers of excellence.

## Management of Information Technology

The committee recognizes that the acquisition and management of information technology (IT) systems and services is highly complex. The budget request contained $38.4 billion for IT alone, and included funds to develop items ranging from avionics to logistics to command and control to desktop computing. Managing such a complex enterprise has traditionally been a challenge for the Department.

The committee is concerned that recent organizational changes within the Department that are a part of the Secretary of Defense's efficiency initiatives may in fact hamper management of Department of Defense IT. For example, the committee believes that the decision to eliminate core management and oversight functions within the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration and the Business Transformation Office appears to have been made without adequate planning, or justification. Furthermore, the rationale for eliminating these functions at a time when IT reform and consolidation is being contemplated to generate cost savings is counterintuitive to the committee.

The committee believes that the Department must maintain responsibility and oversight of its IT programs as well as sufficient numbers of experienced and trained acquisition professionals if they are to succeed.

NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence

The committee is aware that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has accredited a Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence (CCD COE) to enhance the capability, cooperation, and information sharing among NATO member nations and partners in cyber defense through education, research and development, lessons learned, and consultation. The Center represents the main source of expertise in the field of cooperative cyber defense within NATO and the committee recognizes the importance of this organization in linking U.S. and European initiatives to improve cyber defense capabilities. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to provide more support to the Center by increasing the number of personnel exchanges, and supporting additional cooperative workshops and other initiatives. The committee believes that this could help support our foreign partners build their own cyber operations capabilities, as well as boost U.S. capacity in this area.

Office of Cyberthreat Analysis

The committee is aware that the Defense Intelligence Agency has established the Office of Cyberthreat Analysis to provide an all-source analysis capability focused on threats in cyberspace. The office provides a range of support functions to the entire defense community, including: all-source defense analysis of cyberthreats to the Nation; target development; exercise planning; battle damage assessment;

and counterintelligence investigations and operations, including supply chain risk management.

The committee is concerned that this office has not been sufficiently staffed to complete the tasks assigned. For instance, the growing importance of conducting supply chain risk assessments and vulnerability assessments on specific acquisition programs are likely to drive the needs for the limited numbers of personnel, making it difficult to carry out other missions. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Commander, U.S. Cyber Command to assess the sufficiency of the workforce assigned to the Office of Cyberthreat Analysis compared to the missions assigned to it. The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence shall submit a report on this assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

### Protection of Sensitive Information

The committee understands that numerous directives, memoranda, and other instructions guide the policy and processes of properly safeguarding information. The committee believes one very important source of guidance is the June 2006 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) memorandum titled, "Protection of Sensitive Agency Information" (OMB Memorandum M-06-16) as the memorandum directs government agencies to emplace specific safeguards that conform with National Institute of Standards and Technology procedures for the protection of remote information.

The committee is concerned that the safeguards directed to be emplaced have not been fully implemented or incorporated into existing Department of Defense procedures. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department to review the guidance directed in the OMB memorandum and ensure that those safeguards are instituted within the Department of Defense.

### Report on Contractors at the Defense Intelligence Agency

In subtitle D of title IX of this Act, the committee recommends several provisions on total force management within the Department of Defense, including section 934 which would amend an annual reporting requirement by the Secretary of Defense contained in section 115a of title 10, United States Code, on defense manpower requirements, to include an estimate for contractor requirements for support services. This provision would facilitate an improved awareness of the Department of Defense requirements being performed by contractors.

The committee is particularly interested in understanding the use of contractors by the defense intelligence community, starting with the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the manpower mix criteria used to determine which

defense intelligence functions should be performed by contractors and which functions should be performed by military members or Government civilians.

The committee, therefore, directs the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on how the Defense Intelligence Agency plans to implement subtitle D of title IX of this Act by December 9, 2011. The report also shall include an identification of the current contractor workforce, current and planned use of contractors by the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the manpower mix criteria used to determine which defense intelligence functions are performed by contractors and which functions are performed by military members or Government civilians. The report shall be provided in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if descriptions of the use of contractors or criteria are classified.

### Report on Increasing Competition for Space Launch

The committee is pleased that highly reliable space launch vehicles in the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program have resulted in over 30 successful launches since 2002. However, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should provide expanded opportunities for competition in support of its space launch requirements, including competition in the EELV program. The committee further believes that the Department of Defense should establish clear criteria that new providers of space launch capabilities would be expected to meet in order to become qualified competitors for launching defense payloads.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report detailing how it intends to incorporate new providers of space launch capabilities into its space launch acquisition plans while preserving mission assurance, identify potential cost savings, and identify the criteria required for new entrants wishing to bid on opportunities to provide launch services for defense payloads.

### Research and Development Assessments in Quadrennial Defense Review and the Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense is required every 4 years to conduct a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code. The QDR is intended to provide a strategic review of force modernization plans and to define sufficient force modernization plans necessary to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in the national defense strategy. The committee believes an essential element of any force modernization plan is the research and development plan necessary to deliver future capabilities. As well, while the exact military capabilities required in 20 years may be difficult to predict, adequate research and development in the near-term creates options for

decision makers in the long-term. The committee believes the QDR was intended to identify such prudent hedges against future, ill-defined threats. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to identify the assumptions used in future QDRs related to research and development and the core capabilities relating to research, development, test, and evaluation required to support the national defense.

The committee also notes that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has a key role in advising the Secretary on requirements, programs, and budgets, and the committee believes this role should include advice on research and development. Specifically, paragraph (a)(4) of section 153 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Chairman to advise the Secretary on the priorities of the requirements identified by the combatant commanders. The committee is aware that the combatant commanders often include science and technology priorities in their respective integrated priority lists. As a result, the committee believes it is important for the Chairman to include in his advice to the Secretary the research and development needs of the combatant commanders and to maintain situational awareness of technological innovations that could pose challenges to U.S. national security.

## Total Force Management

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense's recent focus on efficiencies without a thorough business case analysis and risk assessment potentially undermines the Department's ability to appropriately plan and budget for its total manpower requirements. The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) should aggressively undertake a more holistic approach to its requirements in order to achieve the appropriate balance in its total workforce, rather than managing simply to an arbitrary civilian authorization level.

Total force management would improve personnel requirements determination and planning to facilitate decisions on which sector is most appropriate to perform that requirement with consideration of the distinct value of each component of the plan, whether military (Active and Reserve Components), civilian, or contractor personnel. For example, the military provides an expeditionary capability with specialized training in combat, combat support, and combat service support capabilities; civilian personnel provide needed oversight and direction, continuity of operations, and specialized enduring skills that do not require expeditionary, combat, or combat-related competencies; and contractor personnel provide specialized skills and surge capabilities that do not require the command and control or transparency to the public required by military and civilian personnel.

The committee notes that several tools are available to facilitate total force management decisions. These include the strategic civilian human capital plan (10 U.S.C. 115b), service contracting inventory (10 U.S.C. 2330a), inclusion of

contractor services support work in the annual budget displays (10 U.S.C. 235), and the list of commercial activities required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act (Public Law 105-270). In addition, section 129, title 10, United State Code, requires that the Department of Defense civilian workforce be managed on the basis of workload rather than any arbitrary constraints or limitations. Furthermore, the committee notes that sections 2461 and 2463 of title 10, United States Code, outline the procedures for the conversion of functions to performance by either DOD civilian personnel or contractor personnel; these procedures are tools that allow the Department to "right size" its workforce where appropriate. The committee notes that these tools should be used only in response to changes in the Department's mission or if insufficient strategic human capital planning was done prior to workforce decisions being made initially.

Therefore, elsewhere in this title the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a total force management plan that would provide the means to establish the appropriate mix of manpower, military, civilian, and contractor personnel, to perform the mission of the Department of Defense. Risk mitigation should take precedence over cost when necessary to maintain appropriate manpower to support the Department's operations and readiness to perform the core missions of the Armed Forces.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

#### Section 901—Revision of Defense Business System Requirements

This section would update the structure and process of the defense business systems investment review boards, including clarifying responsibilities based on recent reorganization within the Department of Defense. This section would also consolidate reporting by the Department of Defense Deputy chief management officers and the reports required by the Chief Management Officer of the military departments required by section 908 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417).

#### Section 902—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would re-designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

## SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

### Section 911—Notification Requirement for Harmful Interference to Department of Defense Global Positioning System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a notification to Congress upon such a determination that a space-based or terrestrial-based commercial communications service will cause or is causing widespread harmful interference with Global Positioning System (GPS) receivers of the Department of Defense (DOD). The notification would include a summary of the reasons for such harmful interference, the entity causing the interference, and the magnitude and duration of the interference.

The committee is aware that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issued a conditional order to a commercial communications company on January 26, 2011, authorizing it to provide broadband voice and data communications services that potentially interfere with GPS. The committee recognizes that the Armed Forces are highly dependent on GPS capabilities and services. The committee believes that any space-based or terrestrial-based commercial communications service that has the potential to interfere with GPS should not receive final authorization to provide service within the United States by the FCC unless and until the potential interference with GPS is resolved.

Such commercial services are planned to be transmitted from 40,000 land-based towers across the United States. The committee understands, based on information received from the Air Force, that the signal strength of such service is estimated to be one billion times more powerful than the GPS signal. Though the commercial service would broadcast on a frequency adjacent to GPS, it may still overwhelm GPS receivers, potentially causing a denial of service for millions of users in the United States relying on GPS navigation and timing services. Such users included the military, emergency responders, maritime and aeronautical emergency communication systems, banking transactions, air traffic and ground transportation systems, and myriad commercial applications.

The committee understands that the Deputy Secretary of Defense sent a letter to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission on January 12, 2011, highlighting the "strong potential for interference to… critical national security systems," and "strongly recommend[ing] deferral of final action on [the FCC order and authorization] until the proper interference analysis and mitigation studies can be conducted."

The committee is aware of several other letters of concern regarding potential GPS interference, including: a December 28, 2010, multi-agency memorandum to the Chairman of the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC) signed by officials from the military departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Commerce, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of the Interior, and

Department of Homeland Security; a January 12, 2011, letter to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information; and a March 25, 2011, letter co-signed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The committee understands that the authorization of commercial communications service is conditional "upon the completion of the process for addressing interference concerns relating to GPS" undertaken by a technical working group whose analysis of potential interference with GPS devices and recommendations to mitigate such interference is due to be submitted to the FCC no later than June 15, 2011.

The committee is concerned about the impact on U.S. national security resulting from potential harmful interference with GPS. The committee recognizes the extent to which the military is reliant on GPS and notes the military's current inventory of nearly one million GPS receivers. Thousands of GPS receivers are integrated into weapons systems, aircraft, ships, and vehicles. GPS is crucial in such areas as blue force tracking, precision munitions employment, combat search and rescue, close air support, logistics, and communications.

The committee understands that the FCC did not conduct a study on potential interference prior to the January 26, 2011, order and authorization. The committee is disappointed that the FCC proceeded with the order and authorization prior to any study and resolution of the GPS interference issue. Furthermore, the committee understands that the Department of Defense has not determined whether it can mitigate the interference and questions whether sufficient analysis and mitigating measures can be identified and implemented by June 15, 2011. The committee believes the burden of proof for non-interference should be placed on the commercial communications company and believes the FCC should indefinitely postpone final decision until the harmful interference issue has been resolved, with the full coordination and approval of the Department of Defense.

The committee reminds the Secretary of Defense of the authority in section 2281 of title 10, United States Code, which states that the Secretary "may not agree to any restriction on the Global Positioning System… that would adversely affect the military potential of the Global Positioning System." The committee intends to work with the Secretary of Defense to mitigate the effects of any harmful interference with GPS on the military.

## SUBTITLE C—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED MATTERS

### Section 921—Report on Implementation of Recommendations by Comptroller General on Intelligence Information Sharing

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the House Permanent Select Committee on

Intelligence, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on actions taken to implement the recommendation of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, "Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance: Establishing Guidance, Timelines, and Accountability for Integrating Intelligence Data Would Improve Information Sharing" (GAO-10-265NI). GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretaries of the military services, develop intelligence information sharing guidance, such as a concept of operations, and to provide such direction and prioritization to improve intelligence community information sharing. In addition, this section directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Under Secretary's report to determine whether it is consistent with and adequate to address its recommendation.

The committee is concerned about the extent to which Department of Defense intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance efforts are managed in accordance with overarching direction and priorities for sharing intelligence information across the defense intelligence community. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to implement the recommendation. The committee also requests that GAO provide it with an update regarding its conclusions from this review as soon as practicable.

Section 922—Insider Threat Detection

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program for enhanced information sharing protection and insider threat mitigation for the information systems of the Department of Defense in order to detect unauthorized access to, use of, or transmission of, classified or controlled unclassified information.

The committee is concerned with the acute damage to national security of recent unauthorized releases of classified information from the Department of Defense and other Government information systems. The committee notes that the impact of these releases will continue for many years, to the detriment of existing operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as well as the reputation and credibility of the United States in international affairs now and in the future.

The committee recognizes that the Department is responding seriously to this event and is implementing safeguards to prevent such a breach again. While the Department should continue to pursue technical security measures, the committee is concerned that the human dimension is not receiving sufficient attention. The committee therefore encourages the Department to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the means by which to detect, respond and mitigate the threat posed by trusted persons inside the organization who would purposely compromise the security of the network (otherwise known as the "insider threat").

Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the technological and procedural responses may be having a negative impact on the productivity and effectiveness of forces supporting ongoing operations in areas of hostility. The

committee cautions the Department to pay special consideration in how technological or procedural fixes are implemented in operational areas of hostility to ensure that these concerns do not become a significant problem.

## SUBTITLE D—TOTAL FORCE MANAGEMENT

### Section 931—General Policy for Total Force Management

This section would amend section 129a of title 10, United States Code to require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a total force management plan that would determine the appropriate manpower mix of military (Active and Reserve Components), civilian and contractor personnel necessary to accomplish the mission of the Department of Defense (DOD). Overall responsibility for establishing the policies and procedures to implement such a plan would be given to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, with responsibility for requirements determination, planning and programming being given to the manpower and force structure authorities for each DOD component.

The committee is aware that DOD Instruction 1100.2 requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to obtain a written statement from each requiring official regarding decisions to contract for support. This section would codify that requirement and also would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to ensure that the policies and procedures governing the acquisition process are consistent with those developed to implement the total force management plan. Furthermore, to ensure that budget decisions are developed in line with these policies, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) would be required to justify in the annual budget submission any budget decision that may inhibit implementation of the total force management plan.

The committee notes that manpower and force structure personnel should have a greater role in requirements determination, planning, programming, and budgeting. This is intended to ensure that all aspects of the Department of Defense workforce (military, civilian and contractor personnel) are utilized in a balanced and rational fashion.

### Section 932—Revisions to Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Constraints

This section would amend section 129 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (DOD) are managed on the basis of workload and in support of the total force management plan developed in accordance with section 129a, as would be amended by this Act. This change would reinforce the committee's position that manpower requirements

should be based on mission requirements and not arbitrary cost savings that ignore the workload needs of the DOD components.

Section 933—Additional Amendments Relating to Total Force Management

This section would amend section 113 of title 10, United States Code, to include an accounting for contractors in the Secretary of Defense annual report to Congress on expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the Department of Defense. The inclusion of contractors in this report would facilitate improved awareness of the role of contractors in accomplishing the mission of the Department. In addition, this section would amend section 1597 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the guidelines put in place related to civilian personnel reductions comply with the total force management plan required by section 129a, title 10, United States Code, as would be amended by this act.

This section also would amend section 863 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), to include considerations relating to policy for total force management required by section 129a of title 10, United States Code, in the implementation plan required for establishment of requirements processes for the acquisition of services. The committee believes that this is necessary in order to align the processes for the acquisition of services with the manpower requirements determination process required by section 129a.

Section 934—Amendments to Annual Defense Manpower Requirements Report

This section would amend section 115a of title 10, United States Code, to revise the annual defense manpower requirements report to include a projection of the annual Department of Defense (DOD) civilian personnel requirements for the next fiscal year, and the strength levels of the previous year. This change reflects the recognition that DOD civilian personnel should be managed by workload requirements, which may fluctuate during a given year and should be accommodated as necessary. In addition, this section would require the inclusion of an estimate for contractor requirements for support services, as outlined in each military department's service contractor inventory as required by section 2330a of title 10, United States Code. The inclusion of contractors in this report would facilitate an improved awareness of the Department of Defense requirements being performance by contractors.

Section 935—Revisions to Strategic Workforce Plan

This section would amend section 115b of title 10, United States Code to achieve the following outcomes in Department of Defense (DOD) civilian workforce planning requirements:

(1) Reduce costs associated with planning and allow the Department to improve its implementation efforts by moving from an annual to a biennial report;
(2) Align the workforce planning assessment period to correspond with existing DOD budget and manpower planning cycles upon which workforce requirements, authorizations, and forecasts are based; and
(3) Require that the assessment of the appropriate mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel is aligned with the total force management plan developed in accordance with section 129a, title 10, United States Code, as would be amended by this Act.

While the committee recommends these changes in order to align the Department's strategic civilian workforce plans with existing budget and manpower planning structures and provide time to implement planned strategies, it remains concerned that the Department has not fully complied with the requirements outlined in section 115b of title 10, United States Code. According to a September 2010 report by the Government Accountability (GAO-10-814R), this could result in the Department relying on "incomplete information concerning the size, composition and needs of the civilian workforce. In particular, the Department may not be able to determine whether its investment in strategies to improve the civilian workforce is effective and efficient." Therefore, the committee urges the Department to develop performance measures to assess its progress and guide its civilian workforce planning.

Section 936—Technical Amendments to Requirement for Inventory of Contracts for Services

This section would amend section 2330a(c) of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional clarity regarding the types of contracted services to be inventoried and the manner in which contractor full-time equivalents are captured. In addition, this section would more clearly delineate the statutory responsibilities and roles in developing guidance and implementing particular aspects of the statute. This section also would direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to develop and promulgate guidance specific to the review requirements outlined in paragraph (e) of 2330a of title 10, United States Code. This clarification is intended to ensure that the Department of Defense's total force manpower management equities are fully represented.

Section 937—Modification of Temporary Suspension of Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Contractor Performance

This section would lift the temporary suspension of Department of Defense public-private competitions that was included in section 325 of the National Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). Section 325 temporarily suspended the authority to initiate public-private competitions until the Secretary of Defense provided a report to Congress on the conduct of such competitions and certified compliance with certain statutory requirements. This section would eliminate the compliance certification and lift the suspension 30 days after receipt by Congress of the Secretary of Defense report, and after an assessment of the report is conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The committee notes that the moratorium already could have been lifted if the Department had complied with the requirements of Section 325 under the time frame outlined in that section. However, the committee is taking this action to ensure that the report is delivered promptly so that the Department can reinstate the public-private competition process once the reporting requirements are complied with.

### Section 938—Preliminary Planning for Department of Defense Public-Private Competitions

This section would amend section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, to place the responsibility to issue and maintain guidance and procedures for preliminary planning for public-private competitions with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. Currently all elements of public-private competitions are the responsibility of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. However, the committee believes that preliminary planning for public-private competitions should include an increased and more active role for the manpower and personnel communities, which have greater expertise in determining manpower requirements, whether military, civilian, or contractor personnel. While the committee believes that the manpower and personnel communities should remain actively engaged throughout the entirety of the process, the conduct of the acquisition component of the competition remains the responsibility of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, which has the requisite acquisition expertise. However, the committee recommends the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics realign responsibility for public-private competitions from the Deputy Under Secretary for Installations and Environment to the Director for Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy.

### Section 939—Conversion of Certain Functions from Contractor Performance to Performance by Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would amend section 2463 of title 10, United States Code, to require the conversion of any inherently governmental function to performance by Department of Defense (DOD) civilian employees. The committee notes that this

requirement was not specifically included in section 2463 when it was enacted originally because it was presumed that such functions were not being performed by contractors. However, the committee is aware that was a false presumption. For example, according to a report by the Government Accountability Office, "Defense Acquisitions: Further Action Needed to Better Implement Requirements for Conducting Inventory of Service Contract Activities, January 2011", within the Department of the Army, more than 2,000 contractor full-time equivalents are performing work that is inherently governmental, and an additional 45,934 Army contractors are performing activities deemed closely associated with inherently governmental functions. The committee finds this troubling and urges the military services, particularly the Army, to convert such functions immediately to performance by DOD civilian employees.

In addition, this section would require a cost analysis and a savings differential before converting certain commercial functions to performance by DOD civilian employees. This requirement would be applied for the conversion of functions that are not inherently governmental. This section also would require procedures to be developed to notify a contractor of the intent to in source a contract on which the contractor is currently performing; a copy of the notification would be provided to the congressional defense committees. The intent of the notification is to provide fair notice to affected contractors but not to delay or stop an insourcing initiative.

### Section 940—Assessment of Appropriate Department of Defense and Contractor Personnel for the Defense Medical Readiness Training Institute

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the appropriate mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to carry out mission and functions of the Defense Medical Readiness Training Institute. This assessment would be carried out in accordance with sections 129 and 129a of title 10, United States Code, as would be amended by this Act.

## SUBTITLE E—QUADRENNIAL ROLES AND MISSIONS AND RELATED MATTERS

### Section 951—Transfer of Provisions Relating to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to transfer the requirement for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct an assessment of roles and missions of the Armed Forces from section 118b to section 153, and to enhance the Chairman's role in advising the Secretary of Defense on the assignment of functions of the Armed Forces in order to obtain maximum efficiency and effectiveness of the Armed Forces.

Section 952—Revisions to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review

This section would amend section 118b of title 10, United States Code, to enhance the requirements of the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review by requiring the review to include an assessment of the functions and capabilities of the Department of Defense and its major components to achieve the objectives of the national defense strategy and the national military strategy.

Section 953—Amendment to Presentation of Future-Years Budget and Comptroller General Report on Budget Justification Material

This section would amend section 944 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) to include the functions of each of the armed forces as identified under the most recent Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review pursuant to section 118b of title 10, United States Code. This section also would require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the sufficiency of Department of Defense regulations, policies, and guidance governing the construction of budget exhibits and to provide recommendations to improve the consistency, clarity, accuracy, and completeness of the Department of Defense's budget justification material.

Section 954—Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Assessment of Contingency Plans

This section would amend paragraph (b)(1) of section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to submit to Congress, as part of the Chairman's assessment of risks under the National Military Strategy submitted pursuant to paragraph (b)(2) of such section, an assessment of the critical deficiencies and strengths in force capabilities (including manpower, logistics, intelligence, and mobility support) identified during the preparation and review of contingency plans of each geographic combatant commander, and assess the effect of such deficiencies and strengths on meeting national security objectives, policy, and strategic plans. The committee notes that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is already required to advise the Secretary of Defense on such information, in accordance with Department of Defense Directive 5100.01. This section would further amend paragraph (b)(2) of section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a plan for mitigating a critical deficiency in force capability for a contingency plan, as identified by the Chairman in paragraph (b)(1) of such section, as amended.

Section 955—Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would express the sense of Congress that the quadrennial defense review is a critical strategic document and should be based upon a process unconstrained by budgetary influences so that such influences do not determine or limit its outcome. This section would also amend paragraph (4) of section 118(b) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that each quadrennial defense review shall be conducted so as to make recommendations that are not constrained to comply with and are fully independent of the budget submitted to Congress by the President, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, in order to allow Congress to determine the level of acceptable risk to execute the missions associated with the national defense strategy within appropriated funds.

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 961—Deadline Revision for Report on Foreign Language Proficiency

This section would amend section 958 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) by striking "annually thereafter" in subsection (a) and inserting "by June 30 each year thereafter;" and by striking "December 31, 2013" in subsection (d) and inserting "June 30,2013".

### Section 962—Military Activities in Cyberspace

This section would affirm that the Secretary of Defense has the authority to conduct military activities in cyberspace. The committee recognizes that because of the evolving nature of cyber warfare, there is a lack of historical precedent for what constitutes traditional military activities in cyberspace.

In particular, this section would clarify that the Secretary of Defense has the authority to conduct clandestine cyberspace activities in support of military operations pursuant to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) outside of the United States or to defend against a cyber attack on an asset of the Department of Defense.

The committee notes that al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces are increasingly using the internet to exercise command and control as well as to spread technical information enabling attacks on U.S. and coalition forces in areas of ongoing hostilities.

While these terrorist actions often lead to increased danger for U.S. and coalition forces in areas of ongoing hostilities, terrorists often rely on the global reach of the internet to communicate and plan from distributed sanctuaries throughout the world. As a result, military activities may not be confined to a physical battlefield, and the use of military cyber activities has become a critical part of the effort to protect U.S. and coalition forces and combat terrorism globally.

In certain instances, the most effective way to neutralize threats and protect U.S. and coalition forces is to undertake military cyber activities in a clandestine

manner. While this section is not meant to identify all or in any way limit other possible military activities in cyberspace, the Secretary of Defense's authority includes the authority to conduct clandestine military activities in cyberspace in support of military operations pursuant to an armed conflict for which Congress has authorized the use of all necessary and appropriate force or to defend against a cyber attack on a Department of Defense asset.

Because of the sensitivities associated with such military activities and the need for more rigorous oversight, this section would require quarterly briefings to the congressional defense committees on covered military activities in cyberspace.

Section 963—Activities to Improve Multilateral, Bilateral, and Regional Cooperation regarding Cybersecurity

This section would establish a cybersecurity fellowship program within the Department of Defense that would allow for the temporary assignment of a member of the military forces of a foreign country to a Department of Defense organization for the purpose of assisting the member to obtain education and training to improve the member's ability to understand and respond to information security threats, vulnerabilities of information security systems, and the consequences of information security incidents.

Section 964—Report on U.S. Special Operations Command Structure

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2012, a report on U.S. Special Operations Command structure and make recommendations to better support development and deployment of joint s

# TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

The budget request contained $1.15 billion for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $486.5 million, for Overseas Contingency Operations, which is contained within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2012 to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2) domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology support; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2012 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

| | |
|---|---|
| FY12 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request | $1,156.3 |
| International Support | $553.8 |
| Domestic Support | $238.8 |
| Intelligence and Technology Support | $212.1 |
| Demand Reduction | $151.6 |
| FY12 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request Recommendation | $1,156.3 |

### INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

#### Whole-of-Government Approaches and the National Security Strategy

In its July 2010 report, the Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel emphasized a call for interagency reform, writing that "the Panel notes with extreme concern that our federal government structures-both executive and legislative, and in particular those related to security-were fashioned in the 1940s and, at best, they work imperfectly today…a new approach is needed." The Panel continued, "the Panel finds that the Executive branch lacks an effective 'whole of government' capacity that integrates the planning and execution capabilities of the many federal departments and agencies that have national security responsibilities." The committee agrees, and believes that the current agency-centric structures, processes, and cultures within the national security system prevent full and effective whole-of-government integration.

The President's 2010 "National Security Strategy" stated that there is a need to "update, balance, and integrate all tools of American power and work with our allies and partners to do the same," and laid out various aspects of a broad vision to strengthen whole-of-government integration. The committee believes that success in implementing this vision can best be assured by the preparation and oversight of an implementation plan containing concrete actions to be taken toward achieving the broad whole-of-government vision articulated in the "National Security

Strategy." Therefore, the committee recommends that the President develop and submit to Congress an implementation plan for the whole-of-government vision prescribed in the "National Security Strategy."

## OTHER MATTERS

### Analysis of Nuclear Force Structure Alternatives

The committee is aware that the President is considering further nuclear force reductions and changes in nuclear targeting guidance. The committee believes any decisions about the size and composition of the Nation's nuclear forces must be informed by robust quantitative analysis, to include war gaming and simulations, force-on-force analysis, scenario-based exchange calculations, and examination of alternative employment policies.

While this type of analysis was done extensively during the cold war, recent reports, including a September 2008 Defense Science Board report on "Nuclear Deterrence Skills" and the December 2008 "Report of the Secretary of Defense Task Force on Department of Defense Nuclear Weapons Management," reveal that the skills needed to conduct this type of nuclear analysis are in danger of atrophying. Furthermore, the assumptions and scope of cold war-era nuclear analyses are vastly different than what is needed today. Today's geopolitical environment presents a diverse range of new threats and opportunities that the committee believes must be examined using the same robust quantitative analysis that was done in previous decades as well as new analytical methods appropriate to address emerging challenges.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on current, proposed, and several alternative nuclear force structures of the United States and brief the congressional defense committees on the methodology, findings, and recommendations of the study by March 1, 2012. In conducting the study, the Secretary of Defense should coordinate, as appropriate, with the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration.

The study should include an analysis of the effects of various U.S. nuclear force structures and policies on the forces and policies of other nations, as well as the linkages to and effects on nuclear terrorism, nonproliferation, missile defense, and strategic conventional capabilities. The study should examine various scenarios, a broad spectrum of assumptions, and include rigorous quantitative analysis of the potential vulnerability, survivability, and effectiveness of various U.S. nuclear force structures under these scenarios. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to use common metrics to examine and compare the implications of different force structures, and encourages the use of red-teams or competitive analysis to ensure a comprehensive assessment of the options. The committee believes this study will provide the President and Congress with

important information needed to inform future decisions regarding U.S. nuclear force structure and policies.

### Annual Report on Missile Proliferation

The committee notes that section 1308(f)(1)(A) of the Security Assistance Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-228) requires the President to deliver an annual report to several congressional committees, including the House Committee on Armed Services, on the proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological weapons. Section 1308(e) states that, "The Secretary shall make every effort to submit all of the information required by this section in unclassified form. Whenever the Secretary submits any such information in classified form, the Secretary shall submit such classified information in an addendum and shall also submit concurrently a detailed summary, in unclassified form, of that classified information."

After multiple requests by the committee for the unclassified summary required by section 1308(e), representatives of the Department of State informed the committee that it had been deemed less important and that only the classified report had been generated. Although the Department ultimately submitted a two-sentence unclassified summary, the committee believes that such a submission is inconsistent with intent of the law. The committee notes that statutory requirements specifying that detailed unclassified summaries be submitted are legally binding, and should be followed. While respecting the need for classification of certain information, the committee notes the utility of the unclassified report for the purpose of open discussion as the committee monitors missile proliferation and the evolving missile threat.

### Audit Readiness of the Department of Defense

The committee is concerned that the blended civilian and contractor workforce within the Department of Defense that is responsible for financial improvement and audit readiness lacks the appropriate skill sets required to achieve a clean audit opinion by 2017, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). Specifically, the committee is concerned that the Department's audit readiness workforce may be lacking in qualified financial managers, including Certified Public Accountants (CPAs), who have prior experience performing complex financial statement audits for large commercial entities and/or large governmental agencies. The committee believes that such prior experience is an essential attribute to properly guide the Department in building its capacity to produce a clean audit by 2017. Therefore, the committee directs the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense to conduct an analysis of its civilian and contractor workforce supporting audit readiness, and provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and

the House Committee on Armed Services no later than October 15, 2011. The analysis should include the following information:

(1) The number and relevant qualifications of Senior Executive Service (SES) personnel currently leading audit readiness efforts for the military services, defense agencies, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense;
(2) The current number of full-time equivalents, including contractors directly supporting audit readiness efforts, for the military services, defense agencies, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and
(3) The current number of civilian and contractor personnel with prior experience performing large, complex financial statement audits, including the number of CPAs, directly supporting audit readiness efforts for the military services, defense agencies and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Comptroller General Review of Security Requirements for Special Nuclear Material

The committee continues to remain concerned about the security requirements associated with facilities that operate with special nuclear materials (SNM). The committee would like to gain a clearer understanding of the similarities and differences in security and inspection procedures at Department of Energy and Department of Defense (DOD) facilities that operate with special nuclear materials, as well as commercial facilities that operate with SNM in direct support of DOD or National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) mission requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the security requirements for SNM and submit a preliminary report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2012, with a final report and classified annex, as necessary, to be submitted by July 2, 2012. The review should consist of the security requirements and inspection procedures for DOD and NNSA facilities that operate with significant quantities of special nuclear materials. These SNM include, but are not limited to, plutonium-239, uranium-233, and uranium-235 in the form of nuclear weapons components, metals, oxides, and reactor fuels.

The review should also examine commercial facilities that operate with significant quantities of SNM in direct support of DOD or NNSA mission requirements. This review is not intended to cover operationally deployed or stored nuclear weapons.

Countering Adversarial Narratives

The committee applauds the U.S. Government, and in particular the Department of Defense, for its efforts to develop and implement an effective communications strategy to counter violent extremist messaging and other adversarial narratives. However, the committee remains concerned that the United

States and its allies are losing the ever present information campaign to its adversaries. Through the use of emerging new media capabilities, our enemies make it appear that they are acting more swiftly and with a more unified message than the U.S. Government. Furthermore, many of these media channels originate in the United States or neutral countries and pose an even greater challenge because they threaten our ability to successfully communicate our objectives while negating our ability to counter their information flow.

The committee is concerned that the Armed Forces are increasingly seen as the strategic communications provider for the United States within their areas of responsibilities. The committee is concerned, though, that the Department is increasingly challenged by a shortage of in-house practical expertise and, in general, military and civilian senior leadership has limited or no practical experience in strategic communication. The committee is also concerned that the Department lacks the technical capabilities to respond in a systemic, rapid, sustained and measurable way to the constant barrage of narratives being used to undermine our military and security efforts.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the Department of Defense's efforts to counter adversarial narratives and provide a briefing on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This assessment should address the following:

(1) Does the Department of Defense have the authorities, organizational structure, tools, techniques, procedures, and resources to rapidly analyze and respond to adversarial narratives in the information environment;

(2) Does the Department of Defense have adequate manpower, talent pool and training base to provide the leadership and staffing required to monitor and respond to adversarial narratives in the information environment; and

(3) What additional legal authorities or resources are necessary to remedy any challenges or shortages that limit the Department's ability to succeed.

Countering Network-Based Threats

The committee continues to encourage the Secretary of Defense to pursue efforts to develop innovative, non-materiel, and multi-disciplinary methodologies and strategies for disrupting irregular and asymmetric threats. During his March 2011 Senate confirmation hearing, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence testified that "a comprehensive understanding of the socio-cultural environment is absolutely critical to developing and implementing effective strategies to separate the insurgency from any viable base of support in the general population," and that "a detailed understanding of tribal dynamics is a critical intelligence task, and will likely remain so for the foreseeable future." The committee believes an effective military strategy for operations, such as those in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, must appropriately balance kinetic operations with counterinsurgency

operations, emphasizing population protection, tribal dynamics, cultural insight, and the rule of law. However the committee remains concerned that the intelligence community is overwhelmingly focused on kinetic operations to the detriment of the socio-cultural environment critical to counterinsurgency operations.

The committee notes that U.S. Army Field Manual 3-24, dated December 2006, defines the key to all counterinsurgency tasks is developing an effective host-nation security force. Chapter 6 of the manual states: "Few military units can match a good police unit in developing an accurate human intelligence picture of their area of operation. Because of their frequent contact with populace, police often are the best force for countering small insurgent bands supported by the local populace."

The committee remains concerned that the Secretary of Defense has not taken full advantage of a novel approach that takes into account an understanding of the tribal landscape and invests in developing host-nation security forces, particularly local police organizations that maintain close ties with and function to protect the local population. The committee praised this approach, the Legacy program, in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. In the report, the committee noted special interest in the "Attack the Network" approach used in the Republic of Iraq and Afghanistan under the Legacy program.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the following:

(1) The applicability of the Legacy program in other operations and regions where network-based threats are present or where conditions are conducive to supporting these threats; and

(2) Options for an appropriate management structure within the Department to institutionalize and sustain the capabilities that Legacy and other similar programs provide.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by July 31, 2011, on the findings of the aforementioned activities and on the plan in H. Rept. 111-491 for supporting and sustaining innovative approaches, including such approaches that incorporate and blend legal, law enforcement, intelligence, and military tactics, techniques, and procedures.

## Counterproliferation Improvements and Efficiencies

The committee notes with concern several counterproliferation and combating weapons of mass destruction program inefficiencies identified in the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report "Weapons of Mass Destruction: Actions Needed to Track Budget Execution for Counterproliferation Programs and Better Align Resources with Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction Strategy,"

(GAO-10-755R). The committee directed GAO to examine this issue in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

In GAO-10-755R, GAO notes that "The Department of Defense (DOD) cannot precisely identify what proportion of its resources are specifically devoted to counterproliferation." GAO also states that "Visibility over how the Department's resources support its counterproliferation strategies is limited, in part because those resources are not comprehensively aligned with gaps in counterproliferation capabilities identified by the Joint Staff based on inputs from the combatant commands and other DOD sources." The committee is concerned about these and other findings within GAO-10-755R, also since the Department of Defense has not yet provided its comments to GAO on the related classified annex may delay implementation of its report recommendations. Additionally, as noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-166), the committee remains concerned about the potential for overlap and redundancy with the coordinating functions of the Counterproliferation Program Review Committee (CPRC) and the Office of the Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to work with GAO to identify and implement counterproliferation improvements and efficiencies, and to more effectively align resources with the Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction Strategy. The committee also encourages the Department of Defense to review the efficacy and relevancy of the CPRC and to determine if the CPRC is still required to coordinate activities and programs as directed by Section 1605 the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160) and Section 1502 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337).

### Cyber Activity of the People's Republic of China

The committee continues to be concerned with the national security implications of the increasing levels of malicious cyber activity emanating from the People's Republic of China. The U.S.-China Economic Security and Review Commission notes in its 2010 "Report to Congress" that malicious cyber activity such as "Operation Aurora", which targeted proprietary information at Google and other U.S. companies, and instances of Chinese internet service providers and censors disrupting U.S. and other foreign internet traffic, such as China Telecom's routing of U.S. internet traffic, including .gov and .mil data, through Chinese servers, are efforts likely being conducted with the tacit knowledge of the Chinese Government, if not with full government support. The report also notes that in May 2010, the Chinese Government instituted new regulations requiring foreign firms to disclose sensitive encryption and software design information.

Further, the Department of Defense noted in its report "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2010" submitted in accordance with section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) that developing capabilities for cyberwarfare is consistent with authoritative People's Liberation Army military writings and that intrusions emanating from China continue to focus on the exfiltration of U.S. Government information, some of which could be of strategic or military utility.

Given the potential ties between the Chinese Government and malicious actors within China, the committee is alarmed that two state-owned Chinese firms, Huawei and ZTE, have been included on the Department of Agriculture's list of safe and approved telecommunications equipment providers for the U.S. broadband expansion program. As the Department of Defense at times relies on commercial providers through leasing agreements or shared infrastructure for the transmission of information, the committee is concerned about the potential threat this may pose to national security as well as to Department of Defense data.

The committee supports the Department of Defense's ongoing efforts to protect its data and networks and encourages the Department of Defense to collaborate with its interagency partners to share technology, best practices, and knowledge to provide for enhanced cyber security across the Government. The committee also requests that a designee of the Secretary of Defense brief the congressional defense committees on the Department of Defense's assessment of the security implications of the recent addition of two state-owned Chinese firms to the safe and approved telecommunications equipment providers list.

Cyber Threats to Critical Infrastructure

The committee is aware of the Department of Defense's efforts to safeguard its activities from cyber threats but is concerned that the Department remains indirectly vulnerable to cyber attack on critical pieces of civilian infrastructure not under the Department's protection. Because of the nature of their location and construction, U.S. military installations are often supported by the surrounding communities' infrastructure, including civilian power grids, public works, and telecommunications networks. Many of these utilities are poorly protected or completely unprotected from potential cyber attacks. Loss of service from these utilities could have significant implications on the Department's ability to assure mission critical capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the threat to the readiness of military installations from possible cyber attacks on civilian critical infrastructure, and brief the results of that study along with a plan to mitigate any risk associated with this vulnerability to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

## Economic Warfare

The committee is aware that the national security posture of the Nation is directly tied to the health and vitality of the economy. Periods of economic hardship have historically caused pressures on budgeting, execution, and planning for defense capabilities, and thus can slow or halt acquisition and modernization activities. Since U.S. military strength is underpinned by its technological superiority, the committee is aware of the direct dependency that military strength has on economic health.

The committee is concerned that our adversaries understand this dependency, and are developing means to attack our military strength by attacking our economy. The committee is aware that in public statements and documents, Al Qaeda has discussed "bleeding the Nation dry" through economic attacks, and has conducted a number of physical attacks internationally in order to cause economic damage. In addition, other nations have written about using economic warfare to complement or support military actions. Historically, even the United States has planned for and conducted economic warfare to subvert adversaries during World War II and the cold war.

The committee is aware that there is a 2009 report from the Irregular Warfare Support Program titled "Economic Warfare: Risks and Responses" that offered plausible scenarios about how economic warfare might be used against the United States. The committee is concerned that there does not appear to be any organization within the Department responsible for looking at the threats of economic warfare, or the impact economic attacks might have on military capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Office of Net Assessment to conduct a study on economic warfare threats to the United States and deliver a report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

## Evaluation of the Alternative Methods for Titanium Production

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate alternative methods for titanium production such as electrochemical processing to determine potential for such production to aid in meeting the Department of Defense's requirements for titanium. The evaluation shall include an assessment of production capability, cost as compared to the cost of traditional methods of titanium production, an assessment of the potential to reduce environmental impact through such processes, and any other items the Secretary deems relevant. The Secretary shall brief the findings of the evaluation to the congressional defense committees not later than December 1, 2011.

## Global Posture Review Report

The committee notes that section 1063 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plan for basing of forces outside the United States, concurrent with the delivery of the report on the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) required by section 118 of title 10, United States Code. Although the report of the 2009 QDR was delivered in February 2010, the Secretary requested additional time to complete the basing report following a global posture review being conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The committee has been briefed on the global posture review, but the report required by section 1063 of Public Law 111-84 is still forthcoming. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to submit the statutorily required report at the earliest possible date.

## Government Accountability Office Assessment of Reporting Cost Data Collection

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for implementing a process for collecting an estimate of resources required for the Department of Defense to generate both internally and externally required reports. The committee agrees with the Secretary that additional transparency would be useful for decision makers when determining the utility of various reporting requirements. However, the committee observes that any tool used to collect costs is only as useful as the inputs received. In order to ensure that the Secretary's guidance is consistently and appropriately applied across the Department, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the methodology and tools used to collect cost data on both internal and external reporting requirements of the Department of Defense, and to submit a report of the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The Comptroller General's report should also include any recommendations the Comptroller General believes are necessary to improve the data collection, transparency, and utility of the tool.

## Management and Security of Nuclear Weapons

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has made notable progress in increasing weapons accountability and improving security for the nuclear weapons in its possession. However, the committee is concerned that the Department may not be fully in compliance with the recommendations of the various task forces chartered to address nuclear weapons management and security. The committee is concerned about the Department's progress in addressing those findings and recommendations and, therefore, directs the

Comptroller General of the United States to examine the Department of Defense's nuclear security programs and provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. At a minimum, the report should examine the progress the Department has made in responding to the recommendations of the various task forces, such as the Secretary of Defense Task Force on DOD Nuclear Weapons Management, chartered to address nuclear weapons management and security and the extent to which resource implications of planned security modernization efforts have been considered. The report should also examine the extent to which the military services' requirements are coordinated and synchronized to prevent duplication and overlap, and the Department's efforts to secure nuclear weapons stored outside of the United States.

Nuclear Command, Control and Communications

The committee notes that the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) highlighted an interagency study that was to begin in 2010 and provide a long-term strategy and needed investments to further strengthen nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) capabilities. The NPR also noted that the Secretary of Defense has directed a number of initiatives to further improve the resiliency of the NC3 system.

The committee appreciates the Department's focus on this vital capability. However, the committee understands that the NC3 interagency study has not yet begun.

The committee is concerned about potential capability gaps or shortfalls, particularly with continued delays in the Family of Advanced Beyond-line-of-sight Terminals (FAB-T) program. Further discussion is contained in the classified annex accompanying this report.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks, Information and Infrastructure (ASD NII) is designated as the enterprise architect for NC3 and responsible for the development and maintenance of the defense-wide NC3 architecture. Although the ASD NII has this architecture responsibility, the military services are responsible for funding the individual elements of the NC3 system.

The committee understands that the various NC3 elements are highly interdependent; a reduction in funding by one service may affect other services' NC3 capabilities. Without strong, centralized oversight of the NC3 portfolio and investments, the committee is concerned that such dispersion of activity may have negative consequences for the overarching NC3 capability.

The committee therefore directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks, Information and Infrastructure, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to submit to the congressional defense committees by February 6, 2012, a report on the NC3 architecture, long-term strategy, and an

identification of the NC3 elements across the services, including current and needed investments across the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense intends to eliminate the position of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks, Information and Infrastructure as part of the Department's efficiency initiative. If this occurs, the committee expects the report to be submitted by the Department's designated enterprise architect for NC3.

Planning for Electromagnetic Pulse Events

The committee remains concerned with the continued vulnerability of the United States homeland to electromagnetic pulse (EMP) events, both man-made and naturally occurring. The 2008 report of the EMP Commission found that "EMP generated by a high altitude nuclear explosion is one of a small number of threats that can hold our society at risk of catastrophic consequences." The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the U.S. Military has the appropriate authorities, capabilities, procedures, protections, and force structure to prevent or defend against any threats posed by EMP generated by a high altitude nuclear or by a naturally occurring event, as well as response plans for dealing with the aftermath of an EMP event.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on efforts to prepare for, prevent, defend against, and remediate after an EMP event, whether natural or manmade. Within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act the report should include the following:

(1) An assessment of any threats posed by a natural or manmade EMP event, including identifying of the foreign countries that may be developing weapons capable of producing high altitude EMP, the nature of the capabilities, and possible advances in the capabilities over the next 10 years;

(2) A description of any efforts by the Department of Defense since the 2008 EMP Commission Report was released to address the findings in (1);

(3) A description of the appropriate authorities, capabilities, procedures, protections, and force structure that the United States may require over the next 10 years to prevent or defend against threats from foreign actors identified in (1);

(4) A description of Government contingency response plans to prevent an EMP event, or to mitigate the consequences of or remediate after an EMP event, especially with regard to critical infrastructure;

(5) In the event that no Government contingency response plans exist, a description of what steps are being undertaken by the Department on an emergency basis to respond to an EMP event;

(6) A description of plans and guidance for military base commanders to be prepared to act on their own authority to provide support to or receive support from local authorities, police, fire, and other emergency services or critical infrastructure providers, as well as plans and training with civil first responders in their locality to help restore critical infrastructures and assist the civilian population after a catastrophic EMP event and;
(7) An assessment of additional legal authorities or resources that may be needed to develop contingency response plans and capabilities to protect the American people and critical infrastructures and to remediate after an EMP event.

Reduction in Reporting Requirements

The committee considered the Department of Defense's legislative proposal to reduce the congressionally mandated reporting requirements for the Department of Defense. In reviewing the Department's proposal the committee found that many of the reports listed have value and aid the committee in conducting its oversight responsibilities, or otherwise serve to ensure compliance with the law. In many cases, the reporting requirements proposed to be repealed are just notifications of the Secretary's actions, such as use of a statutorily authorized waiver, or the intent to obligate funds for a specified purpose. The committee believes that these notification requirements should not be repealed. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would repeal reporting requirements that it deemed redundant or no longer relevant.

The committee notes that in the justification material transmitted with the proposal, the Department stated that many of the reports in question provide limited utility or informational value. In many cases, the committee agrees with the Department's assessment, but also notes that the limited utility or value of the report is not a result of congressional mandate, but rather results from the Department's failure to fully comply with the intent of the request. The committee also notes that the Department deemed many reports as unnecessary or stated that they do not appear to be useful to members of Congress or their staff. The committee cautions the Department that it is not its responsibility to determine what is or is not valuable to Congress as it conducts its oversight role.

In its review of the Department's request, the committee notes that there were several reporting requirements proposed for repeal that were mischaracterized, previously repealed, expired, or outside the jurisdiction of the committee. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of reporting requirements and to provide recommendations for repeal of requirements for consideration by the committee on a biennial basis. Furthermore, the committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the Secretary to deliver reports, to the

maximum extent practical, in electronic format in order to reduce printing and reproduction costs.

### Secure Telecommuting Centers

The committee is aware that the Defense Intelligence Agency operates two pilot projects at Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia, and Fort Meade, Maryland, for secure telecommuting. These 2 centers are available to Department of Defense employees with the appropriate level of security clearance, with 16 seats currently available. However, the committee is concerned that the Department is not adequately taking advantage of these secure facilities. For example, the facility at Marine Corps Base Quantico is located at the Joint Reserve Intelligence Center, which is not a dedicated telecommute center. This facility is used primarily during the weekends when employees are completing their Reserve duty and the seats are generally open during the week.

The committee encourages the Department to better utilize the available space at these two facilities during the work week for secure telecommuting purposes. To do so, the committee encourages the Department to develop an online reservation and facility usage system to generate meaningful quantifiable data on utilization and demand for these secure telecommuting sites. The committee believes that once the Department has analyzed data on the utilization rates and demand, it may wish to expand these pilot projects to other facilities. The committee also encourages the Department to provide regular updates to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on utilization rates for these facilities, including unmet demand and waiting lists, and any other relevant data to be utilized by the Department in assessing the effectiveness of these secure telecommuting sites and possible future plans for expansion.

### Special Operations Aviation and Rotary Wing Support

The committee is pleased with the Department of Defense decision to establish a new U.S. Army Special Operations Aviation Command (ARSOAC) to enhance Army Special Operations Aviation as well as provide more capable rotary-wing solutions for Special Operations Forces. The committee is aware that the new command will be challenged to provide additional capabilities and improvements for Army Special Operations Aviation amidst ongoing overseas contingency operations, increased global requirements and potential future fiscal constraints.

The committee therefore encourages the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities (ASD SO/LIC&IC), the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), and the Commander, U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) to ensure continued communication with the defense committees to enable operational

success and optimization of the rotary-wing force structure. The committee further encourages the Assistant Secretary, Commander, USSOCOM, and Commander, USASOC to continue to aggressively pursue programmatic and operational solutions to include modernization programs in an effort to address rotary-wing shortfalls for direct and indirect special operations activities and Special Operations Forces.

## State Partnership Program

The committee continues to believe that the National Guard's State Partnership Program (SPP) is an important part of the larger Department of Defense (DOD) effort to build the capacity of our foreign partners in a wide variety of security related activities. The committee notes, however, that the Department of Defense has yet to issue regulations regarding the use of Department funds to pay the costs associated with SPP, as required by section 1210 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). The committee understands that the Department of Defense is preparing to issue a Directive Type Memorandum (DTM) on SPP and encourages it to complete that process as soon as possible.

In the meantime, the committee is aware that pending the release of the DTM and DOD regulations, some National Guard units have taken a conservative view of the scope of authorized SPP activities, and have curtailed their engagement with partner countries accordingly. The committee commends this approach, but does not want SPP activities unnecessarily limited and therefore encourages the National Guard to proactively consult the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense if clarification regarding certain engagement programs is required.

## The Role of Military Information Support Operations

The committee is aware of the Secretary of Defense's directed name change from Psychological Operations to Military Information Support Operations (MISO). This committee is also aware of an ongoing implementation strategy that will institutionalize this change within the Department. While the committee understands the rationale for this change, the committee notes with concern that the Department did not consult the congressional defense committees in a timely fashion as the Psychological Operations activity and mission is codified in Section 167 and Section 2011 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee supports efforts by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities to support geographic combatant commander and chiefs of mission requirements through the deployment of Military Information Support Teams and Regional Military

Information Support Teams. The committee is encouraged that the Assistant Secretary has recently established an Information Operations Directorate dedicated to information operations (IO) and MISO, and supports ongoing reviews to improve the force structure and readiness framework of the Active Component of MISO through the establishment of the MISO Command. The committee expects these changes to contribute to a more comprehensive information operations and strategic communication (IO/SC) strategy that will effectively utilize and incorporate MISO to inform and influence foreign audiences with cultural precision and enable geographic combatant commanders and chiefs of mission to counter enemy narratives and activities.

However, the committee is concerned about a growing operational, technical, and capability divide between the Active and Reserve Components of MISO forces which could limit options available to geographic combatant commanders and chiefs of mission as a tool to satisfy critical IO/SC requirements. The committee is further concerned about deficiencies in the reserve component of MISO and the resultant capabilities gap to provide support to the general purpose forces across the full spectrum of MISO. This capability divide between Active and Reserve components could fracture overall U.S. Government efforts and activities, and limit the ability to field a globally persistent and culturally aware MISO force that is capable of informing and influencing foreign audiences, contributing to strategic and tactical IO/SC requirements, and integrating with other information disciplines.

While the committee is encouraged that USSOCOM is shifting overseas contingency operations funds into base budget funds for Major Force Program (MFP) 11 funded MISO, it is concerned that a similar program shift is not taking place for the Reserve Component of MISO and therefore may potentially constitute a force structure, limited in capability, that is dependent on Overseas Contingency Operations funds.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities in coordination with the Commander, USSOCOM to provide a report to the congressional defense committees that outlines: a comprehensive MISO strategy to include the roles, missions, authorities, and capabilities of MISO Active and Reserve Components; current and future force structure requirements, operational limitations and constraints; and efforts to shift required Active and Reserve Component funding from overseas contingency operations to base funding to support future active and reserve force structure requirements. The report should also examine and include recommendations for the potential transfer of proponency of the MISO Reserve Component from USSOCOM to the Department of the Army, similar to the potential transfer of proponency responsibilities for U.S. Army Reserve Component Civil Affairs forces. The report should also include an analysis of the relationship among all IO/SC disciplines to determine if they are sufficient or could be improved through changes to authorities, processes, procedures, and

synchronization mechanisms. The committee further directs the Assistant Secretary to submit the report to the congressional defense committees in unclassified format (with a classified annex as required) within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### U.S. Special Operations Command Undersea Mobility Strategy

The committee supports the recent program and strategy shift in the Undersea Mobility Program by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and U.S. Naval Special Warfare Command (WARCOM). The committee is pleased and supports recent reprogramming requests by USSOCOM and WARCOM to consolidate and shift Joint-Multi-Mission Submersible (JMMS) and Advance SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) program funds into a consolidated Undersea Mobility Way Ahead program designed to deliver more platforms sooner and at less cost across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee recognizes the critical operational importance of this program to provide technologically advanced undersea mobility platforms and address capability gaps for operating in denied maritime areas from strategic distances. The committee therefore stresses the need for continued communication with the congressional defense committees to ensure programmatic success and prevent previous program shortfalls in undersea mobility platform strategies.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

### Section 1001—General Transfer Authority

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to make transfers between any amounts of authorizations for fiscal year 2012 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount transferred under this authority to $4.0 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

### Section 1002—Budgetary Effects of This Act

This section would specify that the budgetary effects of this Act for purposes of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139) will be determined by reference to a statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

## SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

### Section 1011—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities

This section would extend, by 1 year, the support by joint task forces under section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136), as most recently amended by section 1012 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

### Section 1012—Extension of Authority of Department of Defense To Provide Additional Support for Counterdrug Activities of Other Governmental Agencies

This section would extend, by 2 years, the authority of the Department of Defense to provide additional support to counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies under section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510).

### Section 1013—One-Year Extension of Authority To Provide Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments

This section would extend, by 1 year, the authority to provide support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments under subsection (a)(2) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), as most recently amended by section 1014(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

### Section 1014—Extension of Authority To Support Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend, by 1 year, the unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia under section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), as most recently amended by section 1011 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). The committee recognizes that, although the Government of Colombia has made significant progress combating narcotics trafficking and designated terrorist organizations such as Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), these authorities are still required to consolidate the strategic gains made over the past decade.

## SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

### Section 1021—Budgeting for Construction of Naval Vessels

This section would repeal an amendment made by section 1023 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). This section would require that a 30-year shipbuilding plan be delivered to Congress periodically. The section that would be repealed changed the periodicity from an annual requirement to once every 4 years to be delivered with the Quadrennial Defense Review.

The committee believes that returning to an annual submittal of the plan would promote stability and continuity in the planning process, both in the plan itself, and in the shipbuilding industrial base. One aspect of the section that would be retained is the requirement that the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, within 60 days of submittal of the plan, provide an assessment of the sufficiency of funds to execute the plan in the budget year and Future Years Defense Program to the congressional defense committees.

## SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

### Section 1031—Definition of Individual Detained at Guantanamo

This section defines the term "individual detained at Guantanamo" for purposes of subtitle D.

### Section 1032—Extension of Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism

This section would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or Government personnel of Allied Forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. armed forces through fiscal year 2014 and change the annual reporting timeline from December to February.

### Section 1033—Clarification of Right To Plead Guilty in Trial of Capital Offense by Military Commission

This section would clarify an accused's right to plead guilty to a capital offense before a military commission.

The committee believes that a guilty plea should only be accepted if the military judge addresses the accused personally and determines that the plea is knowing and voluntary. The committee also believes that the parties should be required to disclose the terms of any plea agreement in open court at the conclusion of sentencing, unless the military judge for good cause allows the parties to disclose

the plea agreement in camera. While the Manual for Military Commissions addresses some of these areas, the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the Manual fully addresses these issues.

### Section 1034—Affirmation of Armed Conflict with Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Associated Forces

This section would affirm that the United States is engaged in an armed conflict with al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note). This section would also affirm that the President's authority pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force includes the authority to detain certain belligerents until the termination of hostilities.

The committee notes that as the United States nears the tenth anniversary of the attacks on September 11, 2001, the terrorist threat has evolved as a result of intense military and diplomatic pressure from the United States and its coalition partners. However, Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces still pose a grave threat to U.S. national security. The Authorization for Use of Military Force necessarily includes the authority to address the continuing and evolving threat posed by these groups.

The committee supports the Executive Branch's interpretation of the Authorization for Use of Military Force, as it was described in a March 13, 2009, filing before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. While this affirmation is not intended to limit or alter the President's existing authority pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, the Executive Branch's March 13, 2009, interpretation remains consistent with the scope of the authorities provided by Congress.

### Section 1035—Requirement for National Security Protocols Governing Detainee Communications

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a national security protocol governing communications of each individual detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The committee believes that all communications for such individuals should be reviewed for the protection of the Armed Forces and other personnel at Guantanamo Bay as well as to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of classified information.

### Section 1036—Process for the Review of Necessity for Continued Detention of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a review process to determine whether the continued detention of individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is necessary to protect U.S. national security. This section would not affect the jurisdiction of any Federal court to determine the legality of detention of any individual detained at Guantanamo Bay.

Section 1037—Prohibition on Use of Funds To Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States To House Detainees Transferred from Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 to modify or construct any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any detainee transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

Section 1038—Prohibition on Family Member Visitation of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 for the purpose of allowing family members to visit individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Section 1039—Prohibition on the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within the United States

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 to transfer or release certain detainees to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions. This prohibition applies to individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and to individuals detained by the Department of Defense overseas pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

Section 1040—Prohibitions Relating to the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within Foreign Countries

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 2012 to transfer or release individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within a foreign country or any other foreign entity. This prohibition would apply unless the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies

to Congress at least 30 days prior to the transfer of any such individual, that the government of the country or the recognized leadership of the entity to which the individual would be transferred:

(1) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(2) maintains effective control over each detention facility in which an individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(3) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(4) has agreed to take effective steps to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(5) has taken such steps as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity;

(6) has agreed to share any information with the United States that is related to the individual or any associates of the individual and could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies; and

(7) has agreed to allow appropriate agencies of the United States to have access to the individual, if requested.

This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds for the transfer of any such individual to the custody or effective control of a foreign country or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the same country or entity who engaged in terrorist activity subsequent to their transfer. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to waive this additional prohibition if the Secretary of Defense certifies that such a transfer would be in the national security interests of the United States and certifies that the general requirements relating to other transfers or releases to foreign countries or entities described above have been met.

While this section does not prohibit the transfer of third country nationals detained at theater-level detention facilities in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee believes that determinations as to the disposition of such individuals who continue to pose a threat to U.S. national security should be carefully reviewed and evaluated. This is of particular concern as primary responsibility for detention operations transitions to the Government of Afghanistan.

Section 1041—Counterterrorism Operational Briefing Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide quarterly briefings to the congressional defense committees outlining Department of Defense

counterterrorism operations and related activities involving Special Operations Forces not later than March 1, 2012.

### Section 1042—Requirement for Department of Justice Consultation Regarding Prosecution of Terrorists

This section would require the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, or Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, to consult with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense before instituting any prosecution of an alien in U.S. district court for a terrorist offense.

## SUBTITLE E—NUCLEAR FORCES

### Section 1051—Annual Assessment and Report on the Delivery Platforms for Nuclear Weapons and the Nuclear Command and Control System

This section would require the director of the Strategic Systems Program, U.S. Navy, commander of the Global Strike Command, U.S. Air Force, and Commander, U.S. Strategic Command to each complete an assessment of the safety, security, reliability, sustainability, performance, and military effectiveness for each type of nuclear weapons delivery platform and the nuclear command and control system of the United States within their direct responsibility.

This section would further require that these assessments be submitted to the Secretary of Defense and Nuclear Weapons Council not later than December 1 of each year, along with several other reporting requirements. The Secretary of Defense would then be required to submit to the President each report along with any comments that the Secretary considers appropriate, not later than March 1 of each year. Finally, the President shall forward to Congress the reports provided by the Secretary of Defense along with any comments the President considers appropriate. The first submissions to Congress would be required by March 15, 2012.

The committee notes a parallel requirement for the assessment of the nuclear weapons stockpile established in section 3141 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314). The committee believes these annual assessments provide oversight value.

### Section 1052—Plan on Implementation of the New START Treaty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy, to submit a plan for implementing nuclear force reductions, limitations, and verification and transparency measures contained in the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START).

The plan would include a description of the nuclear force structure under New START, changes necessary and how such changes would be implemented under New START, the costs and schedule for New START implementation, and options for and feasibility of accelerating New START implementation, including an assessment of potential cost savings, benefits, and risks of accelerating implementation. In this context, the committee notes that the next nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference will occur in 2015.

This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department's implementation plan and submit the results of this review to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, within 180 days after the date the plan is submitted. This section would require the plan and review to be submitted in unclassified form with a classified annex if necessary.

Section 1053—Annual Report on the Plan for the Modernization of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile, Nuclear Weapons Complex, and Delivery Platforms

This section would require the President to submit an annual report for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2019 to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the plan for the modernization of the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons complex, and delivery platforms. The report would include a detailed account of the plans to enhance the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile; to modernize the nuclear weapons complex; to maintain, modernize, or replace the delivery platforms for nuclear weapons; and a detailed account of any plans to retire, dismantle, or eliminate any covered nuclear system.

This section would build upon a single year reporting requirement established in section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), and codify direction from the President to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly provide annual updates to the 1251 Report, as stated in a February 7, 2011, White House press statement regarding the Annual Update to the Report Specified in Section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

Section 1054—Sense of Congress on Nuclear Force Reductions

This section would express the sense of Congress that any reduction in the nuclear forces of the United States should be supported by a thorough assessment of the strategic environment, threat, and policy, as well as the technical and operational implications of such reductions. This section would also state that specific criteria are necessary to guide future decisions regarding further reductions in such nuclear forces.

## Section 1055—Limitation on Nuclear Force Reductions

This section would limit the obligation of amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy for any of the fiscal years 2011 through 2017, to retire, dismantle, eliminate, or remove from deployed status any covered nuclear system (as defined here) of the United States as required by the New START Treaty. This limitation would not preclude the use of funds for any other treaty requirement, including verification. This section would allow this limitation to be jointly waived by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, if they submit written notice of the status of carrying out the modernization plan described in the most recent report required by section 1053 of this Act. If the notice describes that such plan is not being carried out, no funds could be obligated or expended for a period of 180 days following the date on which the President submits the report for the modernization plan. If the notice describes that such a plan is being carried out, no funds could be obligated or expended for a period of 30 days.

This section would further prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy from obligating or expending amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to their departments to retire, dismantle, or eliminate any nondeployed strategic or non-strategic nuclear weapon, until the date that is 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits written certification that the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility (CMRR-NF) and the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) are fully operational; that CMRR-NF and the Plutonium Facility-4 are together able to deliver to the nuclear weapons stockpile not less than a total of 80 pits per year; that the UPF is able to deliver to the nuclear weapons stockpile not less than 80 refurbished or new canned subassemblies per year; and that the nuclear security enterprise has a capacity that supports two simultaneous life extension programs. This limitation would not apply, however, to the dismantlement of legacy warheads that are awaiting dismantlement on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Lastly, this section would prohibit the President from retiring, dismantling, or eliminating, or preparing to retire, dismantle, or eliminate, any nuclear weapon of the United States, if such action would reduce the number of such weapons to a number that is less than the level described in the New START Treaty, unless such action is required by a treaty or international agreement specifically approved with the advice and consent of the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution; or specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

## Section 1056—Nuclear Employment Strategy

This section would require that the President not make any changes to the nuclear employment strategy of the United States unless the President submits a report to Congress describing the implications of such changes, certifying that such

changes do not require a change in targeting strategy from counterforce to counter value targeting, and certifying that such proposed changes preserve the nuclear force structure triad. The President would be required to wait a period of 90 days from submission of such report until changes to the nuclear employment strategy may be made.

### Section 1057—Comptroller General Report on Nuclear Weapon Capabilities and Force Structure Requirements

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the strategic nuclear weapon capabilities, force structure, employment policy, and targeting requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD). The study would be required to include an update to the September 1991 Government Accounting Office (GAO) report titled "Strategic Weapons: Nuclear Weapons Targeting Process" (GAO/NSIAD-91-319FS); an assessment of the process and rigor used by DOD to determine the effectiveness of nuclear-related capabilities and policies in achieving the goals of deterrence, extended deterrence, assurance, and defense; and an assessment of the requirements of DOD for strategic nuclear bomber aircraft and intercontinental ballistic missiles. This section would require the Comptroller General to submit one or more reports on such study to Congress, and require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to provide full cooperation and access to the Comptroller General for the purposes of carrying out this study.

## SUBTITLE F—FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

### Section 1061—Amendments Relating to Financial Management Workforce

This section would establish a financial management certification program for the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee concurs with the Department on the need to develop capable financial managers that understand the advanced fiscal concepts incorporated with the management of the United States' scarce monetary resources. More than 60 percent of the DOD financial community exists outside the auditing, accounting, and financial management job classifications. In addition, the committee notes that this program should help facilitate the Department's ability to achieve clean financial audits by 2017, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). Furthermore, the committee notes that this program also should ensure that financial managers are able to fully understand total force management issues, and the impact of budget decisions on manpower requirement decisions. Future budget resource managers need to be developed with a broad knowledge base.

However, the committee is concerned that the construction of such a program will create yet another training development track within the financial community.

The committee notes that there are similar tracks within each military service. For this new initiative to be successful, and to further the efficiency initiatives within the Department, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in consultation with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) should look to consolidate these multiple training development programs to effectively train the financial management community, while considering the unique fiscal structures and management held within each military service. Incorporating these multiple tracks into a single defense-wide development strategy would ensure that the Department can develop the most capable financial management cadre for future fiscal success.

Section 1062—Reliability of Department of Defense Financial Statements

This section would amend section 1008(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107) by striking "Not later than October 31" and inserting "Not later than the date that is 180 days prior to the date set by the Office of Management and Budget for the submission of financial statements".

Section 1063—Financial Management Personnel Competency Assessment

This section would require the Chief Management Officer (CMO) of the Department of Defense, in coordination with the CMO of each military department, to identify, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the number of financial management personnel and the financial and budgetary skills required to: (1) effectively perform financial and budgetary accounting, including reconciling fund balances with Treasury; (2) document processes and maintain internal controls for financial and budgetary accounting cycles; and (3) maintain professional certification standards. This section would further require that within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issue joint guidance regarding the assessment of the competency of the Department of Defense financial management personnel to perform such financial and budgetary accounting skills. Following the issuance of such guidance, this section would require the CMO of the Department of Defense and the CMO of each military department to conduct a competency assessment of the financial management personnel of the defense agencies and military departments, respectively, and to each submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on such an assessment, along with a corrective action plan for any skill gaps identified. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees regarding the assessment and the corrective action plans of the CMOs within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Finally, this section would require each CMO to designate in the report to the Secretary of Defense which office will be

responsible for monitoring progress in the implementation of any corrective action plan submitted.

Section 1064—Tracking Implementation of Department of Defense Efficiencies

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States, for each fiscal year 2012-16, to assess the extent to which the Department of Defense is tracking and realizing the savings proposed pursuant to the initiative led by the Secretary of Defense to identify at least $100.0 billion in efficiencies during the period of fiscal year 2012-16. This section would require the Comptroller General to submit an annual report on the prior fiscal year's assessment and the Comptroller General's associated recommendations to the congressional defense committees starting on October 30, 2012 and concluding on October 30, 2016.

Section 1065—Business Case Analysis for Department of Defense Efficiencies

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out an assessment of the extent to which components of the Department of Defense conducted business case analysis prior to recommending and implementing efficiencies initiatives. This section would require that such an assessment: (1) use a case study approach, (2) identify best practices used by components of the Department of Defense; and (3) identify deficiencies in the analysis conducted. This section would further require, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General to submit a report of such an assessment to the congressional defense committees. This section would require the Comptroller General to include in the report recommendations relating to the appropriate application of business case analysis and best practices that should be adopted by the Department of Defense prior to the implementation of any future effort to identify savings in defense operations.

The committee intends this assessment to be selective and encourages the Comptroller General to choose case studies from each of the four major tracks identified by the Secretary of Defense in his May 8, 2010, speech at the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kansas. The committee intends that this retrospective assessment form the basis of the Comptroller General's recommendations, to assist the Department of Defense as the Department responds to any future guidance it receives from the President to identify additional savings for fiscal year 2013 and beyond. While the committee supports the reduction of waste and the improvement of efficiency within the Department of Defense, the committee is concerned that short-sighted decisions may be made to achieve savings targets, unless rigorous analysis is conducted in advance of such decision-making.

Section 1066—Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan

This section would establish a specific sub-activity group within each of the operation and maintenance appropriations in section 4301 of this Act to identify funds to be executed in support of the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan. This section would also require additional detail regarding subordinate activities associated with interim milestones for audit readiness, as required to be included in the FIAR plan pursuant to section 881 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

### Section 1067—Corrective Action Plan Relating to Execution of Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on a corrective action plan for any weaknesses and deficiencies in the execution of the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan of the Department of Defense required by section 881 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). The corrective action plan shall identify near-term and longer-term measures for resolution of any weaknesses and deficiencies in execution of the FIAR plan, shall assign responsibilities in the Department of Defense for actions to implement such measures, and shall specify steps and identify timelines for implantation of such measures.

## SUBTITLE G—STUDIES AND REPORTS

### Section 1071—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements

This section would repeal certain report requirements for the Department of the Defense that were deemed to be redundant or no longer relevant.

### Section 1072—Biennial Review of Required Reports

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review, on a biennial basis, of the Department of Defense reports required to be submitted to Congress. In conducting the review, the Secretary would evaluate the content, quality, cost, and timeliness of the Department of Defense's compliance with the reporting requirements. This section also would provide the Secretary the authority to recommend reports for repeal or modification to the congressional defense committees based on the results of the biennial review. This section also would require the Secretary to conduct a biennial review of the required reports internal to the Department and to take such steps as necessary to eliminate or modify reports deemed by the Secretary to be redundant, overly burdensome, of limited value, unjustifiably costly, or otherwise determined to unduly reduce the efficiency of the Department.

Section 1073—Transmission of Reports in Electronic Format

This section would amend section 122a of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to transmit reports required by law in electronic format to the maximum extent practical in order to reduce the printing and reproduction costs of the Department of Defense.

Section 1074—Modifications to Annual Aircraft Procurement Plan

This section would amend section 231(a) of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual aviation report to the congressional defense committees covering a 30-year time period. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to: provide more fidelity on cost estimates; include the Department of the Army aviation programs in the report; include an inventory of all Department of Defense aircraft; and include remotely piloted vehicles, rotary-wing aircraft, and operational support and executive airlift programs in the report.

Section 1075—Change of Deadline for Annual Report to Congress on National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment

This section would amend section 10541(a) of title 10, United States Code, to change the date for the annual report from the Secretary of Defense concerning the equipment of National Guard Bureau and the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces from February 15 of each year to March 15 of each year.

Section 1076—Report on Homeland Defense Activities

This section would amend section 908(a) of title 32, United States Code, by adding at the end "For any fiscal year during which no assistance was provided, and no activities were carried out, under this chapter, a report is not required to be submitted under this section."

Section 1077—Report on Nuclear Aspirations of Non-State Entities, Nuclear Weapons, and Related Programs in Non-Nuclear Weapons States and Countries Not Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and Certain Foreign Persons

This section would amend section 1055(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to add the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to the list of committees that receive the required report required by such section.

## SUBTITLE H—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 1081—Exemption from Freedom of Information Act for Data Files of the Military Flight Operations Quality Assurance Systems of the Military Departments

This section would amend section 2254 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to exempt data files of the Military Flight Operations Quality Assurance (MFOQA) systems of the military departments from the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and would direct the Secretary of Defense to prescribe guidance for implementation of this authority. The committee is concerned that the release of MFOQA data, either when viewed in the aggregate, when combined with other information already in the public domain, or already subject to release under the Freedom of Information Act, could reveal sensitive information regarding the tactics, techniques, procedures, processes, and operational and maintenance capabilities concerning military combat aircraft, units, and aircrew.

### Section 1082—Limitation on Procurement and Fielding of Light Attack Armed Reconnaissance Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the capability of the elements of the Department of Defense to conduct light attack and armed reconnaissance missions, or to fulfill requests of partner nations for training in the conduct of such missions, in the next Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review required by section 118b of title10, United States Code. This section would also prohibit obligation or expenditure of funds for the start of any new program to procurement of field light attack and armed reconnaissance aircraft until the Joint Requirements Oversight Council validates a requirement for such aircraft and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics approves the acquisition strategy for such aircraft. This section would allow the Secretary to waive the prohibition should he determine that acquisition of the aircraft is necessary to support contingency operations in Republic of Iraq or Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The committee is concerned by the disjointed approach taken by the Department of Defense in its many efforts to acquire and field light attack and armed reconnaissance aircraft. The committee is aware of efforts by the Navy and Marine Corps to field an operational demonstration of light attack and armed reconnaissance aircraft in Afghanistan. The committee has not supported these efforts because there has not been a validated requirement for such aircraft and the Combined Force Air Component Commander has not indicated a need for additional assets to provide light attack and armed reconnaissance capability for the U.S. Central Command theater of operations. The committee is also aware that the budget request contained $158.5 million for a new program to procure nine Light

Attack Armed Reconnaissance (LAAR) aircraft for the Air Force for fiscal year 2012. The LAAR program is proposed to eventually procure 15 aircraft to provide the Air Force capability to train foreign air forces in light attack aircraft to facilitate building partnership capacity (BPC). The committee is not aware of a validated requirement for such aircraft and is concerned that the use of Air Force procurement funds for the sole purpose of BPC may be in violation of section 1301(a) title 31, United States Code.

### Section 1083—Use of State Partnership Program Funds for Civilians and Non-Defense Agency Personnel

This section authorizes the National Guard to use up to $3.0 million of the funds made available through the State Partnership Program to pay travel and per diem costs associated with the participation of U.S. and foreign civilian and non-defense ministry personnel in authorized National Guard State Partnership Program events.

### Section 1084—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for Manufacturing Beyond Low Rate Initial Production at Certain Prototype Integration Facilities

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated for production activities at prototyping integrations facilities beyond initial low rate production in order to ensure that full-rate production activities are accomplished in the most efficient manner possible. The provision also contains a waiver, allowing the Assistant Secretary of the Army to waive the prohibition in emergent cases or to respond to urgent warfighter needs in theater.

## SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 1091—Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of Certain Department of Defense Critical Infrastructure Information

This section would exempt certain Department of Defense critical infrastructure information from disclosure pursuant to Section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

### Section 1092—Expansion of Scope of Humanitarian Demining Assistance Program to Include Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance

This section would update the Department of Defense definition of "Humanitarian Demining Assistance" to include physical security, stockpile management and explosive safety as components of assistance and training.

## Section 1093—Mandatory Implementation of the Standing Advisory Panel on Improving Coordination Among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development on Matters of National Security

This section would amend section 1054 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) to require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to jointly establish a standing advisory panel to advise, review, and make recommendations on ways to improve coordination among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID on matters relating to national security, including reviewing their respective roles and responsibilities.

The committee believes this panel would provide invaluable, objective information and recommendations to both the agencies and Congress about how to improve interagency coordination and collaboration. The committee encourages the panel to review and make recommendations on coordination among, and the respective roles and responsibilities of, the agencies in activities such as stability operations, foreign assistance, including security assistance, strategic communications, public diplomacy, and countering proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Further, the committee encourages the panel to review and make recommendations on: the structures and systems used to coordinate policymaking and policy execution among the agencies; efforts to share lessons learned; the coordination of activities conducted abroad by the agencies or their contractors; the processes and systems for providing and incentivizing interagency education, training, and rotational assignment opportunities to agency personnel; and other matters as the panel considers appropriate.

## Section 1094—Number of Navy Carrier Air-Wings and Carrier Air-Wing Headquarters

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to maintain a minimum force structure of 10 aircraft-carrier air-wings and a dedicated headquarters for each carrier air-wing.

## Section 1095—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a budget justification display that covers programs and activities for procurement of organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE). The committee notes that the report on the acquisition strategy of OCIE required by the committee report (H. Rept.111-491) accompanying the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) has not been delivered. The committee continues to be concerned that the military services are reliant on overseas contingency operation requests to fund OCIE requirements and believes that greater transparency in annual budget justification materials would enhance oversight.

Section 1096—National Rocket Propulsion Strategy

This section contains five findings concerning the reviews undertaken by the Department of Defense (DOD) of the solid rocket motor and liquid rocket engine propulsion industrial base, the reliance of multiple Government agencies on this industrial base, the impact on the Department of Defense resulting from the end of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Shuttle program and termination of the Constellation program, and the increasing cost of DOD systems that are in part due to the uncertainty in the industrial base.

This section would require the President to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a national rocket propulsion strategy for the United States. Lastly, this section would express the sense of Congress that the sustainment of the solid rocket motor and liquid rocket engine industrial base is a national challenge that spans multiple government agencies and requires the Administration's attention.

Section 1097—Inclusion of Religious Symbols as Part of Military Memorials

This section would add a new section to chapter 21 of title 36, United States Code, and would authorize the inclusion of religious symbols as part of a military memorial that is established or acquired by the U.S. Government. This section would also authorize the inclusion of religious symbols on certain military memorials that are not established by the U.S. Government.

Section 1098—Unmanned Aerial Systems and National Airspace

This section would require a program to integrate unmanned aircraft systems into the national airspace system at six test ranges.

Section 1099—Sense of Congress Regarding the Killing of Osama Bin Laden

This section would express a number of findings regarding Osama bin Laden, al Qa'ida, and the United States Special Operations Command. This section would also express the sense of Congress regarding the service provided to the nation by the United States Special Operations Command and that the killing of Osama bin Laden represents a major victory in the war against terrorism and radical extremists.

Section 1099A—Grants to Certain Regulated Companies for Specified Energy Property Not Subject to Normalization Rules

This section would amend section 1603(f) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5) for grants for energy property in lieu of tax credits.

Section 1099B—Submittal of Information Regarding Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to produce certain materials compiled in coordination with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence relating to current and former Guantanamo detainees to appropriate committees of Congress.

# TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Department of Defense Hiring Processes

The committee is concerned that Federal hiring process has become too lengthy and complicated to attract quality candidates and to enable the timely and responsive execution of hiring actions. This is of particular concern for the Department of Defense (DOD) which currently is seeking to expand its acquisition workforce as well as bring back "in-house" functions that are inherently governmental and currently performed by contractors. To address many of the current inefficiencies, Congress has provided the Department with direct and expedited hiring authorities for certain health care professions and acquisition workforce positions, and science and technology positions for the DOD laboratories. However, these are temporary solutions for a fundamental problem with the Department's internal hiring processes.

To promote improvements in the Department's hiring process, the committee included section 1113 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) which gave the Department general flexibilities to reform its hiring processes. However, little progress has yet been realized.

The committee notes that the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) has conducted several studies over the years on the Federal hiring process, and has made several recommendations for reforming the Federal hiring process – many of which do not need legislative or regulatory changes. Among the MSPB recommendations are:

(1) Manage hiring as a business function, not an administrative function;
(2) Evaluate internal agency hiring processes and policies to identify barriers to quality, timely and cost-effective hires;
(3) Employ rigorous assessment strategies that emphasize quality; and
(4) Properly prepare human resources staff and managers for their hiring responsibilities.

Within the Department, human resources management is the responsibility of the Civilian Personnel Management System (CPMS), which reports to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. However, the committee is concerned that the reliance on outdated staffing systems is hindering the Department's ability to recruit and hire qualified individuals to fulfill its mission requirements. Since 1997, the Department has used the Resumix human resources staffing tool, with each component maintaining customized versions. The committee notes that a 2009 report by the Inspector General (IG) of the Department of Defense found that Resumix has "experienced a number of escalating system issues such as the inability to keep pace with continuous technological advancements" and other problems that have made it difficult to maintain and

operate. As a result, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness tasked the CPMS office with replacing Resumix; although, as the committee notes, that has not yet occurred.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to take immediate steps to improve the Department's hiring processes, including more involvement of DOD managers in the process as well as modernizing staffing tools. Furthermore, the Under Secretary should provide a briefing by December 1, 2011, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the steps taken to address the findings in the 2009 IG report, the steps taken to incorporate the MSPB recommendations, a description of the initiatives being taken towards hiring reform, a summary of any statutory or regulatory barriers to hiring process improvements, and the actions taken to modernize staffing tools. The briefing also should identify the resources required to implement the changes.

Pay Parity for Department of Defense Federal Wage System Employees Employed at Joint Military Institutions

The committee is aware that the recommendations made under the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 101-510) to create joint military installations throughout the continental United States and Hawaii resulted in instances where the constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality. The President's Pay Agent subsequently assigned General Schedule employees of certain joint military installations to a single locality area, resulting in a disparity between General Schedule and Federal Wage System employees employed at the particular joint military installation. The committee recognizes the impact of such disparity on effective personnel management.

An example of this is Joint Base McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst where the former McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix are in the Philadelphia cost of living area, and the former Lakehurst NAES is in the New York cost of living area. The President's Pay Agent placed Joint Base McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst in the New York locality pay area effective October 2009. The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC) recommended consolidation of the Federal Wage System area within the same General Schedule locality pay area in October 2010; however, no further action has been taken.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to make a timely determination on the FPRAC recommendation of October 2010 with respect to Department of Defense Federal Wage System employees employed at joint military institutions constituted on or before the date of enactment whose constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality. The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall provide a briefing to the Senate and House

Committees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on the actions being taken to address the FPRAC recommendation by November 15, 2011.

Performance Management Authorities for the Department of Defense

Section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) repealed the Department of Defense (DOD) National Security Personnel System. In addition to requiring the conversion of all DOD civilian employees back to the General Schedule (GS) system, section 1113 provided the Department with performance management and hiring flexibilities which would apply across the DOD civilian workforce, within the context of the existing GS system and consistent with collective bargaining principles. The committee is aware that the transition office has been moving forward in its efforts to develop the new authorities, starting with a "New Beginnings" conference held in September 2010 that brought together DOD management and labor representatives to discuss perspectives on performance management. As a next step, design teams have been established to begin the development of a plan for implementing the performance management and hiring flexibilities authorized in section 1113. In the area of performance management, the committee encourages the design teams to consider methods that more closely link pay with performance rather than tenure, which has been the primary persistent criticism of the GS system. Such incentives could include both monetary (such as quality step increases or cash awards for performance) and non-cash awards. These are just examples of the range of options the committee believes the performance management design team should consider. In addition, the Department should develop measurable personnel performance metrics and consider whether professional certification programs are appropriate.

In addition, the committee recognizes that the Department needs flexibility to efficiently hire and retain qualified individuals. The committee encourages the hiring design team to review the lessons learned from the expedited hiring authorities provided for the acquisition workforce and other demonstration projects as well as undertake a review of, and consider changes to, the current position classification system to allow greater hiring and promotion flexibilities as well as developing career paths that would allow civilian employees to develop professionally. Furthermore, the committee believes that in order for these authorities to be properly implemented, and to ensure enduring leadership and commitment, the Department must establish robust training programs for managers and human resources offices, as called for in section 1113. Finally, the committee recognizes that while the work of the design teams is not expected to be completed until September 2011, legislation may be needed to address issues raised that might hinder the ability of the Department to implement a fair and transparent performance management system. Therefore, the committee has

included language a provision elsewhere in this title that may facilitate legislative changes as the process moves forward.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1101—Amendments to Department of Defense Personnel Authorities

This section would make technical amendments to the Department of Defense performance management, hiring and training authorities in section 9902 of title 5, United States Code. This section also would change the heading of chapter 9, title 5, United States Code, to reflect the fact that the Department of Defense National Security Personnel System was repealed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

### Section 1102—Provisions Related to the Department of Defense Performance Management System

This section would make technical amendments to the reporting requirements in section 9902 of title 5, United States Code. Section 9902 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to implement a performance management system to replace the National Security Personnel System, which was repealed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). Within 1 year after date of enactment (October 28, 2009), the Secretary of Defense was required to report to the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on the Department's plan for the new personnel management system. However, while significant progress has been made, no new performance management system has been implemented.

This section would extend the reporting requirements to ensure that the relevant congressional committees are kept apprised of the progress toward a new Department of Defense performance management system. In addition, the Comptroller General of the United States was required to review the Department's plan and to assess employee satisfaction with the new system. Since there currently is no plan to review, this provision would extend the existing reporting mandate and clarify the elements on which the Comptroller General Office should report to the relevant congressional committees.

### Section 1103—Repeal of Sunset Provision Relating to Direct Hire Authority at Demonstration Laboratories

This section would make permanent the direct hire authorities that were provided to the Department of Defense (DOD) demonstration laboratories by section 1108 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417). The committee notes that the direct hire authority has

been an effective tool to the DOD demonstration laboratories in recruiting qualified individuals with advanced scientific and engineering degrees.

Section 1104—Denial of Certain Pay Adjustments for Unacceptable Performance

This section would prohibit payment of the annual nationwide adjustment to any Federal civilian employee who is rated as "below satisfactory", which is estimated to be about 1 percent of the Department of Defense's more than 700,000 civilian employees. Currently, all Federal civilian employees, no matter how they are rated on their performance, receive the annual nationwide adjustment in January of each year. Federal civilian employees who are rated as "below satisfactory" still receive an increase in salary despite the fact that they are underperforming. An incentive is necessary to entice these employees to improve their job performance.

Section 1105—Revisions to Beneficiary Designation Provisions for Death Gratuity Payable Upon Death of a Government Employee

This section would amend section 8102 of title 5, United States Code, to allow a Federal civilian employee to designate anyone they choose to receive the entirety of a death gratuity if the Federal civilian employee dies of injuries incurred in connection with service with an Armed Force in a contingency operation. Currently, section 8102 restricts Federal civilian employees from designating more than 50 percent of a death gratuity to an unrelated person. This section would provide parity with the beneficiaries of military service members who may receive 100 percent of a death regardless of the relationship to the deceased.

Section 1106—Extension of Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas

This section would extend, for 2 additional years, the authority of the head of a Federal agency to waive the limitations on the amount of premium pay that may be paid to a Federal civilian employee who performs certain work in an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Central Command, an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Africa Command, in support of a military operation, or responding to an emergency declared by the President. The payment may not exceed the annual rate of salary payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3, United States Code.

Section 1107—Waiver of Certain Pay Limitations

This section would amend section 9903 of title 5, United States Code, which provides authority to the Secretary of Defense to hire highly qualified experts and prescribes appropriate pay rates. This section would clarify the intent of that

statute to allow such individuals who are serving in a contingency operation area, as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code, to receive similar benefits and compensation as other Federal civilian employees serving in those areas currently receive. This includes premium pay or danger pay allowances, compensatory time off, and other appropriate compensation or allowances authorized under chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code.

The committee is aware that highly qualified experts currently serving in areas of contingency operations have been denied any type of hazardous duty compensation because the Department of Defense and the Office of Personnel Management have interpreted such compensation as an incentive, which is explicitly prohibited under section 9903 of title 5, United States Code. While the committee does not agree with the interpretation that such hazardous duty compensation is an incentive, this section would remove any possible ambiguity. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Department to take immediate action to remedy the compensation inequities experienced by the highly qualified experts currently working in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 1108—Services of Post-Combat Case Coordinators

This section would require that each Federal agency that sends civilian employees on hazardous duty assignments in support of U.S. military operations in a contingency operation assign post-combat case coordinators to employees who sustain a traumatic injury, or experience a serious disease or illness during performance of their duty in the contingency operation. The committee notes that Federal civilian employees increasingly are providing important support in contingency operations, and many are experiencing serious medical problems upon returning to their regular assignment.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense already assigns caseworkers to its civilian expeditionary workforce. The responsibility of these caseworkers is to guide and direct all deployed civilians to available resources, provide intervention in problem claims, and work with the service component's Injury Compensation Program Administrators to help injured employees navigate the Office of Worker's Compensation Program claims process. However, the committee is concerned that no similar support yet exists for civilians deployed from other Federal agencies who need assistance coordinating benefits between the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and the Federal Employees Compensation Act (Public Law 89-554).

Section 1109—Authority to Waive Recovery of Certain Payments Made under Civilian Employees Voluntary Separation Incentive Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive repayment of the voluntary separation incentive pay (VSIP) for employees who accepted a

reassignment with the Department of Defense during the period of April 1, 2004, to May 1, 2008, and had received written assurance that repayment would not be required or would be waived. The committee notes that the individuals who were rehired were assured that they would not be required to repay their separation pay based on an Office of Personnel Management (OPM) national emergency guidance issued following September 1, 2001. However, due to an oversight, the committee understands that it was subsequently determined the guidance did not apply to employees covered under section 9902, title 5, United States Code, which effectively superseded the OPM guidance. The committee understands that approximately 40 individuals were affected by this determination and that the Defense Finance and Accounting Service now is seeking VSIP repayment from these individuals. While the Department no longer waives VSIP repayment for individuals who have been rehired since May 1, 2008, the committee believes those individuals who returned to the Department immediately following the declaration of a national emergency, and who received written assurances that repayment would not be required, deserve to retain, or be repaid, their voluntary separation incentive pay.

Section 1110—Extension of Continued Health Benefits

This section would extend for 5 years the ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to pay the Federal Government's share and administrative fees for Temporary Continuation of Coverage (TCC) of health insurance premiums for DOD employees who have been separated due to a reduction in force action, as described in section 8905a(d)(4) of title 5, United States Code. Originally authorized by section 346 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484), the current authority expires on: December 31, 2011, or February 1, 2012, if a specific notice of the separation is given to the individual before December 31, 2011. TCC enables Federal employees who are separated from Federal service to continue their Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHB) coverage for up to 18 months. Payment of the Federal Government portion of the TCC FEHB premium and the 2 percent administrative fee has eased a tremendous financial hardship on former DOD employees who lost their jobs due to Base Realignment and Closure activities. This payment also has enabled families to continue health coverage that they otherwise may not have been able to afford.

Section 1111—Authority to Waive Maximum Age Limit for Certain Appointments

This section would amend section 3307 of title 5, United States Code, to allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to waive the hiring and retirement age limits for Federal law enforcement and fire fighter positions in certain circumstances. While the committee supports the Department's plan to scale back significantly the use of contractors in support services, it is concerned that there may be unintended consequences when converting law enforcement and fire fighting functions to

Federal Government positions. Even if the contractor employees currently performing these functions would like to transition into positions with the Federal Government, many may not be able to compete for such positions because of the existing statutory age limits. This section would help rectify that situation by explicitly allowing the waiver of the hiring age limits for Federal law enforcement and firefighter personnel in these circumstances, thus ensuring that the Federal Government is able to hire these experienced individuals. The committee expects that any DOD-established physical or medical standards for these positions still would apply.

Section 1112—Sense of Congress Relating to Pay Parity for Federal Employees Serving at Certain Remote Military Installations

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of Defense (DOD) shall develop procedures for determining locality pay to address circumstances unique to DOD civilian personnel. These circumstances would address pay parity issues for Department of Defense (DOD) civilian personnel employed at military installations located in remote locations where such employees may have to live in a higher cost municipality in the vicinity. An example of this would be the Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center which has had difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified civilians to work at this remote training center.

Section 1113—Reports by Office of Special Counsel

This section would make a technical amendment to section 1213 of title 5, United States Code, regarding the content of whistleblower reports transmitted to Congress. While the committee recommends this as an efficiency initiative, it notes that this section still would ensure that Congress receives sufficient information necessary to determine if any follow-up action is needed on a whistleblower case.

Section 1114—Disclosure of Senior Mentors

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to publicly disclose the names of senior mentors. This section would expand upon section 1102 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) that would codify Department of Defense policy (issued in April 2010) that senior mentors be hired as highly qualified experts and comply with all Federal laws and regulations on personnel and ethics.

# TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

## OVERVIEW

The committee focused on three broad areas in this title. First, the committee continued its effort to ensure that both the necessary resources and the proper degree of oversight were brought to bear on the war against al Qa'ida and other militant extremists in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Second, the committee worked to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to build the capacity of nations that have chosen to partner with the United States in combating militant extremism. Third, the committee strengthened its oversight of Department of Defense efforts to identify and prepare for future threats to U.S. national security.

On December 16, 2010, the Administration released the findings of its annual Afghanistan and Pakistan Review, noting significant operational gains in Afghanistan due to an increased operational tempo, expanded special operations forces targeting of Taliban leadership in Afghanistan, and expanded local security measures at the village level. These operations have reduced Taliban influence and arrested the momentum they had achieved in recent years. While noting the operational progress achieved in 2010, the Administration's review also noted these gains were "fragile and reversible," and stated "the challenge remains to make our gains durable and sustainable." To consolidate these gains, the committee has extended the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP), adding additional funds made available by the termination of CERP in Iraq as U.S. forces withdraw from that country. The committee has also extended the Afghan Infrastructure Fund.

The committee applauds the declaration of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) at the November 2010 Lisbon Summit of a transition process that will continue through 2014, when the Afghan Government will assume full authority for security in Afghanistan. While guaranteeing a U.S. troop presence through 2014, the committee remains concerned that the Administration still plans to redeploy troops in July 2011 without having specified what conditions will determine the decision regarding troop withdrawals. In order to assist continued allied participation in the fight against al Qa'ida and other violent extremists, the committee has authorized the continuation of the Coalition Support Fund and the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund, although the committee notes with concern the deterioration in relations between the United States and Pakistan in early 2011 and subsequent statements by the Government of Pakistan that threaten to undermine our concerted effort against common threats.

The committee seeks to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to build the capacity of nations that have chosen to partner with the United States in combating militant extremism. Recent turmoil in the greater Middle East has demonstrated the importance of strong military-to-military relationships, as

throughout the region there was a strong correlation between the existence and strength of the military-to-military relationship between the United States and the partner nation and the level of violence in that country during the "Arab Spring" protests. Given the increased uncertainty regarding the nature of the regimes that will emerge from the turbulence of the past months, these military-to-military relationships are more vital than ever. Our forces' ability to conduct in-country training with partner nation counterterrorism units will be critical in disrupting al Qa'ida and affiliated groups' attempts to exploit the region's turmoil. Consequently, the committee has increased the authorization for the 1206 program from $350.0 million to $400.0 million as a hedge against the uncertainty of the region's revolutions.

The committee believes that the stability and security of the Republic of Iraq is an important U.S. national interest. Yet the committee is concerned that the scheduled departure of U.S. forces from Iraq by December 31, 2011, will leave the Iraqi Security Forces with several critical capabilities gaps that may render it unable to achieve minimum combat readiness, thereby jeopardizing Iraq's stability. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consider multiple methods of strengthening the military-to-military relationship with Iraq, to include – but not limited to – joint military exercises and the expansion of Department of State programs that bring Iraqi officers and non-commissioned officers to the United States for education and training.

The committee has also taken several steps to strengthen its oversight of Department of Defense efforts to identify and prepare for future threats to U.S. national security. While commending the Secretary of Defense for previous reports on the military power of the People's Republic of China and the Islamic Republic of Iran, the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to provide more detailed reporting on each country's missile capabilities and proliferation activities. The committee has also directed a classified study be undertaken by an independent research entity on any gaps between these country's anti-access capabilities and U.S. forces' ability to overcome them. Furthermore, the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct assessments of two less conventional, but potentially grave, threats to national security: an assessment of the energy security of the NATO alliance, and an assessment of the risk posed to the United States or U.S. allies as a result of U.S. Federal debt owned by the People's Republic of China. Finally, the committee remains concerned about instability on the Korean peninsula, particularly given anticipated leadership changes within the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). Therefore, the committee includes a requirement for a detailed report on the military and security developments involving the DPRK.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### African Security Sector Reform

The committee supports continued efforts to promote African security sector reform and to increase the professionalism and accountability of civilian control of African security forces. The committee notes that increased professionalism and accountability of civilian control of security forces reduces the risk posed to civilians by soldiers who might otherwise commit abuses with impunity. Specifically, the committee commends the commitment of the United States armed forces to security sector reform in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), as evidenced by the ongoing U.S.-DRC training and advisement partnership at Kisangani in the DRC. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to prioritize such efforts as a part of its overall strategy for promoting peace, stability, and human rights on the African continent.

### Closure of United States Military Installations and Alteration of Basing Arrangements in European Command Theater of Operations

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense plans to reduce the number of Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) stationed in Europe from four to three, in accordance with a decision announced in April, 2011. The committee is concerned that reductions below three BCTs in Europe could impair the ability of the combatant command to fulfill the Unites States' commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and theater cooperation activities.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consult with Congress prior to any decision to implement the closure of any installation or alteration of a permanent basing arrangement in the European theater. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Secretary to consider the importance of the United States NATO commitments and the reliance of our allies upon the United States military force structure for deterrence and defense. Likewise, the committee notes that recently expanded missions of the U.S. forces in Europe should also be considered, including the use of Joint Task Forces to train and build mutual capabilities with partner countries, support missile defense, and cybersecurity missions.

### Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program

The committee recognizes the Euro-North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT) program as a unique opportunity to improve relationships with international partners and train allied pilots to a consistent standard. Currently, section 21(g) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(g)) and the ENJJPT memorandum of understanding (MOU) require nations participating in the ENJJPT program to share in the costs of the program. The committee believes that it is in the national security interests of the United States and NATO to expand participation in ENJJPT to include additional NATO and certain Partnership for Peace nations, and to establish mechanisms to assist

these nations in meeting the cost-sharing obligations for participation. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to seek an amendment to the ENJJPT MOU to allow signatory nations to sponsor the participation of pilots from other NATO and Partnership for Peace nations in the ENJJPT program.

Joint Military Exercises with Iraq

The committee believes that the stability and security of the Republic of Iraq is an important national interest given Iraq's role as an ally in the global war on terrorism, as a potential counterweight against Iranian aggression, as a bulwark of representative government in the Arab world, and as a potential supplier of energy resources to the United States and allied countries. Yet in November 2010, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense issued a report warning that the pending departure of U.S. forces by December 31, 2011, will leave U.S. forces little time to assist the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) in developing its logistics system, and cautioned that without viable logistical and industrial capabilities, the ISF may be unable to achieve minimum combat readiness, potentially endangering the Republic of Iraq's stability. In January 2011, U.S. Forces-Iraq (USF-I) reported that additional investments will have to be made to fill what it described as "essential gaps" in Iraqi Security Forces capabilities, noting that additional funds and training personnel may be required after 2011 to ensure that the Iraqi Security Force is capable of providing for Iraq's security. Among the gaps cited by analysts are logistics, training, special operations, and air space management. In testimony before the committee on February 16, 2011, the Secretary of Defense said, "The truth of the matter is, the Iraqis are going to have some problems that they're going to have to deal with if we are not there in some numbers," and that "there is certainly, on our part, an interest in having an additional presence" above levels set by the 2008 Strategic Framework Agreement.

There currently is no agreement in place for U.S. forces to remain in Iraq after December 31, 2011, beyond the projected 150-member Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq (OSC-I) to be based in Embassy Baghdad. Yet the committee believes that a residual U.S. force presence in Iraq, after 2011, and above the OSC-I presence would be beneficial in order to continue to train and advise Iraqi units in functional areas where it lacks capability. If the Government of Iraq requests to discuss agreements that would retain a U.S. force-presence in Iraq, the committee would look favorably on such a discussion, and encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of State to pursue such an agreement. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees within 10 days of reaching such an agreement or, in absence of such an agreement, to report on the extent which participation by the Department of Defense in OSC-I programs will address the capability gaps of the Iraqi Security Forces.

In the event that such an agreement proves unattainable, the committee believes the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Department of State, should consider methods to strengthen the military-to-military relationship with Iraq in order to secure the gains that have been made to date, contribute to Iraq's stability, deter potential aggression by Iraq's neighboring countries, further professionalize the Iraqi military, and assist Iraq in becoming a positive force for stability in the Middle East. The committee does not intend to be prescriptive in describing activities, but believes that the Department of Defense and the Department of State should consider the value of conducting joint exercises with the Iraqi military, similar to the Bright Star exercises carried out with the Arab Republic of Egypt. Further, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of State to explore ways to bring more Iraqi officers and noncommissioned officers to the United States for education, training, and similar activities. The committee further requests that the Department of Defense, within a reasonable period of time, provide a briefing to the committee on ways to strengthen the U.S.-Iraq military relationship.

Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for delivering a comprehensive report on the "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China," in accordance with section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65), including a discussion of the extent to which China's ballistic and cruise missiles increase its ability to control access to the western Pacific. The committee does not believe, however, that the report sufficiently addressed China's domestic production capabilities or proliferation of these technologies.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include greater detail on the ballistic and cruise missile activities of the People's Republic of China, in subsequent submission of report required by section 1202, including China's domestic development and production of these capabilities, and any Chinese proliferation activities of technologies related to cruise missiles, ballistic missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and weapons of mass destruction to other countries. This detail should include, but should not be limited to, the proliferation of missile technologies and components at or near the threshold prohibited by the Missile Technology Control Regime and other multinational export control regimes, in as much unclassified detail as possible.

Finally, the committee encourages the Secretary to submit the next report by March 1, 2012, as required by section 1202.

Military Power of Iran

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for the 2010 report on the military power of the Islamic Republic of Iran, pursuant to section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), in particular for the report's attention to Iran's rocket and missile capabilities and Iran's proliferation activities. The committee encourages the Department to provide equal or greater detail on Iran's missile programs and missile-related proliferation activities in future reports.

NATO Special Operations Headquarters

The committee recognizes the tremendous achievements of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ) in advancing and building a self-sustaining and interoperable special operations force across the alliance. The committee further recognizes the courageous direct and indirect contributions that NATO special operations forces have made particularly in Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee notes that the current authorized base funding level for the NATO Special Operations Headquarters is $50.0 million and recognizes that this base funding level neither precludes nor prevents NSHQ from supplemental funding in support of additional overseas contingency requirements and encourages the Department of Defense to consider using Overseas Contingency Operations funds for this purpose where appropriate.

Report on Deployment of Assets and Personnel to Libya

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services upon making a decision to task any asset of the Department of Defense (DOD) to Libya, if such asset is currently tasked to support ongoing contingency operations in Afghanistan or Iraq. Any such notification must be submitted no later than 72 hours after the redeployment or tasking of a DOD asset in support of Operation Odyssey Dawn or Operation Unified Protector. Such a notification should include at a minimum the number and type of assets and associated personnel transferred from supporting operations in Afghanistan or Iraq to supporting operations in Libya, including but not limited to: Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) assets; close air support assets (to include unmanned platforms); aerial refueling assets; and the diversion of any logistical or other resources used to support operations in Afghanistan or Iraq.

The Secretary of Defense is further directed to report the deployment of any U.S. military personnel or Department of Defense civilians to sovereign Libyan territory, whether held by government or rebel forces.

Taxing Foreign Assistance in Afghanistan

The committee is concerned over recent actions by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, which has contravened existing bilateral agreements by sending past-due tax bills to U.S. companies implementing U.S. Government programs to deliver much-needed stabilization and reconstruction assistance to the Afghan people. While the committee understands that taxing foreign companies operating in Afghanistan is a potentially important source of revenue for the Afghan Government, U.S. law forbids the taxing of U.S. Government assistance. Moreover, there are reports that some Afghan Government officials have reportedly threatened companies with arrests of their employees, loss of licenses, and confiscation of aid goods should those companies ignore the tax bills. These actions are counter-productive to both Afghan and U.S. national security, as they threaten to undermine public support for U.S. Government assistance efforts necessary to create a stable Afghanistan capable of preventing that country from once again becoming a safe haven for extremists groups seeking to attack the U.S. homeland.

The U.S. Government and the Afghan Government carefully negotiated bilateral agreements to exempt U.S. companies operating in Afghanistan from such taxation. The committee therefore urges the Department of Defense and the Department of State to examine the accords and work with their Afghan counterparts to eliminate any confusion or disagreement regarding the tax-exempt status for U.S.-based companies that implement U.S. Government assistance programs in Afghanistan.

## Transparency in NATO Arms Sales

The committee is concerned about press reports that indicate members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Alliance have engaged in, or planned to engage in, major sales or financing of defense articles and defense services with non-NATO member states, including the Russian Federation. According to recent press reports, a corporation in the Federal Republic of Germany will build a combat training center for the Russian Army in the Nizhny Novgorod region. The German corporation would also reportedly work with a Russian corporation to handle the support, repair, and modernization of military equipment. Other press reports have indicated that a corporation in the French Republic has recently contracted to sell Mistral amphibious assault craft to the Russian Federation. The committee is concerned that such sales and financing could adversely affect the deterrence and defense capabilities and the cohesion of the NATO alliance, as well as other security commitments by the United States.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Economic Secretariat of NATO, to monitor these trends and purchases, and to analyze any potential dangers that such sales and financing might pose to the cohesion of the NATO alliance. The committee requests a briefing from the Secretary of Defense about any adverse political and strategic impacts that these

sales and financing have had or could have on the integrity and cohesion of the NATO alliance.

## Unfunded Requirements of the Department of Defense

The committee notes that in the past, the service chiefs have submitted a list of unfunded requirements for each fiscal year, upon the request of the committee. The committee believes these lists have provided valuable insight into the priorities of the military departments, in the event that additional resources can be made available during the annual authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense. While the committee recognizes that the President's request represents the highest priorities of the Department, there are always programs for which planned funding would be un-executable or circumstances that have changed since the submission of the President's request. The committee has historically reinvested these funds in items from the unfunded requirements list of the service chiefs. However, the committee also assesses that, in recent years, the level of detail of the service chiefs' unfunded requirements lists has diminished. Additionally, the committee notes that the failure of the Department of Defense to provide unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2012 in a timely manner harmed the ability of the committee to perform oversight of the Department of Defense. The committee urges the service chiefs to continue to provide detailed unfunded requirements lists to the committee so it may continue to ensure the most efficient use of funds to meet mission requirements.

## United States Missile Defense Cooperation with Russia

The committee welcomes long-standing efforts by the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to seek cooperative opportunities with the Russian Federation on missile defense through bilateral U.S.-Russia discussions and the NATO-Russia Council.

During the November 2010 summit meetings of NATO Heads of State and Government in Lisbon, Portugal, NATO members agreed to continue a joint missile threat assessment with Russia, reaffirmed their readiness to invite Russia to explore jointly the potential for linking NATO and Russian missile defense systems, and sought to resume theater missile defense exercises. However, the committee notes that Russia still appears to oppose the latter phases of the phased, adaptive approach (PAA) for missile defense in Europe. As Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov stated in February 2011, "Experts are fully aware that the 3rd and the 4th stages of the US 'phased, adaptive approach'… if implemented, will mean reaching a strategic level which directly infringes the efficiency of Russian nuclear deterrent forces. If our concerns are not taken into account, if no equitable joint work is achieved, then we will have to compensate for the emerging imbalance."

The committee notes a pledge made by the President, in a letter to Senator Mitch McConnell dated December 18, 2010, that "as long as I am President, and as long as the Congress provides the necessary funding, the United States will continue to develop and deploy effective missile defenses to protect the United States, our deployed forces, and our allies and partners. My Administration plans to deploy all four phases of the EPAA [European Phased Adaptive Approach]." The letter further stated that, "the continued development and deployment of U.S. missile defense systems, including qualitative and quantitative improvements to such systems, do not and will not threaten the strategic balance with the Russia Federation."

The committee commends this pledge, supports the full implementation of the four phases of the PAA, and shares the President's view that planned U.S. missile defenses do not and will not threaten the strategic balance with the Russia Federation. Furthermore, the committee believes that the United States should improve U.S. missile defensive capabilities both quantitatively and qualitatively and opposes any efforts by the United States or Russia to negotiate a future treaty or agreement that may limit U.S. missile defense capabilities.

The committee is also aware that Russia has proposed splitting the defense of Europe into "sectors" whereby Russia would protect Eastern Europe and the U.S. and NATO would protect Western Europe, and has also sought integrated command and control of missile defense assets.

The committee does not support either sectoral missile defense or integrated command and control of missile defense assets. The committee notes that the President has also rejected these proposals. In the December 18, 2010 letter to Senator McConnell cited above, the President also wrote, "we have made clear [to Russia] that the system we intend to pursue with Russia will not be a joint system, and it will not in any way limit United States' or NATO's missile defense capabilities." The committee appreciates such clarification.

Additionally, the committee is aware of proposals made by the United States to establish a missile defense data processing center that would synthesize U.S. and NATO sensor data with Russian sensor data to allow both sides to cue each other's missile defense interceptor systems. While the committee is open to such proposals, it is currently unclear exactly what data and technology would be shared, how they would be shared, and what equitable contributions would be made by Russia. The committee opposes any proposals that involve the transfer of sensitive U.S. missile defense technology and data. Furthermore, the committee expects to receive frequent updates on these proposals and presumes the Department of Defense will take measures necessary to protect U.S. missile defense technology and data.

Lastly, the committee notes that the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) Resolution of Advice and Consent to Ratification as Amended (Treaty Doc. 111-5) stated that "Given its concern about missile defense issues, the Senate expects the executive branch to offer regular briefings… to the Committees on

Foreign Relations and Armed Services of the Senate on all missile defense issues related to the New START Treaty and on the progress of United States—Russia dialogue and cooperation regarding missile defense." In the spirit of bicameralism, the committee requests that the executive branch offer these same briefings to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

U.S. Africa Command and the Lord's Resistance Army

The committee remains concerned about the Lord's Resistance Army, its nearly two decade long reign of terror in northern Uganda and central Africa, its killing and brutalizing of civilians, and its continued destabilization of the region. The committee further notes that pursuant to the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-172), it is the policy of the United States to work with regional governments toward a comprehensive and lasting resolution to the conflict in northern Uganda, including support of viable multilateral efforts to disarm and demobilize the Lord's Resistance Army. The committee encourages the vigorous implementation of the policy enumerated in Public Law 111-172 and recommends that Department of Defense provide U.S. Africa Command with any and all resources it requires in the execution of its efforts pursuant to this policy.

Village Stability Operations and the Afghan Local Police Program in Afghanistan

The committee is aware of an ongoing expansion of local security initiatives such as Village Stability Operations (VSO) and the Afghan Local Police (ALP) program, which are designed to empower local elders and marginalize the influence of the criminal and extremist insurgency. Under the leadership of the Combined Forces Special Operations Component Command - Afghanistan (CFSOCC-A), these activities have grown in scope and scale, and are effectively empowering Afghans to stand up for themselves with close support from the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and coalition forces. To support VSO and ALP expansion, the committee is also aware that conventional U.S. infantry battalions have been assigned under the operational control of CFSOCC-A, which had heretofore been manned almost exclusively by Special Operations Forces. The committee is aware that U.S. Special Operations Command has responded to critical mission needs and emerging requirements in support of VSO and ALP and has realigned considerable Major Force Program (MFP) - 11 resources, including communications equipment, vehicles, alternative energy technologies, and non-standard aviation fixed-wing aircraft.

While these programmatic shifts in MFP-11 funding appear warranted, the committee is concerned about an increased reliance upon Government contracts to provide security guards at forward operating bases and facilities in support of U.S. Special Operations Forces, and Afghan and Coalition Forces. The committee is also

concerned that as the Department of Defense expands VSO and ALP activities, other U.S. Government agencies have been unable to contribute a comparable and concomitant expansion of civilian-led U.S. and Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan development and governance initiatives and activities. Improper and inconsistent program expansion may jeopardize realized gains, encourage splinter and outlier activities not coordinated within the overall ALP strategy, and systemically further damage Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan credibility if Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and Coalition Forces are unable to deliver security, development, and governance at the district, provincial, and national level.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

#### Section 1201—Expansion of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would increase the amount authorized for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2086), as most recently amended by section 1201 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4385), from $45 million to $50 million, extend the authority through fiscal year 2014, and direct the Department of Defense to provide an implementation strategy that outlines the future requirements that would require similar authority in preparation for pending authority expiration.

#### Section 1202—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program To Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

This section would extend, by 1 year, the authorities relating to programs to build the capacity of foreign military forces under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), as most recently amended by section 1207(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). This section would increase the amount authorized from fiscal year 2011 by $50.0 million, for a total of $400.0 million in fiscal year 2012. This section would also increase the limitation on the amount for building capacity to participate in or support military and stability operations by $50.0 million, for a total of $150.0 million in fiscal year 2013. This section would also add a new reporting requirement regarding implementation of the authority during the previous fiscal year. The President would be required to submit such a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as part of the supporting materials accompanying the President's budget request, submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

### Section 1203—Five-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would authorize the Department of Defense to continue to develop, manage, and execute a Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery personnel recovery program for isolated Department of Defense, U.S. Government, and other designated personnel supporting United States national interests globally. The initial authorization contained in section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) provided for funds for this program to be available through fiscal year 2011. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use funds through fiscal year 2016.

## SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND PAKISTAN

### Section 1211—Authority To Establish a Program To Develop and Carry Out Infrastructure Projects in Afghanistan

This section would extend for 1 year, through the end of fiscal year 2012, the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund established under section 1217 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). The committee further recommends increasing the amount authorized under this provision to $475.0 million in order to undertake high-priority, large-scale infrastructure projects in support of the civil-military campaign in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

### Section 1212—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan

This section would authorize the use of operation and maintenance funds made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 to provide funds for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would authorize $425.0 million for activities in fiscal year 2012, and would require the Secretary of Defense to provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees.

The committee notes that this section does not authorize the use of the Commanders' Emergency Program in Iraq, as previously authorized by section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 106-163), as amended most recently by section 1212 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). The remaining U.S. forces in the Republic of Iraq are operating in a strictly training and advisory capacity to Iraqi Security Force units. The committee believes that any immediate

humanitarian needs such units encounter should be addressed through Iraqi funding sources.

Section 1213—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would extend, by 1 year, section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), as most recently amended by section 1213 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383). This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for: (a) logistical, military, and other support provided by that nation to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Operation Enduring Freedom; or (b) logistical and military support provided by that nation to confront the threat posed by Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and other militant extremists in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The total amount of reimbursements made under this authority during fiscal year 2012 would not exceed $2.2 billion. The congressional notification and reporting requirements relating to reimbursement of Pakistan for support provided by Pakistan as required by section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), as amended by section 1213 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), would apply to Coalition Support Fund reimbursements authorized by this section.

Section 1214—Extension and Modification of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund

This section would extend, by 1 year, section 1224(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), as most recently amended by section 1220 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), to provide assistance to the security forces of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to build and maintain those forces' counterinsurgency capability. This section would also withhold authority to obligate more than 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) until the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy to utilize the fund, a discussion of the terrorist or extremist groups that the United States encourages Pakistan to combat, the gaps in capabilities of Pakistani security units, how assistance provided utilizing the fund will address these capability gaps, and metrics of progress. This section directs that future updates of the report be submitted concurrently with the President's budget request, and requires quarterly reporting on progress in achieving U.S. strategic objectives in Pakistan and progress made by programs supported by PCF.

The committee feels that PCF remains a critical part of a comprehensive program to train and equip the Pakistani army and Pakistani Frontier Scouts to be able to conduct counterinsurgency operations in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) of Pakistan. The committee further notes that the Pakistani security forces have undertaken significant operations against some extremist organizations in the FATA, including at least one such organization that has attempted to launch an attack against the United States homeland. However, to date, the committee believes that Pakistan has lacked both the capability and political will to pursue and eliminate some well-armed and dangerous extremist groups that have attacked U.S. forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, such as the Haqqani Network. The committee believes that significantly enhancing the capabilities of Pakistan through PCF, if properly conceived and carried out, should make it easier for the government of Pakistan to make the hard decisions to combat these groups. However, some recent events, such as the public request to cease drone operations against terrorists in Pakistan's tribal areas and requests that the United States reduce the number of special forces trainers and intelligence operatives working in Pakistan, have caused the committee to question if the government of Pakistan will be able to make such a decision in the near future. The committee intends the report required by this section to address such questions in order to determine on an on-going basis, the value of such assistance in promoting security in Pakistan, consistent with the interests of the United States.

Section 1215—Report on Extension of United States-Iraq Status of Forces Agreement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with formal notification if the U.S. Government and the Government of the Republic of Iraq complete an agreement permitting the United States to maintain a force presence in Iraq above that envisioned for the Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq (OSC-I). This section would require that in the absence of such an agreement in place by December 31, 2011, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2012, outlining how Department of Defense participation in OSC-I programs will address the capability gaps of the Iraqi Security Forces, should the Government of Iraq request such assistance. This section would also require the Secretary to submit an update to such a report concurrent with the submission of the President's budget requests for fiscal years 2014-15, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, unless such an agreement is reached. The committee intends for these updates to cover Department of Defense OSC-I efforts for calendar year 2012 and 2013, respectively.

Section 1216—Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to utilize funds available for operations and maintenance by the Air Force to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I). This section would fund the life support, transportation, and personal security of Department of Defense personnel in OSC-I. This section would not authorize funding to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of State.

## SUBTITLE C—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

### Section 1221—Review and Report on Iran's and China's Conventional and Anti-Access Capabilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act to submit to the congressional defense committees a classified study undertaken by an independent entity outside the Department of Defense assessing the gaps between the conventional and anti-access capabilities of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the People's Republic of China and the U.S. forces' ability to overcome such capabilities. The committee notes that sections 1238 and 1243 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) required a report and a briefing from the Department of Defense on these subjects. However, given the potentially grave threats posed by these capabilities to U.S. national security and stability in the western Pacific and Middle East, the committee believes an additional, independent assessment is warranted to further inform the Department's planning and the committee's oversight of these issues. The committee encourages the Secretary to select an entity with the necessary security clearances and expertise to review the intelligence assessments upon which the Department's findings were based pursuant to the report and briefing required by sections 1238 and 1243.

### Section 1222—Report and Consultation on Energy Security of NATO Alliance

This section would express certain findings related to energy security for members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and would require the Secretary of Defense to direct a federally funded research and development center of the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment of the energy security of the NATO alliance, with an emphasis on the vulnerabilities of NATO alliance members to a sole supplier or distribution network for oil or gas, and how such vulnerabilities could adversely affect the security and cohesion of the alliance. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report of such assessment not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This section would further direct the Secretary of Defense to consult with other NATO member countries and NATO's Emerging Security Challenges Division on other ways the United States as a NATO member country

could contribute to the energy security of the NATO alliance and NATO regional partners.

Section 1223—Extension of Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan

This section would extend the "Report on Progress Toward Stability and Security in Afghanistan," as required by section 1230(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), as most recently amended by section 1231 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

Section 1224—Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than March 1, 2012 and March 1, 2013 to submit, in both classified and unclassified form, a report on the current and future military power of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This section would require the report be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Section 1225—National Security Risk Assessment of the United States Federal Debt Owned by the People's Republic of China

This section would require, within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to determine and make publicly available the amount of accrued interest on United States Federal debt paid to the People's Republic of China during the five years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to carry out an assessment of the national security risks posed to the United States and United States allies as a result of the Federal debt liabilities owed to China and the amount of interest determined to have been paid by the United States to China. This section would require the Secretary to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs within 120 days following the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 1226—Congressional Notification Requirement before Permanent Relocation of Any United States Military Unit Stationed Outside the United States

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section 162a, that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress at least

30 days before the relocation of a unit stationed outside the United States. Elements of the notification would include how the action supports the national security strategy, commitments undertaken by international security treaties, a combatant commander's area of responsibility, the cost differential between relocation and rotation to maintain the same capabilities, and how such relocation would affect overseas Base Realignment and Closure activities. This section would also waive the notification requirement for relocation of a unit to a contingency operation, for relocation as a result of a closure of an overseas installation at the request of the government of the host nation, or for the planned reduction of brigade combat teams within the European command area of operations from four to three. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the ability of the Secretary of Defense to relocate military units stationed outside the United States.

Section 1227—Annual Report on Military Power of the People's Republic of China

This section would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65), as most recently amended by section 1246(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), by changing the name of the annual report required by such section from "Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China" to "Annual Report on Military Power of the People's Republic of China". This section would also clarify the reporting requirements relating to China's cyber and espionage activities.

Section 1228—Limitation on Funds to Provide the Russian Federation with Access to United States Missile Defense Technology

This section would establish two limitations on funds made available in this Act to provide the Russian Federation with access to the missile defense technology and data of the United States. The first limitation would limit funds from being used to provide the Russian Federation with access to sensitive U.S. missile defense technology or sensitive data. The second limitation would limit funds from being used to provide the Russian Federation with access, more generally, to U.S. missile defense technology or data as part of a defense technical cooperative agreement unless the President submits a report and certification to certain committees.

Section 1229—International Agreements Relating to Missile Defense

This section includes several findings related to unilateral statements made concerning the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), and several of the understandings and declarations in the Senate's Resolution of Ratification for that treaty, related to United States legal obligations and U.S. national interests with respect to limiting, restricting, and improving the missile defense capabilities

of the United States. This section further includes several policy statements concerning further limitations on and improvements to the U.S. missile defense capabilities, and with respect to future agreements restricting those capabilities.

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to state that, in accordance with the Senate's Resolution of Ratification of the New START Treaty, any agreement with a country or international organization or amendment to the New START Treaty (including an agreement made by the Bilateral Consultative Commission established by the treaty) concerning the limitation of U.S. missile defense capabilities shall not be binding on the United States, and shall not enter into force with respect to the United States, unless after the date of the enactment of this section, such agreement or amendment is specifically approved with the advice and consent of the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution; or specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

This section would further require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs an annual notification whether the Russian Federation has recognized during the previous year the sovereign right of the United States to pursue quantitative and qualitative improvements in missile defense capabilities; and furthermore whether during any treaty negotiations or other Government-to-Government contacts between the United States and the Russian Federation during the previous year a representative of the Russian Federation suggested that a treaty or other international agreement include, with respect to the United States, restricting missile defense capabilities, military capabilities in space, or conventional prompt global strike capabilities, or reducing the number of non-strategic nuclear weapons deployed in Europe.

### Section 1230—Non-strategic Nuclear Weapon Reductions and Extended Deterrence Policy

This section would express certain policy statements of the United States on Russian and United States non-strategic nuclear weapon reductions and extended deterrence commitments to Europe.

This section would further prohibit any action from being taken to effect or implement the reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of nuclear forces of the United States that are based in Europe unless either 1) the reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of such nuclear forces is requested by the government of the host nation in the manner provided in the agreement between the United States and the host nation regarding the forces; or 2) the President certifies that NATO member states have considered the reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal at the High Level Group, that NATO has decided to support such reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal, and that the remaining nuclear forces of the United States that are based in Europe after such reduction, consolidation or withdrawal would provide a

commensurate or better level of assurance and credibility as before such reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal.

This section would further require that upon any decision to reduce, consolidate, or withdraw nuclear forces of the United States from Europe, the President to submit to certain congressional committees a notification that the above referenced certification has been made, a justification for such reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal, and an assessment of how NATO member states, in light of such action, assess the credibility of the deterrence capability of the United States in support of its commitments under article f of the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949.

This section would further require the expiration of a 180 day period beginning on the date that the President makes the above referenced certification, before the President may commence a reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of the nuclear forces of the United States that are based in Europe.

# TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

## OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $508.2 million for fiscal year 2012, representing a decrease of $14.23 million from the amount requested and authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2011. Since the submission of the fiscal year 2011 request, several of the CTR accounts have been reorganized. The request for fiscal year 2012 included $63.2 million for Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination, $9.8 million for Chemical Weapons Destruction, $121.1 million for Global Nuclear Security, $259.5 million for Cooperative Biological Engagement, $28.1 million for Proliferation Prevention, $2.5 million for Threat Reduction Engagement, and $24.0 million for Other Assessments/Administrative support.

The committee continues to support the goals of the CTR program and continues to believe that the program is critical to United States national security. In past years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have sometimes limited progress of the CTR Program. The committee notes, however, that the CTR program has made significant achievements, and that much threat reduction work remains to be done.

Recent national defense authorization acts addressed these concerns by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the former Soviet Union; increasing CTR funding, including funding for new CTR initiatives; requiring reports by the National Academy of Sciences and the Secretary of Defense on the development of new CTR initiatives and metrics; requiring a report by the Secretary of Defense regarding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project in the Russian Federation at Schuch'ye; requiring increased reporting from the Secretary of Defense on CTR defense and military contacts; providing CTR programs with authority for urgent threat reduction activities; authorizing the CTR program to accept international contributions; and ensuring that the CTR program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee notes that the CTR Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP), formerly called the Biological Threat Reduction Program (BTRP), now encompasses over one half of the CTR budget request. The committee reaffirms its view, stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 that biological threat reduction and engagement "should be guided by a comprehensive long-term interagency engagement and coordination; rigorous Department management and oversight; coordination and integration with other Department programs and activities; and concrete metrics for measuring progress." The committee further reaffirms its view that the CTR program as a whole should "maintain a strong

focus" on the full range of threat reduction challenges. The committee further reaffirms its view that concrete metrics remain important for measuring the impact and effectiveness of all CTR activities. The committee welcomes efforts by the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and keep the committee fully informed of efforts and developments in these areas.

Section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2010 (Public Law 111-84) placed a limitation on the use of funds for establishing centers of excellence in countries outside the former U.S.S.R. Section 1304 of the same Act required the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly submit a plan, not later than April 1, 2011, on carrying out CTR program activities planned in the People's Republic of China. The committee notes that this report was not submitted on time. The committee continues to remain deeply interested in the CTR program activities taking place outside of the former U.S.S.R., and in particular those activities in the People's Republic of China. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to ensure that reports are submitted on time, to continue to actively consult with the committee, and to keep the committee fully informed of developments and CTR program activities involving the People's Republic of China.

Finally, the committee believes that the phrases "military-to-military and defense contacts" and "defense and military contacts" as used in section 1501(b)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, as amended, and subsequent relevant legislation, includes defense and military contacts that are used to support participation by foreign non-defense departments and agencies, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations in activities that support the CTR mission.

The committee authorizes $508.2 million, the amount of the budget request.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Cooperative Threat Reduction Biological Surveillance Network

The committee is concerned that the proposed biological surveillance network within the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP) could prove insufficient to monitor, detect, and deter manmade pathogens, even if implemented widely. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess whether the biological surveillance network would fall short of addressing the global biological threat. The assessment should examine the potential for dangerous pathogens to be weaponized: (1) by relatively unsophisticated non-state actors, including terrorists, (2) by state or non-state actors in countries that do not fully cooperate with such a network, or (3) by rogue state or sub-state actors who, with modest biological knowledge and equipment, might be able to circumvent such a network even in countries that would participate in such a network. The Secretary should consult with the intelligence community in the conduct of such an assessment. The

Secretary is further directed to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, House Committee on Armed Services, and House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on any necessary recommendations regarding the modification of the CBEP mission, in unclassified form with a classified annex, as necessary, within 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Cooperative Threat Reduction of Biological Weapons

The committee has long expressed support for reducing the threats from biological weapons and the proliferation of dangerous pathogens. However, the committee has also expressed concern regarding measures of effectiveness of Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) activities. Section 1304 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) directed the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement metrics to measure the impact and effectiveness of all CTR activities. The "Report on Metrics for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program" referred to here as the CTR Metrics Report, was completed in September 2010.

The committee also notes that the CTR biological program has recently undergone a name change, from the Biological Threat Reduction Program to the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program, and appears to be transforming from the site-specific and arms control threat reduction paradigms to a new global effects paradigm, characterized by engagement and capacity building. Additionally, budget requests for biological threat-related CTR activities have gradually increased and now represent more than half of the program request.

The committee is concerned that this reorientation could both impair CTR's traditional focus on threat reduction and complicate program assessment. To the extent that the biological engagement monitors naturally occurring diseases, it may become more difficult for Congress to monitor CTR's continued focus on threats that are directly related to weapons of mass destruction. Despite the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention (BWC), there is no shortage of biological weapons material and facilities. For example, as noted in the 2005 Department of State report, "Adherence to and Compliance With Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments," the "United States judges, based on available evidence, that Russia continues to maintain an offensive program in violation of the BWC." The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue its efforts to attempt to gain access to such sites. While there is a hope that engagement could facilitate the attainment of this goal, it is not clear that additional spending on engagement would persuade an uncooperative country from opening or even admitting the existence of such facilities. The CTR Metrics Report notes, "we need better measures to show that these efforts actually result in changed practices or additional effectiveness." Indeed, the CTR Metrics Report

further acknowledges that the metrics do not attempt to "determine whether the activities of the CTR program are the 'right' activities."

The committee believes that engagement dollars must yield verifiable results and must result in threat reduction. Therefore, elsewhere in this title the committee includes a provision that would limit the funds available for CBEP until the Secretary certifies that biological engagement efforts do actually result in changed practices or additional effectiveness, and that the program leads to a reduction in the threat from biological weapons, bioterrorism, and pathogen proliferation.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would define the programs and funds that are Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act and specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

### Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program element under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program from within the overall $508.2 million that the committee would authorize for the CTR program. The allocation under this section reflects the amount of the budget request for fiscal year 2012. This section would also require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2012 funds for purposes other than those specifically authorized. In addition, this section would provide limited authority to obligate amounts for a program element under the CTR program in excess of the amount specifically authorized for that purpose.

### Section 1303—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cooperative Biological Engagement Program

This section would limit funds that may be obligated or expended for fiscal year 2012 for the cooperative biological engagement program (CBEP) to not more than 75 percent of the amounts authorized or otherwise available for such purpose, until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits certain information to the appropriate congressional committees. The Secretary would be required to submit a detailed analysis of the effectiveness of CBEP, and either written certification that CBEP results in changed practices and threat reduction, or a detailed list of policy and program recommendations considered by the Secretary to be necessary to modify, expand, or curtail CBEP. This section would require the Secretary to submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

# TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

#### Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 1405—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 1406—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

### SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

#### Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $50.1 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2012. This section would also permit the use of

additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

### Section 1412—Revision to Required Receipt Objectives for Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize revisions on limitations in asset sales contained in section 3402(b)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) as most recently amended by section 1412 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to increase the Department of Defense's stockpile commodity disposal authority from $730.0 million to $830.0 million, and extend this authority from 2013 to 2016.

## SUBTITLE C—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION MATTERS

### Section 1421—Changes to Management Organization to the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative Program

This section would allow the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative Program (ACWA) to work closely with the U.S. Army Chemical Materials Agency (CMA). The committee believes that CMAs leadership, engineers, scientists, project managers, technical managers, and safety technicians represent a pool of talent and experience that can and should be leveraged as CMA begins to draw down upon the completion of its mission to help address and anticipate risks and help to underwrite future success of ACWA.

## SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 1431—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $67.7 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2012.

### Section 1432—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

### Section 1433—Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund

This section would establish a fund to be known as the "Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund". Funds would be authorized to be appropriated for the fund for fiscal year 2012 as specified in the funding table in section 4501 of this Act. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to transfer amounts from the fund to another account of the Department of Defense to mitigate unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2012 for any of the following: (1) ballistic and cruise missile defense; (2) Navy shipbuilding; (3) strike fighter shortfalls; (4) mine warfare; (5) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; (6) capabilities to defeat anti-access/area denial technologies; and (7) basic research. The authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to transfer amounts from the fund to other accounts would be in addition to any other authority provided to the Secretary to transfer funds provided in this Act. This section would specify that the transfer of an amount from the fund to another Department of Defense account would be deemed an increase to the amount authorized to be appropriated for such account. This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from transferring amounts from the fund until the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Secretary notifies the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of the proposed transfer. Finally, the Secretary of Defense would be required to issue guidance, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, regarding the identification and selection of projects to be funded under this section using merit-based selection criteria.

# TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

## OVERVIEW

The committee notes that section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) requires the budget submission to Congress for each fiscal year to include:

(1) A request for the appropriation of funds for ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(2) An estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for operations; and

(3) A detailed justification of the funds requested.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations to be available upon enactment of this Act to support overseas contingency operations principally associated with Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### CV-22 Combat Loss Replacement Funding

The budget request contained $15 million for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications for one CV-22 for a total of $15.0 million.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2011 appropriations included funding for this combat loss replacement.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $15.0 million, for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications.

### Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained $100.0 million for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUON) Fund.

The committee understands this fund would be used to address unknown operational needs in Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom. However, the committee believes that this request lacks proper justification and is duplicative with other requests for rapid acquisition capabilities to address urgent operational needs. The committee is aware the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has identified 31 entities within the Department of Defense, the military services, and U.S. Special Operations Command whose mission is to respond to urgent operational needs from combat theaters of operation that all have separate budgets that could be used to develop, equip, and field solutions to the warfighter. For example, the committee notes the total budget request contained $2.8 billion for

the Joint IED Defeat Organization, $191.4 million for the Rapid Equipping Force, and $334.4 million for the Rapid Fielding Directorate.

The committee also notes that Congress provided the Department with Rapid Acquisition Authority (RAA) in section 806(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314), as amended by section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) and section 803 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) which provides the Secretary of Defense $200.0 million in authority, per fiscal year, to waive any necessary statutes for quick response to immediate warfighter capability requirements in response to combat fatalities. The committee understands the Department has rarely used this authority.

According to GAO, the Department of Defense lacks complete visibility to readily identify the total cost of its urgent operational needs and lacks the internal controls necessary to manage these efforts. For instance, the Department has no comprehensive database for which to track, monitor, and evaluate urgent operational requests and no set of universal metrics to effectively evaluate its performance once the system is fielded. The committee also understands the Secretary of Defense has not issued Department-wide policy guidance that provides for a unified approach for managing quick reaction programs and urgent need efforts to include managing funding requirements. Given the current budgetary challenges, the committee believes it is critical for the Department to reevaluate its current processes for fulfilling its urgent needs and determine whether there is potential to reduce duplication, fragmentation, and overlap to achieve increased efficiencies, cost savings, or both.

Section 804 of Public Law 111-383 requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's urgent operational needs and rapid acquisition process and report the findings to the congressional defense committees by January 2012. The committee believes that the Department should complete this required comprehensive evaluation of its urgent operational needs processes before requesting approval for a separate funding account. The committee also encourages the Secretary to utilize RAA to address urgent operational needs.

The committee recommends $50.0 million, a decrease of $50.0 million, for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. Elsewhere in title 1 of this Act, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $100.0 million, for the JUON Fund.

### MH-60 Combat Loss Replacement Funding

The budget request contained $7.8 million for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications for one MH-60 for a total of $7.8 million.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2011 appropriations included funding for this combat loss replacement.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $7.8 million, for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications.

### National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained $280.0 million for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

The committee notes the specific amount of resources, including equipment, needed to achieve the National Guard and Reserve Component's new operational reserve status remains a challenge, given the dual mission responsibility of the National Guard and Reserve Components, in particular the National Guard. The committee understands that despite recent increases in equipment funding levels that equipment shortfalls still exist for the National Guard and Reserve Components. The committee believes additional funds would help eliminate identified shortfalls in the areas of critical dual-use equipment. The committee expects these funds to be used for the purposes of, but not limited to the procurement of: aircraft, missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, non-system training devices, logistics automation systems, remote weapon stations, chemical/biological protective shelters, and other critical dual-use procurement items for the National Guard and Reserve Components. The committee understands the National Guard is also in the process of upgrading central pedestal displays for their F-16 block 30 aircraft and recommends the National Guard examine the viability of utilizing a similar upgrade program for F-16 block 40 and 50 aircraft.

The committee recommends $505.0 million, an increase of $225.0 million for National Guard and Reserve equipment within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. Elsewhere in title 1 of this Act, the committee recommends $4.8 billion, an increase of $100.0 million, for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in additional to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

#### Section 1502—Procurement

This section would authorize additional appropriations for procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize additional appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act. .

Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance programs at the levels identified in section 4302 of division D of this Act.

Section 1505—Military Personnel

This section would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

Section 1506—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1507—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1508—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide at the level identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1509—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations

This section would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

### Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to $3.0 billion of additional war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

## SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

### Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would extend, by 1 year, the conditions and limitations on funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) pursuant to section 1513 of the National Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), as most recently amended by section 1531 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

The committee believes that improving the capabilities of Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) and the capacity of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan's security-related ministries is vital to achieving the stated goal of transitioning responsibility for security in Afghanistan by 2014. Consequently, the committee authorizes the Department of Defense to utilize amounts in the ASFF to construct and operate schools for the purpose of providing literacy instruction to recruits for the ANSF and to civilians entering the Afghan Ministry of Defense.

### Section 1532—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq

This section would apply the prohibitions of section 1508(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) to funds authorized to this title, to prohibit the acquisition, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of facilities for use by the Government of the Republic of Iraq, its subdivisions, agencies, departments, or forces, as well as the political subdivisions of Iraq.

### Section 1533—One-Year Extension of Project Authority and Related Requirements of Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan

This section would extend by 1 year the project authority and related requirements of the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations (TFBSO) in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan under section 1535 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) and provide $75.0 million for such purposes.

The committee notes that it has still not received the plan required by section 1545 of Public Law 111-383 Act to transition the activities of the Task Force to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The committee notes that the function of private sector business development falls outside the core competency of the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee believes that the mission of TFBSO should eventually fall under the jurisdiction of a different agency, likely USAID or possibly the Department of Commerce. However, the committee notes that the USAID does not appear ready to assume responsibility for the TFBSO by the time the previous authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 2011. The committee understands that developing Afghanistan's private business sector is critical to reviving that nation's economy. Therefore, the committee has provided the authority to extend the TFBSO through fiscal year 2012 in order to support the International Security Assistance Force's comprehensive counterinsurgency strategy to achieve our strategic objectives in Afghanistan.

# TITLE XVI—ADDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—PROCUREMENT

#### Section 1601—Budget Item Relating to Modification of Torpedoes and Related Equipment

This section would add $5,000,000 to Weapons Procurement, Navy, for the modification of torpedoes and related equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

#### Section 1602—Budget Item Relating to Anti-Submarine Warfare Electronic Equipment

This section would add $9,600,000 to Other Procurement, Navy, for anti-submarine warfare electronic equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

#### Section 1603—Budget Item Relating to Shallow Water Mine Counter Measures

This section would add $8,000,000 to Other Procurement, Navy for shallow water mine countermeasures or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

#### Section 1604—Budget Item Relating to LHA-7 Ship Program

This section would add $150,000,000 to Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for the LHA-7 ship program or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

#### Section 1605—Budget Item Relating to Mobility Aircraft Simulators

This section would add $25,000,000 to Aircraft Procurement, Air Force line 105 for mobility aircraft simulators, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

#### Section 1606—Budget Item Relating to Modifications to Aircraft

This section would add $10,000,000 to Aircraft Procurement, Army Line 027 for radio communication systems for National Guard helicopters, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1607—Budget Item Relating to SH-60 Crew and Passenger Survivability Upgrades

This section would add $4.5 million to Aircraft Procurement, Navy, Line 036 for SH-60 crew and survivability upgrades to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1608—Budget Item Relating to Modification of In Service A-10 Aircraft

This section would add $5.0 million to Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, Line 038, for A-10 lightweight airborne recovery systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1609—Budget Item Relating to Radar Support

This section would add $5,000,000 to Other Procurement, Navy, for radar support, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1610—Budget Item Relating to Electronic Equipment-Automation

This section would add $4,000,000 to Other Procurement, Army, for electronic equipment- automation for support of the deployment and adoption of new information processing systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1611—Budget Item Relating to Base Defense Systems

This section would add $6.0 million to Other Procurement, Army, Line 130 for base defense system equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1612—Budget Item Relating to Sniper Rifle Modifications

This section would add $2.5 million to the Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, Budget Activity 002 for modifications of weapons and other combat vehicles, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1613— Budget Item Relating to Generators and Associated Equipment

This section would add $10,000,000 to Other Procurement, Army, Line 177 for generators and associated equipment to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures

### Section 1614—Budget Item Relating to National Guard and Reserve Equipment

This section would add $100,000,000 to Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment, line 007, and reduce the amount for Aircraft Procurement, Army, line 003, for Aerial Common Sensor, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

## SUBTITLE B—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

### Section 1616—Budget Item Relating to New Design SSN

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 113 for continued design improvements for new SSNs to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

### Section 1617—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Submarine System Development

This section would add $9,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 42 for advanced submarine system development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

### Section 1618—Budget Item Relating to Surface Anti-Submarine Warfare

This section would add $3,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy for surface anti-submarine warfare, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

### Section 1619—Budget Item Relating to Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies

This section would add $19,900,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy for ship preliminary design and feasibility studies, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

### Section 1620—Budget Item Relating to Industrial Preparedness

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 226 for industrial preparedness, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1621—Budget Item Relating to Mixed Conventional Load Capability for Bomber Aircraft

This section would add $20,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force line 122 for the development of mixed conventional load capability for bomber aircraft to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1622—Budget Item Relating to TACAIR-launched UAS Capability Development

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 209 for TACAIR-launched UAS capability development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1623—Budget Item Relating to Electro-photonic Component Capability Development

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation line 186 for electro-photonic component capability development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1624—Budget Item Relating to Airborne Reconnaissance Systems

This section would increase Research, Development, Test and Evaluation line 201 by $3.0 million for airborne reconnaissance systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1625—Budget Item Relating to Small Business Innovative Research

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 139 to accelerate the use of technologies from the small business innovative research program into Army acquisition programs of record, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1626—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 003 to conduct research into the magnetic and electric fields

of the coastal ocean environment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1627—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 002 to support research into innovative new techniques combat wound repair, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1628—Budget Item Relating to Communications Advanced Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 034 for the development of communications and information networking technologies to support Army requirements, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1629—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 019 to develop radio frequency signals intelligence processing equipment and associated applications, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1630—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology

This section would add $8,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 019 for the development of enhanced low-light level visual sensors for persistent surveillance and dismounted soldier applications, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1631—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 050 for the development of deployable force protection sensors, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1632—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 050 for the development and fielding of a solution for

helicopter "brownout" situational awareness, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1633—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology

This section would add $4.8 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 050 for night vision advanced technology development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1634—Budget Item Relating to Rotary Wing Surfaces

This section would add $6,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 025 for the development of mission planning and support tools for rotary wing surfaces, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1635—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Technology

This section would add $30,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 017 for the development of weapons and munitions technologies by small and non-traditional defense businesses, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1636—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 032 for development of innovative manufacturing techniques and processes for munitions and weapons systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1637—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 032 for the development of innovative manufacturing techniques and processes for munitions and weapons systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1638—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 005 to develop innovative nanomaterials and nanomanufacturing processes for warfighter systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1639—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology

This section would add $1,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 005 for the development and demonstration of novel lightweight composite packaging and structural materials, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1640—Budgetary Amendment for Materials Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 005 for advanced manufacturing, repair and sustainment technologies for defense needs, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1641—Budgetary Amendment for Lightweight Body Armor

This section would add $5,100,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 016 for the development of new lightweight body armor, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1642—Budgetary Amendment Relating to Industrial Preparedness Manufacturing Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Wide, Line 248 for sustainment of the body armor industrial base, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1643—Budgetary Amendment for Secure Microelectronics

This section would add $15,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 050 to conduct research into the development, identification and management of secure microelectronics, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1644—Budget Item Relating to Army Tactical Command and Control Hardware and Software

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 115 for the development of interoperable national security information sharing systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1645— Budget Item Relating to Battlespace Knowledge Development and Demonstration

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 026 to conduct research and educational programs that support cyber workforce development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1646—Budget Item Relating to Technology Transfer

This section would add $9,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 045 for small business technology transfer efforts into major Department of Defense acquisition programs of record, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1647—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives

This section would add $7,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 003 for multidisciplinary research into nanotechnology science, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1648—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives

This section would add $7,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 002 for the development hypersonic testing facilities for defense applications, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1649—Budget Item Relating to Clinical Care and Research

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 003 for development of informatics tools to support clinical care and research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1650—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 028 for the development of biomaterials for wound prevention and healing, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1651—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 028 for research in spinal cord injuries, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1652—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $3,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 028 for the development of high-throughput, microarray diagnostic systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1653—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $1,468,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 028 to support research into innovative new techniques to develop vaccines of interest to the military, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1654—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 030 for functional genomics research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1655—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 030 for the development of telemedicine technologies, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1656—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 030 for the study of health effects from manganese and other potential toxins, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1657—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 030 for the development of innovative medical training technologies, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1658—Budget Item Relating to Chemical and Biological Defense Program

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 017 for chemical and biological defense program applied research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1659—Budget Item Relating to Special Operations Advanced Technology Development

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 074 for special operations advanced technology development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1660—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $3,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support and risk assessment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1661—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $1,200,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support and the development of mobile training content, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1662—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $6,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1663—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 029 for the development of modeling and simulation technologies for testing of blast structures, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1664—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1665—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support to improve the collaborative experimentation model, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1666—Budget Item Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction Defeat Technologies

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 024 for weapons of mass destruction defeat technologies, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1667—Budget Item Relating to Countermine Systems

This section would add $4,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 020 for countermine systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1668—Budget Item Relating to Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research

This section would add $8,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 014 for the development of remote- robotic naval mine countermeasure research and development capability, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1669—Budget Item Relating to Special Applications for Contingencies

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 217 for special operations advanced technology development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1670—Budget Item Relating to Microelectronics Technology Development and Support

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 053 for the development of innovative semiconductor design and fabrication tools, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1671—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 009 to support research into corrosion control and anti-biofouling coatings, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1672—Budget Item Relating to Marine Corps Landing Force Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 006 for the development of situational awareness and communications networking tools for tactical units, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1673—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Concepts and Simulation

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 012 to develop realistic human representations of software agents for simulation systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1674—Budget Item Relating to Human Effectiveness Applied Research

This section would add $2,200,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 006 to develop training and simulation capabilities for the Air Force, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1675—Budget Item Relating to Aerospace Propulsion

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 007 for the development of innovative aircraft deoxygeneration systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1676—Budget Item Relating to End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities

This section would add $7,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 188 to develop a 3-D model-based design and manufacturing capability, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1677—Budget Item Relating to Sensors and Electronic Survivability

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 006 for the development of command, control and navigation capabilities for manned and unmanned aircraft, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1678—Budget Item Relating to Military Engineering Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 052 for the development of innovative capabilities that support core missions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1679—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $8.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for the development and demonstration of a high efficiency air breathing turbine propulsion system for unmanned aircraft systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1680—Budget Item Relating to Establishment of Protocols for Joint Strike Fighter Lead-Free Electronics Components

This section would add $1.0 million to Research Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, Line 077, for development of protocols for the use of lead-free solder products and finished in the Joint Strike Fighter program, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1681—Budget Item Relating to Portable Helicopter Oxygen Delivery Systems

This section would add $3.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 084 for improvements to helicopter portable oxygen delivery systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1682—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research

This section would add $8.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for advanced rotorcraft flight research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1683—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology

This section would add $6,250,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 045 for the development of missile simulation technology, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1684—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology

This section would add $4.3 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 045 for development of base defense counter fire intercept systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1685—Budget Item Relating to Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs

This section would add $25.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 163 for Abrams tank engine technology insertion, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

The committee supports continued upgrades to the Army's fleet of M1 Abrams tanks. The Army has stated in multiple committee hearings that the M1 Abrams tank is expected to be in service through fiscal year 2045. As a result, the

committee believes that an aggressive upgrade program is necessary to keep the M1 Abrams tank fleet capable of defeating all possible threats. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on March 9 2011, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army stated that the M1 Abrams tank modernization activities are focused on increasing the space, weight, and power capabilities by specifically improving the power portion of the tank. The committee is concerned, however, that the Army's current incremental plans for M1 Abrams upgrades are not adequately funded to resolve the current space, weight, and power limitations, as the budget request for power improvements contained no funds. The committee understands that there is an engine technology insertion demonstration program and would replace the current axial compressors on existing M1 Abrams engines that would improve fuel efficiency, enhance reliability, and lower maintenance costs. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to address the space, weight, and power limitations on the M1 Abrams tank, specifically by implementing engine technology insertion upgrades that would improve fuel efficiency, enhance reliability, and lower maintenance costs.

Section 1686—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Advanced Technology

This section would add $5.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 029 for warfighter advanced technology for soldier protection modeling and simulation, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1687—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $2.5 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for the development and demonstration of autonomous cargo for rotorcraft unmanned aerial vehicles, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1688—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $7.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for common data link waveform improvements, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1689—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $2,300,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for aviation advanced technology to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1690—Budget Item Relating to Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness, and Safety

This section would add $5.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 153 for enhanced survivability and lethality system development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1691—Budget Item Relating to Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Wide, PE 63892C, Line 091 for Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1692—Budget Item Relating to Operationally Responsive Space

This section would add $20,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, PE 64857F, Line 053, for Operationally Responsive Space (ORS), to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1693—Budget Item Relating to Space Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, PE 602601F, Line 009, for Space Technology, Applied Research , to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1694—Budget Item Relating to Army Net Zero Programs

This section would add $8,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 065 for the Army net zero program to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1695—Budget Item Relating to an Offshore Range Environmental Baseline Assessment

This section would add $1,750,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 052 for an offshore range environmental baseline assessment to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1696—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects

This section would add $10,300,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 104 for Department of Defense corrosion protection projects to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1697—Budget Item Relating to a Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Applications in the Pacific Region

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 003 for a study of renewable and alternative energy applications in the Pacific region to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1698—Budget Item Relating to Alternative Energy for Mobile Power Applications

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 005 for alternative energy for mobile power applications to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Battery Technologies

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 016 for advanced battery technologies to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699A—Budget Item Relating to an Operational Energy Improvement Pilot Project

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 072 for an operational energy improvement pilot project to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699B—Budget Item Relating to a Microgrid Pilot Program

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 082a for a microgrid pilot program to be committed,

obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures

Section 1699C—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Surface Machinery Systems

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 047 for advanced surface machinery systems to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699D—Budget Item Relating to Base Camp Fuel Cells

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 052 for base camp fuel cells to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699E—Budget Item Relating to Defense Alternative Energy

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 047 for defense alternative energy to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699F—Budget Item Relating to Radiological Contamination Research

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 052 for radiological contamination research to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

SUBTITLE C—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Section 1699G—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention Program

This section would add $2,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Line 260 for Department of Defense corrosion prevention program to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699H—Budget Item Relating to Navy Emergency Management and Preparedness

This section would add $2,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Navy, Line X for Navy emergency management and preparedness to be committed, obligated,

or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699I—Budget Item Relating to Army Simulation Training Systems

This section would add $4,000,000 to Operation & Maintenance, Army Budget Activity 01, Force Readiness Operations Support, Line 070, for Army simulation training systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699J—Budget Item Relating to Army Industrial Facility Energy Monitoring

This section would add $2,380,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Army, Line 110 for Army industrial facility energy monitoring to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699K—Budget Item Relating to Army National Guard Simulation Training Systems

This section would add $2,000,000 to Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard Budget Activity 12, Land Forces Readiness, Line 070, for simulation training systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section1699L—Budgetary Amendment on Army Arsenals

This section would add $6,000,000 to Operation & Maintenance, Army Budget Activity 04, Administration and Service-wide Activities, Line 370, for arsenal capital improvements, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699M—Budget Item Relating to Cold Weather Protective Equipment

This section would add $3,000,000 to Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Special Operations Command for cold weather protective equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

# DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

## PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction, family housing, and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2012. As recommended by the committee, division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $14,766,026,000 for construction in support of the active forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2012.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $12,489,382,000 for military construction, $582,319,000 for Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities, and $1,694,346,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $12,489,361,000 for military construction, $582,319,000 for BRAC activities, and $1,694,346,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2012.

### Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012."

### Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to Be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVI shall expire on October 1, 2014, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

### Section 2003—Limitation on Implementation of Projects Designated as Various Locations

This section would provide that the authorizations of appropriations provided in sections 2104, 2204, 2304, 2403, 2411, 2502, 2606, and 2703 shall be available for the programs specified in the table provided in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

### Section 2004—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI and XXVII of this Act take effect on October 1, 2011, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

# TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,235,991,000 for Army military construction and $681,755,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $3,305,991,000 for military construction and $681,755,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2010.

### Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2012.

### Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize appropriations for Army military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

### Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110-417) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct a loading dock consistent with the Army's construction guidelines for Multipurpose Training Ranges. This provision was included in the President's request.

### Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2107—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project Using Prior-Year Unobligated Army Military Construction Funds

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct a water treatment facility for Fort Irwin, California, in the amount of $115,000,000 using unobligated prior-year Army military construction funds. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2109—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2110—Technical Amendments to Correct Certain Project Specifications

This section would make certain technical corrections to project descriptions included in table 3002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383). This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2111—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Army military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

# TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $2,461,547,000 for Navy military construction and $468,835,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $2,491,547,000 for military construction and $468,835,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $14,998,000 for the Massey Avenue Corridor Improvements and $15,000,000 in Planning and Design for construction activities at Naval Station Mayport, Florida.

The budget request included $14,998,000 to construct road improvements at Naval Station Mayport, Florida, and $15,000,000 to support planning and design efforts to facilitate the homeporting of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has located a variety of strategic assets at one homeport for many years across the range of Navy assets to include aviation, surface, and subsurface combatants. Furthermore, the committee notes that the Department of the Navy has intentionally rejected the notion of strategic homeporting and has closed multiple locations that were deemed strategic homeports through the Base Realignment and Closure process. The committee believes that the Department of the Navy's assertion that strategic homeporting is required to maintain strategic access is inconsistent with previous naval decisions. As to costs, the onetime construction costs to implement the Department of the Navy's recommendation exceeds $500.0 million, and the recurring costs include a requirement to temporarily relocate nuclear capable shipyard workers from Norfolk, Virginia, to Mayport, Florida, to complete nuclear maintenance requirements. The committee believes that the overall costs to build a redundant carrier homeport do not appear to be in the Government's best interest.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $29,998,000, for this project.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2012.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2012.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize appropriations for Navy military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act. Finally, this section would restrict the expenditures of planning and design appropriations to support the establishment of a homeport for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier at Naval Station Mayport, Florida.

Section 2205—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2207—Additional Budget Items Relating to Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Navy military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

# TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,364,858,000 for Air Force military construction and $489,565,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $1,330,858,000 for military construction and $489,565,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $64,000,000 for Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar at Joint Region Marianas, Guam.

The budget request included $128,000,000 and would provide the first increment to construct a fuel systems maintenance hangar required to support a Continuous Bomber Presence, a Tanker Task Force, Theater Security Packages, and the Global Hawk beddown.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $64,000,000, a reduction of $64,000,000, to support this project.

(2) $30,000,000 for Technical Applications Center, Increment 2, at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida.

The budget request included $79,000,000 and would provide the second increment to construct a Technical Applications Center.

The committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $49,000,000, a reduction of $30,000,000, to support this project.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2012.

### Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2012.

### Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize appropriations for Air Force military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

### Section 2305—Modification of Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111-84) and authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications. This provision was included in the President's request.

### Section 2306—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

### Section 2307—Limitation on Implementation of Consolidation of Air and Space Operations Center of the Air Force

This section would prohibit the disestablishment, closure, or realignment of any element of the Air and Space Operations Center until the Secretary of the Air Force, in conjunction with the commanders of the combatant commands, provides a

notice to the congressional defense committees that include a cost-benefit assessment and the strategic consequences of the proposed disestablishment, closure, or realignment. This notice shall also include a local economic assessment and a description of the continuity of operations for the proposed disestablishment, closure, or realignment.

### Section 2308—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Air Force military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

## TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,848,757,000 for defense agency military construction and $54,191,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $3,705,457,000 for military construction and $54,191,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

The budget request also contained $75,312,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of $75,312,000 for chemical demilitarization construction for fiscal year 2012.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $50,000,000 for the Hospital Replacement, Increment 3, at Fort Bliss, Texas.

The budget request included $136,700,000 and would provide the third increment to construct an Army Medical Center.

The committee continues to support the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $86,700,000, a reduction of $50,000,000, to support this project.

(2) $70,000,000 for the Mountainview Operations Facility at Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado.

The budget request included $140,932,000 to construct an Operations Building to support an Aerospace Data Facility.

However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $70,932,000, a reduction of $70,000,000, to support this project.

(3) $73,300,000 for the Ambulatory Care Center, at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland.

The budget request included $242,900,000 and would construct an ambulatory care center.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $169,600,000, a reduction of $73,300,000, to support this project.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

#### Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

#### Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects and require that the Secretary of Defense reserve a portion of the amount for energy conservation projects for Reserve Components.

#### Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Agencies military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

### Section 2404—Additional Budget Items Relating to Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize defense agencies military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

## SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

### Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Demilitarization construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

# TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $272,611,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $272,611,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2012.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this Act and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

### Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

# TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,230,306,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2012 of $1,307,585,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard.....$823,592,000
Air National Guard.....$133,525,000
Army Reserve..... $280,549,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.....$26,299,000
Air Force Reserve.....$43,620,000

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Explanation of Funding Adjustment

The committee recommends a reduction of funding for a project contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. This reduction includes:

(1) $12,721,000 for TFI – F-22 Combat Aircraft Parking Apron at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii.

The budget request included $12,721,000 and would construct an aircraft parking apron for twenty F-22 Aircraft.

The committee supports the requirements associated with this project but notes that other projects authorized for appropriation in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) will have a cascading impact on the timely construction of this project. The committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $12,721,000, to support this project.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

### SUBTITLE B—ADDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS

#### Section 2611—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Army National Guard military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

#### Section 2612—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Air National Guard military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

#### Section 2613—Additional Budget Item Relating to Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Air Force Reserve military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

### SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 2621—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

#### Section 2622—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

## TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $323,543,000 for activities related to prior Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities and $258,776,000 for activities related

to BRAC 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $323,543,000 for prior BRAC round activities and $258,776,000 for BRAC 2005 activities.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Base Realignment and Closure Community Recovery

The Base Realignment and Closure process has challenged many communities to determine a new direction because of a loss of military mission. Some of these former military installations have unique capabilities that are difficult to replicate in the private sector to include extensive Secure Compartmented Information Facilities (SCIFs) that support specific physical and infrastructure security requirements. Many of these communities also have an experienced labor force, complete with Department of Defense/Department of Homeland Security security clearances.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense may be able to utilize these specialized facilities and support the private sector in reusing these unique capabilities. To this end, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to use all of the available real estate conveyance mechanisms to quickly revert closed military installations into productive, viable business units that support the unique capabilities resident in these local communities. Using installations that have been impacted by Base Realignment and Closure as part of the DARPA program entitled "National Cyber Range" is a good example of how a community can establish new missions and capabilities while still providing a critical national security service. The committee believes that leases in furtherance of conveyance and economic development conveyances represent ideal real estate mechanisms to quickly put closing military installations into the private sector. These conveyance mechanisms should allow communities to recover rapidly from the debilitating effects of Base Realignment and Closure.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990

This section would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of prior Base Realignment and Closure activities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

### Section 2702—Authorized Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2012 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions to support Base Realignment and Closure 2005 activities.

### Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2012 that are required to implement the decisions of the Base Closure and Realignment 2005 activities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

### Section 2704—Authority to Extend Deadline for Completion of Limited Number of Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations

This section would amend section 2904 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510) and provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to extend the completion of not more than seven recommendations provided by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission of 2005 for up to 1 year.

### Section 2705—Increased Emphasis on Evaluation of Costs and Benefits in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment

This section would amend section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, and require the secretary concerned to include a cost-benefit analysis of all proposed closures and realignments that exceed such thresholds. Finally, this section would restrict the secretary concerned ability to bypass overall thresholds of this section by reducing the workforce to a lower threshold and then realigning the remaining function.

### Section 2706—Special Considerations Related to Transportation Infrastructure in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment

This section would amend section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, and require the secretary concerned to include a transportation assessment of a proposed closure or realignment of civilian personnel that exceed certain thresholds.

## TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Homeporting in Europe

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is exploring the feasibility of homeporting U.S. Aegis ballistic missile defense (BMD) ships in Europe in support of the phased, adaptive approach for missile defense in Europe. The committee understands that such forward-basing of U.S. Aegis BMD ships in Europe may alleviate some force structure demands on the Aegis fleet by reducing their time in transit and providing closer proximity to Europe and the Middle East. Such a naval port in Europe would also further U.S. policy on international missile defense cooperation and burden sharing for the collective defense of Europe and the United States.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a notification to the congressional defense committees preceding the Department's announcement of a decision to homeport U.S. Aegis BMD ships in Europe. The notification should include, at a minimum: the proposed location; number of ships to be homeported in Europe; the implementation schedule and funding profile, including military construction; and a summary of any analysis of alternatives that supports the decision, including any cost-benefit analysis.

## Africa Command Basing Alternatives

The committee notes that a viable model exists to locate a geographic combatant command headquarters outside the respective area of responsibility and in the United States, as demonstrated by U.S. Central Command, U.S. Southern Command, and U.S. Pacific Command. The committee believes that this type of basing model is particularly relevant for U.S. Africa Command because of the sensitivities that many African nations may have with regard to a permanent U.S. combatant command on the African continent. The committee further notes that the Commander, U.S. Africa Command has reviewed alternative basing options in the United States to support mission requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2012, the conclusions of an alternative basing review. This report should include the following:

(1) An assessment of the cost-benefit associated with moving the U.S. Africa Command headquarters from its current location to the United States; and

(2) An assessment of the strategic risk associated with each basing alternative.

The committee urges the Secretary to conduct this basing review in an open and transparent manner consistent with the processes established for such a major review. The committee believes the headquarters of U.S. Africa Command should be located at an installation that provides the maximum military value to the realigned command and at the minimum cost required to implement the relocation.

## Army Housing Shortfall at Growth Installations

The committee understands the Army has identified a shortfall of housing at several Army installations as a result of base realignment and closure and other force structure changes. While local communities are working to respond to the increased demand for off-post housing, the committee is concerned that the lingering effects of the financial crisis have made it difficult for civilian developers to obtain construction financing to fulfill the Army's off-post housing requirements. The committee encourages the Army to examine existing authorities which permit the leasing of off-post housing.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide to the committee, no later than September 30, 2011, a report which identifies installations where a housing deficit exists. The report also should detail the efforts being taken by the Army to address unmet housing requirements, including the use of existing authorities.

Assessment of Improvements in Construction Techniques to Achieve Life-Cycle Cost-Effective Facilities

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense failed to submit the report "Assessment of Improvements in Construction Techniques to Achieve Life-Cycle Cost Effective Facilities" directed by the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 by March 1, 2011. The committee believes that the Secretary has allowed disparate construction methods to be incorporated into the military construction program that reduce the committee's ability to determine whether life-cycle, cost-effective facilities are being proposed by the Secretary. Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary expedite the completion of this critical report to maximize efficiencies in the military construction portfolio by identifying the appropriate, qualified entity to conduct the assessment directed by committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and submit the report to the congressional defense committees by November 1, 2011.

Castner Range Complex

The committee understands that the Department of Defense ceased operations at the Castner Range Complex at Fort Bliss, Texas, in 1971. In testimony, the Army indicated that Castner Range is "wholly impractical to use for any range activity." The committee is interested in maintaining this land for a conservation purpose. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of the Army to assess whether the Castner Range Complex should be retained in the Department's inventory and encourages the Department to enter into a lease or other agreement in furtherance of conveyance with eligible conservation entities.

Collateral Support for Infrastructure and Real Property Programs

The committee is aware that Department of Defense relies extensively on consultants and contractors to support various Department infrastructure initiatives and real estate transactions involving programs such as housing, lodging, and utility privatization programs; real property exchanges; enhanced use leasing; and various other public-private partnerships involving real property. In particular, as the complexity of such initiatives and transactions has increased over the past several years, so too has the Department's use of consultants, contractors, and other experts to help ensure that prudent real property decisions are made to provide the best capabilities and economic outcomes to the Department.

The committee recognizes and supports the Department's efforts to obtain certain economies and achieve other objectives through the various infrastructure and real property initiatives and programs. However, regardless of whether Government employees or consultants and contractors are used to negotiate and implement deals to support the various public-private partnerships and alternatively financed projects, the Government's interests must be well represented from start to finish. As such, the committee is concerned about the preparedness of the Department's employees for negotiating and implementing such deals, the use and cost of consultant and contractor support participation in these arrangements, and the Department's monitoring and oversight of such consultant and contractor involvement. Moreover, the acquisition, management, and disposal of real property and related programs may involve inherently governmental functions, raising questions about whether they should be performed by qualified government employees.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department's use of consultants and contractors to support infrastructure and real property programs, including negotiations for alternatively financed projects, and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2012. At a minimum, the review should assess the following:

(1) To what extent and at what cost has the Department used consultants and contractors to assist in negotiating and implementing the various infrastructure and real property programs?

(2) How does the Department determine the level of involvement of consultants and contractors in support of negotiations for various real estate deals and alternatively financed projects, or in the management of the Department's real property programs?

(3) To what extent does the Department's oversight and monitoring of consultant and contractor support in these areas ensure that the level of support is appropriate, expected results are realized, and costs are minimized?

(4) How has the Department ensured that Government employees are sufficiently trained to successfully negotiate and implement the various

infrastructure and real property programs as well as oversee related support provided by consultants and contractors?

The Comptroller General may add such additional questions as he deems relevant.

Comptroller General Report regarding Third-Party Financing for Renewable Energy Projects on Military Installations

In order for the Department of Defense to achieve energy security and reduce energy consumption in accordance with federal laws and executive orders, it has identified mechanisms to partner with industry for third-party financing for the development of renewable energy projects. These include agreements with private-sector entities through Enhanced Use Leases, Energy Savings Performance Contracts, Power Purchase Agreements, and Utility Energy Service Contracts that leverage private investment in developing renewable energy projects and purchasing energy.

These agreements can be of great benefit to the Department of Defense. However, the committee is concerned that Department of Defense project-level officials may not have the necessary information to develop the best possible contracts that most effectively leverage a variety of factors including resource potential, federal and state incentives, payback periods, state regulations, and other regulatory considerations. For the Department of Defense to be successful in its renewable energy partnerships with the private sector, it is critical that Department officials have adequate energy-related technical and contracting expertise. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 29, 2012. At a minimum, the review should assess the following:

(1) What kinds of funding approaches, such as full up-front appropriated funds and alternative financing approaches, are used by the Department of Defense to enable the construction of renewable energy projects and purchase of such energy?

(2) What are some of the benefits and risks, including cost implications, of the funding approaches used by the Department of Defense in renewable energy projects and purchases?

(3) To what extent has the Department of Defense used each of the funding approaches identified in the first question?

(4) To what extent have oversight mechanisms been developed by the Department of Defense or the military services to monitor the use of these funding approaches and ensure the best value and terms?

The Comptroller General may add such additional questions as he deems appropriate in furtherance of this directive to ensure adequate coverage of the issues related to renewable energy contracting actions.

## Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense's Report on the Arctic and Northwest Passage

The committee continues to be concerned about the Department of Defense's resources and preparedness for accessing, operating and protecting national interests in the Arctic. With approximately 20 percent of the world's untapped natural resources located in that region, there are significant national security equities. The Navy estimates that by 2030, shipping lanes will be open for several months during the summer thereby increasing shipping traffic.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on Arctic operations and the Northwest Passage to the congressional defense committees by May 30, 2011. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a copy of the report to the Comptroller General of the United States concurrent with submission to the congressional defense committees. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment of the report to the congressional defense committees including the Secretary's response to the requirements in H. Rept. 111-491, any shortfalls noted, recommendations for legislative action, and any information the Comptroller General deems appropriate in the context of that review, within 180 days after the Secretary's submission.

## Construction Unit Costs

The committee notes that the Department recently completed an assessment of construction unit costs and determined that there is a multitude of construction variables that challenge the Department to provide competitive construction costs with comparable type facilities in the commercial sector. These challenges include requirements that drive the overall costs to include Federal contracting requirements (including Davis-Bacon wages, Federal subcontracting and small-business goals, bonding requirements per the Miller Act), Federal design requirements (including Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection measures), energy efficiency objectives, and a robust quality-assurance capacity to manage construction contracts. The committee is alarmed to note that these costs generally add 25-40 percent in construction costs above private-sector construction requirements. The committee believes that these substantive markups are excessive and limit the purchasing ability of the Department to procure vital military construction projects. The committee also believes that it is incumbent on the Department to minimize barriers to competition and ensure the widest participation of construction contractors to military construction programs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to complete a report by March 1, 2012 to the congressional defense committees and should include the following:

(1) An assessment of the programs or policies and the associated costs that contribute to the overall military construction program beyond those costs associated with typical construction projects in the private sector. This review should also include an assessment of specific facility categories to include, at a minimum, child care centers, chapels, dependent schools, and dormitories;
(2) An assessment of the programs and policies and their associated costs that contribute to variances between the Secretaries of the military department's unit costs. This assessment should specifically include variances in the development of military construction justification documents and overall approaches to construction methods to include concrete and wood type construction practices; and
(3) The Secretary's plan of action and milestones to reduce these costs, consistent with the life-cycle, cost-effective assessment as defined by section 2802 of title 10, United States Code.

Cooperative Agreements to Facilitate Defense Posture Review Initiatives

The Defense Posture Review Initiative includes the realignment of military forces in Japan, along with the realignment of Marines from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. This effort is one of the most extensive realignments of military forces in recent memory.

The committee recognizes the impacts on Guam associated with the strategic realignment of military forces from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam and recognizes that non-governmental organizations, including institutes of higher learning, have provided analysis and research into a variety of environmental and socioeconomic impacts for other projects on Guam and in the Western Pacific region. The committee acknowledges that the Department of Defense has entered into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher learning to provide baseline studies and analyses will be needed to facilitate additional assessments on the location of a proposed firing range and transient nuclear aircraft carrier berthing on Guam over the coming months and years.

The committee recommends that the Department of Defense (DOD) enter into a cooperative agreement to help facilitate further Environmental Impact processes associated with the Defense Posture Review Initiative in the Asia-Pacific region. As such, the committee urges the Department of Defense take all necessary steps pursuant and consistent with DOD directive 3210.6-R, "Department of Defense Grant and Agreement Regulations" and establish a cooperative agreement with appropriate non-governmental organizations, including qualified institutions of learning, to facilitate better studies and analyses to support the Defense Policy Review Initiatives.

Corrosion Evaluation for Facilities and Infrastructure

Because the costs associated with facilities and infrastructure account for a significant portion of the Department of Defense's $22.5 billion annual cost to address the impact of corrosion, the committee believes that there may be more cost-efficient opportunities for developing strategies for enhancing the sustainability of existing facilities as well as for ensuring the integration of corrosion prevention and mitigation technologies into the buildup of future facilities. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (as designated by section 2228 of title 10, United States Code) to conduct a study of these costs and to submit the findings to the House Committee on Armed Services a report within 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The study should include the following:

(1) Identify the key drivers of these costs and recommend strategies for reducing their impact.
(2) Review a sampling of facilities that are representative of facility type, military department, and facility age.
(3) An assessment of at least one planned facility construction program.
(4) Include, but not limited to, information obtained from site visits and the examination of program documentation including maintenance and facility engineering processes.

The Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight is further directed to consult with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to determine the appropriate level of access necessary to conduct an effective and comprehensive evaluation. Lastly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees of the completeness of the evaluation within 60 days of the delivery of the Director's report to the congressional defense committees.

Department of Defense Microgrid Activities

The committee is concerned about the implications and potential consequences of a failure in the public grid and the impact on military installations. However, the committee recognizes that the Department of Defense is taking steps to invest in microgrid and smart grid technologies for installation and operational energy. The committee is concerned that there may be redundancy among these investments. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 29, 2012, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of the total investment being made into Department of Defense microgrid and smart grid activities, including total value, location, duration of project, and transition plan;
(2) An assessment of activities being pursued collaboratively with the Department of Energy to advance microgrids; and

(3) An assessment of policy initiatives and oversight of microgrid and smart grid activities by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Operational Energy Plans, and Programs to streamline investments for the purposes of installation energy and operational energy.

Elementary and Secondary Schools on Military Installations

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has undertaken an assessment of the conditions and capacity of elementary and secondary schools located on military installations that serve children of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees. Furthermore, the committee is aware of preliminary reports that many of these schools face capacity or structural deficiencies. The committee is concerned by these reports and the adverse impact that the substandard capacity and structural conditions may have on the quality of life for military families.

The committee notes that one of the results of this assessment is a $439 million capital investment into the Department of Defense Education Activity for Department of Defense-owned schools in fiscal year 2011. These appropriations will be applied to address some of the structural and quantity deficiencies that exist in the education enterprise. The committee also notes that there is another category of elementary and secondary schools located on military installations; these schools are operated by a Local Education Authority but owned by the Federal Government. For this category of schools, the committee notes that $250 million in fiscal year 2011 defense appropriations were applied toward the recapitalization of existing, structurally deficient elementary and secondary schools.

The committee encourages the prompt disbursement of funds made available in fiscal year 2011 to construct, renovate, repair, or expand educational facilities on military installations in order to address identified capacity or structural deficiencies. For those funds to support a Local Education Authority-operated school but owned by the Federal Government, the committee urges the Department to disburse these funds in a manner that gives priority to schools with the most serious deficiencies as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

Energy and Water Utilities Privatization

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should more aggressively and effectively implement utilities privatization as part of their asset management strategy to allow each military service to focus on core defense missions and functions. The committee further believes that the use of utilities privatization can improve energy and water efficiencies and improve installation infrastructure in a cost effective manner for the long-term benefit of our military members and their families. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of

Defense to submit a report by February 1, 2012, to the congressional defense committees that includes the following:

(1) An update of the report elements included in section 2823(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163); and

(2) An assessment of whether it would be beneficial to leverage utilities privatization as part of agency initiatives to increase use of renewable energy and conserve water.

Fort Bragg Parking Assessment

The committee notes that Fort Bragg has significantly increased the overall base population and this population increase has had a cascading impact on the overall transportation infrastructure on the installation. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2012, that assesses the parking requirements to support the entirety of Fort Bragg's personnel to include all civilian employees and family members. The report should address the significant increase in daily vehicular traffic through Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and surrounding communities not only due to Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities but to the entirety of Fort Bragg's force structure increases as well. At a minimum, this report should include:

(1) The projected number of military and civilian personnel that require parking to support activities on Fort Bragg;

(2) The current parking available;

(3) The parking plan to accommodate the increased number of personnel caused by the BRAC realignment, and the distances that service members have to travel via their personal transportation or military vehicles to conduct day-to-day activities such as vehicular maintenance; and

(4) Options to address the entirety of Fort Bragg's parking deficiencies that could include parking garages or other public transportation mitigation measures.

Homeowners Assistance Program

The Department of Defense's Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP) has provided financial assistance to military personnel and Department of Defense civilians who suffer financial loss on the sale of their home when a base realignment or closure action causes a decline in the local real estate market. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-16) expanded the program to assist additional categories of people, including those who are wounded, injured, or become ill while deployed, the surviving spouses of military personnel and civilians who are killed in the line of duty, and service members who purchased

property before July 1, 2006, and were required to permanently relocate between February 1, 2006, and September 30, 2010.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is assessing the magnitude of a potential shortfall in existing resources and is currently projecting a $400.0 million deficit in the expanded Homeowners Assistance Program. This deficit could begin to impact eligible beneficiaries by the end of the current fiscal year and has the potential to impact more than 3,000 beneficiaries. The Department of Defense briefed the committee on its intent to address this deficit issue in its fiscal year 2013 budget submission. Furthermore, even if the program were fully funded, the committee is concerned that while the average time to process a complete application is 60 days, the committee understands that a number of applicants have seen delays of up to 1 year. Finally, the committee is concerned that the eligibility dates that were provided in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-16) have excluded certain localities whose real estate markets declined after July 1, 2006, and service members who receive permanent change of station orders within those localities, after September 30, 2010.

The committee is concerned that the compilation of these issues will have a cascading impact on thousands of beneficiaries who linger in potential foreclosure and bankruptcy because of the inability of the Department of Defense to adequately forecast required investments or to promptly process a completed application. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a brief to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2011, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of the overall military construction program with a goal to eliminate unnecessary programmatic investments and apply savings toward the potential deficit in the Homeowners Assistance Program; and
(2) An assessment on methods to improve the efficiency of processing applications as well to include hiring, on a temporary basis, additional staff to assist with the current backlog of claims that has resulted due to the increased volume of applications made under the expanded criteria provided by the Homeowners Assistance Program as expanded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; and
(3) An assessment of large military installations, whose local real estate market declined after July 1, 2006, and options that could be pursued at these large military installations, to include the associated cost impact, that would ameliorate the impact of the declining real estate market.

## Leasing of Military Museums

The committee notes that section 2812 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) provided expanded authority to retain proceeds generated from leases of non-excess military museum

property by the military museum that developed such proceeds. The committee supports the utilization of leasing agreements to expand the use of military museums for the generation of revenue for these museums through the rental of facilities to the public, commercial and non-profit entities, State and local governments, and other Federal agencies. The committee encourages the Department to expand the use of this authority and pursue such opportunities without additional specific, per-facility authorization for such activities.

Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range

The committee notes that the San Diego Shotgun Sports Association has operated a trap and skeet range on Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California since 1957, providing free recreational shooting for active duty military personnel and their families for more than 50 years and strengthening the bond between the residents of the community and the United States Marine Corps. The committee understands that operation of the trap and skeet range has ceased while environmental mitigation and cleanup measures are conducted.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2011 that includes the following:

(1) Details of a plan to make adjustments to the range property and reopen the trap and skeet range for operation without affecting the environmental sensitive area containing lead shot;
(2) Plans and timeline to reopen the trap and skeet range;
(3) Other locations available on the base where a trap and skeet range could be operated;
(4) Criteria needed to operate a trap and skeet range while properly meeting necessary environmental laws through a Lead Management Plan (LMP);
(5) Possible revenue collected through implementing a lead mining operation on the trap and skeet range guided by a certified LMP;
(6) Details of all environmental clean-up measures necessary to reopen the trap and skeet range;
(7) A copy of the environmental assessment that was completed for the trap and skeet range including documentation detailing the imminent danger and hazard of lead contamination in the local water source directly linked to the lead shot from the trap and skeet range.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

#### Section 2801—Prohibition on Use of Any Cost-Plus System of Contracting for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Projects

This section would amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, and prohibit the use of cost-type contracting for military construction projects and military family housing projects. Such prohibition will not apply in case of a declaration of war or the declaration by the President of a national emergency pursuant to section 1621 of title 50, United States Code.

#### Section 2802—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction Projects

This section would increase the authority provided by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, and establish a $3,000,000 threshold requiring specific military construction authorization. This provision would also amend section 2805 by extending certain temporary authorities associated with defense laboratories.

#### Section 2803—Condition on Rental of Family Housing in Foreign Countries for General and Flag Officers

This section would amend section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, and limit general and flag officer housing leases in foreign countries to the design criteria for similar housing in the United States.

#### Section 2804—Protections for Suppliers of Labor and Materials under Contracts for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects

This section would amend section 2852 of title 10, United States Code, and increase the performance and payment threshold requirements for construction contracts from $100,000 to $150,000. This change would align performance and payment bonding requirements with the recently revised simplified acquisition threshold.

#### Section 2805—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects inside United States Central Command Area of Responsibility and Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa Areas of Responsibility and Interest

This section would amend section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108-136) and extend the Department's ability to use operation and maintenance appropriations for military construction purposes for the U.S. Central Command and Horn of Africa area until September 30, 2012.

## SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

### Section 2811—Clarification of Authority to Use Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund for Minor Construction and Alteration Activities at Pentagon Reservation

This section would provide unspecified minor construction authority, at the limits prescribed by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, for the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund.

### Section 2812—Removal of Discretion of Secretaries of the Military Departments Regarding Purposes for which Easements for Rights-of-Way May Be Granted

This section would amend section 2668 of title 10, United States Code, and prohibit the use of a real estate easement as a method to bypass other real estate authorities. The committee is aware that certain leasing proposals for energy projects have used authority provided by section 2668 of title 10, United States Code, as an expedited method to obtain a real estate lease. The committee believes that the authorities provided by section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, provide the appropriate framework that allows the secretary concerned to manage Government properties and to evaluate leasing proposals.

### Section 2813—Limitations on Use or Development of Property in Clear Zone Areas

This section would modify section 2684(a) of title 10, United States Code, to permit the use of the readiness and environmental protection initiative authority to protect clear zone areas from use of encroachment that is incompatible with the mission of the installation.

### Section 2814—Defense Access Road Program Enhancements to Address Transportation Infrastructure in Vicinity of Military Installations

This section would amend section 210 of title 23, United States Code, and expand the authority of the Department of Defense to use military construction appropriations to mitigate significant transportation impacts caused as a result of an expanded defense mission. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to convene the Economic Adjustment Committee to consider sources of

funding associated with the defense access roads program. Finally, this section would require a separate budget exhibit for the defense access roads program.

## SUBTITLE C—ENERGY SECURITY

### Section 2821—Consolidation of Definitions Used in Energy Security Chapter

This section would modify subchapter 3 of chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, and create a new chapter 2924 to consolidate energy security definitions.

### Section 2822—Consideration of Energy Security in Developing Energy Projects on Military Installations Using Renewable Energy Sources

This section would amend sections 2911, 2917 and 2922a, of title 10, United States Code, to account for energy security when entering into facility energy projects financed by third parties using renewable energy sources on military installations.

The committee is concerned when the Department of Defense contracts for renewable energy projects through third parties on military installations that have no capability to provide power directly to the installation in case of emergency.

### Section 2823—Establishment of Interim Objective for Department of Defense 2025 Renewable Energy Goal

This section would modify section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to establish an interim goal for fiscal year 2018 for the production or procurement of facility energy from renewable sources.

### Section 2824—Use of Centralized Purchasing Agents for Renewable Energy Certificates to Reduce Cost of Facility Energy Projects Using Renewable Energy Sources and Improve Efficiencies

This section would amend section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy requiring centralized, bulk purchase of replacement renewable energy certificates when entering into agreements for facility energy projects involving renewable technologies to maximize savings for the Department of Defense. This will help the Department of Defense achieve the goal regarding the consumption of electricity from renewable energy sources established by section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

### Section 2825—Identification of Energy-Efficient Products for Use in Construction, Repair, or Renovation of Department of Defense Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, to prescribe a list of energy-efficient products for use in construction, repair, or renovation of Department of Defense facilities. The list would be updated annually and submitted with the annual Energy Performance Master Plan. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider at a minimum the following technologies in developing the list:

(1) Roof-top solar thermal, photovoltaic, direct solar technology, and energy reducing coating technologies;
(2) On demand solar and tank-less hot water systems;
(3) Energy management control and supervisory control and data acquisition systems;
(4) Energy-efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems;
(5) Thermal windows and insulation systems;
(6) Electric meters;
(7) Lighting, equipment, and appliances that are designed to use less electricity;
(8) Hybrid vehicle plug-in charging and hydrogen-generating fuel stations;
(9) Solar-power collecting structures to shade vehicle parking areas;
(10) Wall and roof insulation systems and air infiltration mitigation systems, such as weather-proofing;
(11) Fuel cells;
(12) Hydrogen; and
(13) Ground source and natural gas heat pumps and combined heat and power systems.

Section 2826—Core Curriculum and Certification Standards for Department of Defense Energy Managers

This section would amend section 2915 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of Defense to establish a training program for Department of Defense installation energy managers. The requirement for federal energy managers is defined by section 8253 of title 42, United States Code. The committee encourages the Department to consider industry accreditations in the development of its training and certification of energy managers. The committee recommends that at a minimum, the Secretary of Defense create annual opportunities for energy managers to exchange ideas and lessons learned.

Section 2827—Submission of Annual Department of Defense Energy Management Reports

This section would amend section 2925 of title 10, United States Code, and require the Department of Defense to submit its installation energy management report within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year.

Section 2828—Continuous Commissioning of Department of Defense Facilities to Resolve Operating Problems, Improve Comfort, Optimize Energy Use, and Identify Retrofits

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include continuous commissioning in its requirements to execute section 8253 of title 42, United States Code. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to modify the plan prepared pursuant to section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code, to reflect the requirement to include continuous commissioning under subsection (a). The committee expects the Department of Defense to protect its facility energy investments by conducting continuous commissioning to ensure it facilities operate at optimum energy efficiency.

Section 2829—Requirement for Department of Defense to Capture and Track Data Generated in Metering Department Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to capture and track the data that is being metered in accordance with section 8253 of title 42, United States Code. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to modify his plan prepared pursuant to section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code for the Department of Defense to reflect the requirement to capture and benchmark data that has been metered. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has made significant investments to meter its facilities but is not pursuing technologies to capture the data from the meters across its facilities.

Section 2830—Metering of Navy Piers to Accurately Measure Energy Consumption

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to modify the Navy's plan for implementing section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code to include a metering requirement for Navy piers, in addition to its buildings to ensure energy consumption can be tracked, captured, and reduced while naval vessels are in port. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to modify his plan prepared pursuant to section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code, as necessary to reflect the inclusion of Navy piers under subsection (a).

Section 2831—Report on Energy-Efficiency Standards and Prohibition on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Gold or Platinum Certification

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services regarding a cost benefit analysis of Department of Defense investments in American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers standards and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)

certifications. This section would also prohibit the use of funds for LEED gold or platinum certifications in fiscal year 2012. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is investing significant amounts of funds for more aggressive certifications without demonstrating the appropriate return on investment.

## SUBTITLE D—PROVISIONS RELATED TO GUAM REALIGNMENT

### Section 2841—Use of Operation and Maintenance Funding to Support Community Adjustments Related to Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to assist the Government of Guam in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities associated with the realignment of military forces to Guam. This authorization would be provided if the Secretary determines that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by the Government of Guam to provide the services and facilities in the absence of the Secretary's assistance. This authority would expire on September 30, 2018.

### Section 2842—Medical Care Coverage for H-2B Temporary Workforce on Military Construction Projects on Guam

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from awarding any additional construction projects associated with the realignment of military forces to Guam until the Secretary establishes a lead system integrator for health care for the H-2B workers.

### Section 2843—Certification of Military Readiness Need for Firing Range on Guam as Condition on Establishment of Range

This section would prohibit the establishment of a firing range on Guam until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the firing range is required to meet a national security need.

### Section 2844—Repeal of Condition on Use of Specific Utility Conveyance Authority regarding Guam Integrated Water and Wastewater Treatment System

This section would modify section 2822 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383) and modify the permissive utility conveyance to the Guam Waterworks Authority. Specifically, this section would eliminate the requirement to allocate representation on the Guam Consolidated Commission on Utilities for the Department of the Navy.

## SUBTITLE E—LAND CONVEYANCES

### Section 2851—Land Exchange, Fort Bliss Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange approximately 694 acres of real property at Fort Bliss, Texas, for approximately 2,880 acres of real property from the Texas General Land Office.

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 2861—Change in Name of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces to the Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy

This section would change the name of the "Industrial College of the Armed Forces" to the "Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy".

### Section 2862—Limitation on Reduction in Number of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Permanent Duty at a Military Installation to Effectuate Realignment of Installation

This section would limit the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned from reducing more that 1,000 military service members at a military installation until a notice is provided by the Secretary as to the rationale for such reduction and a period of 90 days expires.

### Section 2863—Prohibition on Naming Department of Defense Real Property after a Member of Congress

This section would amend section 2661 of title 10, United States Code, and prohibit the naming of Department of Defense real property after any individual, who is a Member of Congress, at the time the property is so named.

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

## TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $18.1 billion for atomic energy defense activities, an increase of 2.1 percent from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. Of this amount, $11.8 billion is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and $6.3 billion is for environmental and other defense activities.

For NNSA programs, the budget request contained an increase of $568.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. This amount includes a $620.9 million increase for the Weapons Activities account, which supports the management and stewardship of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and a $137.7 million decrease for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account. The budget request for the Defense Environmental Cleanup account contained a decrease of $181.3 million from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The committee supports these requests and believes that the budget request for Department of Energy National Security Programs for fiscal year 2012 reflects an appropriately balanced approach to meeting the diverse missions encompassed within the atomic energy defense activities account.

The committee recommends $18.1 billion, the amount of the budget request.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

##### Overview

The budget request contained $11.8 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends $11.8 billion, the amount of the budget request.

##### Nuclear Modernization

The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is framed by several noteworthy events and key policy and posture documents released in the last few years.

The President's vision for "a world without nuclear weapons," which he outlined in an April 2009 speech in Prague, Czech Republic, along with his emphasis on arms control, changes in U.S. nuclear policy and posture, and direction to review further U.S. nuclear force reductions, has led to a renewed focus within the executive and legislative branches on nuclear security matters.

The bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, established by section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), prefaced its May 2009 final report by stating that, "The conditions that might make possible the global elimination of nuclear weapons are not present today and their creation would require a fundamental transformation of the world political order." The committee agrees and, elsewhere in this Act, recommends a sense of Congress that further reductions should be supported by thorough assessments and guided by specific criteria.

Furthermore, while the Commission advised against substantial unilateral U.S. nuclear force reductions, it did conclude that U.S. reliance on reserve warheads could be reduced so long as the nuclear infrastructure was refurbished. To this point, the Commission found that, "the physical infrastructure is in serious need of transformation… but [NNSA] lacks the needed funding," and that, "the intellectual infrastructure is in more serious trouble."

The Commission further observed that the "United States requires a stockpile of nuclear weapons that is safe, secure, and reliable, and whose threatened use in military conflict would be credible." However, the Commission went on to state that, "maintaining the reliability of the warheads as they age is an increasing challenge," and that the life extension program (LEP) "is becoming increasingly difficult to continue within the constraints of a rigid adherence to original materials and design as the stockpile continues to age." The three directors of the nation's nuclear weapons laboratories have registered similar concerns in correspondence with the committee to address an unclassified finding in a JASON study which found that "no evidence that accumulation of changes incurred from aging and LEPs have increased risk to certification of today's deployed nuclear warheads." One lab director noted that, "Thus far we have been able to retain confidence in warhead safety and reliability by offsetting these increased uncertainties with corresponding increases in performance margins… or by relaxing and eliminating (in coordination with the Department of Defense) military requirements. Options to further improve these margins using techniques similar to those employed to date have largely been exhausted."

Addressing these concerns, and in the context of the ratification of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), the President made a significant commitment to the modernization of the nation's nuclear stockpile and infrastructure.

The April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review called for making much-needed investments to rebuild the nation's aging nuclear infrastructure, maintaining that a credible modernization plan would "enable further arms reductions."

The May 2010 NNSA Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan provides further detail on NNSA modernization plans, to include plans for stockpile stewardship, life extension programs, facility upgrades and construction, and sustainment of science, technology, and engineering capabilities to ensure the nuclear stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear explosive testing. It also describes specific modernization milestones and baseline capabilities that must be established, such as a capacity to manufacture up to 80 pits and 80 canned subassemblies per year and fabricate up to 500 high explosive hemispheres per year, that will "enable further reductions in the stockpile over time."

The Secretary of Defense committed to transferring over $8.0 billion from the Department of Defense to NNSA in fiscal years 2013 through 2016 to support nuclear modernization. Similarly, a May 2010 report to Congress on nuclear force structure and modernization plans, which was required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) ("Section 1251 Report"), noted a nearly 10-percent increase in the President's fiscal year 2011 budget request for stockpile sustainment and infrastructure over the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level. In a November 2010 update to the Section 1251 Report, the President committed to an additional nine-percent increase in his fiscal year 2012 budget request for NNSA weapons activities over the fiscal year 2011 requested level, and a total increase of $4.1 billion across the Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP) over the fiscal year 2011 FYNSP.

The updated Section 1251 Report noted that, "Given the extremely tight budget environment facing the federal government, these requests to the Congress demonstrate the priority the Administration places on maintaining the safety, security and effectiveness of the deterrent."

The committee commends this commitment and is encouraged by the fiscal year 2012 budget request for NNSA. On a bipartisan basis, the committee has expressed its support for nuclear modernization and the increased investments necessary to carry it out. The committee believes there is a direct linkage between such modernization and consideration of any further reductions. Members of the Senate have also made clear that their support for the nuclear force reductions in New START was directly linked to the modernization of NNSA's nuclear weapons facilities and the nuclear arsenal.

However, the committee also recognizes that continued progress on nuclear modernization requires the long-term commitment of both the executive and legislative branches of government. The committee acknowledges the demands that such significant investments will place on the nation's budget, particularly in challenging economic times, but it also knows that these crucial national security

activities cannot be deferred any longer without increasing the risk to the safety, security, and reliability of the nation's nuclear deterrent.

Lastly, the committee notes that the committee report accompanying the fiscal year 2012 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) states that the resolution seeks to "prioritiz[e] the nuclear modernization work of the National Nuclear Security Administration. This includes providing fiscal space for the modernization of the nuclear weapons complex and in connection with the implementation of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia." Consistent with this position, the committee reaffirms its belief that nuclear modernization is a national priority and elsewhere in this title recommends authorizing the full amount of the fiscal year 2012 request for NNSA.

Weapons Activities

The budget request contained $7.6 billion for the Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for fiscal year 2012, an increase of $620.9 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

In May 2009, the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States reported that the "Stockpile Stewardship Program and the Life Extension Program (LEP) have been remarkably successful in refurbishing and modernizing the stockpile." But at the same time, the Commission concluded that these strategies "cannot be counted on for the indefinite future." The Commission noted that the NNSA's "physical infrastructure is in serious need of transformation" and that the "intellectual infrastructure is also in trouble."

The JASON scientific advisory panel report from September 2009 noted: "All options for extending the life of the nuclear weapons stockpile rely on the continuing maintenance and renewal of expertise and capabilities in science, technology, engineering, and production unique to the nuclear weapons program." The JASON panel concluded that "this expertise is threatened by lack of program stability, perceived lack of mission importance, and degradation of the work environment."

In its April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), the Administration recognized these critical problems, saying, "In order to sustain a safe, secure, and effective U.S. nuclear stockpile as long as nuclear weapons exist, the United States must possess a modern physical infrastructure – comprised of the national security laboratories and a complex of supporting facilities – and a highly capable workforce with the specialized skills needed to sustain the nuclear deterrent." The NPR outlined several proposed investments to improve both the physical infrastructure and the human capital needed to sustain the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee is encouraged by these statements, and supports the vision for a reinvigorated nuclear security enterprise.

The committee welcomes the robust budget request for Weapons Activities for fiscal year 2012, which should enable NNSA to continue modernizing its physical

infrastructure and strengthening its human capital. However, the committee notes that these challenges can only be overcome through long-term program and budget stability. In its November 2010 update to the report required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), the President stated his plan to increase funding for Weapons Activities across the Future-Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP), from fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2016, by more than $4.1 billion beyond that planned in his original May 2010 report. However, the November 2010 update also stated that these FYNSP funding levels "are appropriately called 'projections'" and are "not a 'fixed in stone' judgment." The committee notes these caveats with concern, and encourages the President to sustain these critical investments in the nuclear security enterprise for future years.

The committee recommends $7.6 billion for Weapons Activities, the amount of the budget request.

*Stockpile Stewardship*

The committee views execution of the Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP) as the first component of the core national security mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The SSP utilizes data from previous nuclear explosive tests, unique experimental tools, advanced simulation and computing capabilities, and the world's foremost scientists, engineers, and technicians to assess and certify the safety, security, and reliability of our nuclear weapons without additional nuclear explosive testing. The SSP enables NNSA to better understand the science of how nuclear weapons work, predict and identify problems in the stockpile, and respond quickly to emerging threats.

In the past, the committee has expressed concern about NNSA's ability to fully utilize the new experimental capabilities that it has developed over the past decade. Such experiments are critical to the long-term management of the stockpile because specific areas of remaining uncertainty about the performance of our nuclear weapons can only be illuminated through scientific experiments using these capabilities. The committee believes the budget request for the SSP should be sufficient to properly utilize all experimental capabilities and to continue improving the nation's ability to certify the nuclear weapons stockpile without additional nuclear explosive testing.

*Stockpile Management*

The committee views execution of the Stockpile Management Program (SMP) as the second component of the core national security mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). Through the SMP, NNSA sustains the nuclear weapons stockpile and ensures our nuclear weapons are safe, secure, and reliable. Development and execution of the SMP was required by section 3113 of the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), which also prescribed objectives and limitations for the program.

The SMP includes surveillance of weapons and weapon components in the stockpile, non-nuclear testing, production and exchange of limited life components, dismantlement of retired weapons, and many other important activities. However, the key aspects of the SMP are the Life Extension Programs (LEPs), which seek to extend the life of existing weapon types while improving their safety and security. For fiscal year 2012, the budget request included the following objectives regarding LEPs: continuing the W76-1 LEP, producing enough W76-1 warheads to meet U.S. Navy requirements; initiating a B61-12 LEP, moving from the current feasibility study (phase 6.2/2A) into development engineering activities (phase 6.3); and continuing a life extension study for the W78 by beginning the phase 6.2/2A feasibility study, to include examining the feasibility of a common W78/W88 warhead.

The committee supports these activities, and encourages NNSA to consider the full spectrum of options for managing the nuclear weapons stockpile, as identified by the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States in their May 2009 report. The NNSA laboratories should thoroughly evaluate, on a case-by-case basis, all options for managing and extending the life of any particular weapon system.

Furthermore, the committee encourages NNSA to plan and execute the SMP such that the scientists, engineers, and technicians employed in all parts of the nuclear security enterprise are actively engaged in challenging work that continually utilizes their skill sets in meaningful ways. The committee also encourages NNSA to structure the SMP to ensure that no critical capabilities go unutilized for extended periods of time, and therefore atrophy.

*Directed Stockpile Work*

The budget request contained $2.0 billion for Directed Stockpile Work (DSW), an increase of $65.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. DSW includes a variety of activities related to stockpile management and stockpile stewardship, including life extension programs, stockpile system surveillance and maintenance, testing and experiments, component manufacturing, and weapons dismantlement and disposition.

The committee recommends $2.0 billion for Directed Stockpile Work, the amount of the budget request.

*B61 Phase 6.3 Life Extension Program*

The budget request contained $223.6 million for Directed Stockpile Work for the B61 Life Extension Program (LEP). This funding request is new, and would establish the B61 LEP as a full program.

The request would fund phase 6.3 development engineering activities for the B61 LEP, including: development of designs and maturation of technologies for various components; implementation of enhanced surety technologies; qualification and certification testing of components and systems; systems engineering for integrating the B61 with modern aircraft such as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter; and consolidation of several versions of the B61 (the B61-3, -4, and -7) into a single version (the B61-12). The committee understands that the Nuclear Weapons Council plans to meet at the end of 2011 to determine whether the B61 LEP is ready to enter phase 6.3.

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) expects to deliver the first production unit (FPU) of the B61-12 in fiscal year 2017. Due to prior delays, the NNSA is operating on a compressed schedule to meet the FPU timeline. The committee understands the importance of meeting the 2017 delivery date, and fully supports the B61 LEP. However, the committee is concerned about the scope of technology maturation planned for this program and the impact such activities may have on an already aggressive schedule. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that total costs for the program may grow as NNSA attempts to meet its 2017 FPU deadline. The committee will continue to conduct rigorous oversight of this important program, and expects the NNSA Administrator to keep the committee fully informed of any expected deviations from the schedule and baseline cost estimate, once such estimate is established.

*Science Campaign*

The budget request contained $405.9 million for the Science Campaign, an increase of $40.7 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. The Science Campaign is a critical component of stockpile stewardship, and provides the tools, experiments, and human capital needed to increase our knowledge of nuclear weapons science and assess and certify the safety, security, and reliability of the stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing. The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the Science Campaign will enable continued experiments to provide data for predictive computer models, enhance methodologies used for certification and assessment of margins and uncertainties, and meet various deliverables and milestones to support life extension program timelines.

The committee recommends $405.9 million for the Science Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

*Engineering Campaign*

The budget request contained $143.1 million for the Engineering Campaign, an increase of $1.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The Engineering Campaign provides the engineering basis, tools, and capabilities to assess and certify the stockpile throughout the lifecycle of nuclear

weapons. Engineering Campaign activities include development of options for improving safety and security of nuclear weapons in future life extension programs, development of tools for designing and qualifying weapons and weapon components in hostile environments, and development of advanced diagnostics for identifying and predicting component aging issues.

The committee recommends $143.1 million for the Engineering Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

*Readiness Campaign*

The budget request contained $142.5 million for the Readiness Campaign, an increase of $30.4 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. Readiness Campaign activities include the production of tritium for use in the nuclear weapons stockpile and the selection and maturation of production technologies for manufacturing components of nuclear weapons.

For fiscal year 2012, the budget request aligns all funding for the Readiness Campaign into two programs that focus on tritium production and non-nuclear component manufacturing technologies. The committee is concerned that, should life extension programs not proceed on the planned schedule, important activities formerly funded by the Readiness Campaign will be neglected and critical capabilities will atrophy. The committee encourages the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to ensure that such capabilities, such as the enhancement of production technologies for high explosives, receive appropriate attention.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee expressed concern that the NNSA had not identified effective technical solutions for increased tritium production nor viable alternative supplies. The committee notes that NNSA plans to increase its production of tritium in fiscal year 2012, but has still not resolved certain major technical challenges associated with tritium permeation in the production process. The committee is concerned by an October 2010 report by the Government Accountability Office that found that "NNSA currently meets the nuclear weapons stockpile requirements for tritium, but its ability to do so in the future is in doubt." To ensure required supplies of tritium remain available in the future, the committee supports the requested increase in funds for tritium production and associated research to resolve the ongoing technical challenges, and will continue to conduct vigorous oversight of NNSA's progress in this area.

The committee recommends $142.5 million for the Readiness Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

*Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign*

The budget request contained $476.3 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Ignition and High-Yield Campaign, a decrease of $5.3 million below the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

Activities in the ICF Ignition and High-Yield Campaign support development of enhanced understanding of high energy density environments, a critical aspect of nuclear explosions. ICF experiments conducted at a variety of facilities are used to inform and validate theoretical models used to assess and certify the stockpile without nuclear explosive testing.

Early in fiscal year 2012, the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory will attempt, for the first time, to demonstrate ignition in a laboratory environment. Achieving ignition would provide important, previously unavailable, experimental data to support assessment and certification of the stockpile, and would be a major advance in nuclear science.

The committee recommends $476.3 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

*Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign*

The budget request contained $628.9 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) Campaign, an increase of $13.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The ASC Campaign provides the simulation and computing capability needed to validate and certify the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing. As experiments are conducted under various other campaigns, the data from those experiments is used to refine simulation codes developed under the ASC Campaign. As the experiments, computing infrastructure, and simulation codes are concurrently improved, confidence in the ability to predict weapon performance, and potential problems, should also improve.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee notes its support for the new strategic investments by the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy in research and development of "exa-scale" computing.

The committee recommends $628.9 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

*Exa-scale computing at the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration National Laboratories*

To maintain our economic and national security, the committee believes that the United States must continue to be at the forefront of high-performance computing technology. The committee is encouraged by recent progress in developing and deploying "peta-scale" computing at the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) national laboratories.

The budget request includes new strategic investments in research and development of "exa-scale" computing: $90.0 million through the DOE Office of Science and $36.0 million through the NNSA Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign. The committee believes these investments in next generation computing systems are critical to the nation, and will not only help ensure the long-term viability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing, but will also support important technology innovation for the broader economy.

The committee believes the United States must continue its leadership in developing and utilizing state-of-the-art supercomputers, and notes with concern the recent surge of the People's Republic of China in the field of high performance computing. In particular, the committee notes China's deployment of the world's first and third fastest supercomputers in rankings published in November 2010, while the NNSA laboratories did not have a machine in the top five of these rankings for the first time in 20 years.

*Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities*

The budget request contained $2.3 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF), an increase of $477.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

RTBF supports the physical infrastructure and operational readiness of the nuclear security enterprise. RTBF funds are divided between Operations and Maintenance, and Construction programs. The RTBF program is aligned with and provides resources to support the execution of all other programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), including Directed Stockpile Work, the Campaigns, and Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.

The committee has previously noted its concern regarding funding to support the operations and maintenance of facilities at the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, and the Y-12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The committee appreciates the increase in funds for both facilities in the budget request to support the increased workload at both plants associated with increases in life extension program production rates, surveillance, and dismantlement activities. The committee also notes the increase in funds provided for material recycle and recovery to support a similar workload increase.

The budget request for RTBF included funds for the two largest ongoing NNSA infrastructure projects: $300.0 million for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory and $160.2 million for the Uranium Processing Facility at the Y-12 National Security Complex. Elsewhere in this title, the committee discusses its concerns regarding these important projects, including the continuing cost increases and schedule delays associated with them. The committee recommends $2.3 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities, the amount of the budget request.

*Report on project management for large-scale construction programs*

The committee believes that successful, efficient, and timely completion of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement (CMRR) at the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) at the Y-12 National Security Complex are critical to the long-term sustainability of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee is concerned that, given its history regarding management of large-scale construction projects, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) may encounter significant difficulty in managing and executing these programs to build two large, and wholly unique, nuclear facilities simultaneously.

The committee notes with concern the large cost growth and schedule delays of both of these programs as they have advanced in the design process. With the designs for UPF and the major nuclear component of CMRR only 45 percent complete, expected total project costs for constructing the facilities have increased several times over compared to original estimates. The original 2004 maximum cost estimate for CMRR was less than $1.0 billion; the current expected maximum cost for CMRR, based on the 45 percent complete design of the nuclear facility, has increased dramatically to over $6.0 billion. Similarly, the expected maximum cost for UPF has increased from $3.5 billion in 2007 to $6.5 billion today. As discussed in documents accompanying the fiscal year 2012 budget request, NNSA will not determine full baseline costs for these facilities until their designs are 90 percent complete. The committee agrees with this decision to establish a mature design before full cost estimates are developed, and expects NNSA to avoid concurrent design and construction for these facilities.

The committee recognizes the one-of-a-kind nature of these facilities and the difficulties in estimating their costs and schedules in conceptual phases. However, the dramatic increases in the expected costs of these facilities, coupled with their importance to sustaining the Nation's nuclear deterrent, demonstrate the need for strong oversight of the project management approach taken by NNSA for constructing these facilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 15, 2012, on NNSA's approach to construction project management for CMRR and UPF. The report should cover NNSA's general approach to managing both large-scale construction projects simultaneously; application of lessons learned by NNSA and the Department of Energy from previous large-scale construction projects; NNSA's approach to ensuring accurate cost and schedule estimates throughout the project design and construction cycle; how NNSA conducts oversight and ensures accountability from its design and construction contractors; alternatives considered for managing and scheduling the two projects; advice and guidance received from other Government organizations with experience managing large-scale construction projects; and any other matters the Administrator determines appropriate. The

committee encourages NNSA to think creatively and explore all of its options for managing these projects, and to strive to complete them in an efficient and expeditious manner.

*Secure Transportation Asset*

The budget request contained $251.3 million for the Secure Transportation Asset (STA), an increase of $3.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. The mission of the STA is to provide safe and secure transport of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon components, and special nuclear materials to meet the needs of the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, and other customers. The STA is a key enabler for the nuclear security enterprise, supporting life extension programs, surveillance, dismantlement, and other activities through the movement of nuclear cargos throughout the continental United States.

The committee recommends $251.3 million for the Secure Transportation Asset, the amount of the budget request.

*Comptroller General Evaluation of Study on Options for Nuclear Weapon Transportation*

In House Report 110-652 accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 111-383), the committee directed the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a feasibility study regarding transporting nuclear weapons and related materials by aircraft. The committee received this report, titled "Report to Congress on the Feasibility of Increasing Air Transportation of Nuclear Weapons, Components, and Materials" in September 2009.

Given the inherent institutional tendency to continue conducting operations in the same manner as before, the committee seeks an independent evaluation of the study and the feasibility of increased transportation of nuclear cargos by air. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an evaluation of the September 2009 study, and submit a report on that evaluation to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2012. The evaluation should assess the assumptions, methodology, findings, and conclusions of the study conducted by the NNSA and U.S. Air Force, including the study's rigor and completeness. The evaluation should also include rough cost estimates for pursuing various options for the transport of nuclear weapons, and evaluate the September 2009's assessment of safety and security impacts of the various options examined. The evaluation should consider changes in procedures and concepts of operations, incorporation of new or emerging technologies, and the utilization of threat information in its examination of the options.

*Work for Others at the national nuclear laboratories*

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) laboratories provide unique research and development expertise to other Government agencies through the Work for Others (WFO) program. The committee is also aware that partnerships between NNSA laboratories and the Department of Defense (DOD) and the intelligence community have enabled the application of the expertise and capabilities within NNSA to address challenging defense and intelligence priorities.

NNSA's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories, in particular, have a wide-range of capabilities developed for the Nation's nuclear security which are also utilized to support a wide-range of national security requirements. Recent examples of this utilization of laboratory expertise include: employing high explosives experts to support the development of advanced conventional munitions for the military services; applying modeling and simulation and supercomputer capabilities to improve DOD space situational awareness capabilities; leveraging high energy laser capabilities for a wide variety of DOD missions; and teaming with the Department of Defense on nonproliferation research and development programs.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense and other Government agencies to capitalize on WFO partnerships with NNSA laboratories to provide innovative solutions for the national security challenges faced by the United States.

## Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

*Nuclear Centers of Excellence*

The committee notes that in April 2010, at the nuclear security summit held in the District of Columbia, President Hu of the People's Republic of China announced his intention to pursue a nuclear Center of Excellence (COE). Subsequently, the United States and China entered into a memorandum of understanding in January 2011 and have since begun cooperation on the COE.

The committee further notes that in the budget request, funds are requested in the respective nonproliferation programs within the Department of Defense and Department of Energy for a nuclear COE in India and China. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) requested $26,000,000 for the China COE in fiscal year 2011. An additional $15.0 million has been requested for fiscal year 2012. Materials, reports, and briefings provided to the committee by NNSA indicate that the rationale for the China COE is to "expand best practices training" and "to establish/expand relationships to better address high-risk sites." With respect to best practices training, China is an economically advanced and prosperous country with robust infrastructure capabilities, and the committee

intends to scrutinize whether the United States should pay for best practice implementation in China.

Additionally, over the past two decades, China's weapons of mass destruction and missile-related proliferation records have been mixed. Although China has pledged to improve its domestic export controls, various entities within China have been the subject of U.S. sanctions for proliferation activities. The committee believes that stemming the flow of advanced technologies and dual-use materials must remain a top priority. The committee is therefore concerned that cooperation on the COE may distract from a candid assessment of proliferation by China to third parties, including states of concern. The 2011 update of the Unclassified Report to Congress on the Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions, prepared by the Deputy Director of National Intelligence, notes that "Chinese entities—which include private and state-owned companies and individuals—continue to engage in WMD-related proliferation activities." The report further notes that Chinese companies have been sanctioned by the United States "for sales of WMD- and ballistic missile-related technologies to states of concern," and that "Although, China has export control legislation that approximates Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) controls, enforcement continues to fall short. Chinese entities continue to supply a variety of missile-related items to multiple customers, including Iran, Syria, and Pakistan."

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision elsewhere in this title that would limit the availability of funding for the China COE until the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, conducts a review of these matters and submits two related reports to certain congressional committees.

*Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention*

The committee continues to support the nonproliferation objectives of the Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) program. The committee recognizes that the continued success of this program is tied to the unique involvement of the U.S. private sector. The involvement of the United States private sector helps ensure the program's ability to provide non-military, commercial employment opportunities for former and potential weapons of mass destruction scientists and engineers in the former U.S.S.R. and other countries and regions of non-proliferation concern, while also supporting job creation in the United States. Therefore, the committee recommends that the National Nuclear Security Administration ensure that GIPP projects include a commercial U.S. industry partner.

## Naval Reactors

The budget request contained $1.2 billion for Naval Reactors, an increase of $83.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion work, from reactor technology development, to reactor operation, to reactor retirement and disposal. The program ensures the safe and reliable operation of 104 nuclear reactors, most of them in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers which comprise 40 percent of the Navy's total combatants. Naval Reactors is developing new reactor designs for *Gerald R. Ford*-class aircraft carriers and *Virginia*-class attack submarines. The requested increase would also support three key deliverables: design of the reactor for the *Ohio*-class submarine replacement; refueling of a land-based prototyping and demonstration reactor in upstate New York; and recapitalization of the spent nuclear fuel infrastructure located at Idaho National Laboratory.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10) reduced fiscal year 2011 funding for Naval Reactors by $108.4 million, or 10 percent, from the fiscal year 2011 budget request. The committee is concerned that this reduction will delay design and procurement of critical naval reactors, particularly for the *Ohio*-class submarine replacement, and lead to an unacceptable delay in deployment of the *Ohio*-class submarine replacement. This replacement submarine is critical to the long-term viability of the nation's nuclear deterrent, and the committee encourages full funding for Naval Reactors in the future.

The committee recommends $1.2 billion for Naval Reactors, the amount of the budget request.

### Office of the Administrator

The budget request contained $450.1 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Office of the Administrator, an increase of $1.8 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The Office of the Administrator provides planning, management, and oversight of the NNSA and its laboratories, production plants, and programs.

The committee recommends $450.1 million for the Office of the Administrator, the amount of the budget request.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

### Overview

The budget request contained $6.3 billion for environmental and other defense activities for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends $6.3 billion, the amount of the budget request.

## Defense Environmental Cleanup

The budget request contained $5.4 billion for Defense Environmental Cleanup, a decrease of $181.3 million from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The committee is aware that the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5) provided an additional $5.1 billion in funding for Defense Environmental Cleanup. This funding was utilized by the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management to accelerate cleanup efforts, and has resulted in approximately $7.0 billion in cost savings and cost avoidances. The committee applauds the recent efforts of the Office of Environmental Management, which has made major strides in recent years to address the environmental legacy of our Cold War-era defense nuclear facilities. Plans to shrink the legacy footprint, from 900 square miles in 2009 to 90 square miles in 2015, appear to be on track and well managed. Also by 2015, 90 percent of legacy transuranic waste is slated to be disposed of at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. Furthermore, three major tank waste construction projects are slated for completion by 2016. The committee will continue its oversight of this important long-term cleanup program to ensure it remains on cost and schedule, but recognizes the significant progress being made under the effective leadership of the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management.

The committee recommends $5.4 billion for Defense Environmental Cleanup, the amount of the budget request.

## Other Defense Activities

The budget request contained $860.0 million for Other Defense Activities, a decrease of $18.3 million from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. The request for Other Defense Activities includes: $456.5 million for the Office of Health, Safety, and Security; $170.1 million for the Office of Legacy Management; $188.8 million for Defense Related Administrative Support; and $98.5 million for the Office of Nuclear Energy.

The committee recommends $860.0 million for Other Defense Activities, the amount of the budget request.

## Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

### *Report on Mixed Oxide Fuel*

In light of the earthquake and tsunami in Japan and the resulting damage to nuclear reactors and spent fuel pools at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant which released radioactivity into the air, soil and sea, the committee seeks additional information on the characteristics of mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel rods in the

event of an accident or attack. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit to the defense committees, no later than March 1, 2012 a report on MOX fuel. Such a report should compare the risks to human health and safety of the MOX fuel fabricated at the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility to the use of low-enriched uranium (LEU) fuel, particularly in the event of an accident or attack on a reactor or spent fuel pond resulting in the release of radioactivity. Specifically, the report should include an analysis of the amount of radiation a MOX fuel rod made at the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility at Savannah River Site would release relative to an LEU fuel rod; and a description of whether this technical difference from LEU fuel has been factored into the discussions with potential users of this fuel. The report should be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if necessary.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

#### Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2012, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2012, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize appropriations for other defense activities for fiscal year 2012, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance

This section would authorize appropriations for energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2012, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

## SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 3111—Consolidated Reporting Requirements relating to Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship, Management, and Infrastructure

This section would consolidate several existing reporting requirements in the Atomic Energy Defense Act, chapter 42 of title 50, United States Code. Specifically, this section would repeal reporting requirements in sections 4202, 4203, 4203A, 4204, and 4208 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act and consolidate them into a new section 4203.

This section would create a consolidated requirement for the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to create a plan for sustaining the nuclear weapons stockpile. The plan would be required to cover, at a minimum, stockpile stewardship, stockpile management, stockpile surveillance, program direction, infrastructure modernization, human capital, and nuclear test readiness. This section would require the Administrator to submit a summary of this plan, including identification of changes to the plan, to the congressional defense committees in each even-numbered year, and a detailed report on the plan in each odd-numbered year. Finally, this section would require the Nuclear Weapons Council, in each odd-numbered year, to submit to Congress an assessment of certain aspects of the plan developed by the Administrator and determine whether the plan adequately supports nuclear security enterprise infrastructure modernization requirements.

### Section 3112—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security

This section would limit funds that may be obligated or expended by the Secretary of Energy for fiscal year 2012 to not more than $7.0 million for a Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security in the People's Republic of China until the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits two reports to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. These two reports would provide additional insight and analysis into the two stated rationales for the Center of Excellence.

The first report would require the Secretary of Energy in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to review and submit a report of such a review of the date of enactment of the Act, on the existing capacity of China to develop and implement best practices training. The second report would require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to submit report within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the extent to which additional best practices training and relationship building activities would contribute to improving the Chinese record of proliferation with respect to weapons of mass destruction,

missiles, and related technologies and materials. This report should specifically include an assessment of the potential to improve the Chinese record on the proliferation of these technologies and materials to countries which are currently or have been state sponsors of terrorism.

Section 3113—Use of Savings from Pension Reimbursements for Budgetary Shortfalls

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management to make determinations throughout each fiscal year, until the end of fiscal year 2016, regarding the level of funds needed to meet the minimum funding standard required by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-406) for any defined-benefit pension plan operated by management and operating contractors of either the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management or National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). If economic conditions improve, or efficiencies are identified, such that the amounts originally budgeted for contributions to the contractors' pension plans exceed the minimum required by statute, this section would require the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to promptly obligate or expend the excess funds on high priority budgetary shortfalls, as identified by the Administrator or the Assistant Secretary, respectively. This section would authorize the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to transfer any such funds as needed to fulfill this purpose, and would require the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to promptly notify the congressional defense committees if such excess funds are identified or transferred. The authorities authorized by this section would terminate on September 30, 2016.

The committee recognizes the need to fully fund the pension plans of the highly skilled scientists, engineers, and other workers employed by the contractors managing and operating Department of Energy and NNSA facilities. The committee believes these employees are the backbone of efforts to ensure the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's nuclear deterrent, and pension promises made to them must be kept. The committee notes that the President's request anticipates NNSA and the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management to make approximately $1.25 billion in contributions to these pension plans in fiscal year 2012. However, the required contributions to these pension plans are uncertain and will not be fully known until well into a given fiscal year. If economic conditions improve or efficiencies are identified, the total amount of contributions required by law may be less than the $1.25 billion anticipated in the budget request. This section would require the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to determine if such savings are realized at any time during fiscal year 2012-16, from any program within the Office of Environmental Management or NNSA, and require them to promptly obligate such funds on high-priority budgetary shortfalls. The committee expects high-priority budgetary shortfalls to include modernization of the nuclear

security enterprise, reduction in deferred maintenance, and acceleration of environmental cleanup activities. The committee believes that modernizing and refurbishing the infrastructure of the nuclear security enterprise must be a top priority for the Department of Energy and NNSA, and this section would ensure that any savings from the anticipated pension contributions are put toward that end or similar high priorities.

## SUBTITLE C—REPORTS

### Section 3121—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements

This section would repeal requirements for several recurring reports from the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security. Specifically, it would repeal section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107), which requires an annual report to Congress on the financial and programmatic activities of the Nuclear Cities Initiative Program, which ended in 2006. This section would also modify section 4302(a)(6) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2562). The modification would repeal a requirement for the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress each time funds for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program are used to pay a tax or customs duty levied by the Government of the Russian Federation. No such payments have been made since 2000, and the program ended in 2006.

### Section 3122—Progress on Nuclear Nonproliferation

This section would express the sense of Congress that the spread of nuclear and radiological weapons, or weapons-usable material, technology, equipment, information and expertise, poses a short- and long-term threat to the security of the United States, and that the U.S. nonproliferation efforts should prioritize those programs which most directly address this threat. This section would require the Secretary of Energy to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, not less than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter on March 1 of each year until 2016, on the strategic plans of the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to prevent nuclear and radiological proliferation and on the implementation of these plans, including progress and challenges of implementation, an estimate of budget requirements over 10 years, and interagency coordination. This section would also require the Secretary of Energy to submit, no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and by March 1 annually thereafter until 2016, an assessment of the risk that non-nuclear weapon countries may acquire nuclear enrichment or reprocessing technology, and a classified list of the location and vulnerability of highly-enriched

uranium worldwide. Both the report and the assessments should be submitted in unclassified form, with classified annexes.

The committee is concerned about the danger that additional countries or terrorists may acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons-usable materials, and related technology, equipment, and expertise. The committee is aware of the urgency and importance of the efforts necessary to prevent and counter this threat. The committee also notes the findings of the 2009 Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States that "success in advancing U.S. nonproliferation interests requires U.S. leadership" and that "the risks of a proliferation 'tipping point' and of nuclear terrorism underscore the urgency of acting now."

Section 3123—Reports on Role of Nuclear Sites and Efficiencies

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to submit to the appropriate committees, no later than February 1, 2012, a report assessing the role of the nuclear security complex sites in supporting a safe, secure, and reliable nuclear deterrent, nuclear weapons reductions, and nuclear nonproliferation efforts. The report would also be required to include an assessment of opportunities for efficiencies and cost savings and a long-term plan for the nuclear security complex. Finally, this section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the appropriate committees, no later than 180 days after submission of the Secretary of Energy's report, an assessment of the Secretary's report.

The committee notes past independent assessments by the Comptroller General on the nuclear security complex, including consolidation of special nuclear material, proposals to transform the complex, and management of the complex. Therefore, the committee is pleased that the Department of Energy has made progress in recent years in consolidating sites that use special nuclear material. This consolidation effort has led to the removal of plutonium from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the consolidation of tritium operations at the Savannah River Site. Additionally, the committee notes that the 2008 National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Complex Transformation Plan intended to transform the "nuclear weapons complex to be smaller, and more responsive, efficient, and secure in order to meet national security requirements." The committee also notes NNSA's most recent Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan outlined progress and plans for sustaining and modernizing the nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive testing, and the 10-year plan and funding commitments required pursuant to section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84). The committee seeks an updated analysis of potential opportunities for efficiencies in the nuclear security complex and of the Administration's strategic plan for the nuclear security complex, including how the strategic plan links to efforts to sustain the nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive testing, modernize the infrastructure of the nuclear

security complex, support nuclear weapons reductions by improving verification and detection technologies, and strengthen nuclear nonproliferation efforts.

Section 3124—Net Assessment of High-Performance Computing Capabilities of Foreign Countries

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Under Secretary of Energy for Science, and the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security, to conduct a net assessment of high-performance computing capability possessed by foreign countries. The assessment would be required to cover a variety of matters, including an analysis of current and potential future capabilities and trends in high-performance computing; descriptions of how high-performance computing capabilities are used throughout the world; and an evaluation of similarities and differences in approaches to innovation, development, and utilization of high-performance computing among the United States and major foreign competitors in the field. The section would require the Administrator to coordinate the assessment with other appropriate executive agencies and, upon request by the Administrator, require the Secretary of Defense to provide net assessment expertise through the Department of Defense Office of Net Assessment. The Administrator would be required to submit an unclassified report on the results of the assessment, with a classified annex if appropriate, to the appropriate congressional committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

# TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $29.1 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends $29.1 million, the amount of the request.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10) appropriated $23.3 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), a reduction of $5.3 million from the President's budget request for fiscal year 2011.

The committee is concerned that continuation of this reduction into fiscal year 2012 would have negative impacts on DNFSB's ability to carry out its mission even as the need for independent safety oversight of certain National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) programs increases. In particular, the committee is concerned that the reduction will impact the DNFSB's ability to conduct robust and timely oversight of the designs being developed for the two major new NNSA construction projects currently underway. Prior history has shown that incorporation of safety features at early stages of facility design can result in large cost savings and cost avoidances later on, and the committee believes the ability of the DNFSB to provide timely independent oversight of these designs will be negatively impacted by continued budget reductions.

The committee believes DNFSB provides an important and independent oversight function to ensure the health and safety of workers and the public at facilities across the nuclear security enterprise. The committee supports the work conducted by DNFSB and the scientists and engineers it employs.

Therefore, elsewhere in this title the committee recommends $29.1 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2012, the amount of the budget request.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2012.

# TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $14.9 million for fiscal year 2012 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

# TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2012

This section would authorize a total of $328.9 million for the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2012. Of the funds authorized, $93.1 million would be available for expenses necessary for operations of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, $17.1 million would be available for support of the various state maritime academies, $18.5 million for the program to dispose of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, $186.0 million for the Maritime Security Program, and $14.3 million for the loan guarantee program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Title XI Loan Program.

### Section 3502—Use of National Defense Reserve Fleet and Ready Reserve Force Vessels

This section would amend section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744(b)) to allow the Secretary of Transportation, with concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, to use National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels for civil contingency and promotional and media events subject to other criteria to be considered.

### Section 3503—Recruitment Authority

This section would amend section 51301 of title 46, United States Code, by allowing the Secretary of Transportation, subject to the availability of appropriations, to expend funds available for the operating expenses for the United States Merchant Marine Academy for recruiting activities to obtain recruits for the Academy and cadet applicants.

### Section 3504—Ship Scrapping Reporting Requirement

This section would amend section 3502(f) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398), as amended by section 3505(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) by eliminating a mandatory reporting requirement for ship scrapping. This section would require the Maritime Administrator to provide briefings, upon request, to the congressional committees with jurisdictional authority on issues concerning the recycling of vessels.

# DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables

This section would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, this section would also require that a decision by an Agency Head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

# TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

## SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | | | | | |
| | FIXED WING | | | | | | |
| 001 | UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT | | 14,572 | | | | 14,572 |
| 002 | C–12 CARGO AIRPLANE | | | | | | |
| 003 | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP) | 18 | 539,574 | –18 | –523,900 | | 15,674 |
| | Early to Need | | | [–14] | [–417,900] | | |
| | Program Decrease | | | [–4] | [–106,000] | | |
| 004 | MQ–1 UAV | 36 | 658,798 | | | 36 | 658,798 |
| 005 | RQ–11 (RAVEN) | 1,272 | 70,762 | | | 1,272 | 70,762 |
| 006 | BCT UNMANNED AERIAL VEH (UAVS) INCR 1 | | | | | | |
| | ROTARY | | | | | | |
| 007 | HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH) | 39 | 250,415 | | | 39 | 250,415 |
| 008 | AH–64 BLOCK II/WRA | | | | | | |
| 009 | AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN | 19 | 411,005 | | | 19 | 411,005 |
| 010 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 192,764 | | | | 192,764 |
| 011 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 104,263 | | | | 104,263 |
| 012 | UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP) | 71 | 1,325,666 | | | 71 | 1,325,666 |
| 013 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 199,781 | | | | 199,781 |
| 014 | CH–47 HELICOPTER | 47 | 1,305,360 | | | 47 | 1,305,360 |
| 015 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 54,956 | | | | 54,956 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 016 | HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING | | | |
| 017 | KIOWA WARRIOR UPGRADE (OH–58 D)/WRA | | | |
| | MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | | |
| 018 | C–12 AIRCRAFT MODS | | | |
| 019 | MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS | 136,183 | | 136,183 |
| 020 | MQ–1 WEAPONIZATION—UAS | | | |
| 021 | GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP) | 27,575 | | 27,575 |
| 022 | MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) | 8,362 | | 8,362 |
| 023 | AH–64 MODS | 331,230 | | 331,230 |
| 024 | CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP) | 79,712 | | 79,712 |
| 025 | UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS | 22,107 | | 22,107 |
| 026 | AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS | | | |
| 027 | UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS | 80,745 | 10,000 | 90,745 |
| | Modifications to Aircraft | | [10,000] | |
| 028 | KIOWA WARRIOR | 162,052 | | 162,052 |
| 029 | AIRBORNE AVIONICS | | | |
| 030 | NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN | 138,832 | | 138,832 |
| 031 | COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE | 132,855 | | 132,855 |
| 032 | GATM ROLLUP | 105,519 | | 105,519 |
| 033 | RQ–7 UAV MODS | 126,239 | | 126,239 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | |
| 034 | SPARE PARTS (AIR) | | | |
| | GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS | | | |
| 035 | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT | 35,993 | | 35,993 |
| 036 | SURVIVABILITY CM | | | |
| 037 | CMWS | 162,811 | | 162,811 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | | |
| 038 | AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 4,840 | | 4,840 |
| 039 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | 176,212 | | 176,212 |
| 040 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | 82,883 | | 82,883 |
| 041 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 114,844 | | 114,844 |
| 042 | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 1,593 | | 1,593 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 043 | LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET | 464 | 2,878 | | | 464 | 2,878 |
| 044 | AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 1,966 | 7,061,381 | –18 | –513,900 | 1,948 | 6,547,481 |
| | MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | | | | | |
| | SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| 001 | PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY | 88 | 662,231 | | | 88 | 662,231 |
| 002 | MSE MISSILE/PAC–3 | | 74,953 | | | | 74,953 |
| 003 | SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY: | | | | | | |
| | AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| 004 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | | 1,410 | | | | 1,410 |
| | ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS | | | | | | |
| 005 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | 710 | 160,767 | | | 710 | 160,767 |
| 006 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | 802 | 61,676 | | | 802 | 61,676 |
| 007 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 19,886 | | | | 19,886 |
| 008 | BCT NON LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM—INCREM | | | | | | |
| 009 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 2,784 | 314,167 | | | 2,784 | 314,167 |
| 010 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) | 2,370 | 18,175 | | | 2,370 | 18,175 |
| 011 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS | | 31,674 | | | | 31,674 |
| | MODIFICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 012 | PATRIOT MODS | | 66,925 | | | | 66,925 |
| 013 | STINGER MODS | | 14,495 | | –14,495 | | |
| | Budget Adjustment per Army Request | | | | [–14,495] | | |
| 014 | ITAS/TOW MODS | | 13,577 | | | | 13,577 |
| 015 | MLRS MODS | | 8,236 | | | | 8,236 |
| 016 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS | | 11,670 | | | | 11,670 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 017 | HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS | | | | | |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | | | |
| 018 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 8,700 | | | 8,700 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | | | | |
| 019 | AIR DEFENSE TARGETS | | 3,674 | | | 3,674 |
| 020 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES) | | 1,459 | | | 1,459 |
| 021 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | 5,043 | | | 5,043 |
| | TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 6,754 | 1,478,718 | –14,495 | 6,754 | 1,464,223 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | | | | | |
| | TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | |
| 001 | STRYKER VEHICLE | 100 | 632,994 | | 100 | 632,994 |
| 002 | FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS) | | | | | |
| 003 | FCS SPIN OUTS | | | | | |
| 004 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | |
| | MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | |
| 005 | STRYKER (MOD) | | 52,797 | | | 52,797 |
| 006 | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) | | 43,962 | | | 43,962 |
| 007 | BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) | | 250,710 | 153,000 | | 403,710 |
| | Program Increase | | | [153,000] | | |
| 008 | HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD) | | 46,876 | | | 46,876 |
| 009 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES) | | 10,452 | | | 10,452 |
| 010 | ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE | 19 | 99,904 | | 19 | 99,904 |
| 011 | M88 FOV MODS | | 32,483 | | | 32,483 |
| 012 | JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE | | | | | |
| 013 | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | | 160,578 | | | 160,578 |
| 014 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | 21 | 181,329 | 272,000 | 21 | 453,329 |
| | Industrial Base and Guard Modernization | | | [272,000] | | |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | | | | |
| 015 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) | | 1,073 | | | 1,073 |
| | WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES | | | | | |
| 016 | HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119 | | | | | |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 017 | INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY | 5 | 16,046 | | | 5 | 16,046 |
| 018 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM) | | | | | | |
| 019 | MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL | 4,700 | 65,102 | | | 4,700 | 65,102 |
| 020 | LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN | 700 | 28,796 | | | 700 | 28,796 |
| 021 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM) | | | | | | |
| 022 | MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM) | | | | | | |
| 023 | MORTAR SYSTEMS | 142 | 12,477 | | | 142 | 12,477 |
| 024 | M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE | | | | | | |
| 025 | XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) | 2,873 | 12,055 | | | 2,873 | 12,055 |
| 026 | M110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS) | | | | | | |
| 027 | M4 CARBINE | 19,409 | 35,015 | | | 19,409 | 35,015 |
| 028 | SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS) | 3,038 | 6,707 | | | 3,038 | 6,707 |
| 029 | COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO | | | | | | |
| 030 | HANDGUN | | | | | | |
| 031 | HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T) | | 13,066 | | | | 13,066 |
| | MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH | | | | | | |
| 032 | MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS | | | | | | |
| 033 | M4 CARBINE MODS | | 25,092 | | | | 25,092 |
| 034 | M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS | | 14,856 | | | | 14,856 |
| 035 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS | | 8,480 | | | | 8,480 |
| 036 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS | | 15,718 | | | | 15,718 |
| 037 | SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS | | 1,994 | | 2,506 | | 4,500 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [2,506] | | |
| 038 | M119 MODIFICATIONS | | 38,701 | | | | 38,701 |
| 039 | M16 RIFLE MODS | | 3,476 | | | | 3,476 |
| 040 | M14 7.62 RIFLE MODS | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 041 | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | | 2,973 | | | 2,973 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | | | | |
| 042 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | | | | | |
| 043 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) | | 10,080 | | | 10,080 |
| 044 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | | 424 | | | 424 |
| 045 | SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG) | | 2,453 | | | 2,453 |
| | SPARES | | | | | |
| 046 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV) | | 106,843 | | | 106,843 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | 31,007 | 1,933,512 | 427,506 | 31,007 | 2,361,018 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | | | | | |
| | SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION | | | | | |
| 001 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | | 210,758 | | | 210,758 |
| 002 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | | 83,730 | | | 83,730 |
| 003 | CTG, 7.62MM, 4 BALL M80 FS, 1 DIM TRCR M276, | | | | | |
| 004 | CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES | | 9,064 | | | 9,064 |
| 005 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | | 131,775 | | | 131,775 |
| 006 | CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES | | | | | |
| 007 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | | 14,894 | | | 14,894 |
| 008 | OBJECTIVE FAMILY OF WEAPONS AMMUNITION, ALL T | | 3,399 | | | 3,399 |
| 009 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | | 118,966 | | | 118,966 |
| 010 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | | 84,799 | | | 84,799 |
| 011 | CTG, CAL .300 WIN MAG, MK 248 MOD 0 (7.62X67M | | | | | |
| | MORTAR AMMUNITION | | | | | |
| 012 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 31,287 | | | 31,287 |
| 013 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 12,187 | | | 12,187 |
| 014 | 120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 108,416 | | | 108,416 |
| | TANK AMMUNITION | | | | | |
| 015 | CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES | | 105,704 | | | 105,704 |
| 016 | CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES | | | | | |
| | ARTILLERY AMMUNITION | | | | | |
| 017 | ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP | | 103,227 | | | 103,227 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 018 | CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES | | | | | | |
| 019 | ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES | | 32,887 | | | | 32,887 |
| 020 | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982 | | 69,074 | | | | 69,074 |
| 021 | ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL | | 48,205 | | | | 48,205 |
| | ARTILLERY FUZES | | | | | | |
| 022 | ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES | | | | | | |
| | MINES | | | | | | |
| 023 | MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES | | 2,518 | | | | 2,518 |
| 024 | MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES | | | | | | |
| | NETWORKED MUNITIONS | | | | | | |
| 025 | SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 43,123 | | | | 43,123 |
| 026 | SCORPION, INTELLIGENT MUNITIONS SYSTEM , ALL | | | | | | |
| | ROCKETS | | | | | | |
| 027 | SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 19,254 | | | | 19,254 |
| 028 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | | 127,265 | | | | 127,265 |
| | OTHER AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| 029 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 53,685 | | | | 53,685 |
| 030 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | | 42,558 | | | | 42,558 |
| 031 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | | 26,173 | | | | 26,173 |
| 032 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | | 14,108 | | | | 14,108 |
| 033 | ALL OTHER (AMMO) | | 50 | | | | 50 |
| | MISCELLANEOUS | | | | | | |
| 034 | AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES | | 18,296 | | | | 18,296 |
| 035 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | | 14,864 | | | | 14,864 |
| 036 | CAD/PAD ALL TYPES | | 5,449 | | | | 5,449 |
| 037 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 11,009 | | | | 11,009 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 038 | AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT | | 24,200 | | 24,200 |
| 039 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO) | | 13,711 | | 13,711 |
| 040 | CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES | | 103 | | 103 |
| | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | | | |
| 041 | PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 199,841 | | 199,841 |
| 042 | LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 9,451 | | 9,451 |
| 043 | MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES | | 5,533 | | 5,533 |
| 044 | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL | | 189,789 | | 189,789 |
| 045 | ARMS INITIATIVE | | 3,273 | | 3,273 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | | 1,992,625 | | 1,992,625 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | | | |
| | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | | | |
| 001 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | | | | |
| 002 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED: | 102 | 13,496 | 102 | 13,496 |
| 003 | SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS | | | | |
| 004 | HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) | | | | |
| 005 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | 2,390 | 432,936 | 2,390 | 432,936 |
| 006 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP | | 21,930 | | 21,930 |
| 007 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | | 627,294 | | 627,294 |
| 008 | PLS ESP | | 251,667 | | 251,667 |
| 009 | ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) | | | | |
| 010 | MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY | | 56,671 | | 56,671 |
| 011 | FAMILY OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTEC (MRAP) | | | | |
| 012 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916 | 6 | 1,461 | 6 | 1,461 |
| 013 | HVY EZPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV | 412 | 156,747 | 412 | 156,747 |
| 014 | HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM | | 161,631 | | 161,631 |
| 015 | TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS | | 39,908 | | 39,908 |
| 016 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | | 362,672 | | 362,672 |
| 017 | MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS | | 142,862 | | 142,862 |
| 018 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH) | | | | |
| 019 | TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL | | | | |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 020 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS, OPA1 | | 20,156 | | | | 20,156 |
| | NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| 021 | HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN | 6 | 1,161 | | | 6 | 1,161 |
| 022 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 3,222 | | | | 3,222 |
| 023 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER | | 19,869 | | | | 19,869 |
| | COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 024 | JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM | | 9,984 | | | | 9,984 |
| 025 | WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK | 3,931 | 974,186 | | | 3,931 | 974,186 |
| 026 | JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) | | 4,826 | | | | 4,826 |
| | COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 028 | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS | 3 | 123,859 | | | 3 | 123,859 |
| 029 | SHF TERM | 2 | 8,910 | | | 2 | 8,910 |
| 030 | SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE) | | | | | | |
| 031 | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) | 6,312 | 29,568 | | | 6,312 | 29,568 |
| 032 | SMART-T (SPACE) | | 49,704 | | | | 49,704 |
| 033 | SCAMP (SPACE) | | 2,415 | | | | 2,415 |
| 034 | GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS | | 73,374 | | | | 73,374 |
| 035 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) | 140 | 31,799 | | | 140 | 31,799 |
| | COMM—COMBAT SUPPORT COMM | | | | | | |
| 036 | MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER | | 969 | | | | 969 |
| | COMM—C3 SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| 037 | ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS) | | 18,788 | | | | 18,788 |
| | COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 038 | ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO) | | 3,994 | | | | 3,994 |
| 039 | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM | 17,120 | 775,832 | | –59,800 | 17,120 | 716,032 |
| | Early to Need | | | | [–35,800] | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Program Decrease | | | [–24,000] | |
| 040 | RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2) | | 8,336 | | 8,336 |
| 041 | SINCGARS FAMILY | | 4,992 | | 4,992 |
| 042 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2 | | | | |
| 043 | TRACTOR DESK | | 10,827 | | 10,827 |
| 044 | COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING | | | | |
| 045 | SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT | | 36,224 | | 36,224 |
| 046 | IMS REMOTE CONTROL UNIT | | | | |
| 047 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS | | 1,843 | | 1,843 |
| 048 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL) | | | | |
| 049 | GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM (GDS) | 87 | 3,939 | 87 | 3,939 |
| 050 | RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY | 550 | 38,535 | 550 | 38,535 |
| 051 | MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4) | 957 | 26,232 | 957 | 26,232 |
| | COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM | | | | |
| 053 | CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE | | 1,547 | | 1,547 |
| 054 | CIVIL AFFAIRS/INFO OPS | | 28,266 | | 28,266 |
| | INFORMATION SECURITY | | | | |
| 055 | TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS) | 499 | 12,541 | 499 | 12,541 |
| 056 | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP | | 39,349 | | 39,349 |
| | COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS | | | | |
| 057 | TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION | | 2,232 | | 2,232 |
| 058 | BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS | | 37,780 | | 37,780 |
| 059 | WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP) | | 12,805 | | 12,805 |
| | COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | |
| 060 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS | 164 | 187,227 | 164 | 187,227 |
| 061 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS) | | 4,393 | | 4,393 |
| 062 | INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM( | | 310,761 | | 310,761 |
| 063 | PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM | | 4,992 | | 4,992 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA) | | | | |
| 066 | JTT/CIBS-M | | 4,657 | | 4,657 |
| 067 | PROPHET GROUND | 23 | 72,041 | 23 | 72,041 |
| 068 | DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) | | | | |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 069 | DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA) | | | | | | |
| 070 | DCGS-A (MIP) | | 144,548 | | | | 144,548 |
| 071 | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS) | 5 | 1,199 | | | 5 | 1,199 |
| 072 | TROJAN (MIP) | | 32,707 | | | | 32,707 |
| 073 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP) | | 9,163 | | | | 9,163 |
| 074 | CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) (MIP | | 3,493 | | | | 3,493 |
| 075 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP) | | 802 | | | | 802 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) | | | | | | |
| 076 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR | 10 | 33,810 | | | 10 | 33,810 |
| 077 | CREW | | 24,104 | | | | 24,104 |
| 078 | BCT UNATTENDED GROUND SENSOR | | | | | | |
| 079 | FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITES | | | | | | |
| 080 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | | 1,252 | | | | 1,252 |
| 081 | CI MODERNIZATION | | 1,332 | | | | 1,332 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV) | | | | | | |
| 082 | FAAD GBS | | 7,958 | | | | 7,958 |
| 083 | SENTINEL MODS | 47 | 41,657 | | | 47 | 41,657 |
| 084 | SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW) | 5,831 | 47,498 | | | 5,831 | 47,498 |
| 085 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | 8,793 | 156,204 | | | 8,793 | 156,204 |
| 086 | LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 118 | 102,334 | | | 118 | 102,334 |
| 087 | NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT | | 186,859 | | | | 186,859 |
| 088 | SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF | | 10,227 | | | | 10,227 |
| 089 | RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS | | | | | | |
| 090 | COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM) | 7 | 15,774 | | | 7 | 15,774 |
| 091 | BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS | | | | | | |
| 092 | GREEN LASER INTERDICTION SYSTEM | | 25,356 | | | | 25,356 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 093 | ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP | | | | |
| 094 | ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE | | | | |
| 095 | PROFILER | 1 | 3,312 | 1 | 3,312 |
| 096 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS) | | 3,005 | | 3,005 |
| 097 | FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2) | | | | |
| 098 | JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P) | | 69,514 | | 69,514 |
| 099 | LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER | 171 | 58,042 | 171 | 58,042 |
| 100 | COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32 | | | | |
| 101 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | | 21,022 | | 21,022 |
| 102 | COUNTERFIRE RADARS | 16 | 227,629 | 16 | 227,629 |
| 103 | ARMS CONTROL ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM | | 2,226 | | 2,226 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS | | | | |
| 104 | TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS | 80 | 54,907 | 80 | 54,907 |
| 105 | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY | 898 | 54,223 | 898 | 54,223 |
| 106 | BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC | 612 | 12,454 | 612 | 12,454 |
| 107 | FAAD C2 | | 5,030 | | 5,030 |
| 108 | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS | 9 | 62,710 | 9 | 62,710 |
| 109 | KNIGHT FAMILY | 12 | 51,488 | 12 | 51,488 |
| 110 | LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) | | 1,807 | | 1,807 |
| 111 | AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | | 28,924 | | 28,924 |
| 112 | TC AIMS II | | | | |
| 113 | TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER | | | | |
| 114 | NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE | | | | |
| 115 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | 498 | 34,031 | 498 | 34,031 |
| 116 | SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE) | 26,660 | 210,312 | 26,660 | 210,312 |
| 117 | RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET | | 19,113 | | 19,113 |
| 118 | MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCOTM) | | | | |
| | ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION | | | | |
| 119 | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM | | 23,664 | | 23,664 |
| 120 | ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION | | 11,192 | | 11,192 |
| 121 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | | 220,250 | | 220,250 |
| 122 | CSS COMMUNICATIONS | 452 | 39,310 | 452 | 39,310 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 123 | RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) | | 41,248 | | | | 41,248 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V) | | | | | | |
| 124 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V) | | 10,437 | | | | 10,437 |
| 125 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) | 168 | 7,480 | | | 168 | 7,480 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 126 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) | | 571 | | | | 571 |
| 127 | BCT NETWORK | | | | 20,334 | | 20,334 |
| | Budget Adjustment per Army Request | | | | [20,334] | | |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | | | |
| 127A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 4,273 | | | | 4,273 |
| 127U | UNDISTRIBUTED OPA2 | | | | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| | Electronic Equipment—Automation | | | | [4,000] | | |
| | CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 128 | PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS | | | | | | |
| 129 | FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE) | | 8,636 | | | | 8,636 |
| 130 | BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS) | | 41,204 | | 6,000 | | 47,204 |
| | Base Defense Systems | | | | [6,000] | | |
| 131 | CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION | | 10,700 | | | | 10,700 |
| 132 | SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM) | | 362 | | | | 362 |
| | BRIDGING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 133 | TACTICAL BRIDGING | | 77,428 | | | | 77,428 |
| 134 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | | 49,154 | | | | 49,154 |
| | ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 135 | HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST | | 39,263 | | | | 39,263 |
| 136 | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS) | | 20,678 | | | | 20,678 |
| 137 | ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS) | | 30,297 | | | | 30,297 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 138 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) | | 17,626 | | | 17,626 |
| 139 | REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS | | 14,672 | | | 14,672 |
| 140 | < $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT | | 7,352 | | | 7,352 |
| 141 | AERIAL DETECTION | | | | | |
| | COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 142 | HEATERS AND ECU'S | | 10,109 | | | 10,109 |
| 143 | LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES | | | | | |
| 144 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT | | 9,591 | | | 9,591 |
| 145 | LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME) | | | | | |
| 146 | PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS) | | 8,509 | | | 8,509 |
| 147 | GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM | | 184,072 | –28,000 | | 156,072 |
| | Schedule Slip- Nett Warrior, Increment One | | | [–28,000] | | |
| 148 | MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM | | 43,419 | | | 43,419 |
| 149 | FORCE PROVIDER | | | | | |
| 150 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT | | 26,860 | | | 26,860 |
| 151 | CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM | | 68,392 | | | 68,392 |
| 152 | MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM: | | 7,384 | | | 7,384 |
| 153 | FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS | | 54,190 | | | 54,190 |
| 154 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT) | | 12,482 | | | 12,482 |
| | PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 155 | QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 156 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER | | 75,457 | | | 75,457 |
| | WATER EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 157 | WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS | | | | | |
| | MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 158 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | | 53,450 | | | 53,450 |
| | MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 159 | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS | | 16,572 | | | 16,572 |
| 160 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ) | | 3,852 | | | 3,852 |
| | CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 161 | GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) | | 2,201 | | | 2,201 |
| 162 | SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM | 54 | 8,584 | | 54 | 8,584 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 163 | SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING | 30 | 21,031 | | | 30 | 21,031 |
| 164 | MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING | | 43,432 | | | | 43,432 |
| 165 | COMPACTOR | | 2,859 | | | | 2,859 |
| 166 | LOADERS | | | | | | |
| 167 | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR | | | | | | |
| 168 | TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED | 171 | 59,534 | | | 171 | 59,534 |
| 169 | PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING | 4 | 8,314 | | | 4 | 8,314 |
| 170 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR TYPE—FOS | | 18,974 | | | | 18,974 |
| 171 | ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPA | | 15,833 | | | | 15,833 |
| 172 | CONST EQUIP ESP | | 9,771 | | | | 9,771 |
| 173 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | | 12,654 | | | | 12,654 |
| | RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 174 | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV) | 1 | 223,845 | | | 1 | 223,845 |
| 175 | HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER (HCCC | | | | | | |
| 176 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | | 10,175 | | | | 10,175 |
| | GENERATORS | | | | | | |
| 177 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | | 31,897 | | 10,000 | | 41,897 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [10,000] | | |
| | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 178 | ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH) | | | | | | |
| 179 | FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS | 101 | 10,944 | | | 101 | 10,944 |
| 180 | ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM | 135 | 21,859 | | | 135 | 21,859 |
| | TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 181 | COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT | | 133,178 | | | | 133,178 |
| 182 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | | 168,392 | | | | 168,392 |
| 183 | CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER | | 17,760 | | | | 17,760 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 184 | AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER | | 9,413 | | | 9,413 |
| 185 | GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING | | | | | |
| | TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD) | | | | | |
| 186 | CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT | | 13,618 | | | 13,618 |
| 187 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | | 49,437 | | | 49,437 |
| 188 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) | | 30,451 | | | 30,451 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 189 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 4,923 | | | 4,923 |
| 190 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) | | 69,316 | | | 69,316 |
| 191 | BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT | | 1,591 | | | 1,591 |
| 192 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3) | | 72,271 | | | 72,271 |
| 193 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) | | 2,325 | | | 2,325 |
| 194 | SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING | | 17,411 | | | 17,411 |
| 195 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3 | | 34,500 | | | 34,500 |
| 196 | TRACTOR YARD | | 3,740 | | | 3,740 |
| 197 | BCT UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE | | 24,805 | 69,027 | | 93,832 |
| | Budget Adjustment per Army Request | | | [69,027] | | |
| 198 | BCT TRAINING/LOGISTICS/MANAGEMENT | | 149,308 | –123,297 | | 26,011 |
| | Budget Adjustment per Army Request | | | [–123,297] | | |
| 199 | BCT TRAINING/LOGISTICS/MANAGEMENT INC 2 | | 57,103 | –57,103 | | |
| | Budget Adjustment per Army Request | | | [–57,103] | | |
| 200 | BCT UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE INC 2 | | 11,924 | –11,924 | | |
| | Budget Adjustment per Army Request | | | [–11,924] | | |
| | OPA2 | | | | | |
| 201 | INITIAL SPARES—C&E | 33 | 21,647 | | 33 | 21,647 |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 77,621 | 9,682,592 | –170,763 | 77,621 | 9,511,829 |
| | JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND | | | | | |
| | STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE | | | | | |
| 004 | OPERATIONS | | 220,634 | | | 220,634 |
| | TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND | | 220,634 | | | 220,634 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | | | | | |
| | COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 001 | EA–18G | 12 | 1,079,364 | | | 12 | 1,079,364 |
| 002 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 28,119 | | | | 28,119 |
| 003 | F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET | 28 | 2,366,752 | | | 28 | 2,366,752 |
| 004 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 64,962 | | | | 64,962 |
| 005 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV | 7 | 1,503,096 | | | 7 | 1,503,096 |
| 006 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 217,666 | | | | 217,666 |
| 007 | JSF STOVL | 6 | 1,141,933 | | | 6 | 1,141,933 |
| 008 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 117,229 | | | | 117,229 |
| 009 | V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | 30 | 2,224,817 | | | 30 | 2,224,817 |
| 010 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 84,008 | | | | 84,008 |
| 011 | UH–1Y/AH–1Z | 25 | 700,306 | | | 25 | 700,306 |
| 012 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 68,310 | | | | 68,310 |
| 013 | MH–60S (MYP) | 18 | 408,921 | | | 18 | 408,921 |
| 014 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 74,040 | | | | 74,040 |
| 015 | MH–60R | 24 | 791,025 | | | 24 | 791,025 |
| 016 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 209,431 | | | | 209,431 |
| 017 | P–8A POSEIDON | 11 | 2,018,851 | | | 11 | 2,018,851 |
| 018 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 256,594 | | | | 256,594 |
| 019 | E–2D ADV HAWKEYE | 5 | 914,892 | | | 5 | 914,892 |
| 020 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 157,942 | | | | 157,942 |
| | AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 021 | C–40A | | | | | | |
| | TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 022 | JPATS | 36 | 266,906 | | | 36 | 266,906 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | | | | |
| 023 | HC–130J | | | | | |
| 024 | KC–130J | 1 | 87,288 | | 1 | 87,288 |
| 025 | RQ–7 UAV | | | | | |
| 026 | MQ–8 UAV | 12 | 191,986 | | 12 | 191,986 |
| 027 | STUASL0 UAV | 8 | 12,772 | | 8 | 12,772 |
| 028 | OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT | | | | | |
| | MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | | | | |
| 029 | EA–6 SERIES | | 27,734 | | | 27,734 |
| 030 | AEA SYSTEMS | | 34,065 | | | 34,065 |
| 031 | AV–8 SERIES | | 30,762 | | | 30,762 |
| 032 | F–18 SERIES | | 499,597 | | | 499,597 |
| 033 | H–46 SERIES | | 27,112 | | | 27,112 |
| 034 | AH–1W SERIES | | 15,828 | | | 15,828 |
| 035 | H–53 SERIES | | 62,820 | | | 62,820 |
| 036 | SH–60 SERIES | | 83,394 | 4,500 | | 87,894 |
| | SH–60 Crew and Passenger Survivability Upgrades | | | [4,500] | | |
| 037 | H–1 SERIES | | 11,012 | | | 11,012 |
| 038 | EP–3 SERIES | | 83,181 | | | 83,181 |
| 039 | P–3 SERIES | | 171,466 | | | 171,466 |
| 040 | E–2 SERIES | | 29,215 | | | 29,215 |
| 041 | TRAINER A/C SERIES | | 22,090 | | | 22,090 |
| 042 | C–2A | | 16,302 | | | 16,302 |
| 043 | C–130 SERIES | | 27,139 | | | 27,139 |
| 044 | FLEET EW | | 2,773 | | | 2,773 |
| 045 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | | 16,463 | | | 16,463 |
| 046 | E–6 SERIES | | 165,253 | | | 165,253 |
| 047 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES | | 58,011 | | | 58,011 |
| 048 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | | 12,248 | | | 12,248 |
| 049 | T–45 SERIES | | 57,779 | | | 57,779 |
| 050 | AIRCRAFT POWER PLANT CHANGES | | 21,847 | | | 21,847 |
| 051 | JPATS SERIES | | 1,524 | | | 1,524 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 052 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS | | 1,069 | | | | 1,069 |
| 053 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | | 92,072 | | | | 92,072 |
| 054 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | | 147,093 | | | | 147,093 |
| 055 | COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| 056 | ID SYSTEMS | | 37,330 | | | | 37,330 |
| 057 | P–8 SERIES | | 2,930 | | | | 2,930 |
| 058 | MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION | | 489 | | | | 489 |
| 059 | RQ–7 SERIES | | 11,419 | | | | 11,419 |
| 060 | V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | | 60,264 | | | | 60,264 |
| | AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | | | | |
| 061 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 1,331,961 | | | | 1,331,961 |
| | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| 062 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | | 351,685 | | | | 351,685 |
| 063 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 22,358 | | | | 22,358 |
| 064 | WAR CONSUMABLES | | 27,300 | | | | 27,300 |
| 065 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | 10,124 | | | | 10,124 |
| 066 | SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 24,395 | | | | 24,395 |
| 067 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | | 1,719 | | | | 1,719 |
| 068 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 223 | 18,587,033 | | 4,500 | 223 | 18,591,533 |
| | WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | | | | | |
| | MODIFICATION OF MISSILES | | | | | | |
| 001 | TRIDENT II MODS | 24 | 1,309,102 | | | 24 | 1,309,102 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| 002 | MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 3,492 | | | | 3,492 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | STRATEGIC MISSILES | | | | | |
| 003 | TOMAHAWK | 196 | 303,306 | | 196 | 303,306 |
| | TACTICAL MISSILES | | | | | |
| 004 | AMRAAM | 161 | 188,494 | | 161 | 188,494 |
| 005 | SIDEWINDER | 132 | 47,098 | | 132 | 47,098 |
| 006 | JSOW | 266 | 137,722 | | 266 | 137,722 |
| 007 | STANDARD MISSILE | 89 | 420,324 | | 89 | 420,324 |
| 008 | RAM | 61 | 66,197 | | 61 | 66,197 |
| 009 | HELLFIRE | 281 | 22,703 | | 281 | 22,703 |
| 010 | STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM) | | | | | |
| 011 | AERIAL TARGETS | | 46,359 | | | 46,359 |
| 012 | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | | 3,561 | | | 3,561 |
| | MODIFICATION OF MISSILES | | | | | |
| 013 | ESSM | 35 | 48,486 | | 35 | 48,486 |
| 014 | HARM MODS | 72 | 73,061 | | 72 | 73,061 |
| 015 | STANDARD MISSILES MODS | | | | | |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | | | | |
| 016 | WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 1,979 | | | 1,979 |
| 017 | FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON | | 238,215 | | | 238,215 |
| 018 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | |
| | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 019 | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 52,255 | | | 52,255 |
| | TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP | | | | | |
| 020 | ASW TARGETS | | 31,803 | | | 31,803 |
| | MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP | | | | | |
| 021 | MK–54 TORPEDO MODS | 45 | 78,045 | | 45 | 78,045 |
| 022 | MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS | 48 | 42,493 | | 48 | 42,493 |
| 023 | QUICKSTRIKE MINE | | 5,770 | | | 5,770 |
| 023A | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| | Modification of Torpedoes and Related Equipment | | | [5,000] | | |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 024 | TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 43,003 | | | 43,003 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 025 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT | | 9,219 | | | | 9,219 |
| | DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | | | | | | |
| 026 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | | 3,553 | | | | 3,553 |
| | GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS | | | | | | |
| 027 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | | 15,037 | | | | 15,037 |
| | MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS | | | | | | |
| 028 | CIWS MODS | | 37,550 | | | | 37,550 |
| 029 | COAST GUARD WEAPONS | | 17,525 | | | | 17,525 |
| 030 | GUN MOUNT MODS | | 43,957 | | | | 43,957 |
| 031 | LCS MODULE WEAPONS | | | | | | |
| 032 | CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS | | 50,013 | | | | 50,013 |
| 033 | AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS | | 12,203 | | | | 12,203 |
| | OTHER | | | | | | |
| 034 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | | | | |
| 035 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 55,953 | | | | 55,953 |
| | TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 1,410 | 3,408,478 | | 5,000 | 1,410 | 3,413,478 |
| | SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY | | | | | | |
| | OTHER WARSHIPS | | | | | | |
| 001 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | | | | | | |
| 002 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | | 554,798 | | | | 554,798 |
| 003 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | 2 | 3,232,215 | | | 2 | 3,232,215 |
| 004 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | | 1,524,761 | | | | 1,524,761 |
| 005 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | | | | | | |
| 006 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | | 529,652 | | | | 529,652 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 007 | SSBN ERO | | | | | |
| 008 | DDG 1000 | | 453,727 | | | 453,727 |
| 009 | DDG–51 | 1 | 1,980,709 | | 1 | 1,980,709 |
| 010 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 100,723 | | | 100,723 |
| 011 | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP | 4 | 1,802,093 | | 4 | 1,802,093 |
| 012 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | |
| | AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS | | | | | |
| 013 | LPD–17 | 1 | 1,847,444 | | 1 | 1,847,444 |
| 014 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | |
| 015 | LHA REPLACEMENT | | 2,018,691 | –50,000 | | 1,968,691 |
| | Contract Delay | | | [–200,000] | | |
| | Program Increase | | | [150,000] | | |
| 016 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | |
| 017 | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL | 1 | 185,106 | | 1 | 185,106 |
| | AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST | | | | | |
| 018 | OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS | 1 | 89,000 | | 1 | 89,000 |
| 019 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 155,200 | | | 155,200 |
| 020 | OUTFITTING | | 292,871 | | | 292,871 |
| 021 | SERVICE CRAFT | | 3,863 | | | 3,863 |
| 022 | LCAC SLEP | 4 | 84,076 | | 4 | 84,076 |
| 023 | COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS | | 73,992 | | | 73,992 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | | |
| 024 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | | |
| | Advance Procurement and Economic Order Quantity | | | [150,000] | | |
| | Program Decrease | | | [–150,000] | | |
| | TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY | 14 | 14,928,921 | –50,000 | 14 | 14,878,921 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC | | | | | |
| | NAVY AMMUNITION | | | | | |
| 001 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | | 64,766 | | | 64,766 |
| 002 | JDAM | | | | | |
| 003 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | | 38,264 | | | 38,264 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 004 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | | 17,788 | | | | 17,788 |
| 005 | PRACTICE BOMBS | | 35,289 | | | | 35,289 |
| 006 | CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES | | 49,416 | | | | 49,416 |
| 007 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | | 60,677 | | | | 60,677 |
| 008 | JATOS | | 2,766 | | | | 2,766 |
| 009 | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | | 19,006 | | | | 19,006 |
| 010 | INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION | | 19,320 | | | | 19,320 |
| 011 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | | 21,938 | | | | 21,938 |
| 012 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | | 51,819 | | | | 51,819 |
| 013 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | | 10,199 | | | | 10,199 |
| 014 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 4,107 | | | | 4,107 |
| | MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION | | | | | | |
| 015 | SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION | | 58,812 | | | | 58,812 |
| 016 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | | 21,434 | | | | 21,434 |
| 017 | 40 MM, ALL TYPES | | 84,864 | | | | 84,864 |
| 018 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | | 937 | | | | 937 |
| 019 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | | 26,324 | | | | 26,324 |
| 020 | 120MM, ALL TYPES | | 9,387 | | | | 9,387 |
| 021 | CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES | | 3,889 | | | | 3,889 |
| 022 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | | 13,452 | | | | 13,452 |
| 023 | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | | 15,556 | | | | 15,556 |
| 024 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | | 42,526 | | | | 42,526 |
| 025 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 22,786 | | | | 22,786 |
| 026 | FUZE, ALL TYPES | | 9,266 | | | | 9,266 |
| 027 | NON LETHALS | | 2,927 | | | | 2,927 |
| 028 | AMMO MODERNIZATION | | 8,557 | | | | 8,557 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 029 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 3,880 | 3,880 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC | 719,952 | 719,952 |
| | | | |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | |
| | SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT | | |
| 001 | LM–2500 GAS TURBINE | 13,794 | 13,794 |
| 002 | ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE | 8,643 | 8,643 |
| | NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | | |
| 003 | OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | 22,982 | 22,982 |
| | PERISCOPES | | |
| 004 | SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP | 60,860 | 60,860 |
| | OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | | |
| 005 | DDG MOD | 119,522 | 119,522 |
| 006 | FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 17,637 | 17,637 |
| 007 | COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD | 3,049 | 3,049 |
| 008 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | 22,266 | 22,266 |
| 009 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 15,892 | 15,892 |
| 010 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 100,693 | 100,693 |
| 011 | SUBMARINE BATTERIES | 42,296 | 42,296 |
| 012 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | 25,228 | 25,228 |
| 013 | DEEP SUBMERGENCE SYSTEMS | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| 014 | CG MODERNIZATION | 590,349 | 590,349 |
| 015 | LCAC | | |
| 016 | UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS | 18,499 | 18,499 |
| 017 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 113,809 | 113,809 |
| 018 | CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS | 5,508 | 5,508 |
| 019 | SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 13,397 | 13,397 |
| | REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 020 | REACTOR POWER UNITS | 436,838 | 436,838 |
| 021 | REACTOR COMPONENTS | 271,600 | 271,600 |
| | OCEAN ENGINEERING | | |
| 022 | DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT | 11,244 | 11,244 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | SMALL BOATS | | | | | | |
| 023 | STANDARD BOATS | | 39,793 | | | | 39,793 |
| | TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 024 | OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | 29,913 | | | | 29,913 |
| | PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 025 | OPERATING FORCES IPE | | 54,642 | | | | 54,642 |
| | OTHER SHIP SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 026 | NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS | | 144,175 | | | | 144,175 |
| 027 | LCS MODULES | | 79,583 | | | | 79,583 |
| | LOGISTIC SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 028 | LSD MIDLIFE | | 143,483 | | | | 143,483 |
| | SHIP RADARS | | | | | | |
| 029 | RADAR SUPPORT | | 18,818 | | 5,000 | | 23,818 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [5,000] | | |
| | SHIP SONARS | | | | | | |
| 030 | SPQ–9B RADAR | | 24,613 | | | | 24,613 |
| 031 | AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM | | 73,829 | | | | 73,829 |
| 032 | SSN ACOUSTICS | | 212,913 | | | | 212,913 |
| 033 | UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 29,686 | | | | 29,686 |
| 034 | SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS | | 13,537 | | | | 13,537 |
| 035 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE MILDEC | | 18,141 | | | | 18,141 |
| | ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 036 | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM | | 20,554 | | | | 20,554 |
| 037 | SSTD | | 2,257 | | | | 2,257 |
| 038 | FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | | 60,141 | | | | 60,141 |
| 039 | SURTASS | | 29,247 | | | | 29,247 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 040 | MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISANCE FORCE | 13,453 | | 13,453 |
| 040A | UNDISTRIBUTED | | 9,600 | 9,600 |
| | Anti-Submarine Warfare Electronic Equipment | | [9,600] | |
| | ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 041 | AN/SLQ–32 | 43,096 | | 43,096 |
| | RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 042 | SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT | 103,645 | | 103,645 |
| 043 | AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS) | 1,364 | | 1,364 |
| | SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 044 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG | 100,793 | | 100,793 |
| | OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 045 | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY | 23,332 | | 23,332 |
| 046 | TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS) | 426 | | 426 |
| 047 | NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS) | 33,017 | | 33,017 |
| 048 | ATDLS | 942 | | 942 |
| 049 | NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS) | 7,896 | | 7,896 |
| 050 | MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT | 27,868 | | 27,868 |
| 051 | SHALLOW WATER MCM | 1,048 | 7,975 | 9,023 |
| | Shallow Water Mine Counter Measures | | [7,975] | |
| 052 | NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) | 9,926 | | 9,926 |
| 053 | AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE | 4,370 | | 4,370 |
| 054 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | 4,143 | | 4,143 |
| | TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 055 | OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT | 45,989 | | 45,989 |
| | AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 056 | MATCALS | 8,136 | | 8,136 |
| 057 | SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 7,394 | | 7,394 |
| 058 | AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM | 18,518 | | 18,518 |
| 059 | NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM | 26,054 | | 26,054 |
| 060 | FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS | 7,213 | | 7,213 |
| 061 | LANDING SYSTEMS | 7,138 | | 7,138 |
| 062 | ID SYSTEMS | 33,170 | | 33,170 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 063 | NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | | 8,941 | | | | 8,941 |
| | OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 064 | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT | | 8,994 | | | | 8,994 |
| 065 | MARITIME INTERGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM | | 13,529 | | | | 13,529 |
| 066 | TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS | | 12,776 | | | | 12,776 |
| 067 | DCGS-N | | 11,201 | | | | 11,201 |
| 068 | CANES | | 195,141 | | | | 195,141 |
| 069 | RADIAC | | 6,201 | | | | 6,201 |
| 070 | CANES-INTELL | | 75,084 | | | | 75,084 |
| 071 | ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIPMENT | | 6,010 | | | | 6,010 |
| 072 | INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY | | 4,441 | | | | 4,441 |
| 073 | EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION | | 4,741 | | | | 4,741 |
| 074 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 51,716 | | | | 51,716 |
| | SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 075 | SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS | | 26,197 | | –15,000 | | 11,197 |
| | Program Decrease | | | | [–15,000] | | |
| 076 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | | 177,510 | | | | 177,510 |
| 077 | MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA) | | 24,022 | | | | 24,022 |
| 078 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M | | 33,644 | | | | 33,644 |
| | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 079 | SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT | | 10,357 | | | | 10,357 |
| 080 | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT | | 75,447 | | | | 75,447 |
| | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 081 | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | | 25,522 | | | | 25,522 |
| 082 | NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT) | | 109,022 | | | | 109,022 |
| | SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 083 | JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | 2,186 | 2,186 |
| 084 | ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS | 1,329 | 1,329 |
| 085 | NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | 2,418 | 2,418 |
| | CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 086 | INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | 119,857 | 119,857 |
| | CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 087 | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | 14,820 | 14,820 |
| | OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT | | |
| 088 | COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT | 6,848 | 6,848 |
| | DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | | |
| 089 | OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | 2,290 | 2,290 |
| | SONOBUOYS | | |
| 090 | SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES | 96,314 | 96,314 |
| | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 091 | WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 40,697 | 40,697 |
| 092 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | 8,561 | 8,561 |
| 093 | AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT | 8,941 | 8,941 |
| 094 | AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT | 19,777 | 19,777 |
| 095 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | 22,003 | 22,003 |
| 096 | DIGITAL CAMERA RECEIVING STATION | 1,595 | 1,595 |
| 097 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT | 66,031 | 66,031 |
| 098 | AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 49,668 | 49,668 |
| 099 | LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | 18,471 | 18,471 |
| 100 | PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS | 7,875 | 7,875 |
| 101 | OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 12,553 | 12,553 |
| | SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT | | |
| 102 | NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM | 2,049 | 2,049 |
| 103 | GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT | 4,488 | 4,488 |
| | SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT | | |
| 104 | NATO SEASPARROW | 8,926 | 8,926 |
| 105 | RAM GMLS | 4,321 | 4,321 |
| 106 | SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM | 60,700 | 60,700 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 107 | AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 43,148 | | | | 43,148 |
| 108 | TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 72,861 | | | | 72,861 |
| 109 | VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS | | 732 | | | | 732 |
| 110 | MARITIME INTEGRATED PLANNING SYSTEM-MIPS | | 4,823 | | | | 4,823 |
| | FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 111 | STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP | | 187,807 | | | | 187,807 |
| | ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 112 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | | 81,596 | | | | 81,596 |
| 113 | SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 5,241 | | | | 5,241 |
| 114 | SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 5,816 | | | | 5,816 |
| 115 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 7,842 | | | | 7,842 |
| | OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 116 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | | 98,847 | | | | 98,847 |
| 117 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 4,073 | | | | 4,073 |
| | OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE | | | | | | |
| 118 | ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM | | 32,716 | | | | 32,716 |
| 119 | SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | | 5,814 | | | | 5,814 |
| 120 | SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | | 36,777 | | | | 36,777 |
| | CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 121 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 6,271 | | | | 6,271 |
| 122 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | | 3,202 | | | | 3,202 |
| 123 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | | 9,850 | | | | 9,850 |
| 124 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | | 14,315 | | | | 14,315 |
| 125 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | 16,502 | | | | 16,502 |
| 126 | AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT | | 3,235 | | | | 3,235 |
| 127 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | | 7,175 | | | | 7,175 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 128 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION | 20,727 | | 20,727 |
| 129 | PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES | 1,142 | | 1,142 |
| | SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 130 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | 14,972 | | 14,972 |
| 131 | OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 4,453 | | 4,453 |
| 132 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 6,416 | | 6,416 |
| 133 | SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS (IT) | 51,894 | | 51,894 |
| | TRAINING DEVICES | | | |
| 134 | TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 16,353 | | 16,353 |
| | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 135 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 28,693 | | 28,693 |
| 136 | EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 2,197 | | 2,197 |
| 137 | MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 7,175 | | 7,175 |
| 138 | NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 1,457 | | 1,457 |
| 140 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 15,330 | | 15,330 |
| 141 | C4ISR EQUIPMENT | 136 | | 136 |
| 142 | ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 18,639 | | 18,639 |
| 143 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 177,240 | | 177,240 |
| 144 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 143,022 | | 143,022 |
| | PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS | | | |
| 147 | JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT | | | |
| | OTHER | | | |
| 148 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | |
| 148A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 14,402 | | 14,402 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | |
| 149 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 208,384 | | 208,384 |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 6,285,451 | 7,575 | 6,293,026 |
| | | | | |
| | PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | | | |
| | TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | |
| 001 | AAV7A1 PIP | 9,894 | | 9,894 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 002 | LAV PIP | | 147,051 | | | | 147,051 |
| | ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS | | | | | | |
| 003 | EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 7 | 11,961 | | | 7 | 11,961 |
| 004 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | | 5,552 | | | | 5,552 |
| 005 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM | | 14,695 | | | | 14,695 |
| 006 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION | | 14,868 | | | | 14,868 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 007 | MODIFICATION KITS | | 53,932 | | | | 53,932 |
| 008 | WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | | 13,795 | | | | 13,795 |
| | GUIDED MISSILES | | | | | | |
| 009 | GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE | | 12,287 | | | | 12,287 |
| 010 | JAVELIN | | | | | | |
| 011 | FOLLOW ON TO SMAW | | 46,563 | | | | 46,563 |
| 012 | ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H) | | 19,606 | | | | 19,606 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 013 | MODIFICATION KITS | | 4,140 | | | | 4,140 |
| | COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS | | | | | | |
| 014 | UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER | | 16,755 | | | | 16,755 |
| | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 015 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | | 24,071 | | | | 24,071 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT (TEL) | | | | | | |
| 016 | COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 25,461 | | | | 25,461 |
| 017 | MODIFICATION KITS | | | | | | |
| | COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL) | | | | | | |
| 018 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | | 5,926 | | | | 5,926 |
| 019 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | | 44,152 | | | | 44,152 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | | | | |
| 020 | RADAR SYSTEMS | | 40,352 | | | 40,352 |
| | INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | | | | |
| 021 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 8,793 | | | 8,793 |
| 022 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 64,276 | | | 64,276 |
| 024 | RQ–11 UAV | | 2,104 | | | 2,104 |
| 025 | DCGS-MC | | 10,789 | | | 10,789 |
| | OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | | | | |
| 028 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | | 6,847 | | | 6,847 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL) | | | | | |
| 029 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | | 218,869 | | | 218,869 |
| 030 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | | 84,856 | | | 84,856 |
| 031 | RADIO SYSTEMS | | 89,479 | 1,000 | | 90,479 |
| | CBRNE Response Force Capability Enhancement | | | [1,000] | | |
| 032 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | | 16,598 | | | 16,598 |
| 033 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | | 47,505 | | | 47,505 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 033A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 1,606 | | | 1,606 |
| | ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES | | | | | |
| 034 | COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES | | 894 | | | 894 |
| 035 | COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES | | 14,231 | | | 14,231 |
| | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | | | | |
| 036 | 5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP) | | | | | |
| 037 | MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS | | 8,389 | | | 8,389 |
| 038 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | 12 | 5,833 | | 12 | 5,833 |
| 039 | LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP | | 972 | | | 972 |
| 040 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | | 21,848 | | | 21,848 |
| 041 | TRAILERS | | | | | |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | |
| 042 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 4,503 | | | 4,503 |
| | ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT | | | | | |
| 043 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | | 2,599 | | | 2,599 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 044 | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT | | 16,255 | | | | 16,255 |
| 045 | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS | | 26,853 | | | | 26,853 |
| 046 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | | 27,247 | | | | 27,247 |
| 047 | AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 5,533 | | | | 5,533 |
| 048 | EOD SYSTEMS | | 61,753 | | | | 61,753 |
| | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 049 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | | 16,627 | | | | 16,627 |
| 050 | GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE) | | 10,827 | | | | 10,827 |
| 051 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | | 37,055 | | | | 37,055 |
| 052 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | | 1,462 | | | | 1,462 |
| | GENERAL PROPERTY | | | | | | |
| 053 | FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | | 24,079 | | | | 24,079 |
| 054 | TRAINING DEVICES | | 10,277 | | | | 10,277 |
| 055 | CONTAINER FAMILY | | 3,123 | | | | 3,123 |
| 056 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | 18,137 | | | | 18,137 |
| 057 | FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV) | | | | | | |
| 058 | BRIDGE BOATS | | | | | | |
| 059 | RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN | | 5,026 | | | | 5,026 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 060 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 5,206 | | | | 5,206 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | | | | |
| 061 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 90 | | | | 90 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | 19 | 1,391,602 | | 1,000 | 19 | 1,392,602 |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | | | | |
| | TACTICAL FORCES | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 001 | F–35 | 19 | 3,340,615 | | | 19 | 3,340,615 |
| 002 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 323,477 | | | | 323,477 |
| 003 | F–22A | | 104,118 | | | | 104,118 |
| | TACTICAL AIRLIFT | | | | | | |
| 004 | C–17A (MYP) | | | | | | |
| | OTHER AIRLIFT | | | | | | |
| 005 | C–130J | 1 | 72,879 | | | 1 | 72,879 |
| 006 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | | |
| 007 | HC–130J | 3 | 332,899 | | | 3 | 332,899 |
| 008 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | | |
| 009 | MC–130J | 6 | 582,466 | | | 6 | 582,466 |
| 010 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | | |
| 011 | HC/MC–130 RECAP | | | | | | |
| 012 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | | |
| 013 | C–27J | 9 | 479,896 | | | 9 | 479,896 |
| | UPT TRAINERS | | | | | | |
| 014 | LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 015 | USAFA POWERED FLIGHT PROGRAM | | 1,060 | | | | 1,060 |
| | OPERATIONAL TRAINERS | | | | | | |
| 016 | T–6 | | | | | | |
| | HELICOPTERS | | | | | | |
| 017 | COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT | 2 | 52,800 | | | 2 | 52,800 |
| 018 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | | |
| 019 | V22 OSPREY | 5 | 339,865 | | | 5 | 339,865 |
| 020 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 20,000 | | | | 20,000 |
| | MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 021 | C–12 A | | | | | | |
| 022 | C–40 | | | | | | |
| 023 | CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C | | 2,190 | | | | 2,190 |
| 024 | HH–60M | 3 | 104,711 | –2 | –69,900 | 1 | 34,811 |
| | Early to Need per H.R. 1473 | | | [–2] | [–69,900] | | |
| 025 | LIGHT ATTACK ARMED RECON ACFT | 9 | 158,549 | | | 9 | 158,549 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 026 | RQ–11 | | | | | | |
| 027 | STUASL0 | | | | | | |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 028 | ITERIM GATEWAY | | | | | | |
| 029 | TARGET DRONES | | 64,268 | | | | 64,268 |
| 030 | C–37A | 3 | 77,842 | | | 3 | 77,842 |
| 031 | RQ–4 | 3 | 323,964 | | | 3 | 323,964 |
| 032 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 71,500 | | | | 71,500 |
| 033 | MC 130 | 1 | 108,470 | | | 1 | 108,470 |
| 034 | MQ–9 | 48 | 813,092 | | | 48 | 813,092 |
| | STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 035 | B–2A | | 41,315 | | | | 41,315 |
| 036 | B–1B | | 198,007 | | | | 198,007 |
| 037 | B–52 | | 93,897 | | | | 93,897 |
| | TACTICAL AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 038 | A–10 | | 153,128 | | 5,000 | | 158,128 |
| | Modification of In Service A–10 Aircraft | | | | [5,000] | | |
| 039 | F–15 | | 222,386 | | | | 222,386 |
| 040 | F–16 | | 73,346 | | –16,600 | | 56,746 |
| | Early to Need- Mode 5 IFF Block 50/52 | | | | [–16,600] | | |
| 041 | F–22A | | 232,032 | | | | 232,032 |
| 042 | F–35 MODIFICATIONS | | | | | | |
| | AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| 043 | C–5 | | 11,741 | | –6,000 | | 5,741 |
| | Program Decrease | | | | [–6,000] | | |
| 044 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 045 | C–5M | 851,859 | | 851,859 |
| 046 | Advance Procurement (CY) | 112,200 | | 112,200 |
| 047 | C–9C | 9 | | 9 |
| 048 | C–17A | 202,179 | –6,000 | 196,179 |
| | Program Decrease | | [–6,000] | |
| 049 | C–21 | 328 | | 328 |
| 050 | C–32A | 12,157 | | 12,157 |
| 051 | C–37A | 21,986 | | 21,986 |
| 052 | C–130 AMP | 235,635 | | 235,635 |
| | TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | | |
| 053 | GLIDER MODS | 123 | | 123 |
| 054 | T–6 | 15,086 | | 15,086 |
| 055 | T–1 | 238 | | 238 |
| 056 | T–38 | 31,032 | | 31,032 |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | | |
| 057 | KC–10A (ATCA) | 27,220 | | 27,220 |
| 058 | C–12 | 1,777 | | 1,777 |
| 059 | MC–12W | 16,767 | | 16,767 |
| 060 | C–20 MODS | 241 | | 241 |
| 061 | VC–25A MOD | 387 | | 387 |
| 062 | C–40 | 206 | | 206 |
| 063 | C–130 | 45,876 | –2,600 | 43,276 |
| | Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request from RDAF–81 | | [10,400] | |
| | Program Decrease | | [–13,000] | |
| 064 | C–130 INTEL | 3,593 | | 3,593 |
| 065 | C–130J MODS | 38,174 | | 38,174 |
| 066 | C–135 | 62,210 | | 62,210 |
| 067 | COMPASS CALL MODS | 256,624 | | 256,624 |
| 068 | RC–135 | 162,211 | | 162,211 |
| 069 | E–3 | 135,031 | | 135,031 |
| 070 | E–4 | 57,829 | | 57,829 |
| 071 | E–8 | 29,058 | | 29,058 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 072 | H–1 | | 5,280 | | | | 5,280 |
| 073 | H–60 | | 34,371 | | 54,600 | | 88,971 |
| | Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request from RDAF–81 | | | | [54,600] | | |
| 074 | RQ–4 MODS | | 89,177 | | | | 89,177 |
| 075 | AC–130 RECAP | | 431 | | | | 431 |
| 076 | OTHER MODIFICATIONS | | 115,338 | | | | 115,338 |
| 076A | EHF SATCOM | | | | | | |
| 076B | JTRS | | | | | | |
| 077 | MQ–1 MODS | | 158,446 | | | | 158,446 |
| 078 | MQ–9 MODS | | 181,302 | | | | 181,302 |
| 079 | MQ–9 UAS PAYLOADS | | 74,866 | | | | 74,866 |
| 080 | CV–22 MODS | | 14,715 | | | | 14,715 |
| | AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS | | | | | | |
| 081 | FIGHTER/UAV INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | | 1,030,364 | | | | 1,030,364 |
| 081A | AIRLIFT/BOMBER INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | | | | | | |
| | COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 082 | AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP | | 92,394 | | | | 92,394 |
| | POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 083 | B–1 | | 4,743 | | | | 4,743 |
| 084 | B–2A | | 101 | | | | 101 |
| 085 | B–2A | | 49,319 | | | | 49,319 |
| 086 | B–52 | | | | | | |
| 087 | C–5 | | 521 | | | | 521 |
| 088 | C–5 | | | | | | |
| 089 | KC–10A (ATCA) | | 5,691 | | | | 5,691 |
| 090 | C–17A | | 183,696 | | | | 183,696 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 091 | C–130 | | 25,646 | | | | 25,646 |
| 092 | EC–130J | | | | | | |
| 093 | C–135 | | 2,434 | | | | 2,434 |
| 094 | F–15 | | 2,076 | | | | 2,076 |
| 095 | F–16 | | 4,537 | | | | 4,537 |
| 096 | T–6 | | | | | | |
| 097 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | 40,025 | | | | 40,025 |
| | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | | | | | | |
| 098 | INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS | | 21,050 | | | | 21,050 |
| | WAR CONSUMABLES | | | | | | |
| 099 | WAR CONSUMABLES | | 87,220 | | | | 87,220 |
| | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | | | | | |
| 100 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | 1,072,858 | | | | 1,072,858 |
| | DARP | | | | | | |
| 104 | U–2 | | 48,875 | | | | 48,875 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| 104A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 16,502 | | | | 16,502 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | | | |
| 105 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | 85,000 | | 85,000 |
| | Mobility Aircraft | | | | [60,000] | | |
| | Mobility Aircraft Simulators | | | | [25,000] | | |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 112 | 14,082,527 | –2 | 43,500 | 110 | 14,126,027 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | | | | | | |
| | ROCKETS | | | | | | |
| 001 | ROCKETS | | 23,919 | | | | 23,919 |
| | CARTRIDGES | | | | | | |
| 002 | CARTRIDGES | | 89,771 | | | | 89,771 |
| | BOMBS | | | | | | |
| 003 | PRACTICE BOMBS | | 38,756 | | | | 38,756 |
| 004 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | | 168,557 | | | | 168,557 |
| 005 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 3,250 | 76,649 | | | 3,250 | 76,649 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | FLARE, IR MJU–7B | | | | | | |
| 006 | CAD/PAD | | 42,410 | | | | 42,410 |
| 007 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) | | 3,119 | | | | 3,119 |
| 008 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 998 | | | | 998 |
| 009 | MODIFICATIONS | | 1,132 | | | | 1,132 |
| 010 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | | 5,075 | | | | 5,075 |
| | FUZES | | | | | | |
| 011 | FLARES | | 46,749 | | | | 46,749 |
| 012 | FUZES | | 34,735 | | | | 34,735 |
| | SMALL ARMS | | | | | | |
| 013 | SMALL ARMS | | 7,195 | | | | 7,195 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | 3,250 | 539,065 | | | 3,250 | 539,065 |
| | MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | | | | |
| | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC | | | | | | |
| 001 | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC | | 67,745 | | | | 67,745 |
| | TACTICAL | | | | | | |
| 002 | JASSM | 142 | 236,193 | | | 142 | 236,193 |
| 003 | SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X) | 240 | 88,769 | | | 240 | 88,769 |
| 004 | AMRAAM | 218 | 309,561 | | | 218 | 309,561 |
| 005 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 416 | 46,830 | | | 416 | 46,830 |
| 006 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | | 7,523 | | | | 7,523 |
| | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | | | | | |
| 007 | INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION | | 726 | | | | 726 |
| | CLASS IV | | | | | | |
| 008 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | | 39 | | | | 39 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 009 | MM III MODIFICATIONS | | 125,953 | | | 125,953 |
| 010 | AGM–65D MAVERICK | | 266 | | | 266 |
| 011 | AGM–88A HARM | | 25,642 | | | 25,642 |
| 012 | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | | 14,987 | | | 14,987 |
| | MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS | | | | | |
| 013 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | | 43,241 | | | 43,241 |
| | SPACE PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 014 | ADVANCED EHF | 2 | 552,833 | | 2 | 552,833 |
| 015 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | |
| 016 | WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE) | 1 | 468,745 | 416,000 | 1 | 884,745 |
| | Transfer from PDW–20 | | | [416,000] | | |
| 017 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | | | | |
| 018 | GPS III SPACE SEGMENT | 2 | 433,526 | | 2 | 433,526 |
| 019 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 81,811 | | | 81,811 |
| 020 | SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) | | 21,568 | | | 21,568 |
| 021 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | | 67,689 | | | 67,689 |
| 022 | DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE) | | 101,397 | | | 101,397 |
| 023 | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE) | 4 | 1,740,222 | | 4 | 1,740,222 |
| 024 | SBIR HIGH (SPACE) | | 81,389 | | | 81,389 |
| 025 | Advance Procurement (CY) | | 243,500 | | | 243,500 |
| 026 | NATL POLAR-ORBITING OP ENV SATELLITE | | | | | |
| | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 029 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM | | | | | |
| 031 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS | | 154,727 | | | 154,727 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 031A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 1,159,135 | | | 1,159,135 |
| | TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 1,025 | 6,074,017 | 416,000 | 1,025 | 6,490,017 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | | | |
| | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | | | | |
| 001 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 5,621 | | | 5,621 |
| | CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES | | | | | |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 002 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | | 18,411 | | | | 18,411 |
| 003 | CAP VEHICLES | | 917 | | | | 917 |
| 004 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (CARGO | | 18,694 | | | | 18,694 |
| | SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | | | | | | |
| 005 | SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES | | 5,982 | | –5,982 | | |
| | Funding No Longer Required | | | | [–5,982] | | |
| 006 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SPECIA | | 20,677 | | | | 20,677 |
| | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 007 | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES | | 22,881 | | | | 22,881 |
| | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 008 | ITEMS LESS THAT $5,000,000 | | 14,978 | | | | 14,978 |
| | BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 009 | RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU | | 16,556 | | | | 16,556 |
| 010 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M BASE MAINT/CONST | | 30,225 | | | | 30,225 |
| | COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC) | | | | | | |
| 011 | COMSEC EQUIPMENT | | 135,169 | | | | 135,169 |
| 012 | MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC) | | 1,263 | | | | 1,263 |
| 013 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY | | | | | | |
| | INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| 014 | INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | 2,645 | | | | 2,645 |
| 015 | INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT | | 21,762 | | | | 21,762 |
| 016 | ADVANCE TECH SENSORS | | 899 | | | | 899 |
| 017 | MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | | 18,529 | | | | 18,529 |
| | ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| 018 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS | | 32,473 | | | | 32,473 |
| 019 | NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM | | 51,426 | | | | 51,426 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 020 | BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED | 32,468 | 32,468 |
| 021 | THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN | 22,813 | 22,813 |
| 022 | WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST | 14,619 | 14,619 |
| 023 | STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL | 39,144 | 39,144 |
| 024 | CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX | 25,992 | 25,992 |
| 025 | TAC SIGNIT SPT | 217 | 217 |
| 026 | DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | | |
| | SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS | | |
| 027 | GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 52,263 | 52,263 |
| 028 | AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS | 16,951 | 16,951 |
| 029 | MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL | 26,433 | 26,433 |
| 030 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | 90,015 | 90,015 |
| 031 | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | 23,955 | 23,955 |
| 032 | C3 COUNTERMEASURES | 7,518 | 7,518 |
| 033 | GCSS-AF FOS | 72,641 | 72,641 |
| 034 | THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM | 22,301 | 22,301 |
| 035 | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS | 15,525 | 15,525 |
| | AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 036 | INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS | 49,377 | 49,377 |
| 037 | BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE | 41,239 | 41,239 |
| 038 | AFNET | 228,978 | 228,978 |
| 039 | VOICE SYSTEMS | 43,603 | 43,603 |
| 040 | USCENTCOM- JCSE | 30,983 | 30,983 |
| | DISA PROGRAMS | | |
| 041 | SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE | 49,570 | 49,570 |
| 042 | NAVSTAR GPS SPACE | 2,008 | 2,008 |
| 043 | NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE | 4,863 | 4,863 |
| 044 | AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE | 61,386 | 61,386 |
| 045 | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE | 125,947 | 125,947 |
| 046 | MILSATCOM SPACE | 104,720 | 104,720 |
| 047 | SPACE MODS SPACE | 28,075 | 28,075 |
| 048 | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM | 20,718 | 20,718 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | ORGANIZATION AND BASE | | | | | | |
| 049 | TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT | | 227,866 | | | | 227,866 |
| 050 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER | | 22,184 | | | | 22,184 |
| 051 | RADIO EQUIPMENT | | 11,408 | | | | 11,408 |
| 052 | CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT | | 11,559 | | | | 11,559 |
| 053 | BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE | | 105,977 | | | | 105,977 |
| | MODIFICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 054 | COMM ELECT MODS | | 76,810 | | | | 76,810 |
| | PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP | | | | | | |
| 055 | NIGHT VISION GOGGLES | | 20,008 | | | | 20,008 |
| 056 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SAFETY) | | 25,499 | | | | 25,499 |
| | DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ | | | | | | |
| 057 | MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | | 37,829 | | | | 37,829 |
| | BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 058 | BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT | | 16,483 | | | | 16,483 |
| 059 | CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS | | 16,754 | | | | 16,754 |
| 060 | PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT | | 3,653 | | | | 3,653 |
| 061 | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | | 30,345 | | | | 30,345 |
| 062 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S) | | 2,819 | | | | 2,819 |
| | SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS | | | | | | |
| 064 | DARP RC135 | | 23,341 | | | | 23,341 |
| 065 | DCGS-AF | | 212,146 | | | | 212,146 |
| 067 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM | | 410,069 | | | | 410,069 |
| 068 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. | | 41,066 | | | | 41,066 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| 068A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 14,618,160 | | | | 14,618,160 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | | |
| 069 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 14,630 | | 14,630 |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | 17,602,036 | –5,982 | 17,596,054 |
| | PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | | | | |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA | | | | |
| 001 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA | | | | |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA | | | | |
| 002 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 1,473 | | 1,473 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA | | | | |
| 003 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | | 2,076 | | 2,076 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA | | | | |
| 004 | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | | 11,019 | | 11,019 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA | | | | |
| 013 | INTERDICTION SUPPORT | | | | |
| 014 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY | | 19,952 | | 19,952 |
| 015 | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | | 5,324 | | 5,324 |
| 016 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 2,955 | | 2,955 |
| 017 | TELEPORT PROGRAM | | 54,743 | | 54,743 |
| 018 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 174,805 | | 174,805 |
| 019 | NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) | | 3,429 | | 3,429 |
| 020 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK | | 500,932 | –416,000 | 84,932 |
| | Transfer to MPAF–16 | | | [–416,000] | |
| 021 | PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE | | 1,788 | | 1,788 |
| 022 | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | | 24,085 | | 24,085 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA | | | | |
| 023 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | | 11,537 | | 11,537 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT | | | | |
| 024 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 5 | 14,542 | 5 | 14,542 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA | | | | |
| 025 | AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS | | 1,444 | | 1,444 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | | | | |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 026 | EQUIPMENT | | 971 | | | | 971 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS | | | | | | |
| 027 | OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT | | 974 | | | | 974 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | | | | | | |
| 028 | VEHICLES | 4 | 200 | | | 4 | 200 |
| 029 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 3 | 12,806 | | | 3 | 12,806 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA | | | | | | |
| 030 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | | 447 | | | | 447 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY | | | | | | |
| 031 | THAAD PROCUREMENT | | | | | | |
| 032 | AEGIS BMD PROCUREMENT | | | | | | |
| 033 | THAAD | 68 | 833,150 | | 50,000 | 68 | 883,150 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [50,000] | | |
| 034 | AEGIS BMD | 46 | 565,393 | | 50,000 | 46 | 615,393 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [50,000] | | |
| 035 | BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS | 2 | 380,195 | | | 2 | 380,195 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA | | | | | | |
| 043 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | | 5,787 | | | | 5,787 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD | | | | | | |
| 045 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD | | 47,123 | | | | 47,123 |
| 045A | JCTD | | | | | | |
| 046 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE | | 20,176 | | | | 20,176 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS | | | | | | |
| 047 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS | | 29,729 | | | | 29,729 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | | | | | | |
| 048 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | | 31,974 | | | | 31,974 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 048A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 554,408 | | | 554,408 |
| | AVIATION PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 049 | ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT | | 41,411 | | | 41,411 |
| 050 | MH–47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM | | | | | |
| 051 | MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | | 171,456 | | | 171,456 |
| 052 | NON-STANDARD AVIATION | 15 | 272,623 | –50,000 | 15 | 222,623 |
| | Unjustified Growth | | | [–50,000] | | |
| 053 | TANKER RECAPITALIZATION | | | | | |
| 054 | U–28 | | 5,100 | | | 5,100 |
| 055 | MH–47 CHINOOK | | 142,783 | | | 142,783 |
| 056 | RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE | | 486 | | | 486 |
| 057 | CV–22 MODIFICATION | 27 | 118,002 | | 27 | 118,002 |
| 058 | MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE | | 3,025 | | | 3,025 |
| 059 | MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE | | 3,024 | | | 3,024 |
| 060 | RQ–7 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE | | 450 | | | 450 |
| 061 | STUASL0 | | 12,276 | | | 12,276 |
| 062 | AC/MC–130J | | 74,891 | | | 74,891 |
| 063 | C–130 MODIFICATIONS | | 19,665 | | | 19,665 |
| 064 | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | | 6,207 | | | 6,207 |
| | SHIPBUILDING | | | | | |
| 065 | UNDERWATER SYSTEMS | | 6,999 | | | 6,999 |
| 066 | SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE | | | | | |
| | AMMUNITION PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 067 | ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT | | 116,009 | | | 116,009 |
| 068 | ORDNANCE ACQUISITION | | 28,281 | | | 28,281 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| 069 | COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS | | 87,489 | 62,800 | | 150,289 |
| | Program Growth | | | [62,800] | | |
| 070 | INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | | 74,702 | | | 74,702 |
| 071 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | | 9,196 | | | 9,196 |
| 072 | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | | 15,621 | | | 15,621 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 074 | MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS | | | | | | |
| 076 | COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS | | 6,899 | | 60,000 | | 66,899 |
| | Program Growth | | | | [60,000] | | |
| 077 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 594 | | | | 594 |
| 078 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | 33,915 | | | | 33,915 |
| 079 | MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS | | | | | | |
| 080 | MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS | | 46,242 | | | | 46,242 |
| 081 | COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS | | 50,000 | | | | 50,000 |
| 082 | MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT | | 18,723 | | | | 18,723 |
| 084 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| 085 | AUTOMATION SYSTEMS | | 51,232 | | | | 51,232 |
| 086 | GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES | | 7,782 | | | | 7,782 |
| 087 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | | 22,960 | | | | 22,960 |
| 088 | SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS | | 362 | | | | 362 |
| 089 | VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS | | 15,758 | | | | 15,758 |
| 090 | TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | | 76,459 | | 25,000 | | 101,459 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [25,000] | | |
| 091 | MARITIME EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 092 | DRUG INTERDICTION | | | | | | |
| 093 | MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | | 1,895 | | | | 1,895 |
| 094 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | | 246,893 | | | | 246,893 |
| 095 | MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | | 4,142 | | | | 4,142 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| 095A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 4,012 | | | | 4,012 |
| | CBDP | | | | | | |
| 096 | INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION | | 15,900 | | | | 15,900 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 097 | INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION | | 71,376 | | | | 71,376 |
| 098 | DECONTAMINATION | | 6,466 | | | | 6,466 |
| 099 | JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL) | | 11,143 | | | | 11,143 |
| 100 | COLLECTIVE PROTECTION | | 9,414 | | | | 9,414 |
| 101 | CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE | | 139,948 | | | | 139,948 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | 170 | 5,365,248 | | –218,200 | 170 | 5,147,048 |
| | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | | | | | | |
| | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | | | | | | |
| 001 | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | | 100,000 | | –100,000 | | |
| | Unjustified Requirement | | | | [–100,000] | | |
| | TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | | 100,000 | | –100,000 | | |
| | NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |
| 007 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [100,000] | | |
| | TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT | 123,571 | 111,453,792 | –20 | –68,259 | 123,551 | 111,385,533 |

## SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **FIXED WING** | | | | | | |
| 002 | C–12 CARGO AIRPLANE | 1 | 10,500 | | | 1 | 10,500 |
| | **ROTARY** | | | | | | |
| 008 | AH–64 BLOCK II/WRA | 1 | 35,500 | –1 | –35,500 | | |
| | Post 2012 Contract Award | | | [–1] | [–35,500] | | |
| 012 | UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP) | 4 | 72,000 | | | 4 | 72,000 |
| 017 | KIOWA WARRIOR UPGRADE (OH–58 D)/WRA | 15 | 145,500 | | | 15 | 145,500 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 019 | MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS | | 10,800 | | | | 10,800 |
| 022 | MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) | | 54,500 | | | | 54,500 |
| 033 | RQ–7 UAV MODS | | 94,600 | | | | 94,600 |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **21** | **423,400** | **–1** | **–35,500** | **20** | **387,900** |
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | |
| 004 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | 907 | 107,556 | | | 907 | 107,556 |
| | **ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS** | | | | | | |
| 009 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 210 | 19,000 | | | 210 | 19,000 |
| | **TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **1,117** | **126,556** | | | **1,117** | **126,556** |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 020 | LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN | 118 | 5,427 | | | 118 | 5,427 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 029 | COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO | 64 | 14,890 | 64 | 14,890 |
| 033 | M4 CARBINE MODS | | 16,800 | | 16,800 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY** | **182** | **37,117** | **182** | **37,117** |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | | | |
| | **SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION** | | | | |
| 004 | CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES | | 1,200 | | 1,200 |
| 009 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| 010 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | | 38,000 | | 38,000 |
| | **MORTAR AMMUNITION** | | | | |
| 013 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| 014 | 120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 49,140 | | 49,140 |
| | **ARTILLERY AMMUNITION** | | | | |
| 019 | ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES | | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| | **ARTILLERY FUZES** | | | | |
| 022 | ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES | | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | |
| 027 | SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| 028 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | | 53,841 | | 53,841 |
| | **OTHER AMMUNITION** | | | | |
| 029 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| 031 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| 032 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS** | | | | |
| 036 | CAD/PAD ALL TYPES | | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| 037 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 400 | | 400 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | **208,381** | | **208,381** |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | |
| 005 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | 32 | 11,094 | 32 | 11,094 |
| 007 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | | 47,214 | | 47,214 |

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | **NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 023 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER | | 3,600 | | | | 3,600 |
| | **COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 025 | WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK | | 547 | | | | 547 |
| | **COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 039 | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM | | 450 | | | | 450 |
| 042 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2 | | 8,141 | | | | 8,141 |
| 049 | GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM (GDS) | | 44,100 | | | | 44,100 |
| 051 | MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4) | | 6,443 | | | | 6,443 |
| | **INFORMATION SECURITY** | | | | | | |
| 055 | TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS) | | | | | | |
| 056 | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP | | 54,730 | | | | 54,730 |
| | **COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 058 | BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS | | 5,000 | | | | 5,000 |
| | **COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 062 | INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM( | | 169,500 | | | | 169,500 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)** | | | | | | |
| 070 | DCGS-A (MIP) | | 83,000 | | | | 83,000 |
| 072 | TROJAN (MIP) | | 61,100 | | | | 61,100 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)** | | | | | | |
| 076 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR | | 54,100 | | | | 54,100 |
| 079 | FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITES | | 53,000 | | | | 53,000 |
| 080 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | | 48,600 | | | | 48,600 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)** | | | | | | |
| 084 | SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW) | | 10,000 | | | | 10,000 |
| 095 | PROFILER | | 2,000 | | | | 2,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 096 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS) | | 30,400 | | 30,400 |
| 098 | JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P) | | 148,335 | | 148,335 |
| 102 | COUNTERFIRE RADARS | | 110,548 | | 110,548 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS** | | | | |
| 105 | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY | | 15,081 | | 15,081 |
| 106 | BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC | | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| 108 | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS | | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| 109 | KNIGHT FAMILY | | 42,000 | | 42,000 |
| 114 | NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE | | 32,800 | | 32,800 |
| 115 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | | 44,000 | | 44,000 |
| 116 | SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE) | | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION** | | | | |
| 121 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | |
| 127A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 795 | | 795 |
| | **CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 128 | PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS | | 11,472 | | 11,472 |
| 129 | FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE) | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| 131 | CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION | | 1,200 | | 1,200 |
| | **BRIDGING EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 133 | TACTICAL BRIDGING | | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| 134 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | | 26,900 | | 26,900 |
| | **ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 138 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) | | 3,205 | | 3,205 |
| | **COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 149 | FORCE PROVIDER | | 68,000 | | 68,000 |
| | **MEDICAL EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 158 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | | 15,011 | | 15,011 |
| | **MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 159 | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS | | 25,129 | | 25,129 |
| | **MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 180 | ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM | 10 | 1,800 | 10 | 1,800 |

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 189 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 43,000 | | | | 43,000 |
| 190 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) | | 4,900 | | | | 4,900 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **42** | **1,398,195** | | | **42** | **1,398,195** |
| | **JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND** | | | | | | |
| | **NETWORK ATTACK** | | | | | | |
| 001 | ATTACK THE NETWORK | | 1,368,800 | | | | 1,368,800 |
| | **JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT** | | | | | | |
| 002 | DEFEAT THE DEVICE | | 961,200 | | | | 961,200 |
| | **FORCE TRAINING** | | | | | | |
| 003 | TRAIN THE FORCE | | 247,500 | | | | 247,500 |
| | **TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND** | | **2,577,500** | | | | **2,577,500** |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 011 | UH–1Y/AH–1Z | 1 | 30,000 | | | 1 | 30,000 |
| 019 | E–2D ADV HAWKEYE | 1 | 163,500 | | | 1 | 163,500 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 028 | OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT | | 21,882 | | | | 21,882 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 030 | AEA SYSTEMS | | 53,100 | | | | 53,100 |
| 031 | AV–8 SERIES | | 53,485 | | | | 53,485 |
| 032 | F–18 SERIES | | 46,992 | | | | 46,992 |
| 034 | AH–1W SERIES | | 39,418 | | | | 39,418 |
| 035 | H–53 SERIES | | 70,747 | | | | 70,747 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 037 | H–1 SERIES | | 6,420 | | 6,420 |
| 038 | EP–3 SERIES | | 20,800 | | 20,800 |
| 043 | C–130 SERIES | | 59,625 | | 59,625 |
| 045 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | | 25,880 | | 25,880 |
| 048 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | | 11,184 | | 11,184 |
| 053 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | | 27,200 | | 27,200 |
| 054 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | | 13,467 | | 13,467 |
| 055 | COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM | | 3,300 | | 3,300 |
| 060 | V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | |
| 061 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 39,060 | | 39,060 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES** | | | | |
| 062 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | | 10,800 | | 10,800 |
| 065 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | 4,100 | | 4,100 |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **2** | **730,960** | **2** | **730,960** |
| | **WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL MISSILES** | | | | |
| 009 | HELLFIRE | 140 | 14,000 | 140 | 14,000 |
| 010 | STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM) | 150 | 20,000 | 150 | 20,000 |
| | **GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS** | | | | |
| 027 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | | 7,070 | | 7,070 |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **290** | **41,070** | **290** | **41,070** |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC** | | | | |
| | **NAVY AMMUNITION** | | | | |
| 003 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | | 80,200 | | 80,200 |
| 004 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | | 22,400 | | 22,400 |
| 007 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| 011 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | | 182 | | 182 |
| 012 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | | 4,545 | | 4,545 |
| 013 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | | 1,656 | | 1,656 |

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 014 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 6,000 | | | | 6,000 |
| | **MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 015 | SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION | | 19,575 | | | | 19,575 |
| 016 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | | 6,691 | | | | 6,691 |
| 017 | 40 MM, ALL TYPES | | 12,184 | | | | 12,184 |
| 018 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | | 10,988 | | | | 10,988 |
| 019 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | | 24,515 | | | | 24,515 |
| 020 | 120MM, ALL TYPES | | 11,227 | | | | 11,227 |
| 021 | CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES | | 802 | | | | 802 |
| 022 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | | 5,911 | | | | 5,911 |
| 023 | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | | 18,871 | | | | 18,871 |
| 024 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | | 57,003 | | | | 57,003 |
| 025 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 7,831 | | | | 7,831 |
| 026 | FUZE, ALL TYPES | | 5,177 | | | | 5,177 |
| 027 | NON LETHALS | | 712 | | | | 712 |
| 029 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 630 | | | | 630 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC** | | **317,100** | | | | **317,100** |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL BOATS** | | | | | | |
| 023 | STANDARD BOATS | | 13,729 | | | | 13,729 |
| | **AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 056 | MATCALS | | 7,232 | | | | 7,232 |
| | **OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 066 | TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS | | 4,000 | | | | 4,000 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 092 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | 47,000 | 47,000 |
| 095 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | 10,800 | 10,800 |
| 097 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| 101 | OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 18,226 | 18,226 |
| | **ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | |
| 112 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| | **OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | |
| 116 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | 15,700 | 15,700 |
| | **CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | |
| 121 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 2,628 | 2,628 |
| 123 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | 13,290 | 13,290 |
| 124 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 3,672 | 3,672 |
| 128 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION | 1,002 | 1,002 |
| | **SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | |
| 130 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | 3,644 | 3,644 |
| | **TRAINING DEVICES** | | |
| 134 | TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 5,789 | 5,789 |
| | **COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | |
| 135 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 3,310 | 3,310 |
| 140 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 6,977 | 6,977 |
| 141 | C4ISR EQUIPMENT | 24,762 | 24,762 |
| 143 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 78,241 | 78,241 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | |
| 149 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 473 | 473 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **281,975** | **281,975** |
| | | | |
| | **PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | | |
| | **TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | |
| 002 | LAV PIP | 23,962 | 23,962 |
| | **ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS** | | |
| 004 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| 005 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM | 10,488 | 10,488 |

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| 010 | JAVELIN | | 2,527 | | | | 2,527 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 013 | MODIFICATION KITS | | 59,730 | | | | 59,730 |
| | **REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 015 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | | 19,040 | | | | 19,040 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 017 | MODIFICATION KITS | | 2,331 | | | | 2,331 |
| | **COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 018 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | | 3,090 | | | | 3,090 |
| 019 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | | 5,236 | | | | 5,236 |
| | **RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 020 | RADAR SYSTEMS | | 26,506 | | | | 26,506 |
| | **INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 021 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 35 | | | | 35 |
| 022 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 47,132 | | | | 47,132 |
| | **OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 028 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | | 9,850 | | | | 9,850 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 029 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | | 18,629 | | | | 18,629 |
| 030 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | | 31,491 | | | | 31,491 |
| 031 | RADIO SYSTEMS | | 87,027 | | | | 87,027 |
| 032 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | | 54,177 | | | | 54,177 |
| 033 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | | 2,200 | | | | 2,200 |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 037 | MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS | | 95,800 | | | | 95,800 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 038 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | 783 | 392,391 | | –50,000 | 783 | 342,391 |
| | Early to Need | | | | [–50,000] | | |
| 039 | LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP | 66 | 38,382 | | | 66 | 38,382 |
| 040 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | | 24,826 | | | | 24,826 |
| | **ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 043 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | | 18,775 | | | | 18,775 |
| 044 | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT | | 7,361 | | | | 7,361 |
| 046 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | | 51,895 | | | | 51,895 |
| 048 | EOD SYSTEMS | | 57,237 | | | | 57,237 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 049 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | | 42,900 | | | | 42,900 |
| 051 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | | 42,553 | | | | 42,553 |
| | **GENERAL PROPERTY** | | | | | | |
| 053 | FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | | 8,307 | | | | 8,307 |
| 054 | TRAINING DEVICES | | 5,200 | | | | 5,200 |
| 055 | CONTAINER FAMILY | | 12 | | | | 12 |
| 056 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | 28,533 | | | | 28,533 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | **849** | **1,260,996** | | **–50,000** | **849** | **1,210,996** |
| | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **HELICOPTERS** | | | | | | |
| 019 | V22 OSPREY | 2 | 70,000 | –2 | –70,000 | | |
| | Funded in H.R. 1473 | | | [–2] | [–70,000] | | |
| | **MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 024 | HH–60M | 2 | 39,300 | | | 2 | 39,300 |
| 027 | STUASLO | | 2,472 | | | | 2,472 |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 043 | C–5 | | 59,299 | | | | 59,299 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 059 | MC–12W | | 17,300 | | | | 17,300 |
| 063 | C–130 | | 164,041 | | | | 164,041 |
| 064 | C–130 INTEL | | 4,600 | | | | 4,600 |

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| 065 | C–130J MODS | | 27,983 | | | | 27,983 |
| 067 | COMPASS CALL MODS | | 12,000 | | | | 12,000 |
| 075 | AC–130 RECAP | | 34,000 | | | | 34,000 |
| 076 | OTHER MODIFICATIONS | | 15,000 | | | | 15,000 |
| 077 | MQ–1 MODS | | 2,800 | | | | 2,800 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 081 | FIGHTER/UAV INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | | 2,800 | | | | 2,800 |
| | **POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 090 | C–17A | | 10,970 | | | | 10,970 |
| | **OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES** | | | | | | |
| 100 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | 23,000 | | | | 23,000 |
| | **DARP** | | | | | | |
| 104 | U–2 | | 42,300 | | | | 42,300 |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **4** | **527,865** | **–2** | **–70,000** | **2** | **457,865** |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | |
| 001 | ROCKETS | | 329 | | | | 329 |
| | **CARTRIDGES** | | | | | | |
| 002 | CARTRIDGES | | 8,014 | | | | 8,014 |
| | **BOMBS** | | | | | | |
| 004 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | | 17,385 | | | | 17,385 |
| 005 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 1,338 | 34,100 | | | 1,338 | 34,100 |
| | **FLARE, IR MJU–7B** | | | | | | |
| 007 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) | | 1,200 | | | | 1,200 |
| | **FUZES** | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 011 | FLARES | | 11,217 | | 11,217 |
| 012 | FUZES | | 8,765 | | 8,765 |
| | **SMALL ARMS** | | | | |
| 013 | SMALL ARMS | | 11,500 | | 11,500 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | **1,338** | **92,510** | **1,338** | **92,510** |
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL** | | | | |
| 005 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 154 | 16,120 | 154 | 16,120 |
| 006 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 100 | 12,300 | 100 | 12,300 |
| | **TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **254** | **28,420** | **254** | **28,420** |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | |
| | **PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES** | | | | |
| 001 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 2,658 | | 2,658 |
| | **CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES** | | | | |
| 004 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (CARGO | | 32,824 | | 32,824 |
| | **SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES** | | | | |
| 006 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SPECIA | | 110 | | 110 |
| | **FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 007 | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES | | 1,662 | | 1,662 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | |
| 008 | ITEMS LESS THAT $5,000,000 | | 772 | | 772 |
| | **BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT** | | | | |
| 010 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M BASE MAINT/CONST | | 13,983 | | 13,983 |
| | **COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)** | | | | |
| 013 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY | | 500 | | 500 |
| | **ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS** | | | | |
| 022 | WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST | 3 | 1,800 | 3 | 1,800 |
| 025 | TAC SIGNIT SPT | | 7,020 | | 7,020 |
| | **SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS** | | | | |
| 030 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | | 25,920 | | 25,920 |

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | **ORGANIZATION AND BASE** | | | | | | |
| 049 | TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT | | 9,445 | | | | 9,445 |
| | **PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP** | | | | | | |
| 055 | NIGHT VISION GOGGLES | | 12,900 | | | | 12,900 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 059 | CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS | | 18,100 | | | | 18,100 |
| 061 | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | | 9,800 | | | | 9,800 |
| 062 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S) | | 8,400 | | | | 8,400 |
| | **SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS** | | | | | | |
| 065 | DCGS-AF | | 3,000 | | | | 3,000 |
| 068 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. | | 64,400 | | | | 64,400 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 068A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 2,991,347 | | | | 2,991,347 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **3** | **3,204,641** | | | **3** | **3,204,641** |
| | **PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA** | | | | | | |
| 017 | TELEPORT PROGRAM | | 3,307 | | | | 3,307 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA** | | | | | | |
| 043 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | | 3,000 | | | | 3,000 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD** | | | | | | |
| 046 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE | | 8,300 | | | | 8,300 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 048A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 101,548 | | | | 101,548 |
| | **AVIATION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 050 | MH–47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM | 2 | 40,500 | | | 2 | 40,500 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 051 | MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 1 | 7,800 | –1 | –7,800 | | |
| | MH–60 Combat Loss Replacement Funding | | | [–1] | [–7,800] | | |
| 052 | NON-STANDARD AVIATION | 9 | 8,500 | | | 9 | 8,500 |
| 057 | CV–22 MODIFICATION | 1 | 15,000 | –1 | –15,000 | | |
| | CV–22 Combat Loss Replacement Funding | | | [–1] | [–15,000] | | |
| 063 | C–130 MODIFICATIONS | 5 | 4,800 | | | 5 | 4,800 |
| | **AMMUNITION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 067 | ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT | 8,682,966 | 71,659 | | | 8,682,966 | 71,659 |
| 068 | ORDNANCE ACQUISITION | 235 | 25,400 | | | 235 | 25,400 |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 069 | COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS | 5 | 2,325 | | | 5 | 2,325 |
| 070 | INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | 149 | 43,558 | | | 149 | 43,558 |
| 071 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | 2,522 | 6,488 | | | 2,522 | 6,488 |
| 072 | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 1 | 2,601 | | | 1 | 2,601 |
| 078 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 88 | 15,818 | | | 88 | 15,818 |
| 085 | AUTOMATION SYSTEMS | 15 | 13,387 | | | 15 | 13,387 |
| 087 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 4 | 5,800 | | | 4 | 5,800 |
| 088 | SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS | 1,103 | 34,900 | | | 1,103 | 34,900 |
| 089 | VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS | 578 | 3,531 | | | 578 | 3,531 |
| 090 | TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | 18 | 2,894 | | | 18 | 2,894 |
| 093 | MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | 30 | 7,220 | | | 30 | 7,220 |
| 094 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 50 | 41,632 | | | 50 | 41,632 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **8,687,782** | **469,968** | **–2** | **–22,800** | **8,687,780** | **447,168** |
| | **JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND** | | | | | | |
| 001 | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | | 100,000 | | –50,000 | | 50,000 |
| | Unjustified Requirement | | | | [–50,000] | | |
| | **TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND** | | **100,000** | | **–50,000** | | **50,000** |
| | **MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND** | | | | | | |
| 001 | MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND | | 3,195,170 | | | | 3,195,170 |
| | **TOTAL MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND** | | **3,195,170** | | | | **3,195,170** |

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| | **NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | | | | |
| 007 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | 225,000 | | 225,000 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [225,000] | | |
| | **TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | **225,000** | | **225,000** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT** | **8,691,884** | **15,021,824** | **–5** | **–3,300** | **8,691,879** | **15,018,524** |

# TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

## SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | | | |
| | | BASIC RESEARCH | | | |
| 001 | 0601101A | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 21,064 | | 21,064 |
| 002 | 0601102A | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 213,942 | 2,000 | 215,942 |
| | | Program Increase | | [2,000] | |
| 003 | 0601103A | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 80,977 | 9,000 | 89,977 |
| | | Clinical Care and Research | | [2,000] | |
| | | Program Increase | | [7,000] | |
| 004 | 0601104A | UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS | 120,937 | –15,245 | 105,692 |
| | | Realignment of Funds for Proper Oversight and Execution | | [–15,245] | |
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 436,920 | –4,245 | 432,675 |
| | | APPLIED RESEARCH | | | |
| 005 | 0602105A | MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY | 30,258 | 10,500 | 40,758 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,500] | |
| 006 | 0602120A | SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY | 43,521 | 10,000 | 53,521 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] | |
| 007 | 0602122A | TRACTOR HIP | 14,230 | | 14,230 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 008 | 0602211A | AVIATION TECHNOLOGY | 44,610 | | 44,610 |
| 009 | 0602270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 15,790 | | 15,790 |
| 010 | 0602303A | MISSILE TECHNOLOGY | 50,685 | | 50,685 |
| 011 | 0602307A | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 20,034 | | 20,034 |
| 012 | 0602308A | ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION | 20,933 | 10,000 | 30,933 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] | |
| 013 | 0602601A | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY | 64,306 | | 64,306 |
| 014 | 0602618A | BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY | 59,214 | | 59,214 |
| 015 | 0602622A | CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY | 4,877 | | 4,877 |
| 016 | 0602623A | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 8,244 | | 8,244 |
| 017 | 0602624A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY | 39,813 | 30,000 | 69,813 |
| | | Program Increase | | [30,000] | |
| 018 | 0602705A | ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES | 62,962 | | 62,962 |
| 019 | 0602709A | NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY | 57,203 | 12,000 | 69,203 |
| | | Program Increase | | [12,000] | |
| 020 | 0602712A | COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS | 20,280 | 4,500 | 24,780 |
| | | Program Increase | | [4,500] | |
| 021 | 0602716A | HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 21,801 | | 21,801 |
| 022 | 0602720A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY | 20,837 | | 20,837 |
| 023 | 0602782A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY | 26,116 | | 26,116 |
| 024 | 0602783A | COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY | 8,591 | | 8,591 |
| 025 | 0602784A | MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 80,317 | 6,000 | 86,317 |
| | | Rotary Wing Surfaces | | [6,000] | |
| 026 | 0602785A | MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY | 18,946 | | 18,946 |
| 027 | 0602786A | WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY | 29,835 | | 29,835 |
| 028 | 0602787A | MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 105,929 | 12,968 | 118,897 |
| | | Program Increase | | [12,968] | |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 869,332 | 95,968 | 965,300 |
| | | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 029 | 0603001A | WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 52,979 | 5,000 | 57,979 |
| | | Program Increase | | [5,000] | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 030 | 0603002A | MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 68,171 | 26,000 | 94,171 |
| | | Program Increase | | [23,000] | |
| | | Treatment of Wounded Warriors | | [3,000] | |
| 031 | 0603003A | AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 62,193 | 27,800 | 89,993 |
| | | Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research | | [8,000] | |
| | | Program Increase | | [19,800] | |
| 032 | 0603004A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 77,077 | 5,000 | 82,077 |
| | | Program Increase | | [5,000] | |
| 033 | 0603005A | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 106,145 | | 106,145 |
| 034 | 0603006A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 5,312 | 3,000 | 8,312 |
| | | Communications Advanced Technology | | [3,000] | |
| 035 | 0603007A | MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 10,298 | | 10,298 |
| 036 | 0603008A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 57,963 | | 57,963 |
| 037 | 0603009A | TRACTOR HIKE | 8,155 | | 8,155 |
| 038 | 0603015A | NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS | 17,936 | | 17,936 |
| 039 | 0603020A | TRACTOR ROSE | 12,597 | | 12,597 |
| 040 | 0603105A | MILITARY HIV RESEARCH | 6,796 | | 6,796 |
| 041 | 0603125A | COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 12,191 | | 12,191 |
| 042 | 0603130A | TRACTOR NAIL | 4,278 | | 4,278 |
| 043 | 0603131A | TRACTOR EGGS | 2,261 | | 2,261 |
| 044 | 0603270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 23,677 | | 23,677 |
| 045 | 0603313A | MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 90,602 | 10,550 | 101,152 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,550] | |
| 046 | 0603322A | TRACTOR CAGE | 10,315 | | 10,315 |
| 047 | 0603461A | HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 183,150 | | 183,150 |
| 048 | 0603606A | LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 31,541 | | 31,541 |
| 049 | 0603607A | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 7,686 | | 7,686 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 050 | 0603710A | NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 42,414 | 13,800 | 56,214 |
| | | Night Vision Advanced Technology | | [4,800] | |
| | | Program Increase | | [9,000] | |
| 051 | 0603728A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 15,959 | | 15,959 |
| 052 | 0603734A | MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 36,516 | 7,000 | 43,516 |
| | | Base Camp Fuel | | [2,000] | |
| | | Military Engineering Advanced Technology | | [5,000] | |
| 053 | 0603772A | ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY | 30,600 | | 30,600 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 976,812 | 98,150 | 1,074,962 |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | |
| 054 | 0603024A | UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID) | | | |
| 055 | 0603305A | ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION(NON SPACE) | 21,126 | | 21,126 |
| 055A | 0603XXXA | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION | 14,883 | | 14,883 |
| 056 | 0603308A | ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE) | 9,612 | | 9,612 |
| 057 | 0603327A | AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | | | |
| 058 | 0603619A | LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV | 35,383 | | 35,383 |
| 059 | 0603627A | SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV | 9,501 | –5,000 | 4,501 |
| | | Engineering, Modeling and Environmental Studies for SOD and SOM systems – funding unjustified. | | [–5,000] | |
| 060 | 0603639A | TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION | 39,693 | | 39,693 |
| 061 | 0603653A | ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS) | 101,408 | | 101,408 |
| 062 | 0603747A | SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY | 9,747 | | 9,747 |
| 063 | 0603766A | TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV | 5,766 | | 5,766 |
| 064 | 0603774A | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 065 | 0603779A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY | 4,946 | 8,000 | 12,946 |
| | | Army Net Zero Programs | | [8,000] | |
| 066 | 0603782A | WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL | 297,955 | | 297,955 |
| 067 | 0603790A | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 4,765 | | 4,765 |
| 068 | 0603801A | AVIATION—ADV DEV | 7,107 | | 7,107 |
| 069 | 0603804A | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV | 19,509 | | 19,509 |
| 070 | 0603805A | COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS | 5,258 | | 5,258 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 071 | 0603807A | MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV | 34,997 | | 34,997 |
| 072 | 0603827A | SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 19,598 | | 19,598 |
| 073 | 0603850A | INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE | 1,496 | | 1,496 |
| 074 | 0604115A | TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES | 10,181 | | 10,181 |
| 075 | 0604131A | TRACTOR JUTE | 15,609 | –15,609 | |
| | | Unjustified Requirement | | [–15,609] | |
| 076 | 0604284A | JOINT COOPERATIVE TARGET IDENTIFICATION—GROUND (JCTI-G) / TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPME | 41,652 | | 41,652 |
| 077 | 0305205A | ENDURANCE UAVS | 42,892 | | 42,892 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 753,084 | –12,609 | 740,475 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | |
| 078 | 0604201A | AIRCRAFT AVIONICS | 144,687 | | 144,687 |
| 079 | 0604220A | ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS | 166,132 | –35,500 | 130,632 |
| | | Early to Need | | [–35,500] | |
| 080 | 0604270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 101,265 | | 101,265 |
| 081 | 0604280A | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO | | | |
| 082 | 0604321A | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM | 17,412 | | 17,412 |
| 083 | 0604328A | TRACTOR CAGE | 26,577 | | 26,577 |
| 084 | 0604601A | INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS | 73,728 | 3,000 | 76,728 |
| | | Portable Helicopter Oxygen Delivery Systems | | [3,000] | |
| 085 | 0604604A | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES | 3,961 | | 3,961 |
| 086 | 0604609A | SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD | | | |
| 087 | 0604611A | JAVELIN | 17,340 | | 17,340 |
| 088 | 0604622A | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES | 5,478 | | 5,478 |
| 089 | 0604633A | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 22,922 | | 22,922 |
| 090 | 0604642A | LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES | | | |
| 091 | 0604646A | NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 092 | 0604660A | FCS MANNED GRD VEHICLES & COMMON GRD VEHICLE | | | |
| 093 | 0604661A | FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT | 383,872 | | 383,872 |
| 094 | 0604662A | FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS | | | |
| 095 | 0604663A | FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES | 143,840 | | 143,840 |
| 096 | 0604664A | FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS | 499 | | 499 |
| 097 | 0604665A | FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D | | | |
| 098 | 0604710A | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—SDD | 59,265 | | 59,265 |
| 099 | 0604713A | COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT | 2,075 | | 2,075 |
| 100 | 0604715A | NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—SDD | 30,021 | | 30,021 |
| 101 | 0604716A | TERRAIN INFORMATION—SDD | 1,596 | | 1,596 |
| 102 | 0604741A | AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—SDD | 83,010 | | 83,010 |
| 103 | 0604742A | CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 28,305 | | 28,305 |
| 104 | 0604746A | AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 14,375 | | 14,375 |
| 105 | 0604760A | DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—SDD | 15,803 | | 15,803 |
| 106 | 0604778A | POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE) | | | |
| 107 | 0604780A | COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE | 22,226 | | 22,226 |
| 108 | 0604802A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—SDD | 13,828 | –10,000 | 3,828 |
| | | Program Reduction- Precision Guidance Kit | | [–10,000] | |
| 109 | 0604804A | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—SDD | 251,104 | –25,000 | 226,104 |
| | | Joint Light Tactical Vehicle Schedule Slip | | [–25,000] | |
| 110 | 0604805A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—SDD | 137,811 | | 137,811 |
| 111 | 0604807A | MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—SDD | 27,160 | | 27,160 |
| 112 | 0604808A | LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—SDD | 87,426 | | 87,426 |
| 113 | 0604814A | ARTILLERY MUNITIONS | 42,627 | | 42,627 |
| 114 | 0604817A | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION | | | |
| 115 | 0604818A | ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE | 123,935 | 2,000 | 125,935 |
| | | Army Tactical Command and Control Hardware and Software | | [2,000] | |
| 116 | 0604820A | RADAR DEVELOPMENT | 2,890 | | 2,890 |
| 117 | 0604822A | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS) | 794 | | 794 |
| 118 | 0604823A | FIREFINDER | 10,358 | | 10,358 |
| 119 | 0604827A | SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL | 48,309 | –7,600 | 40,709 |
| | | Early to Need- Nett Warrior | | [–7,600] | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 120 | 0604854A | ARTILLERY SYSTEMS | 120,146 | | 120,146 |
| 121 | 0604869A | PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP) | 406,605 | –149,500 | 257,105 |
| | | Program Decrease | | [–149,500] | |
| 122 | 0604870A | NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK | 7,398 | | 7,398 |
| 123 | 0605013A | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 37,098 | | 37,098 |
| 124 | 0605018A | ARMY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (A-IMHRS) | 68,693 | | 68,693 |
| 125 | 0605450A | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 127,095 | | 127,095 |
| 126 | 0605455A | SLAMRAAM | 19,931 | | 19,931 |
| 127 | 0605456A | PAC–3/MSE MISSILE | 88,993 | | 88,993 |
| 128 | 0605457A | ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD) | 270,607 | | 270,607 |
| 129 | 0605625A | MANNED GROUND VEHICLE | 884,387 | | 884,387 |
| 130 | 0605626A | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR | 31,465 | | 31,465 |
| 131 | 0303032A | TROJAN—RH12 | 3,920 | | 3,920 |
| 132 | 0304270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 13,819 | | 13,819 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 4,190,788 | –222,600 | 3,968,188 |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | |
| 133 | 0604256A | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 16,992 | | 16,992 |
| 134 | 0604258A | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 11,247 | | 11,247 |
| 135 | 0604759A | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 49,437 | | 49,437 |
| 136 | 0605103A | RAND ARROYO CENTER | 20,384 | | 20,384 |
| 137 | 0605301A | ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL | 145,606 | | 145,606 |
| 138 | 0605326A | CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM | 28,800 | | 28,800 |
| 139 | 0605502A | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| | | Small Business Innovative Research | | [5,000] | |
| 140 | 0605601A | ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES | 262,456 | 100,000 | 362,456 |
| | | Program Increase | | [100,000] | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 141 | 0605602A | ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS | 70,227 | | 70,227 |
| 142 | 0605604A | SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS | 43,483 | | 43,483 |
| 143 | 0605605A | DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY | 18 | | 18 |
| 144 | 0605606A | AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION | 5,630 | | 5,630 |
| 145 | 0605702A | METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES | 7,182 | | 7,182 |
| 146 | 0605706A | MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS | 19,669 | | 19,669 |
| 147 | 0605709A | EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS | 5,445 | | 5,445 |
| 148 | 0605712A | SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING | 68,786 | | 68,786 |
| 149 | 0605716A | ARMY EVALUATION CENTER | 63,302 | | 63,302 |
| 150 | 0605718A | ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG | 3,420 | | 3,420 |
| 151 | 0605801A | PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES | 83,054 | | 83,054 |
| 152 | 0605803A | TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES | 63,872 | –5,000 | 58,872 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–5,000] | |
| 153 | 0605805A | MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY | 57,142 | 5,000 | 62,142 |
| | | Program Increase | | [5,000] | |
| 154 | 0605857A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT | 4,961 | | 4,961 |
| 155 | 0605898A | MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D | 17,558 | | 17,558 |
| 156 | 0909980A | JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT | | | |
| 157 | 0909999A | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 1,048,671 | 105,000 | 1,153,671 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 158 | 0603778A | MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 66,641 | | 66,641 |
| 159 | 0603820A | WEAPONS CAPABILITY MODIFICATIONS UAV | 24,142 | –24,142 | |
| | | Unjustified Requirement | | [–24,142] | |
| 160 | 0102419A | AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE | 344,655 | | 344,655 |
| 161 | 0203347A | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO CYBER (ISC) MIP | | | |
| 162 | 0203726A | ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM | 29,546 | | 29,546 |
| 163 | 0203735A | COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 53,307 | 25,000 | 78,307 |
| | | Program Increase | | [25,000] | |
| 164 | 0203740A | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM | 65,002 | | 65,002 |
| 165 | 0203744A | AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 163,205 | | 163,205 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 166 | 0203752A | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 823 | | 823 |
| 167 | 0203758A | DIGITIZATION | 8,029 | | 8,029 |
| 168 | 0203759A | FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2) | | | |
| 169 | 0203801A | MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 44,560 | 14,500 | 59,060 |
| | | Program Increase for Stinger per Army Request | | [14,500] | |
| 170 | 0203802A | OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | | | |
| 171 | 0203808A | TRACTOR CARD | 42,554 | | 42,554 |
| 172 | 0208053A | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM | 27,630 | | 27,630 |
| 173 | 0208058A | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV) | 3,044 | | 3,044 |
| 175 | 0303028A | SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 2,854 | | 2,854 |
| 176 | 0303140A | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 61,220 | | 61,220 |
| 177 | 0303141A | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 100,505 | | 100,505 |
| 178 | 0303142A | SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE) | 12,104 | | 12,104 |
| 179 | 0303150A | WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 23,937 | | 23,937 |
| 181 | 0305204A | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 40,650 | | 40,650 |
| 182 | 0305208A | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 44,198 | | 44,198 |
| 183 | 0305219A | MQ–1 SKY WARRIOR A UAV | 137,038 | | 137,038 |
| 184 | 0305232A | RQ–11 UAV | 1,938 | | 1,938 |
| 185 | 0305233A | RQ–7 UAV | 31,940 | | 31,940 |
| 186 | 0307207A | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) | | | |
| 187 | 0307665A | BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE | 15,018 | | 15,018 |
| 188 | 0708045A | END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES | 59,297 | 7,000 | 66,297 |
| | | End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities | | [7,000] | |
| 188A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 4,536 | | 4,536 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 1,408,373 | 22,358 | 1,430,731 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | 9,683,980 | 82,022 | 9,766,002 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | | | |
| | | BASIC RESEARCH | | | |
| 001 | 0601103N | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 113,157 | 10,000 | 123,157 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] | |
| 002 | 0601152N | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 18,092 | | 18,092 |
| 003 | 0601153N | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 446,123 | 4,500 | 450,623 |
| | | Program Increase | | [2,500] | |
| | | Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Applications in the Pacific Region | | [2,000] | |
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 577,372 | 14,500 | 591,872 |
| | | APPLIED RESEARCH | | | |
| 004 | 0602114N | POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH | 104,804 | | 104,804 |
| 005 | 0602123N | FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH | 156,901 | 2,000 | 158,901 |
| | | Alternative Energy for Mobile Power Applications | | [2,000] | |
| 006 | 0602131M | MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY | 44,845 | 3,000 | 47,845 |
| | | Marine Corps Landing Force Technology | | [3,000] | |
| 007 | 0602234N | MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY | | | |
| 008 | 0602235N | COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH | 65,448 | | 65,448 |
| 009 | 0602236N | WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH | 101,205 | 2,500 | 103,705 |
| | | Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research | | [2,500] | |
| 010 | 0602271N | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH | 108,329 | | 108,329 |
| 011 | 0602435N | OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH | 50,076 | | 50,076 |
| 012 | 0602651M | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH | 5,937 | | 5,937 |
| 013 | 0602747N | UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH | 108,666 | | 108,666 |
| 014 | 0602782N | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH | 37,583 | 8,000 | 45,583 |
| | | Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research | | [8,000] | |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 783,794 | 15,500 | 799,294 |
| | | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 015 | 0603114N | POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 114,270 | | 114,270 |
| 016 | 0603123N | FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 64,057 | 7,100 | 71,157 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Advanced Battery Technologies | | [2,000] | |
| | | Lightweight Body Armor | | [5,100] | |
| 017 | 0603235N | COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 49,068 | | 49,068 |
| 018 | 0603236N | WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 71,232 | | 71,232 |
| 019 | 0603271N | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 102,535 | | 102,535 |
| 020 | 0603640M | USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD) | 124,324 | | 124,324 |
| 021 | 0603651M | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 11,286 | | 11,286 |
| 022 | 0603729N | WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 18,119 | | 18,119 |
| 023 | 0603747N | UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 37,121 | | 37,121 |
| 024 | 0603758N | NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS | 50,157 | | 50,157 |
| 025 | 0603782N | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 6,048 | | 6,048 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 648,217 | 7,100 | 655,317 |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | |
| 026 | 0603207N | AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS | 94,972 | | 94,972 |
| 027 | 0603216N | AVIATION SURVIVABILITY | 10,893 | | 10,893 |
| 028 | 0603237N | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL | 3,702 | | 3,702 |
| 029 | 0603251N | AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS | 10,497 | | 10,497 |
| 030 | 0603254N | ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 7,915 | | 7,915 |
| 031 | 0603261N | TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE | 5,978 | | 5,978 |
| 032 | 0603382N | ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY | 1,418 | | 1,418 |
| 033 | 0603502N | SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 142,657 | | 142,657 |
| 034 | 0603506N | SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE | 118,764 | | 118,764 |
| 035 | 0603512N | CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 54,072 | | 54,072 |
| 036 | 0603513N | SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 037 | 0603525N | PILOT FISH | 96,012 | | 96,012 |
| 038 | 0603527N | RETRACT LARCH | 73,421 | | 73,421 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 039 | 0603536N | RETRACT JUNIPER | 130,267 | | 130,267 |
| 040 | 0603542N | RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL | 1,338 | | 1,338 |
| 041 | 0603553N | SURFACE ASW | 29,797 | 3,500 | 33,297 |
| | | Surface Anti-Submarine Warfare | | [3,500] | |
| 042 | 0603561N | ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 856,326 | 9,000 | 865,326 |
| | | Program Increase | | [9,000] | |
| 043 | 0603562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS | 9,253 | | 9,253 |
| 044 | 0603563N | SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN | 14,308 | | 14,308 |
| 045 | 0603564N | SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES | 22,213 | 19,900 | 42,113 |
| | | Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies | | [19,900] | |
| 046 | 0603570N | ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS | 463,683 | | 463,683 |
| 047 | 0603573N | ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS | 18,249 | 10,000 | 28,249 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] | |
| 048 | 0603576N | CHALK EAGLE | 584,159 | | 584,159 |
| 049 | 0603581N | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS) | 286,784 | | 286,784 |
| 050 | 0603582N | COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION | 34,157 | | 34,157 |
| 051 | 0603609N | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 4,753 | | 4,753 |
| 052 | 0603611M | MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| 053 | 0603635M | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM | 79,858 | –25,000 | 54,858 |
| | | Joint Light Tactical Vehicle Schedule Slip | | [–25,000] | |
| 054 | 0603654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 33,654 | | 33,654 |
| 055 | 0603658N | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT | 54,783 | | 54,783 |
| 056 | 0603713N | OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 9,996 | | 9,996 |
| 057 | 0603721N | ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION | 21,714 | | 21,714 |
| 058 | 0603724N | NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM | 70,538 | | 70,538 |
| 059 | 0603725N | FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT | 3,754 | | 3,754 |
| 060 | 0603734N | CHALK CORAL | 79,415 | | 79,415 |
| 061 | 0603739N | NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY | 4,137 | | 4,137 |
| 062 | 0603746N | RETRACT MAPLE | 276,383 | | 276,383 |
| 063 | 0603748N | LINK PLUMERIA | 52,721 | | 52,721 |
| 064 | 0603751N | RETRACT ELM | 160,964 | | 160,964 |
| 065 | 0603755N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE | | | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 066 | 0603764N | LINK EVERGREEN | 144,985 | | 144,985 |
| 067 | 0603787N | SPECIAL PROCESSES | 43,704 | | 43,704 |
| 068 | 0603790N | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 9,140 | | 9,140 |
| 069 | 0603795N | LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY | 421 | | 421 |
| 070 | 0603851M | NONLETHAL WEAPONS | 40,992 | | 40,992 |
| 071 | 0603860N | JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS | 121,455 | | 121,455 |
| 072 | 0603879N | SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER (SE) | | | |
| 073 | 0603889N | COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS | | | |
| 074 | 0603925N | DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS | | | |
| 075 | 0604272N | TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM) | 64,107 | | 64,107 |
| 076 | 0604279N | ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION | 711 | | 711 |
| 077 | 0604653N | JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW) | 62,044 | | 62,044 |
| 078 | 0604659N | PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 22,665 | –18,200 | 4,465 |
| | | Cancelation of FMU–164/B Bomb Fuze Program | | [–18,200] | |
| 079 | 0604707N | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT | 33,621 | | 33,621 |
| 080 | 0303354N | ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP | 1,078 | | 1,078 |
| 081 | 0303562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS—MIP | | | |
| 082 | 0304270N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP | 625 | | 625 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 4,481,053 | –800 | 4,480,253 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | |
| 083 | 0604212N | OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT | 35,651 | | 35,651 |
| 084 | 0604214N | AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV | 30,676 | | 30,676 |
| 085 | 0604215N | STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT | 51,191 | | 51,191 |
| 086 | 0604216N | MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT | 17,673 | | 17,673 |
| 087 | 0604218N | AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING | 5,922 | | 5,922 |
| 088 | 0604221N | P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 3,417 | | 3,417 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 089 | 0604230N | WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 9,944 | | 9,944 |
| 090 | 0604231N | TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM | 81,257 | | 81,257 |
| 091 | 0604234N | ADVANCED HAWKEYE | 110,994 | | 110,994 |
| 092 | 0604245N | H–1 UPGRADES | 72,569 | | 72,569 |
| 093 | 0604261N | ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS | 56,509 | | 56,509 |
| 094 | 0604262N | V–22A | 84,477 | | 84,477 |
| 095 | 0604264N | AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 3,249 | | 3,249 |
| 096 | 0604269N | EA–18 | 17,100 | | 17,100 |
| 097 | 0604270N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 89,418 | | 89,418 |
| 098 | 0604273N | VH–71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT | 180,070 | | 180,070 |
| 099 | 0604274N | NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) | 189,919 | | 189,919 |
| 100 | 0604280N | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY) | 688,146 | | 688,146 |
| 101 | 0604307N | SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING | 223,283 | | 223,283 |
| 102 | 0604311N | LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 884 | | 884 |
| 103 | 0604329N | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) | 47,635 | | 47,635 |
| 104 | 0604366N | STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS | 46,705 | | 46,705 |
| 105 | 0604373N | AIRBORNE MCM | 41,142 | | 41,142 |
| 106 | 0604378N | NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 24,898 | | 24,898 |
| 107 | 0604404N | FUTURE UNMANNED CARRIER-BASED STRIKE SYSTEM | 121,150 | | 121,150 |
| 108 | 0604501N | ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS | 60,790 | | 60,790 |
| 108A | 0604XXXN | AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR | 166,568 | | 166,568 |
| 109 | 0604503N | SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION | 100,591 | | 100,591 |
| 110 | 0604504N | AIR CONTROL | 5,521 | | 5,521 |
| 111 | 0604512N | SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS | 45,445 | | 45,445 |
| 112 | 0604518N | COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION | 3,400 | | 3,400 |
| 113 | 0604558N | NEW DESIGN SSN | 97,235 | 10,000 | 107,235 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] | |
| 114 | 0604562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM | 48,466 | | 48,466 |
| 115 | 0604567N | SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E | 161,099 | | 161,099 |
| 116 | 0604574N | NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES | 3,848 | | 3,848 |
| 117 | 0604601N | MINE DEVELOPMENT | 3,933 | | 3,933 |
| 118 | 0604610N | LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT | 32,592 | | 32,592 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 119 | 0604654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 9,960 | | 9,960 |
| 120 | 0604703N | PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS | 12,992 | | 12,992 |
| 121 | 0604727N | JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS | 7,506 | | 7,506 |
| 122 | 0604755N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL) | 71,222 | | 71,222 |
| 123 | 0604756N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL) | 6,631 | | 6,631 |
| 124 | 0604757N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW) | 184,095 | | 184,095 |
| 125 | 0604761N | INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING | 2,217 | | 2,217 |
| 126 | 0604771N | MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT | 12,984 | | 12,984 |
| 127 | 0604777N | NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM | 50,178 | | 50,178 |
| 128 | 0604800M | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD | 670,723 | | 670,723 |
| 129 | 0604800N | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) | 677,486 | | 677,486 |
| 130 | 0605013M | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 27,461 | | 27,461 |
| 131 | 0605013N | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 58,764 | | 58,764 |
| 132 | 0605018N | NAVY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (N-IMHRS) | 55,050 | | 55,050 |
| 133 | 0605212N | CH–53K RDTE | 629,461 | | 629,461 |
| 134 | 0605430N | C/KC–130 AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP) | | | |
| 135 | 0605450N | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 118,395 | | 118,395 |
| 136 | 0605500N | MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) | 622,713 | | 622,713 |
| 137 | 0204201N | CG(X) | | | |
| 138 | 0204202N | DDG–1000 | 261,604 | | 261,604 |
| 139 | 0304231N | TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP | 979 | | 979 |
| 140 | 0304503N | SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION—MIP | | | |
| 141 | 0304785N | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS | 31,740 | | 31,740 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 6,475,528 | 10,000 | 6,485,528 |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | |
| 142 | 0604256N | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 28,318 | | 28,318 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 143 | 0604258N | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 44,700 | 44,700 |
| 144 | 0604759N | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 37,957 | 37,957 |
| 145 | 0605126N | JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION | 2,970 | 2,970 |
| 146 | 0605152N | STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY | 23,454 | 23,454 |
| 147 | 0605154N | CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES | 47,127 | 47,127 |
| 148 | 0605502N | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | 10 | 10 |
| 149 | 0605804N | TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES | 571 | 571 |
| 150 | 0605853N | MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 68,301 | 68,301 |
| 151 | 0605856N | STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 3,277 | 3,277 |
| 152 | 0605861N | RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT | 73,917 | 73,917 |
| 153 | 0605863N | RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | 136,531 | 136,531 |
| 154 | 0605864N | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 335,367 | 335,367 |
| 155 | 0605865N | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY | 16,634 | 16,634 |
| 156 | 0605866N | NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT | 4,228 | 4,228 |
| 157 | 0605867N | SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT | 7,642 | 7,642 |
| 158 | 0605873M | MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT | 25,655 | 25,655 |
| 159 | 0305885N | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES | 2,764 | 2,764 |
| 160 | 0804758N | SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC | | |
| 161 | 0909980N | JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT | | |
| 162 | 0909999N | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 859,423 | 859,423 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 164 | 0604402N | UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT. | 198,298 | 198,298 |
| 165 | 0604717M | MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 400 | 400 |
| 166 | 0604766M | MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS | 1,650 | 1,650 |
| 167 | 0101221N | STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT | 88,873 | 88,873 |
| 168 | 0101224N | SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 33,553 | 33,553 |
| 169 | 0101226N | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 6,360 | 6,360 |
| 170 | 0101402N | NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS | 23,208 | 23,208 |
| 171 | 0203761N | RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT) | 30,021 | 30,021 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 172 | 0204136N | F/A–18 SQUADRONS | 151,030 | | 151,030 |
| 173 | 0204152N | E–2 SQUADRONS | 6,696 | | 6,696 |
| 174 | 0204163N | FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL) | 1,739 | | 1,739 |
| 175 | 0204228N | SURFACE SUPPORT | 3,377 | | 3,377 |
| 176 | 0204229N | TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC) | 8,819 | | 8,819 |
| 177 | 0204311N | INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 21,259 | | 21,259 |
| 178 | 0204413N | AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT) | 5,214 | | 5,214 |
| 179 | 0204571N | CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 42,244 | | 42,244 |
| 180 | 0204574N | CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT | 1,447 | | 1,447 |
| 181 | 0204575N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT | 18,142 | | 18,142 |
| 182 | 0205601N | HARM IMPROVEMENT | 11,147 | | 11,147 |
| 183 | 0205604N | TACTICAL DATA LINKS | 69,224 | | 69,224 |
| 184 | 0205620N | SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION | 22,010 | | 22,010 |
| 185 | 0205632N | MK–48 ADCAP | 39,288 | | 39,288 |
| 186 | 0205633N | AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS | 123,012 | –12,600 | 110,412 |
| | | Cancelation of Multi-Purpose Bomb Racks Program | | [–22,600] | |
| | | Electrophotonic Component Capability Development | | [10,000] | |
| 187 | 0205658N | NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM | 1,957 | | 1,957 |
| 188 | 0205675N | OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS | 82,705 | | 82,705 |
| 189 | 0206313M | MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 320,864 | | 320,864 |
| 190 | 0206623M | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS | 209,396 | | 209,396 |
| 191 | 0206624M | MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 45,172 | | 45,172 |
| 192 | 0206625M | USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP) | 14,101 | | 14,101 |
| 193 | 0207161N | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES | 8,765 | | 8,765 |
| 194 | 0207163N | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) | 2,913 | | 2,913 |
| 195 | 0208058N | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV) | 4,108 | | 4,108 |
| 200 | 0303109N | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE) | 263,712 | | 263,712 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 201 | 0303138N | CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES) | 12,906 | | 12,906 |
| 202 | 0303140N | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 25,229 | | 25,229 |
| 203 | 0303150M | WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 1,250 | | 1,250 |
| 204 | 0303238N | CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)—MIP | 6,602 | | 6,602 |
| 206 | 0305149N | COBRA JUDY | 40,605 | | 40,605 |
| 207 | 0305160N | NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC) | 904 | | 904 |
| 208 | 0305192N | MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES | 4,099 | | 4,099 |
| 209 | 0305204N | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 9,353 | 10,000 | 19,353 |
| | | TACAIR-Launched UAS Capability Development | | [10,000] | |
| 210 | 0305206N | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| | | Advance Reconnaissance Systems | | [3,000] | |
| 211 | 0305207N | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | | | |
| 212 | 0305208M | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 23,785 | | 23,785 |
| 213 | 0305208N | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 25,487 | | 25,487 |
| 214 | 0305220N | RQ–4 UAV | 548,482 | | 548,482 |
| 215 | 0305231N | MQ–8 UAV | 108,248 | | 108,248 |
| 216 | 0305232M | RQ–11 UAV | 979 | | 979 |
| 217 | 0305233N | RQ–7 UAV | 872 | | 872 |
| 218 | 0305234M | SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0) | | | |
| 219 | 0305234N | SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0) | 22,698 | | 22,698 |
| 220 | 0305237N | MEDIUM RANGE MARITIME UAS | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| 221 | 0305239M | RQ–21A | 26,301 | | 26,301 |
| 222 | 0307217N | EP–3E REPLACEMENT (EPX) | | | |
| 223 | 0308601N | MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT | 8,292 | | 8,292 |
| 224 | 0702207N | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) | 21,609 | | 21,609 |
| 225 | 0702239N | AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | | | |
| 226 | 0708011N | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 54,031 | 5,000 | 59,031 |
| | | Industrial Preparedness | | [5,000] | |
| 227 | 0708730N | MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH) | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| 227A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,308,608 | | 1,308,608 |
| 227U | 0607UNDN | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| | | Aviation Component Development | | [10,000] | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Program Decrease | | [–20,000] | |
| | | UAS Development | | [10,000] | |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 4,131,044 | 5,400 | 4,136,444 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | 17,956,431 | 51,700 | 18,008,131 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | | | |
| | | BASIC RESEARCH | | | |
| 001 | 0601102F | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 364,328 | | 364,328 |
| 002 | 0601103F | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 140,273 | 7,000 | 147,273 |
| | | Program Increase | | [7,000] | |
| 003 | 0601108F | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 14,258 | | 14,258 |
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 518,859 | 7,000 | 525,859 |
| | | APPLIED RESEARCH | | | |
| 004 | 0602102F | MATERIALS | 136,230 | | 136,230 |
| 005 | 0602201F | AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES | 147,628 | | 147,628 |
| 006 | 0602202F | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH | 86,663 | 2,200 | 88,863 |
| | | Program Increase | | [2,200] | |
| 007 | 0602203F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION | 207,508 | 2,000 | 209,508 |
| | | Program Increase | | [2,000] | |
| 008 | 0602204F | AEROSPACE SENSORS | 134,787 | | 134,787 |
| 009 | 0602601F | SPACE TECHNOLOGY | 115,285 | 3,000 | 118,285 |
| | | Program Increase | | [3,000] | |
| 010 | 0602602F | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 60,692 | | 60,692 |
| 011 | 0602605F | DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY | 111,156 | | 111,156 |
| 012 | 0602788F | DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS | 127,866 | | 127,866 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 013 | 0602890F | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH | 54,059 | | 54,059 |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 1,181,874 | 7,200 | 1,189,074 |
| | | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 014 | 0603112F | ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS | 39,738 | 10,000 | 49,738 |
| | | Program Increase—Metals Affordability Iniatitive | | [10,000] | |
| 015 | 0603199F | SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) | 5,780 | | 5,780 |
| 016 | 0603203F | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS | 53,075 | | 53,075 |
| 017 | 0603211F | AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO | 67,474 | | 67,474 |
| 018 | 0603216F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY | | | |
| 018A | 0603XXXF | FUELS | 6,770 | | 6,770 |
| 018B | 0603XXXF | POWER TECHNOLOGY | 5,747 | | 5,747 |
| 018C | 0603XXXF | PROPULSION | 80,833 | | 80,833 |
| 018D | 0603XXXF | ROCKET PROPULSION | 27,603 | | 27,603 |
| 019 | 0603270F | ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY | 22,268 | | 22,268 |
| 020 | 0603401F | ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY | 74,636 | | 74,636 |
| 021 | 0603444F | MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS) | 13,555 | | 13,555 |
| 022 | 0603456F | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 25,319 | | 25,319 |
| 023 | 0603601F | CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 54,042 | | 54,042 |
| 024 | 0603605F | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 28,683 | | 28,683 |
| 025 | 0603680F | MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 40,103 | | 40,103 |
| 026 | 0603788F | BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | 38,656 | 4,000 | 42,656 |
| | | Program Increase | | [4,000] | |
| 027 | 0603924F | HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 1,122 | | 1,122 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 585,404 | 14,000 | 599,404 |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | |
| 028 | 0603260F | INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 4,013 | | 4,013 |
| 029 | 0603287F | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 3,586 | | 3,586 |
| 030 | 0603423F | GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT | | | |
| 031 | 0603430F | ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 421,687 | –142,200 | 279,487 |
| | | Transfer to RDAF–49 | | [–142,200] | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 032 | 0603432F | POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 122,991 | | 122,991 |
| 033 | 0603438F | SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY | 45,755 | | 45,755 |
| 034 | 0603742F | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | 38,496 | | 38,496 |
| 035 | 0603790F | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 4,424 | | 4,424 |
| 036 | 0603791F | INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D | 642 | | 642 |
| 037 | 0603830F | SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP) | 9,819 | | 9,819 |
| 038 | 0603850F | INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE | 20,046 | | 20,046 |
| 039 | 0603851F | INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE | 67,202 | 20,000 | 87,202 |
| | | Program increase | | [20,000] | |
| 040 | 0603854F | WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE) | 12,804 | | 12,804 |
| 041 | 0603859F | POLLUTION PREVENTION | 2,075 | | 2,075 |
| 042 | 0603860F | JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS | 20,112 | | 20,112 |
| 043 | 0604015F | NEXT GENERATION BOMBER | 197,023 | | 197,023 |
| 044 | 0604283F | BATTLE MGMT COM & CTRL SENSOR DEVELOPMENT | 60,250 | | 60,250 |
| 045 | 0604317F | TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER | 2,553 | 9,000 | 11,553 |
| | | Program Increase | | [9,000] | |
| 046 | 0604327F | HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM | 38,248 | | 38,248 |
| 047 | 0604330F | JOINT DUAL ROLE AIR DOMINANCE MISSILE | 29,759 | | 29,759 |
| 048 | 0604337F | REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION | 24,217 | | 24,217 |
| 049 | 0604436F | NEXT-GENERATION MILSATCOM TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | 142,200 | 142,200 |
| | | Transfer from RDAF-031 | | [142,200] | |
| 050 | 0604635F | GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT | 24,467 | | 24,467 |
| 051 | 0604796F | ALTERNATIVE FUELS | | | |
| 052 | 0604830F | AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING | | | |
| 053 | 0604857F | OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE | 86,543 | 20,000 | 106,543 |
| | | Program Increase | | [20,000] | |
| 054 | 0604858F | TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM | 2,773 | | 2,773 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 055 | 0305178F | NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM (NPOESS) | 444,900 | | 444,900 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 1,684,385 | 49,000 | 1,733,385 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | |
| 056 | 0603840F | GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS) | 5,680 | | 5,680 |
| 057 | 0604222F | NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT | 18,538 | | 18,538 |
| 058 | 0604233F | SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING | 21,780 | | 21,780 |
| 059 | 0604270F | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 26,880 | | 26,880 |
| 060 | 0604280F | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO | | | |
| 061 | 0604281F | TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE | 52,355 | | 52,355 |
| 062 | 0604287F | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 51 | | 51 |
| 063 | 0604329F | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) | 132,891 | | 132,891 |
| 064 | 0604421F | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS | 31,913 | | 31,913 |
| 065 | 0604425F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS | 273,689 | | 273,689 |
| 066 | 0604429F | AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK | 47,100 | | 47,100 |
| 067 | 0604441F | SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD | 621,629 | 20,000 | 641,629 |
| | | Program Increase | | [20,000] | |
| 068 | 0604443F | THIRD GENERATION INFRARED SURVEILLANCE (3GIRS) | | | |
| 069 | 0604602F | ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 10,055 | | 10,055 |
| 070 | 0604604F | SUBMUNITIONS | 2,427 | | 2,427 |
| 071 | 0604617F | AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT | 11,878 | | 11,878 |
| 072 | 0604618F | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | | | |
| 073 | 0604706F | LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS | 11,280 | | 11,280 |
| 074 | 0604735F | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | 28,106 | | 28,106 |
| 075 | 0604740F | INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A) | 10 | | 10 |
| 076 | 0604750F | INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT | 995 | | 995 |
| 077 | 0604800F | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) | 1,387,926 | 1,000 | 1,388,926 |
| | | Establish Protocols for Joint Strike Fighter Lead-Free Electronic Components | | [1,000] | |
| 078 | 0604851F | INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE | 158,477 | | 158,477 |
| 079 | 0604853F | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE) | 20,028 | | 20,028 |
| 080 | 0605221F | NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT | 877,084 | –27,200 | 849,884 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–27,200] | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 081 | 0605229F | CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION | 94,113 | –83,113 | 11,000 |
| | | Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request to APAF–63 | | [–10,400] | |
| | | Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request to APAF–73 | | [–54,600] | |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–18,113] | |
| 082 | 0605277F | CSAR-X RDT&E | | | |
| 083 | 0605278F | HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E | 27,071 | | 27,071 |
| 084 | 0605452F | JOINT SIAP EXECUTIVE PROGRAM OFFICE | | | |
| 085 | 0101125F | NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION | 93,867 | | 93,867 |
| 086 | 0207100F | LIGHT ATTACK ARMED RECONNAISSANCE (LAAR) SQUADRONS | 23,721 | | 23,721 |
| 087 | 0207451F | SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) | | | |
| 088 | 0207701F | FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING | 39,826 | | 39,826 |
| 089 | 0401138F | JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA) | 27,089 | | 27,089 |
| 090 | 0401318F | CV–22 | 20,723 | | 20,723 |
| 091 | 0401845F | AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S) | 12,535 | | 12,535 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 4,079,717 | –89,313 | 3,990,404 |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | |
| 092 | 0604256F | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 22,420 | | 22,420 |
| 093 | 0604759F | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 62,206 | | 62,206 |
| 094 | 0605101F | RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE | 27,579 | | 27,579 |
| 095 | 0605502F | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH | | | |
| 096 | 0605712F | INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION | 17,767 | | 17,767 |
| 097 | 0605807F | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 654,475 | 109,000 | 763,475 |
| | | Program Increase | | [109,000] | |
| 098 | 0605860F | ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE) | 158,096 | –124,500 | 33,596 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–124,500] | |
| 099 | 0605864F | SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP) | 47,926 | | 47,926 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 | 0605976F | FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 44,547 | | 44,547 |
| 101 | 0605978F | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 27,953 | | 27,953 |
| 102 | 0606323F | MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE | 13,953 | | 13,953 |
| 103 | 0702806F | ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 31,966 | | 31,966 |
| 104 | 0804731F | GENERAL SKILL TRAINING | 1,510 | | 1,510 |
| 105 | 0909999F | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| 106 | 1001004F | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES | 3,798 | | 3,798 |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 1,114,196 | –15,500 | 1,098,696 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 107 | 0603423F | GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT | 390,889 | | 390,889 |
| 108 | 0604263F | COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM | 5,365 | | 5,365 |
| 109 | 0605018F | AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS) | 91,866 | | 91,866 |
| 110 | 0605024F | ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY | 35,467 | | 35,467 |
| 112 | 0101113F | B–52 SQUADRONS | 133,261 | | 133,261 |
| 113 | 0101122F | AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | 803 | | 803 |
| 114 | 0101126F | B–1B SQUADRONS | 33,011 | | 33,011 |
| 115 | 0101127F | B–2 SQUADRONS | 340,819 | | 340,819 |
| 116 | 0101313F | STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM | 23,072 | | 23,072 |
| 117 | 0101314F | NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM | 5,421 | –5,421 | |
| | | Program Termination | | [–5,421] | |
| 119 | 0102325F | ATMOSPHERIC EARLY WARNING SYSTEM | 4,485 | | 4,485 |
| 120 | 0102326F | REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 12,672 | | 12,672 |
| 121 | 0102823F | STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES | 14 | | 14 |
| 122 | 0203761F | WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND | 19,934 | 20,000 | 39,934 |
| | | Mixed Conventional Load Capacity for Bomber Aircraft | | [20,000] | |
| 123 | 0205219F | MQ–9 UAV | 146,824 | | 146,824 |
| 124 | 0207040F | MULTI-PLATFORM ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 125 | 0207131F | A–10 SQUADRONS | 11,051 | | 11,051 |
| 126 | 0207133F | F–16 SQUADRONS | 143,869 | | 143,869 |
| 127 | 0207134F | F–15E SQUADRONS | 207,531 | | 207,531 |
| 128 | 0207136F | MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION | 13,253 | | 13,253 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 129 | 0207138F | F–22A SQUADRONS | 718,432 | | 718,432 |
| 130 | 0207142F | F–35 SQUADRONS | 47,841 | | 47,841 |
| 131 | 0207161F | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES | 8,023 | | 8,023 |
| 132 | 0207163F | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) | 77,830 | | 77,830 |
| 133 | 0207170F | JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS) | 1,436 | | 1,436 |
| 134 | 0207224F | COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY | 2,292 | | 2,292 |
| 135 | 0207227F | COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE | 927 | | 927 |
| 136 | 0207247F | AF TENCAP | 20,727 | | 20,727 |
| 137 | 0207249F | PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT | 3,128 | | 3,128 |
| 138 | 0207253F | COMPASS CALL | 18,509 | | 18,509 |
| 139 | 0207268F | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 182,967 | | 182,967 |
| 140 | 0207277F | ISR INNOVATIONS | | | |
| 141 | 0207325F | JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM) | 5,796 | | 5,796 |
| 142 | 0207410F | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) | 121,880 | | 121,880 |
| 143 | 0207412F | CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC) | 3,954 | | 3,954 |
| 144 | 0207417F | AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) | 135,961 | | 135,961 |
| 145 | 0207418F | TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 8,309 | | 8,309 |
| 146 | 0207423F | ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 90,083 | | 90,083 |
| 148 | 0207431F | COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES | 5,428 | | 5,428 |
| 149 | 0207438F | THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I | 15,528 | | 15,528 |
| 150 | 0207444F | TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD | 15,978 | | 15,978 |
| 151 | 0207445F | FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK | | | |
| 152 | 0207448F | C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK | 1,536 | | 1,536 |
| 153 | 0207449F | COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION | 18,102 | | 18,102 |
| 154 | 0207581F | JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS) | 121,610 | | 121,610 |
| 155 | 0207590F | SEEK EAGLE | 18,599 | | 18,599 |
| 156 | 0207601F | USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION | 23,091 | | 23,091 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 157 | 0207605F | WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS | 5,779 | 5,779 |
| 158 | 0207697F | DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES | 5,264 | 5,264 |
| 159 | 0208006F | MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | 69,918 | 69,918 |
| 160 | 0208021F | INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT | 2,322 | 2,322 |
| 161 | 0208059F | CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES | 702 | 702 |
| 168 | 0301400F | SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE | 11,866 | 11,866 |
| 169 | 0302015F | E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC) | 5,845 | 5,845 |
| 170 | 0303131F | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) | 43,811 | 43,811 |
| 171 | 0303140F | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 101,788 | 101,788 |
| 172 | 0303141F | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 449 | 449 |
| 173 | 0303150F | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 3,854 | 3,854 |
| 174 | 0303158F | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | | |
| 175 | 0303601F | MILSATCOM TERMINALS | 238,729 | 238,729 |
| 177 | 0304260F | AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE | | |
| 177A | 0304XXXF | RE–135 | 34,744 | 34,744 |
| 177B | 0304XXXF | COMMON DEVELOPMENT | 87,004 | 87,004 |
| 180 | 0305099F | GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM) | 4,604 | 4,604 |
| 181 | 0305103F | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 2,026 | 2,026 |
| 182 | 0305105F | DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER | 282 | 282 |
| 183 | 0305110F | SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE) | 18,337 | 18,337 |
| 184 | 0305111F | WEATHER SERVICE | 31,084 | 31,084 |
| 185 | 0305114F | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS) | 63,367 | 63,367 |
| 186 | 0305116F | AERIAL TARGETS | 50,620 | 50,620 |
| 189 | 0305128F | SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES | 366 | 366 |
| 190 | 0305146F | DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 39 | 39 |
| 192 | 0305164F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE) | 133,601 | 133,601 |
| 193 | 0305165F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS) | 17,893 | 17,893 |
| 195 | 0305173F | SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER | 196,254 | 196,254 |
| 196 | 0305174F | SPACE INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 2,961 | 2,961 |
| 197 | 0305182F | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE) | 9,940 | 9,940 |
| 198 | 0305193F | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) | 1,271 | 1,271 |
| 199 | 0305202F | DRAGON U–2 | | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 200 | 0305205F | ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 52,425 | | 52,425 |
| 201 | 0305206F | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 106,877 | | 106,877 |
| 202 | 0305207F | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 13,049 | | 13,049 |
| 203 | 0305208F | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 90,724 | | 90,724 |
| 204 | 0305219F | MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV | 14,112 | | 14,112 |
| 205 | 0305220F | RQ–4 UAV | 423,462 | | 423,462 |
| 206 | 0305221F | NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING | 7,348 | | 7,348 |
| 207 | 0305265F | GPS III SPACE SEGMENT | 463,081 | | 463,081 |
| 208 | 0305614F | JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM | 118,950 | | 118,950 |
| 209 | 0305887F | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE | 14,736 | | 14,736 |
| 210 | 0305913F | NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE) | 81,989 | | 81,989 |
| 211 | 0305924F | NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE | | | |
| 212 | 0305940F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS | 31,956 | | 31,956 |
| 213 | 0307141F | INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOPMENT | 23,931 | | 23,931 |
| 214 | 0308699F | SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW) | 1,663 | | 1,663 |
| 215 | 0401115F | C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON | 24,509 | | 24,509 |
| 216 | 0401119F | C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF) | 24,941 | | 24,941 |
| 217 | 0401130F | C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF) | 128,169 | | 128,169 |
| 218 | 0401132F | C–130J PROGRAM | 39,537 | | 39,537 |
| 219 | 0401134F | LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM) | 7,438 | | 7,438 |
| 220 | 0401139F | LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT (LIMA) | 1,308 | | 1,308 |
| 221 | 0401218F | KC–135S | 6,161 | | 6,161 |
| 222 | 0401219F | KC–10S | 30,868 | | 30,868 |
| 223 | 0401314F | OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT | 82,591 | | 82,591 |
| 224 | 0401315F | C-STOL AIRCRAFT | | | |
| 225 | 0408011F | SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL | 7,118 | | 7,118 |
| 226 | 0702207F | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) | 1,531 | | 1,531 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 227 | 0702976F | FACILITIES RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION—LOGISTICS | | | |
| 228 | 0708012F | LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 944 | | 944 |
| 229 | 0708610F | LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT) | 140,284 | | 140,284 |
| 230 | 0708611F | SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 10,990 | | 10,990 |
| 231 | 0801711F | RECRUITING ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 232 | 0804743F | OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING | 322 | | 322 |
| 233 | 0804757F | JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER | 11 | | 11 |
| 234 | 0804772F | TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS | | | |
| 235 | 0808716F | OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES | 113 | | 113 |
| 236 | 0901202F | JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY | 2,483 | | 2,483 |
| 237 | 0901218F | CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM | 1,508 | | 1,508 |
| 238 | 0901220F | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | 8,041 | | 8,041 |
| 239 | 0901226F | AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY | 928 | | 928 |
| 240 | 0901279F | FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE | 12,118 | | 12,118 |
| 241 | 0901538F | FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 101,317 | | 101,317 |
| 242 | 0902998F | MANAGEMENT HQ—ADP SUPPORT (AF) | 299 | | 299 |
| 242A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 12,063,140 | 25,000 | 12,088,140 |
| | | Defense Reconnaissance Support Activites | | [25,000] | |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 18,573,266 | 39,579 | 18,612,845 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | 27,737,701 | 11,966 | 27,749,667 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | | | |
| | | BASIC RESEARCH | | | |
| 001 | 0601000BR | DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE | 47,737 | | 47,737 |
| 002 | 0601101E | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 290,773 | | 290,773 |
| 003 | 0601110D8Z | BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 14,731 | | 14,731 |
| 004 | 0601111D8Z | GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH | | | |
| 005 | 0601117E | BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE | 37,870 | | 37,870 |
| 006 | 0601120D8Z | NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM | 101,591 | –15,000 | 86,591 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–15,000] | |
| 007 | 0601384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 52,617 | | 52,617 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 545,319 | –15,000 | 530,319 |
| | | APPLIED RESEARCH | | | |
| 008 | 0602000D8Z | JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY | 21,592 | | 21,592 |
| 009 | 0602115E | BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 110,000 | | 110,000 |
| 010 | 0602228D8Z | HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE | | 25,245 | 25,245 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] | |
| | | Realignment of Funds for Proper Oversight and Execution | | [15,245] | |
| 011 | 0602234D8Z | LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM | 37,916 | | 37,916 |
| 012 | 0602250D8Z | SYSTEMS 2020 APPLIED RESEARCH | 4,381 | | 4,381 |
| 013 | 0602303E | INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY | 400,499 | –50,000 | 350,499 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–50,000] | |
| 014 | 0602304E | COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS | 49,365 | | 49,365 |
| 015 | 0602305E | MACHINE INTELLIGENCE | 61,351 | | 61,351 |
| 016 | 0602383E | BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE | 30,421 | | 30,421 |
| 017 | 0602384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 219,873 | 5,000 | 224,873 |
| | | Program Increase | | [5,000] | |
| 018 | 0602663D8Z | DATA TO DECISIONS APPLIED RESEARCH | 9,235 | –4,000 | 5,235 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–4,000] | |
| 019 | 0602668D8Z | CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH | 9,735 | | 9,735 |
| 020 | 0602670D8Z | HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH | 14,923 | –4,000 | 10,923 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–4,000] | |
| 021 | 0602702E | TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY | 206,422 | | 206,422 |
| 022 | 0602715E | MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY | 237,837 | | 237,837 |
| 023 | 0602716E | ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY | 215,178 | | 215,178 |
| 024 | 0602718BR | WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES | 196,954 | 5,000 | 201,954 |
| | | Program Increase | | [5,000] | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 025 | 1160401BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 26,591 | | 26,591 |
| 026 | 1160407BB | SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 1,852,273 | –22,755 | 1,829,518 |
| | | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD) | | | |
| 027 | 0603000D8Z | JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 24,771 | | 24,771 |
| 028 | 0603121D8Z | SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 45,028 | | 45,028 |
| 029 | 0603122D8Z | COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 77,019 | 23,200 | 100,219 |
| | | Program Increase | | [23,200] | |
| 030 | 0603160BR | COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT | 283,073 | | 283,073 |
| 031 | 0603175C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY | 75,003 | | 75,003 |
| 032 | 0603200D8Z | JOINT ADVANCED CONCEPTS | 7,903 | | 7,903 |
| 033 | 0603225D8Z | JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 20,372 | | 20,372 |
| 034 | 0603250D8Z | SYSTEMS 2020 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 4,381 | | 4,381 |
| 035 | 0603264S | AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY | 998 | | 998 |
| 036 | 0603274C | SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY | 61,458 | | 61,458 |
| 037 | 0603286E | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS | 98,878 | | 98,878 |
| 038 | 0603287E | SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY | 97,541 | | 97,541 |
| 039 | 0603384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 229,235 | | 229,235 |
| 040 | 0603618D8Z | JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 7,287 | | 7,287 |
| 041 | 0603648D8Z | JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 187,707 | –20,000 | 167,707 |
| | | Unjustified Growth | | [–20,000] | |
| 042 | 0603662D8Z | NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES | 23,890 | | 23,890 |
| 043 | 0603663D8Z | DATA TO DECISIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 9,235 | –4,000 | 5,235 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–4,000] | |
| 044 | 0603665D8Z | BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY | 10,762 | | 10,762 |
| 045 | 0603668D8Z | CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH | 10,709 | | 10,709 |
| 046 | 0603670D8Z | HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 18,179 | –4,000 | 14,179 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–4,000] | |
| 047 | 0603680D8Z | DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 17,888 | 2,000 | 19,888 |
| | | Defense Alternative Energy | | [2,000] | |
| 048 | 0603699D8Z | EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 26,972 | | 26,972 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 049 | 0603711D8Z | JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS | 9,756 | | 9,756 |
| 050 | 0603712S | GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 23,887 | 15,000 | 38,887 |
| | | Secure Microelectronics | | [15,000] | |
| 051 | 0603713S | DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY | 41,976 | | 41,976 |
| 052 | 0603716D8Z | STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM | 66,409 | 10,750 | 77,159 |
| | | Offshore Range Environmental Baseline Assessment | | [1,750] | |
| | | Program Increase | | [5,000] | |
| | | Radiological Contamination Research | | [4,000] | |
| 053 | 0603720S | MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT | 91,132 | –8,000 | 83,132 |
| | | Microelectronics Technlogy Development and Support | | [3,000] | |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–11,000] | |
| 054 | 0603727D8Z | JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM | 10,547 | | 10,547 |
| 055 | 0603739E | ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES | 160,286 | | 160,286 |
| 056 | 0603745D8Z | SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR (SAR) COHERENT CHANGE DETECTION (CDD) | | | |
| 057 | 0603755D8Z | HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | | | |
| 058 | 0603760E | COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 296,537 | –50,000 | 246,537 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–50,000] | |
| 059 | 0603765E | CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS | 107,226 | | 107,226 |
| 060 | 0603766E | NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 235,245 | | 235,245 |
| 061 | 0603767E | SENSOR TECHNOLOGY | 271,802 | | 271,802 |
| 062 | 0603768E | GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY | | | |
| 063 | 0603769SE | DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 13,579 | | 13,579 |
| 064 | 0603781D8Z | SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE | 30,424 | | 30,424 |
| 065 | 0603826D8Z | QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS | 89,925 | | 89,925 |
| 066 | 0603828D8Z | JOINT EXPERIMENTATION | 58,130 | | 58,130 |
| 067 | 0603832D8Z | DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE | 37,029 | –6,000 | 31,029 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–6,000] | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 068 | 0603901C | DIRECTED ENERGY RESEARCH | 96,329 | 50,000 | 146,329 |
| | | Program Increase | | [50,000] | |
| 069 | 0603902C | NEXT GENERATION AEGIS MISSILE | 123,456 | | 123,456 |
| 070 | 0603941D8Z | TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY | 99,593 | | 99,593 |
| 071 | 0603942D8Z | TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER | | | |
| 072 | 0604055D8Z | OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT | 20,444 | 14,000 | 34,444 |
| | | Operational Energy Improvement Pilot Project | | [4,000] | |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] | |
| 073 | 0303310D8Z | CWMD SYSTEMS | 7,788 | | 7,788 |
| 074 | 1160402BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 35,242 | 5,000 | 40,242 |
| | | Program Increase | | [5,000] | |
| 075 | 1160422BB | AVIATION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS | 837 | | 837 |
| 076 | 1160472BB | SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 4,924 | | 4,924 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD) | 3,270,792 | 27,950 | 3,298,742 |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | |
| 077 | 0603161D8Z | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P | 36,798 | | 36,798 |
| 078 | 0603527D8Z | RETRACT LARCH | 21,040 | | 21,040 |
| 079 | 0603600D8Z | WALKOFF | 112,142 | | 112,142 |
| 080 | 0603709D8Z | JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM | 11,129 | | 11,129 |
| 081 | 0603714D8Z | ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM | 18,408 | | 18,408 |
| 082 | 0603851D8Z | ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM | 63,606 | –30,000 | 33,606 |
| | | Realignment to RDDW-082A | | [–30,000] | |
| 082A | 0603XXXD8Z | INSTALLATION ENERGY TEST BED | | 47,000 | 47,000 |
| | | Installation Energy Test Bed Program Increase | | [15,000] | |
| | | Microgrid Pilot Program | | [2,000] | |
| | | Realignment from RDDW-082 | | [30,000] | |
| 083 | 0603881C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT | 290,452 | | 290,452 |
| 084 | 0603882C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT | 1,161,001 | 100,000 | 1,261,001 |
| | | Program increase | | [100,000] | |
| 085 | 0603883C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT | | | |
| 086 | 0603884BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 261,143 | | 261,143 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 087 | 0603884C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS | 222,374 | | 222,374 |
| 088 | 0603888C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS | 1,071,039 | | 1,071,039 |
| 089 | 0603890C | BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS | 373,563 | | 373,563 |
| 090 | 0603891C | SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA | 296,554 | | 296,554 |
| 091 | 0603892C | AEGIS BMD | 960,267 | 5,000 | 965,267 |
| | | AEGIS Ballistic Missile Defense | | [5,000] | |
| 092 | 0603893C | SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 96,353 | | 96,353 |
| 093 | 0603895C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS | 7,951 | | 7,951 |
| 094 | 0603896C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI. | 364,103 | | 364,103 |
| 095 | 0603897C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE HERCULES | | | |
| 096 | 0603898C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT | 41,225 | | 41,225 |
| 097 | 0603904C | MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC) | 69,325 | | 69,325 |
| 098 | 0603906C | REGARDING TRENCH | 15,797 | | 15,797 |
| 099 | 0603907C | SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX) | 177,058 | | 177,058 |
| 100 | 0603911C | BMD EUROPEAN CAPABILITY | | | |
| 101 | 0603913C | ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS | 106,100 | 110,000 | 216,100 |
| | | Program Increase | | [110,000] | |
| 102 | 0603920D8Z | HUMANITARIAN DEMINING | 14,996 | | 14,996 |
| 103 | 0603923D8Z | COALITION WARFARE | 12,743 | | 12,743 |
| 104 | 0604016D8Z | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM | 3,221 | 10,300 | 13,521 |
| | | Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects | | [10,300] | |
| 105 | 0604400D8Z | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT | 25,120 | | 25,120 |
| 106 | 0604648D8Z | JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | | | |
| 107 | 0604670D8Z | HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING | 10,309 | | 10,309 |
| 108 | 0604787D8Z | JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC) | 13,024 | | 13,024 |
| 109 | 0604828D8Z | JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM | 9,290 | | 9,290 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110 | 0604880C | LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3) | 306,595 | | 306,595 |
| 111 | 0604881C | AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT | 424,454 | 40,000 | 464,454 |
| | | Program Increase | | [40,000] | |
| 112 | 0604883C | PRECISION TRACKING SPACE SENSOR RDT&E | 160,818 | –160,818 | |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–160,818] | |
| 113 | 0604884C | AIRBORNE INFRARED (ABIR) | 46,877 | 20,000 | 66,877 |
| | | Program Increase | | [20,000] | |
| 114 | 0605017D8Z | REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST | | | |
| 115 | 0303191D8Z | JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM | 3,358 | | 3,358 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 6,808,233 | 141,482 | 6,949,715 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD) | | | |
| 116 | 0604051D8Z | DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP) | | | |
| 117 | 0604161D8Z | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD | 7,220 | | 7,220 |
| 118 | 0604165D8Z | PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT | 204,824 | –25,000 | 179,824 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [–25,000] | |
| 119 | 0604384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 400,608 | | 400,608 |
| 120 | 0604709D8Z | JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM | 2,782 | | 2,782 |
| 121 | 0604764K | ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO) | 49,198 | | 49,198 |
| 122 | 0604771D8Z | JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS) | 17,395 | | 17,395 |
| 123 | 0605000BR | WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES | 5,888 | | 5,888 |
| 124 | 0605013BL | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 12,228 | | 12,228 |
| 125 | 0605018BTA | DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (DIMHRS) | | | |
| 126 | 0605020BTA | BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 127 | 0605021SE | HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE | 389 | | 389 |
| 128 | 0605022D8Z | DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM | 1,929 | | 1,929 |
| 129 | 0605027D8Z | OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES | 4,993 | | 4,993 |
| 130 | 0605070S | DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | 134,285 | | 134,285 |
| 131 | 0605075D8Z | DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION | 41,808 | | 41,808 |
| 132 | 0605140D8Z | TRUSTED FOUNDRY | | | |
| 133 | 0605210D8Z | DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES | 14,950 | | 14,950 |
| 134 | 0605648D8Z | DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM | | | |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 135 | 0303141K | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 19,837 | | 19,837 |
| 136 | 0807708D8Z | WOUNDED ILL AND INJURED SENIOR OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (WII-SOC) STAFF OFFICE | | | |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD) | 918,334 | –25,000 | 893,334 |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | |
| 137 | 0604774D8Z | DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS) | 6,658 | | 6,658 |
| 138 | 0604875D8Z | JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT | 4,731 | | 4,731 |
| 139 | 0604940D8Z | CENTRAL TEST AND EVAULATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP) | 140,231 | | 140,231 |
| 140 | 0604942D8Z | ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS | 2,757 | | 2,757 |
| 141 | 0604943D8Z | THERMAL VICAR | 7,827 | | 7,827 |
| 142 | 0605100D8Z | JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC) | 10,479 | | 10,479 |
| 143 | 0605104D8Z | TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS | 34,213 | | 34,213 |
| 144 | 0605110D8Z | USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 1,486 | –1,468 | 18 |
| | | Program Decrease | | [–1,468] | |
| 145 | 0605117D8Z | FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION | 64,524 | | 64,524 |
| 146 | 0605126J | JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO) | 79,859 | | 79,859 |
| 147 | 0605128D8Z | CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P) | | | |
| 148 | 0605130D8Z | FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING | 19,080 | | 19,080 |
| 149 | 0605142D8Z | SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 41,884 | | 41,884 |
| 150 | 0605161D8Z | NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY | 4,261 | | 4,261 |
| 151 | 0605170D8Z | SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION | 9,437 | | 9,437 |
| 152 | 0605200D8Z | GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) | 6,549 | | 6,549 |
| 153 | 0605384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 92,806 | | 92,806 |
| 154 | 0605502BP | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH—CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF | | | |
| 155 | 0605502BR | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH | | | |
| 156 | 0605502C | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH—MDA | | | |
| 157 | 0605502D8Z | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 158 | 0605502E | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | | | |
| 159 | 0605502S | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | | | |
| 160 | 0605790D8Z | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (S | 1,924 | | 1,924 |
| 161 | 0605798D8Z | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS | 16,135 | | 16,135 |
| 162 | 0605799D8Z | EMERGING CAPABILITIES | | | |
| 163 | 0605801KA | DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC) | 56,269 | –5,000 | 51,269 |
| | | Program Increase | | [–5,000] | |
| 164 | 0605803SE | R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION | 49,810 | | 49,810 |
| 165 | 0605804D8Z | DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION | 15,805 | | 15,805 |
| 166 | 0605897E | DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| 167 | 0605898E | MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D | 66,689 | | 66,689 |
| 168 | 0606100D8Z | BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS | 4,528 | | 4,528 |
| 169 | 0606301D8Z | AVIATION SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES | 6,925 | | 6,925 |
| 170 | 0203345D8Z | OPERATIONS SECURITY (OPSEC) | 1,777 | | 1,777 |
| 171 | 0204571J | JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT | 18 | | 18 |
| 174 | 0303166D8Z | SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES | 12,209 | | 12,209 |
| 175 | 0303169D8Z | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION | 4,288 | | 4,288 |
| 176 | 0305103E | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| 177 | 0305193D8Z | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) | 15,002 | | 15,002 |
| 179 | 0305400D8Z | WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT | 861 | | 861 |
| 180 | 0804767D8Z | COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2) | 59,958 | | 59,958 |
| 181 | 0901585C | PENTAGON RESERVATION | | | |
| 182 | 0901598C | MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA | 28,908 | | 28,908 |
| 183 | 0901598D8W | IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES | 167 | | 167 |
| 184 | 0909999D8Z | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| 184A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 82,627 | | 82,627 |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 961,682 | –6,468 | 955,214 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 185 | 0604130V | ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS) | 8,706 | | 8,706 |
| 186 | 0605127T | REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA | 2,165 | | 2,165 |
| 187 | 0605147T | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS) | 288 | | 288 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 188 | 0607384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT) | 15,956 | | 15,956 |
| 189 | 0607828D8Z | JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY | 29,880 | | 29,880 |
| 190 | 0208043J | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 2,402 | | 2,402 |
| 191 | 0208045K | C4I INTEROPERABILITY | 72,403 | | 72,403 |
| 193 | 0301144K | JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING | 7,093 | | 7,093 |
| 200 | 0302016K | NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT | 481 | | 481 |
| 201 | 0302019K | DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION | 8,366 | | 8,366 |
| 202 | 0303126K | LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS | 11,324 | | 11,324 |
| 203 | 0303131K | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) | 12,514 | | 12,514 |
| 204 | 0303135G | PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI) | 6,548 | | 6,548 |
| 205 | 0303136G | KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI) | 33,751 | | 33,751 |
| 206 | 0303140D8Z | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 11,753 | | 11,753 |
| 207 | 0303140G | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 348,593 | | 348,593 |
| 208 | 0303140K | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| 209 | 0303148K | DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | | | |
| 210 | 0303149J | C4I FOR THE WARRIOR | | | |
| 211 | 0303150K | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 54,739 | | 54,739 |
| 212 | 0303153K | DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION | 29,154 | | 29,154 |
| 213 | 0303170K | NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) | 1,830 | | 1,830 |
| 214 | 0303260D8Z | JOINT MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE | 1,241 | | 1,241 |
| 215 | 0303610K | TELEPORT PROGRAM | 6,418 | | 6,418 |
| 217 | 0304210BB | SPECIAL APPILCATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES | 5,045 | 4,000 | 9,045 |
| | | Special Applications for Contingencies | | [4,000] | |
| 220 | 0305103D8Z | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 411 | | 411 |
| 222 | 0305103K | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 4,341 | | 4,341 |
| 223 | 0305125D8Z | CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP) | 13,008 | | 13,008 |
| 227 | 0305186D8Z | POLICY R&D PROGRAMS | 6,603 | | 6,603 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 229 | 0305199D8Z | NET CENTRICITY | 14,926 | | 14,926 |
| 232 | 0305208BB | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 4,303 | | 4,303 |
| 235 | 0305208K | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 3,154 | | 3,154 |
| 237 | 0305219BB | MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV | 2,499 | | 2,499 |
| 239 | 0305387D8Z | HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM | 2,660 | | 2,660 |
| 240 | 0305600D8Z | INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES | 1,444 | | 1,444 |
| 248 | 0708011S | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 23,103 | 5,000 | 28,103 |
| | | Industrial Preparedness Manufacturing Technology | | [5,000] | |
| 249 | 0708012S | LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 2,466 | | 2,466 |
| 250 | 0902298J | MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS) | 2,730 | | 2,730 |
| 251 | 1001018D8Z | NATO AGS | | | |
| 252 | 1105219BB | MQ–9 UAV | 2,499 | | 2,499 |
| 253 | 1105232BB | RQ–11 UAV | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| 254 | 1105233BB | RQ–7 UAV | 450 | | 450 |
| 255 | 1160279BB | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG | | | |
| 256 | 1160403BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 89,382 | | 89,382 |
| 257 | 1160404BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 799 | | 799 |
| 258 | 1160405BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 27,916 | | 27,916 |
| 259 | 1160408BB | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 60,915 | | 60,915 |
| 260 | 1160421BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV–22 DEVELOPMENT | 10,775 | | 10,775 |
| 261 | 1160423BB | JOINT MULTI-MISSION SUBMERSIBLE | | | |
| 262 | 1160426BB | OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 263 | 1160427BB | MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS) | 4,617 | | 4,617 |
| 264 | 1160428BB | UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV) | | | |
| 265 | 1160429BB | AC/MC–130J | 18,571 | | 18,571 |
| 266 | 1160474BB | SOF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS | 1,392 | | 1,392 |
| 267 | 1160476BB | SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | | | |
| 268 | 1160477BB | SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 2,610 | | 2,610 |
| 269 | 1160478BB | SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS | 2,971 | | 2,971 |
| 270 | 1160479BB | SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| 271 | 1160480BB | SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES | 3,522 | | 3,522 |
| 272 | 1160481BB | SOF MUNITIONS | 1,500 | | 1,500 |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 273 | 1160482BB | SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION | 51,123 | | 51,123 |
| 274 | 1160483BB | SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS | 92,424 | | 92,424 |
| 275 | 1160484BB | SOF SURFACE CRAFT | 14,475 | | 14,475 |
| 276 | 1160488BB | SOF MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 2,990 | | 2,990 |
| 277 | 1160489BB | SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES | 8,923 | | 8,923 |
| 278 | 1160490BB | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 9,473 | | 9,473 |
| 278A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 4,227,920 | | 4,227,920 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 5,399,045 | 9,000 | 5,408,045 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | 19,755,678 | 109,209 | 19,864,887 |
| | | OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE | | | |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | |
| 001 | 0605118OTE | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION | 60,444 | | 60,444 |
| 002 | 0605131OTE | LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION | 12,126 | | 12,126 |
| 003 | 0605814OTE | OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES | 118,722 | | 118,722 |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 191,292 | | 191,292 |
| | | TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE | 191,292 | | 191,292 |
| | | TOTAL RDT&E | 75,325,082 | 254,897 | 75,579,979 |

## SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

**SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | | | |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | |
| 140 | 0605601A | ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES | 8,513 | | 8,513 |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 8,513 | | 8,513 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | 8,513 | | 8,513 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | | | |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | |
| 054 | 0603654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | |
| 097 | 0604270N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| 119 | 0604654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| 126 | 0604771N | MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT | 1,950 | | 1,950 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 11,050 | | 11,050 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| 172 | 0204136N | F/A–18 SQUADRONS | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| 189 | 0206313M | MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 192 | 0206625M | USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP) | 4,050 | | 4,050 |
| 227A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 33,784 | | 33,784 |
| 227U | 0607UNDN | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 41,334 | | 41,334 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | 53,884 | 53,884 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | | |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 200 | 0305205F | ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 73,000 | 73,000 |
| 242A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 69,000 | 69,000 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 142,000 | 142,000 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | 142,000 | 142,000 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | | |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | |
| 152 | 0605200D8Z | GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 202 | 0303126K | LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS | 10,500 | 10,500 |
| 207 | 0303140G | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 32,850 | 32,850 |
| 211 | 0303150K | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 254 | 1105233BB | RQ–7 UAV | 2,450 | 2,450 |
| 278A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 135,361 | 135,361 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 183,161 | 183,161 |
| | | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 279 | 0901560D | CONTINUING RESOLUTION PROGRAMS | | |
| | | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | 192,361 | 192,361 |
| | | TOTAL RDT&E | 396,758 | 396,758 |

# TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

## SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 1,399,804 | | 1,399,804 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 104,629 | | 104,629 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 815,920 | | 815,920 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 825,587 | | 825,587 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,245,231 | | 1,245,231 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 1,199,340 | | 1,199,340 |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,939,455 | 4,000 | 2,943,455 |
| | Simulation Training Systems | | [4,000] | |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 451,228 | | 451,228 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,179,675 | | 1,179,675 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 7,637,052 | 230,000 | 7,867,052 |
| | Army Base Operating Services | | [230,000] | |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 2,495,667 | 261,380 | 2,757,047 |
| | Army Industrial Facility Energy monitoring | | [2,380] | |
| | Army Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [259,000] | |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 397,952 | | 397,952 |
| 130 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 171,179 | | 171,179 |
| 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 150 | COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 160 | RESET | | | |
| 170 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS | 459,585 | | 459,585 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 21,322,304 | 495,380 | 21,817,684 |
| | MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 180 | STRATEGIC MOBILITY | 390,394 | | 390,394 |
| 190 | ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS | 169,535 | | 169,535 |
| 200 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 6,675 | | 6,675 |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 566,604 | | 566,604 |
| | TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 210 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 113,262 | | 113,262 |
| 220 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 71,012 | | 71,012 |
| 230 | ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING | 49,275 | | 49,275 |
| 240 | SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 417,071 | | 417,071 |
| 250 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 1,045,948 | | 1,045,948 |
| 260 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 1,083,808 | | 1,083,808 |
| 270 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 191,073 | | 191,073 |
| 280 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 607,896 | | 607,896 |
| 290 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 523,501 | | 523,501 |
| 300 | EXAMINING | 139,159 | | 139,159 |
| 310 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 238,978 | | 238,978 |
| 320 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 221,156 | | 221,156 |
| 330 | JUNIOR ROTC | 170,889 | | 170,889 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 4,873,028 | | 4,873,028 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 340 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 995,161 | | 995,161 |
| 350 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 524,334 | | 524,334 |
| 360 | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 705,668 | | 705,668 |
| 370 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 484,075 | 6,000 | 490,075 |
| | Army Arsenals | | [6,000] | |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 380 | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 457,741 | | 457,741 |
| 390 | ADMINISTRATION | 775,313 | | 775,313 |
| 400 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 1,534,706 | –44,000 | 1,490,706 |
| | Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan | | [–44,000] | |
| 410 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 316,924 | | 316,924 |
| 420 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 214,356 | | 214,356 |
| 430 | OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT | 1,093,877 | –10,000 | 1,083,877 |
| | Unjustified program growth—Joint DOD Support | | [–5,000] | |
| | Unjustified program growth—PA Strategic Communications | | [–5,000] | |
| 440 | ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES | 216,621 | | 216,621 |
| 450 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 180,717 | | 180,717 |
| 455 | FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS | | 44,000 | 44,000 |
| | Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan | | [44,000] | |
| 460 | SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS | 449,901 | | 449,901 |
| 470 | MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS | 23,886 | | 23,886 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | 7,973,280 | –4,000 | 7,969,280 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 480 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | –395,600 | –395,600 |
| | Army unobligated balances estimate | | [–384,600] | |
| | Center for Military Family and Community Outreach | | [1,000] | |
| | Printing & Reproduction (10% cut) | | [–10,600] | |
| | Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut) | | [–1,400] | |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | –395,600 | –395,600 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | 34,735,216 | 95,780 | 34,830,996 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 4,762,887 | | 4,762,887 |
| 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 1,771,644 | | 1,771,644 |
| 030 | AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES | 46,321 | | 46,321 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 104,751 | | 104,751 |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 431,576 | | 431,576 |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,030,303 | 71,200 | 1,101,503 |
| | Aviation Depot Maintenance (Active) | | [71,200] | |
| 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 37,403 | | 37,403 |
| 080 | AVIATION LOGISTICS | 238,007 | 27,000 | 265,007 |
| | Aviation Logistics | | [27,000] | |
| 090 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 3,820,186 | | 3,820,186 |
| 100 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 734,866 | | 734,866 |
| 110 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 4,972,609 | 366,000 | 5,338,609 |
| | Ship Depot Maintenance (Active) | | [366,000] | |
| 120 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,304,271 | | 1,304,271 |
| 130 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 583,659 | | 583,659 |
| 140 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 97,011 | | 97,011 |
| 150 | SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE | 162,303 | | 162,303 |
| 160 | WARFARE TACTICS | 423,187 | | 423,187 |
| 170 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 320,141 | | 320,141 |
| 180 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 1,076,478 | | 1,076,478 |
| 190 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 187,037 | | 187,037 |
| 200 | DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 4,352 | | 4,352 |
| 210 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 103,830 | | 103,830 |
| 220 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 180,800 | | 180,800 |
| 230 | CRUISE MISSILE | 125,333 | | 125,333 |
| 240 | FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE | 1,209,410 | | 1,209,410 |
| 250 | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 99,063 | | 99,063 |
| 260 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 450,454 | | 450,454 |
| 270 | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 358,002 | | 358,002 |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 280 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 971,189 | | 971,189 |
| 290 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 1,946,779 | 352,000 | 2,298,779 |
| | Navy Metering | | [3,000] | |
| | Navy Sustainment Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [349,000] | |
| 300 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 4,610,525 | | 4,610,525 |
| 305 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| | Navy Emergency Management and Preparedness | | [2,000] | |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 32,164,377 | 818,200 | 32,982,577 |
| | MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 310 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 493,326 | | 493,326 |
| 320 | AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 6,228 | | 6,228 |
| 330 | SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 205,898 | | 205,898 |
| 340 | EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS | 68,634 | | 68,634 |
| 350 | INDUSTRIAL READINESS | 2,684 | | 2,684 |
| 360 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 25,192 | | 25,192 |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 801,962 | | 801,962 |
| | TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 370 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 147,540 | | 147,540 |
| 380 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 10,655 | | 10,655 |
| 390 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 151,147 | | 151,147 |
| 400 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 594,799 | | 594,799 |
| 410 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 9,034 | | 9,034 |
| 420 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 173,452 | | 173,452 |
| 430 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 168,025 | | 168,025 |
| 440 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 254,860 | 983 | 255,843 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Navy Recruiting and Advertising | | [983] | |
| 450 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 140,279 | | 140,279 |
| 460 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 107,561 | | 107,561 |
| 470 | JUNIOR ROTC | 52,689 | | 52,689 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 1,810,041 | 983 | 1,811,024 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 480 | ADMINISTRATION | 754,483 | –62,000 | 692,483 |
| | Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan | | [–62,000] | |
| 490 | EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 14,275 | | 14,275 |
| 500 | CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 112,616 | | 112,616 |
| 510 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 216,483 | | 216,483 |
| 520 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 282,295 | | 282,295 |
| 530 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 534,873 | | 534,873 |
| 540 | MEDICAL ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 545 | FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS | | 62,000 | 62,000 |
| | Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan | | [62,000] | |
| 550 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 190,662 | | 190,662 |
| 560 | ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS | | | |
| 570 | PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN | 303,636 | | 303,636 |
| 580 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 903,885 | | 903,885 |
| 590 | HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT | 54,880 | | 54,880 |
| 600 | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 20,687 | | 20,687 |
| 610 | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS | 68,374 | | 68,374 |
| 620 | NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE | 572,928 | | 572,928 |
| 630 | CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGICAL PROGRAM | | | |
| 650 | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE | | | |
| 680 | INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES | 5,516 | | 5,516 |
| 690 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| 700 | JUDGEMENT FUND | | | |
| 705 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 552,715 | | 552,715 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 4,588,308 | | 4,588,308 |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 710 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | –445,700 | –445,700 |
| | Navy unobligated balances estimate | | [–435,900] | |
| | Printing & Reproduction (10% cut) | | [–7,100] | |
| | Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut) | | [–2,700] | |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | –445,700 | –445,700 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | 39,364,688 | 373,483 | 39,738,171 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 715,196 | 8,500 | 723,696 |
| | CBRNE Response Force Capability Enhancement | | [8,500] | |
| 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 677,608 | | 677,608 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 190,713 | | 190,713 |
| 040 | MARITIME PREPOSITIONING | 101,464 | | 101,464 |
| 050 | NORWAY PREPOSITIONING | | | |
| 060 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 823,390 | 68,000 | 891,390 |
| | Marine Corps Sustainment Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [68,000] | |
| 070 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 2,208,949 | | 2,208,949 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 4,717,320 | 76,500 | 4,793,820 |
| | TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 080 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 18,280 | | 18,280 |
| 090 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 820 | | 820 |
| 100 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 85,816 | | 85,816 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110 | FLIGHT TRAINING | | | |
| 120 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 33,142 | | 33,142 |
| 130 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 324,643 | | 324,643 |
| 140 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 184,432 | | 184,432 |
| 150 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 43,708 | | 43,708 |
| 160 | JUNIOR ROTC | 19,671 | | 19,671 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 710,512 | | 710,512 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 170 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | | | |
| 180 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 36,021 | | 36,021 |
| 190 | ADMINISTRATION | 405,431 | 9,000 | 414,431 |
| | USMC Expeditionary Energy Office—Experimental Forward Operating Base | | [9,000] | |
| 200 | ACQUISITION & PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 91,153 | | 91,153 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 532,605 | 9,000 | 541,605 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 210 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | –70,000 | –70,000 |
| | Marine Corps unobligated balances estimate | | [–66,000] | |
| | Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families | | [3,000] | |
| | Printing & Reproduction (10% cut) | | [–6,500] | |
| | Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut) | | [–500] | |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | –70,000 | –70,000 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | 5,960,437 | 15,500 | 5,975,937 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 4,224,400 | | 4,224,400 |
| 020 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 3,417,731 | | 3,417,731 |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 1,482,814 | | 1,482,814 |
| 040 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | | | |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 050 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 2,204,131 | | 2,204,131 |
| 060 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,652,318 | 271,920 | 1,924,238 |
| | Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [271,920] | |
| 070 | BASE SUPPORT | 2,507,179 | | 2,507,179 |
| 080 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 1,492,459 | | 1,492,459 |
| 090 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 1,046,226 | | 1,046,226 |
| 100 | TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | 696,188 | | 696,188 |
| 110 | LAUNCH FACILITIES | 321,484 | | 321,484 |
| 120 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 633,738 | | 633,738 |
| 130 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 735,488 | | 735,488 |
| 140 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 170,481 | | 170,481 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 20,584,637 | 271,920 | 20,856,557 |
| | MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 150 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 2,988,221 | | 2,988,221 |
| 160 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 150,724 | | 150,724 |
| 170 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 373,568 | | 373,568 |
| 180 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 388,103 | 54,118 | 442,221 |
| | Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [54,118] | |
| 190 | BASE SUPPORT | 674,230 | | 674,230 |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 4,574,846 | 54,118 | 4,628,964 |
| | TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 200 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 114,448 | | 114,448 |
| 210 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 22,192 | | 22,192 |
| 220 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) | 90,545 | | 90,545 |
| 230 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 430,090 | 71,340 | 501,430 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [71,340] | |
| 240 | BASE SUPPORT | 789,654 | | 789,654 |
| 250 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 481,357 | | 481,357 |
| 260 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 957,538 | | 957,538 |
| 270 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 198,897 | | 198,897 |
| 280 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 108,248 | | 108,248 |
| 290 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 6,386 | | 6,386 |
| 300 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 136,102 | | 136,102 |
| 310 | EXAMINING | 3,079 | | 3,079 |
| 320 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 167,660 | | 167,660 |
| 330 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 202,767 | | 202,767 |
| 340 | JUNIOR ROTC | 75,259 | | 75,259 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 3,784,222 | 71,340 | 3,855,562 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 350 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 1,112,878 | | 1,112,878 |
| 360 | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 785,150 | | 785,150 |
| 370 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 14,356 | | 14,356 |
| 380 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 416,588 | 82,364 | 498,952 |
| | Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [82,364] | |
| 390 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,219,043 | | 1,219,043 |
| 400 | ADMINISTRATION | 662,180 | | 662,180 |
| 410 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 650,689 | | 650,689 |
| 420 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 1,078,769 | –124,000 | 954,769 |
| | Air Force funds for Space Shuttle (for museum) | | [–14,000] | |
| | Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan | | [–110,000] | |
| 425 | FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS | | 110,000 | 110,000 |
| | Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan | | [110,000] | |
| 430 | CIVIL AIR PATROL | 23,338 | | 23,338 |
| 440 | JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT | | | |
| 460 | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 72,589 | | 72,589 |
| 465 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,215,848 | | 1,215,848 |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 7,251,428 | 68,364 | 7,319,792 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 470 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | –410,500 | –410,500 |
| | Air Force unobligated balances estimate | | [–400,800] | |
| | Printing & Reproduction (10% cut) | | [–7,200] | |
| | Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut) | | [–2,500] | |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | –410,500 | –410,500 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | 36,195,133 | 55,242 | 36,250,375 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 563,787 | | 563,787 |
| 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 3,986,766 | 3,000 | 3,989,766 |
| | Cold Weather Protective Equipment | | [3,000] | |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 4,550,553 | 3,000 | 4,553,553 |
| | TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 030 | DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY | 124,075 | | 124,075 |
| 040 | NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY | 93,348 | | 93,348 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 217,423 | | 217,423 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 050 | CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS | 159,692 | –10,369 | 149,323 |
| | Innovative Readiness Training (Section 591) | | [–10,369] | |
| 070 | DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 080 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 508,822 | | 508,822 |
| 090 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 1,147,366 | | 1,147,366 |
| 100 | DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| 110 | DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 676,419 | 1,000 | 677,419 |
| | Voluntary Separation Repayment | | [1,000] | |
| 120 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 1,360,392 | | 1,360,392 |
| 140 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY | 37,367 | | 37,367 |
| 150 | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 450,863 | 6,000 | 456,863 |
| | Procurement Technical Assistance Centers | | [6,000] | |
| 160 | DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY | 256,133 | | 256,133 |
| 170 | DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE | 22,372 | | 22,372 |
| 180 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY—GLOBAL TRAIN AND EQUIP | 500,000 | –100,000 | 400,000 |
| | Reduction to Global Train and Equip | | [–100,000] | |
| 185 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY—OTHER | 182,831 | | 182,831 |
| 190 | DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 505,366 | | 505,366 |
| 200 | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | 33,848 | | 33,848 |
| 210 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 432,133 | | 432,133 |
| 220 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY | 2,768,677 | | 2,768,677 |
| 230 | MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY | 202,758 | | 202,758 |
| 250 | OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT | 81,754 | | 81,754 |
| 260 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 2,201,964 | 99,000 | 2,300,964 |
| | Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects | | [22,700] | |
| | DOD Installation Energy Manager Training Program | | [3,000] | |
| | Education and Employment Advocacy Program for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces | | [15,000] | |
| | Establish Office of Language and Policy | | [6,000] | |
| | Insider Threat Detection Program | | [5,000] | |
| | Office of Net Assessment | | [1,300] | |
| | Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Victim Advocates | | [45,000] | |
| | Wounded Warriors Career Program | | [1,000] | |
| 270 | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE | 563,184 | | 563,184 |
| 275 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 14,068,492 | | 14,068,492 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 26,172,433 | –4,369 | 26,168,064 |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 280 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | –413,000 | –413,000 |
| | Defense-wide unobligated balances estimate | | [–456,800] | |
| | DOD Impact Aid (Section 581) | | [40,000] | |
| | Printing & Reproduction (10% cut) | | [–4,300] | |
| | Red Cross Reimbursement for Humanitarian Support to Service Members | | [25,000] | |
| | Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut) | | [–16,900] | |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | –413,000 | –413,000 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | 30,940,409 | –414,369 | 30,526,040 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 1,091 | | 1,091 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 18,129 | | 18,129 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 492,705 | | 492,705 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 137,304 | | 137,304 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 597,786 | | 597,786 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 67,366 | 4,300 | 71,666 |
| | Restore Flying Hours to Army Reserve | | [4,300] | |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 474,966 | | 474,966 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 69,841 | | 69,841 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 247,010 | | 247,010 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 590,078 | | 590,078 |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 255,618 | 27,000 | 282,618 |
| | Army Reserve Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [27,000] | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 120 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | | | |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 2,951,894 | 31,300 | 2,983,194 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 130 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 14,447 | | 14,447 |
| 140 | ADMINISTRATION | 76,393 | | 76,393 |
| 150 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 3,844 | | 3,844 |
| 160 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 9,033 | | 9,033 |
| 170 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 53,565 | | 53,565 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 157,282 | | 157,282 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE | 3,109,176 | 31,300 | 3,140,476 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 622,868 | | 622,868 |
| 020 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 16,041 | | 16,041 |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 1,511 | | 1,511 |
| 040 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 123,547 | 1,500 | 125,047 |
| | Aviation Depot Maintenance | | [1,500] | |
| 050 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 379 | | 379 |
| 060 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 49,701 | | 49,701 |
| 070 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 593 | | 593 |
| 080 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 53,916 | 1,000 | 54,916 |
| | Ship Depot Maintenance (Reserve) | | [1,000] | |
| 090 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 15,445 | | 15,445 |
| 100 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 153,942 | | 153,942 |
| 110 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 7,292 | | 7,292 |
| 120 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 75,131 | | 75,131 |
| 130 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 72,083 | | 72,083 |
| 140 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 109,024 | | 109,024 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 1,301,473 | 2,500 | 1,303,973 |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 150 | ADMINISTRATION | 1,857 | | 1,857 |
| 160 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 14,438 | | 14,438 |
| 170 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 2,394 | | 2,394 |
| 180 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 2,972 | | 2,972 |
| 190 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| 200 | JUDGMENT FUND | | | |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 21,661 | | 21,661 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE | 1,323,134 | 2,500 | 1,325,634 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 94,604 | | 94,604 |
| 020 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 16,382 | | 16,382 |
| 030 | TRAINING SUPPORT | | | |
| 040 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 31,520 | | 31,520 |
| 050 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 105,809 | | 105,809 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 248,315 | | 248,315 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 060 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | | | |
| 070 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 852 | | 852 |
| 080 | ADMINISTRATION | 13,257 | | 13,257 |
| 090 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 9,019 | | 9,019 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 23,128 | | 23,128 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE | 271,443 | | 271,443 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 2,171,853 | 36,900 | 2,208,753 |
| | Restore Flying Hours to FY11 levels | | [36,900] | |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 116,513 | | 116,513 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 471,707 | | 471,707 |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 77,161 | 14,000 | 91,161 |
| | Air Force Reserve Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [14,000] | |
| 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 308,974 | | 308,974 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 3,146,208 | 50,900 | 3,197,108 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 84,423 | | 84,423 |
| 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 17,076 | | 17,076 |
| 080 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC) | 19,688 | | 19,688 |
| 090 | OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP) | 6,170 | | 6,170 |
| 100 | AUDIOVISUAL | 794 | | 794 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 128,151 | | 128,151 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE | 3,274,359 | 50,900 | 3,325,259 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 634,181 | | 634,181 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 189,899 | | 189,899 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 751,899 | | 751,899 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 112,971 | | 112,971 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 33,972 | | 33,972 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 854,048 | 7,720 | 861,768 |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Restore O&M Funding for Guard C–23 | | [7,720] | |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 706,299 | 7,000 | 713,299 |
| | Increase funding for Guard simulator training | | [5,000] | |
| | Simulation Training Systems | | [2,000] | |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 50,453 | | 50,453 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 646,608 | | 646,608 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,028,126 | | 1,028,126 |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 618,513 | 66,000 | 684,513 |
| | Army National Guard Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [66,000] | |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 792,575 | | 792,575 |
| 130 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | | | |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 6,419,544 | 80,720 | 6,500,264 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 140 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 11,703 | | 11,703 |
| 150 | ADMINISTRATION | 178,655 | | 178,655 |
| 160 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 42,073 | | 42,073 |
| 170 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 6,789 | | 6,789 |
| 180 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 382,668 | | 382,668 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 621,888 | | 621,888 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD | 7,041,432 | 80,720 | 7,122,152 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD | | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 3,651,900 | 51,100 | 3,703,000 |
| | Restore Flying Hours to FY11 Levels | | [51,100] | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 751,519 | | 751,519 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 753,525 | | 753,525 |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 284,348 | 46,000 | 330,348 |
| | Air National Guard Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100% | | [46,000] | |
| 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 621,942 | | 621,942 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 6,063,234 | 97,100 | 6,160,334 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 39,387 | | 39,387 |
| 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 33,659 | | 33,659 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 73,046 | | 73,046 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD | 6,136,280 | 97,100 | 6,233,380 |
| | MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS | | | |
| 010 | US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE | 13,861 | | 13,861 |
| 020 | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID | 107,662 | | 107,662 |
| 030 | COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION | 508,219 | | 508,219 |
| 040 | ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD | 305,501 | | 305,501 |
| 050 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY | 346,031 | | 346,031 |
| 060 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY | 308,668 | | 308,668 |
| 070 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE | 525,453 | –22,000 | 503,453 |
| | Unjustified program growth | | [–22,000] | |
| 080 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE | 10,716 | | 10,716 |
| 090 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED SITES | 276,495 | | 276,495 |
| 100 | OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND | 5,000 | –5,000 | |
| | Program Reduction | | [–5,000] | |
| | SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS | 2,407,606 | –27,000 | 2,380,606 |
| | TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS | 2,407,606 | –27,000 | 2,380,606 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | 170,759,313 | 361,156 | 171,120,469 |

## SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY** | | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 3,424,314 | | 3,424,314 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,534,886 | | 1,534,886 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 87,166 | | 87,166 |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,675,821 | | 2,675,821 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 579,000 | | 579,000 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 951,371 | | 951,371 |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 22,998,441 | | 22,998,441 |
| 150 | COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM | 425,000 | | 425,000 |
| 160 | RESET | 3,955,429 | | 3,955,429 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **37,881,428** | | **37,881,428** |
| | **ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 340 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 2,476,766 | | 2,476,766 |
| 350 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 3,507,186 | | 3,507,186 |
| 360 | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 50,740 | | 50,740 |
| 380 | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 84,427 | | 84,427 |
| 400 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 66,275 | | 66,275 |
| 420 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 143,391 | | 143,391 |
| 430 | OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT | 92,067 | | 92,067 |
| | **SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **6,420,852** | | **6,420,852** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY** | **44,302,280** | **44,302,280** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY** | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 1,058,114 | 1,058,114 |
| 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 7,700 | 7,700 |
| 030 | AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 12,934 | 12,934 |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 39,566 | 39,566 |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 174,052 | 174,052 |
| 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,586 | 1,586 |
| 080 | AVIATION LOGISTICS | 50,852 | 50,852 |
| 090 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 1,132,948 | 1,132,948 |
| 100 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 26,822 | 26,822 |
| 110 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 998,172 | 998,172 |
| 130 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 26,533 | 26,533 |
| 160 | WARFARE TACTICS | 22,657 | 22,657 |
| 170 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 28,141 | 28,141 |
| 180 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 1,932,640 | 1,932,640 |
| 190 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 19,891 | 19,891 |
| 210 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 5,465 | 5,465 |
| 220 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 2,093 | 2,093 |
| 250 | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 125,460 | 125,460 |
| 260 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 201,083 | 201,083 |
| 270 | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 1,457 | 1,457 |
| 280 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 5,095 | 5,095 |
| 290 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 26,793 | 26,793 |
| 300 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 352,210 | 352,210 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **6,261,464** | **6,261,464** |
| | **MOBILIZATION** | | |

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 310 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 29,010 | | 29,010 |
| 340 | EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS | 34,300 | | 34,300 |
| 360 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 258,278 | | 258,278 |
| | **SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION** | **321,588** | | **321,588** |
| | **TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| 400 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 69,961 | | 69,961 |
| 430 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 5,400 | | 5,400 |
| | **SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **75,361** | | **75,361** |
| | **ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 480 | ADMINISTRATION | 2,348 | | 2,348 |
| 510 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 6,142 | | 6,142 |
| 520 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 5,849 | | 5,849 |
| 530 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 28,511 | | 28,511 |
| 550 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 263,593 | | 263,593 |
| 580 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 17,414 | | 17,414 |
| 610 | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS | 1,075 | | 1,075 |
| 620 | NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE | 6,564 | | 6,564 |
| 650 | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE | 14,598 | | 14,598 |
| 705 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 2,060 | | 2,060 |
| | **SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | **348,154** | | **348,154** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY** | **7,006,567** | | **7,006,567** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS** | | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 2,069,485 | 2,069,485 |
| 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 575,843 | 575,843 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 251,100 | 251,100 |
| 070 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 82,514 | 82,514 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **2,978,942** | **2,978,942** |
| | **TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | |
| 130 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 209,784 | 209,784 |
| | **SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **209,784** | **209,784** |
| | **ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | | |
| 180 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 376,495 | 376,495 |
| 190 | ADMINISTRATION | 5,989 | 5,989 |
| | **SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | **382,484** | **382,484** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS** | **3,571,210** | **3,571,210** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE** | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 2,115,901 | 2,115,901 |
| 020 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 2,033,929 | 2,033,929 |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 46,844 | 46,844 |
| 050 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 312,361 | 312,361 |
| 060 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 334,950 | 334,950 |
| 070 | BASE SUPPORT | 641,404 | 641,404 |
| 080 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 69,330 | 69,330 |
| 090 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 297,015 | 297,015 |
| 120 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 16,833 | 16,833 |
| 130 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 46,390 | 46,390 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **5,914,957** | **5,914,957** |
| | **MOBILIZATION** | | |

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 150 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 3,533,338 | | 3,533,338 |
| 160 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 85,416 | | 85,416 |
| 170 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 161,678 | | 161,678 |
| 180 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 9,485 | | 9,485 |
| 190 | BASE SUPPORT | 30,033 | | 30,033 |
| | **SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION** | **3,819,950** | | **3,819,950** |
| | **TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| 230 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 908 | | 908 |
| 240 | BASE SUPPORT | 2,280 | | 2,280 |
| 250 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 29,592 | | 29,592 |
| 260 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 154 | | 154 |
| 270 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 691 | | 691 |
| 280 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 753 | | 753 |
| | **SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **34,378** | | **34,378** |
| | **ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 350 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 155,121 | | 155,121 |
| 390 | BASE SUPPORT | 20,677 | | 20,677 |
| 400 | ADMINISTRATION | 3,320 | | 3,320 |
| 410 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 111,561 | | 111,561 |
| 420 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 605,223 | | 605,223 |
| 465 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 54,000 | | 54,000 |
| | **SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | **949,902** | | **949,902** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE** | **10,719,187** | | **10,719,187** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | |
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 3,269,939 | 3,269,939 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **3,271,939** | **3,271,939** |
| | **ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | | |
| 080 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 23,478 | 23,478 |
| 090 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 87,925 | 87,925 |
| 120 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 164,520 | 164,520 |
| 140 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY | 102,322 | 102,322 |
| 160 | DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY | 15,457 | 15,457 |
| 185 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY—OTHER | 2,200,000 | 2,200,000 |
| 220 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY | 194,100 | 194,100 |
| 260 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 143,870 | 143,870 |
| 275 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 3,065,800 | 3,065,800 |
| | **SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES** | **5,997,472** | **5,997,472** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **9,269,411** | **9,269,411** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE** | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 84,200 | 84,200 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 28,100 | 28,100 |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 20,700 | 20,700 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 84,500 | 84,500 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **217,500** | **217,500** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE** | **217,500** | **217,500** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE** | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | |

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 38,402 | | 38,402 |
| 020 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 400 | | 400 |
| 040 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 11,330 | | 11,330 |
| 060 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 10,137 | | 10,137 |
| 100 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 13,827 | | 13,827 |
| 140 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 52 | | 52 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **74,148** | | **74,148** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE** | **74,148** | | **74,148** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE** | | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 31,284 | | 31,284 |
| 050 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **36,084** | | **36,084** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE** | **36,084** | | **36,084** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE** | | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | | | |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 131,000 | | 131,000 |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | | |
| 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 6,250 | | 6,250 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **142,050** | | **142,050** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE** | **142,050** | **142,050** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD** | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 89,930 | 89,930 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 130,848 | 130,848 |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 110,011 | 110,011 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 34,788 | 34,788 |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 21,967 | 21,967 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **387,544** | **387,544** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD** | **387,544** | **387,544** |
| | **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD** | | |
| | **OPERATING FORCES** | | |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 34,050 | 34,050 |
| | **SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES** | **34,050** | **34,050** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD** | **34,050** | **34,050** |
| | **AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND** | | |
| | **MINISTRY OF DEFENSE** | | |
| 010 | INFRASTRUCTURE | 1,304,350 | 1,304,350 |
| 020 | EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION | 1,667,905 | 1,667,905 |
| 030 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 751,073 | 751,073 |
| 040 | SUSTAINMENT | 3,331,774 | 3,331,774 |
| | **SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE** | **7,055,102** | **7,055,102** |
| | **MINISTRY OF INTERIOR** | | |
| 060 | INFRASTRUCTURE | 1,128,584 | 1,128,584 |
| 070 | EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION | 1,530,420 | 1,530,420 |
| 080 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 1,102,430 | 1,102,430 |

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 090 | SUSTAINMENT | 1,938,715 | | 1,938,715 |
| | **SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR** | **5,700,149** | | **5,700,149** |
| | **ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 110 | SUSTAINMENT | 21,187 | | 21,187 |
| 120 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 7,344 | | 7,344 |
| 130 | INFRASTRUCTURE | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| 140 | COIN ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 150 | EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION | 1,218 | | 1,218 |
| | **SUBTOTAL ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES** | **44,749** | | **44,749** |
| | **TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND** | **12,800,000** | | **12,800,000** |
| | **PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND** | | | |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | |
| 010 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | 1,100,000 | 1,100,000 |
| | Realignment of funds from Department of State | | [1,100,000] | |
| | **SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED** | | **1,100,000** | **1,100,000** |
| | **TOTAL PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND** | | **1,100,000** | **1,100,000** |
| | **AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND** | | | |
| | **POWER** | | | |
| 010 | POWER | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| 020 | TRANSPORTATION | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| 030 | WATER | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| 040 | OTHER RELATED ACTIVITIES | 25,000 | | 25,000 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| SUBTOTAL POWER | 475,000 | | 475,000 |
| TOTAL AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND | 475,000 | | 475,000 |
| TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | 89,035,031 | 1,100,000 | 90,135,031 |

# TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

## SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

**SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| MILITARY PERSONNEL | 142,828,848 | –664,690 | 142,164,158 |
| Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Officers on Active Duty in Field Grades (Section 501) | | 6,000 | |
| Retain Carrier Air Wing Staff (Section 1095) | | 2,310 | |
| Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants | | 20,000 | |
| Unobligated Balances (Section 421) | | [–693,000] | |

## SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

**SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| MILITARY PERSONNEL | 11,228,566 | | 11,228,566 |

# TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

## SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

**SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY** | | | |
| PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS | 101,194 | | 101,194 |
| **TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY** | **101,194** | | **101,194** |
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE** | | | |
| WAR RESERVE MATERIAL | 65,372 | | 65,372 |
| **TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE** | **65,372** | | **65,372** |
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | |
| DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA) | 31,614 | | 31,614 |
| **TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **31,614** | | **31,614** |
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA** | | | |
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA | 1,376,830 | 2,000 | 1,378,830 |
| Enhanced Commissary Stores Pilot Program | | [2,000] | |
| **TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA** | **1,376,830** | **2,000** | **1,378,830** |
| **NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND** | | | |
| MPF MLP | 425,865 | | 425,865 |
| POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING | 24,161 | | 24,161 |
| NATIONAL DEF SEALIFT VESSEL | 1,138 | | 1,138 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE | 92,567 | | 92,567 |
| DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS | 184,109 | | 184,109 |
| TAH MAINTENANCE | 40,831 | | 40,831 |
| RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 48,443 | | 48,443 |
| READY RESERVE FORCE | 309,270 | | 309,270 |
| **TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND** | **1,126,384** | | **1,126,384** |
| | | | |
| **DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | | | |
| **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE** | | | |
| IN-HOUSE CARE | 8,148,856 | | 8,148,856 |
| PRIVATE SECTOR CARE | 16,377,272 | | 16,377,272 |
| CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT | 2,193,821 | | 2,193,821 |
| INFORMATION MANAGEMENT | 1,422,697 | –19,230 | 1,403,467 |
| Electronic Health Record Way Ahead | | [–15,480] | |
| Virtual Electronic Health Record | | [–3,750] | |
| MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES | 312,102 | | 312,102 |
| EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 705,347 | | 705,347 |
| BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS | 1,742,451 | | 1,742,451 |
| UNDISTRIBUTED | | –178,500 | –178,500 |
| Collaborative Military-Civilian Trauma Training Programs | | [3,000] | |
| Competitive Programs for Alcohol and Substance Use Disorders | | [5,000] | |
| Cooperative Health Care Agreements | | [500] | |
| Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury | | [2,000] | |
| GAO Estimate of Unobligated Balances | | [–225,000] | |
| Mental Health Initiatives | | [10,000] | |
| Military Adaptive Sports Programs Section 582 | | [5,000] | |
| Prohibit TRICARE Prime Fee Increase for 1 year | | [45,000] | |
| Prohibit TRICARE Prime Fee Increase for 1 year | | [–25,000] | |
| Prohibit TRICARE Prime Fee Increase for 1 year | | [–20,000] | |
| TBI and PTSD Initiatives | | [20,000] | |
| Traumatic Brain Injury | | [1,000] | |
| **RDT&E** | | | |

**SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 2,935 | | 2,935 |
| APPLIED BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 33,805 | | 33,805 |
| MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 3,694 | | 3,694 |
| MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 767 | | 767 |
| MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 181,042 | | 181,042 |
| MEDICAL PRODUCTS SUPPORT AND ADVANCED CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT | 167,481 | | 167,481 |
| INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 176,345 | –12,110 | 164,235 |
| Electronic Health Record Way Ahead | | [–11,360] | |
| Virtual Electronic Health Record | | [–750] | |
| MEDICAL PRODUCTS AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 34,559 | | 34,559 |
| MEDICAL PROGRAM-WIDE ACTIVITIES | 48,313 | | 48,313 |
| MEDICAL PRODUCTS AND CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES | 14,765 | | 14,765 |
| UNDISTRIBUTED | | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Prostate Cancer Imaging Research Initiative | | [2,000] | |
| **PROCUREMENT** | | | |
| DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM | 632,518 | –28,170 | 604,348 |
| Electronic Health Record Way Ahead | | [–28,170] | |
| **TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | **32,198,770** | **–236,010** | **31,962,760** |
| **CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION** | | | |
| CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—O&M | 1,147,691 | | 1,147,691 |
| CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—RDT&E | 406,731 | | 406,731 |
| **TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION** | **1,554,422** | | **1,554,422** |
| **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE | 1,156,282 | | 1,156,282 |
| **TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES** | **1,156,282** | | **1,156,282** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | | | |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | 286,919 | 1,000 | 287,919 |
| DOD IG Inspection of Military Cemeteries, Section 562 | | [1,000] | |
| RDT&E | 1,600 | | 1,600 |
| PROCUREMENT | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| **TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | **289,519** | **1,000** | **290,519** |
| **MISSION FORCE ENHANCEMENT TRANSFER FUND** | | | |
| | | 348,256 | 348,256 |
| Creation of the Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund | | [1,000,000] | |
| Program Decreases | | [–651,744] | |
| **TOTAL MISSION FORCE ENHANCEMENT TRANSFER FUND** | | **348,256** | **348,256** |
| **TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | **37,900,387** | **115,246** | **38,015,633** |

## SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

**OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Item | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY** | | | |
| PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS | 54,000 | | 54,000 |
| **TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY** | **54,000** | | **54,000** |
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE** | | | |
| TRANSPORTATION FALLEN HEROES | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| CONTAINER DECONSOLIDATION | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| **TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE** | **12,000** | | **12,000** |
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | |
| DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA) | 369,013 | | 369,013 |
| **TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **369,013** | | **369,013** |
| **DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | | | |
| **OPERATION & MAINTENANCE** | | | |
| IN-HOUSE CARE | 641,996 | | 641,996 |
| PRIVATE SECTOR CARE | 464,869 | | 464,869 |
| CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT | 95,994 | | 95,994 |
| INFORMATION MANAGEMENT | 5,548 | | 5,548 |
| MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES | 751 | | 751 |
| EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 16,859 | | 16,859 |
| BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS | 2,271 | | 2,271 |
| **TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | **1,228,288** | | **1,228,288** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES** | | |
| DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE | 486,458 | 486,458 |
| **TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES** | **486,458** | **486,458** |
| **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | | |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | 11,055 | 11,055 |
| **TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | **11,055** | **11,055** |
| **TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | **2,160,814** | **2,160,814** |

# TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | AFGHANISTAN | Bagram Air Base | Barracks, Ph 5 | 29,000 | | 29,000 |
| Army | AFGHANISTAN | Bagram Air Base | Construct Drainage System, Ph 3 | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Army | AFGHANISTAN | Bagram Air Base | Entry Control Point | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Army | ALABAMA | Fort Rucker | Combat Readiness Center | 11,600 | | 11,600 |
| Army | ALASKA | Fort Wainwright | Aviation Complex, Ph 3A | 114,000 | | 114,000 |
| Army | ALASKA | Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson | Brigade Complex, Ph 2 | 74,000 | | 74,000 |
| Army | ALASKA | Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson | Organizational Parking | 3,600 | | 3,600 |
| Army | ALASKA | Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson | Physical Fitness Facility | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | CALIFORNIA | Fort Irwin | Infantry Squad Battle Course | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| Army | CALIFORNIA | Fort Irwin | Qualification Training Range | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Army | CALIFORNIA | Presidio Monterey | General Instruction Building | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Army | COLORADO | Fort Carson | Aircraft Loading Area | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| Army | COLORADO | Fort Carson | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar | 63,000 | | 63,000 |
| Army | COLORADO | Fort Carson | Barracks | 46,000 | | 46,000 |
| Army | COLORADO | Fort Carson | Barracks | 67,000 | | 67,000 |
| Army | COLORADO | Fort Carson | Brigade Headquarters | 14,400 | | 14,400 |
| Army | COLORADO | Fort Carson | Control Tower | 14,200 | | 14,200 |
| Army | GEORGIA | Fort Benning | Land Acquisition | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Army | GEORGIA | Fort Benning | Land Acquisition | 5,100 | | 5,100 |
| Army | GEORGIA | Fort Benning | Rail Loading Facility | 13,600 | | 13,600 |
| Army | GEORGIA | Fort Benning | Trainee Barracks Complex, Ph 3 | 23,000 | | 23,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | GEORGIA | Fort Gordon | Hand Grenade Familiarization Range | 1,450 | 1,450 |
| Army | GEORGIA | Fort Stewart | Dog Kennel | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| Army | GERMANY | Germersheim | Central Distribution Facility | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| Army | GERMANY | Germersheim | Infrastructure | 16,500 | 16,500 |
| Army | GERMANY | Grafenwoehr | Barracks | 17,500 | 17,500 |
| Army | GERMANY | Grafenwoehr | Chapel | 15,500 | 15,500 |
| Army | GERMANY | Grafenwoehr | Convoy Live Fire Range | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Army | GERMANY | Landstuhl | Satellite Communications Center | 39,000 | 39,000 |
| Army | GERMANY | Landstuhl | Satellite Communications Center | 24,000 | 24,000 |
| Army | GERMANY | Oberdachstetten | Automated Record Fire Range | 12,200 | 12,200 |
| Army | GERMANY | Stuttgart | Access Control Point | 12,200 | 12,200 |
| Army | GERMANY | Vilseck | Barracks | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Army | HAWAII | Fort Shafter | Child Development Center | 17,500 | 17,500 |
| Army | HAWAII | Schofield Barracks | Centralized Wash Facility | 32,000 | 32,000 |
| Army | HAWAII | Schofield Barracks | Combat Aviation Brigade Complex, Ph 1 | 73,000 | 73,000 |
| Army | HONDURAS | Honduras Various | Barracks | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Army | KANSAS | Forbes Air Field | Deployment Support Facility | 5,300 | 5,300 |
| Army | KANSAS | Fort Riley | Chapel | 10,400 | 10,400 |
| Army | KANSAS | Fort Riley | Physical Fitness Facility | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| Army | KANSAS | Fort Riley | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Barracks | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Barracks Complex | 65,000 | 65,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Physical Fitness Facility | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Scout/RECCE Gunnery Range | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar | 67,000 | 67,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Knox | Automated Infantry Platoon Battle Course | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Army | KENTUCKY | Fort Knox | Battalion Complex | 48,000 | 48,000 |
| Army | KOREA | Camp Carroll | Barracks | 41,000 | 41,000 |
| Army | KOREA | Camp Henry | Barracks Complex | 48,000 | 48,000 |
| Army | LOUISIANA | Fort Polk | Brigade Complex | 23,000 | 23,000 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | LOUISIANA | Fort Polk | Fire Station | 9,200 | | 9,200 |
| Army | LOUISIANA | Fort Polk | Land Acquisition | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Army | LOUISIANA | Fort Polk | Military Working Dog Facility | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| Army | LOUISIANA | Fort Polk | Multipurpose Machine Gun Range | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| Army | MARYLAND | Aberdeen Proving Ground | Auto Technology Evaluation Fac, Ph 3 | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Army | MARYLAND | Aberdeen Proving Ground | Command and Control Facility | 63,000 | | 63,000 |
| Army | MARYLAND | Fort Meade | Applied Instruction Facility | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army | MARYLAND | Fort Meade | Brigade Complex | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| Army | MISSOURI | Fort Leonard Wood | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Army | NEW YORK | Fort Drum | Ammunition Supply Point | 5,700 | | 5,700 |
| Army | NEW YORK | Fort Drum | Chapel | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| Army | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | Access Roads, Ph 2 | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Army | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | Battle Command Training Center | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Army | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | Brigade Complex Facilities | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Army | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | NCO Academy | 42,000 | | 42,000 |
| Army | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar | 54,000 | | 54,000 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | Fort Sill | Battle Command Training Center | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | Fort Sill | Chapel | 13,200 | | 13,200 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | Fort Sill | Physical Fitness Facility | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | Fort Sill | Rail Deployment Facility | 3,400 | | 3,400 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | Fort Sill | Reception Station, Ph 1 | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | Fort Sill | THAAD Instruction Facility | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | Fort Sill | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 51,000 | | 51,000 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | McAlester | Ammunition Loading Pads | 1,700 | | 1,700 |
| Army | OKLAHOMA | McAlester | Railroad Tracks | 6,300 | | 6,300 |
| Army | SOUTH CAROLINA | Fort Jackson | Modified Record Fire Range | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| Army | SOUTH CAROLINA | Fort Jackson | Trainee Barracks Complex, Ph 2 | 59,000 | | 59,000 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Applied Instruction Building | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Barracks Complex | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Electronics Maintenance Facility | 14,600 | | 14,600 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Infrastructure | 14,600 | | 14,600 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | JLENS Tactical Training Facility | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 24,000 | | 24,000 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 14,600 | | 14,600 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Water Well, Potable | 2,400 | | 2,400 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Hood | Operational Readiness Training Complex | 51,000 | | 51,000 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Hood | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Hood | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Army | TEXAS | Fort Hood | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| Army | TEXAS | Joint Base San Antonio | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 10,400 | | 10,400 |
| Army | TEXAS | Red River Army Depot | Maneuver Systems Sustainment Ctr, Ph 3 | 44,000 | | 44,000 |
| Army | UTAH | Dugway Proving Ground | Life Sciences Test Facility Addition | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| Army | VIRGINIA | Fort Belvoir | Information Dominance Center, Ph 1 | 52,000 | | 52,000 |
| Army | VIRGINIA | Fort Belvoir | Road and Infrastucture Improvements | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Army | VIRGINIA | Joint Base Langley Eustis | Aviation Training Facility | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | Air Support Operations Facilities | 7,300 | | 7,300 |
| Army | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | Aviation Complex, Ph 1B | 48,000 | | 48,000 |
| Army | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | Aviation Unit Complex, Ph 1A | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| Army | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | Battalion Complex | 59,000 | | 59,000 |
| Army | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | Brigade Complex, Ph 2 | 56,000 | | 56,000 |
| Army | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | Infrastructure, Ph 1 | 64,000 | | 64,000 |
| Army | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | Operational Readiness Training Cplx, Ph 1 | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Community Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Host Nation Support | 25,500 | | 25,500 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Minor Construction | 20,000 | | 20,000 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning & Design | 229,741 | | 229,741 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | R&D Facilities | 0 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Supply Facilities | 0 | | 0 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Training Facilities | 0 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Troop Housing Facilities | 0 | | 0 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Troop Housing Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Army | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities and Ground Improvements | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| **Total Military Construction, Army** | | | | **3,235,991** | **70,000** | **3,305,991** |
| Navy | ARIZONA | Yuma | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar | 39,515 | | 39,515 |
| Navy | ARIZONA | Yuma | Double Aircraft Maintenance Hangar | 81,897 | | 81,897 |
| Navy | ARIZONA | Yuma | JSF Auxiliary Landing Field | 41,373 | | 41,373 |
| Navy | BAHRAIN ISLAND | SW Asia | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 55,010 | | 55,010 |
| Navy | BAHRAIN ISLAND | SW Asia | Waterfront Development Phase 4 | 45,194 | | 45,194 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Barstow | Dip Tank Cleaning Facility | 8,590 | | 8,590 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Bridgeport | Multi-Purpose Building—Addition | 19,238 | | 19,238 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | Armory, 1ST Marine Division | 12,606 | | 12,606 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | Individual Equipment Issue Warehouse | 16,411 | | 16,411 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | Infantry Squad Defense Range | 29,187 | | 29,187 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | Intersection Bridge and Improvements | 12,476 | | 12,476 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | MV–22 Aviation Fuel Storage | 6,163 | | 6,163 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | MV–22 Aviation Pavement | 18,530 | | 18,530 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | MV–22 Double Hangar Replacement | 48,345 | | 48,345 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | New Potable Water Conveyance | 113,091 | | 113,091 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | North Area Waste Water Conveyance | 78,271 | | 78,271 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Coronado | FITNESS CENTER NORTH ISLAND | 46,763 | | 46,763 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Coronado | Rotary Aircraft Depot Maint Fac (North Is.) | 61,672 | | 61,672 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Point Mugu | E–2D AIRCREW TRAINING FACILITY | 15,377 | | 15,377 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Twentynine Palms | Child Development Center | 23,743 | | 23,743 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Twentynine Palms | Land Expansion | 8,665 | | 8,665 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Twentynine Palms | Multi-Use Operational Fitness Area | 18,819 | | 18,819 |
| Navy | CALIFORNIA | Twentynine Palms | Tracked Vehicle Maintenance Cover | 15,882 | | 15,882 |
| Navy | DIEGO GARCIA | Diego Garcia | Potable Water Plant Modernization | 35,444 | | 35,444 |
| Navy | DJIBOUTI | Camp Lemonier | Aircraft Logistics Apron | 35,170 | | 35,170 |
| Navy | DJIBOUTI | Camp Lemonier | Bachelor Quarters | 43,529 | | 43,529 |
| Navy | DJIBOUTI | Camp Lemonier | TAXIWAY ENHANCEMENT | 10,800 | | 10,800 |
| Navy | FLORIDA | Jacksonville | BAMS UAS Operator Training Facility | 4,482 | | 4,482 |
| Navy | FLORIDA | Jacksonville | P–8A Hangar Upgrades | 6,085 | | 6,085 |
| Navy | FLORIDA | Jacksonville | P–8A Training Facility | 25,985 | | 25,985 |
| Navy | FLORIDA | Mayport | Massey Avenue Corridor Improvements | 14,998 | –14,998 | 0 |
| Navy | FLORIDA | Whiting Field | Applied Instruction Facilities, EOD Course | 20,620 | | 20,620 |
| Navy | GEORGIA | Kings Bay | Crab Island Security Enclave | 52,913 | | 52,913 |
| Navy | GEORGIA | Kings Bay | WRA Land/Water Interface | 33,150 | | 33,150 |
| Navy | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | Finegayan Water Utilities | 77,267 | | 77,267 |
| Navy | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | North Ramp Utilities—Anderson AFB (INC) | 78,654 | | 78,654 |
| Navy | HAWAII | Barking Sands | North Loop Electrical Replacement | 9,679 | | 9,679 |
| Navy | HAWAII | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | Navy Information Operations Command FES Fac | 7,492 | | 7,492 |
| Navy | HAWAII | Kaneohe Bay | MCAS Operations Complex | 57,704 | | 57,704 |
| Navy | ILLINOIS | Great Lakes | Decentralize Steam System | 91,042 | | 91,042 |
| Navy | MARYLAND | Indian Head | Decentralize Steam System | 67,779 | | 67,779 |
| Navy | MARYLAND | Patuxent River | Aircraft Prototype Facility Phase 2 | 45,844 | | 45,844 |
| Navy | NORTH CAROLINA | Camp Lejeune | 2nd Combat Engineer Maintenance/Ops Complex | 75,214 | | 75,214 |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | NORTH CAROLINA | Camp Lejeune | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters—Wallace Creek | 27,439 | | 27,439 |
| Navy | NORTH CAROLINA | Camp Lejeune | Base Entry Point and Road | 81,008 | | 81,008 |
| Navy | NORTH CAROLINA | Camp Lejeune | Squad Battle Course | 16,821 | | 16,821 |
| Navy | NORTH CAROLINA | Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station | H–1 HELICOPTER GEARBOX REPAIR & TEST FACILITY | 17,760 | | 17,760 |
| Navy | NORTH CAROLINA | New River | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar and Apron | 69,511 | | 69,511 |
| Navy | NORTH CAROLINA | New River | Ordnance Loading Area Additiion | 9,419 | | 9,419 |
| Navy | SOUTH CAROLINA | Beaufort | VERTICAL LANDING PADS | 21,096 | | 21,096 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Norfolk | Bachelor Quarters, Homeport Ashore | 81,304 | | 81,304 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Norfolk | Decentralize Steam System | 26,924 | | 26,924 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Portsmouth | Controlled Industrial Facility | 74,864 | | 74,864 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Quantico | Academic Instruction Facility | 75,304 | | 75,304 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Quantico | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 31,374 | | 31,374 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Quantico | Embassy Security Group Facilities | 27,079 | | 27,079 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Quantico | Enlisted Dining Facility | 5,034 | | 5,034 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Quantico | Realign Purvis Rd/Russell Rd Intersection | 6,442 | | 6,442 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Quantico | The Basic School Student Quarters—Phase 6 | 28,488 | | 28,488 |
| Navy | VIRGINIA | Quantico | Waste Water Treatment Plant—Upshur | 9,969 | | 9,969 |
| Navy | WASHINGTON | Bremerton | Integrated Dry Dock Water Treatment Fac Ph1 | 13,341 | | 13,341 |
| Navy | WASHINGTON | Kitsap | EHW Security Force Facility (Bangor) | 25,948 | | 25,948 |
| Navy | WASHINGTON | Kitsap | Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (Inc. 1) | 78,002 | | 78,002 |
| Navy | WASHINGTON | Kitsap | WATERFRONT RESTRICTED AREA VEHICLE BARRIERS | 17,894 | | 17,894 |
| Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance & Production Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning And Design | 84,362 | –15,000 | 69,362 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | R&D Facilities | 0 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Troop Housing Facilities | 0 | 29,998 | 29,998 |
| Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Constr | 21,495 | | 21,495 |
| **Total Military Construction, Navy** | | | | **2,461,547** | **30,000** | **2,491,547** |
| AF | ALASKA | Eielson AFB | Dormitory (168 RM) | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| AF | ALASKA | Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson | Brigade Combat Team (Light) Complex, (480 RM) | 97,000 | | 97,000 |
| AF | ARIZONA | Davis-Monthan AFB | EC–130H Simulator/Training Operations | 20,500 | | 20,500 |
| AF | ARIZONA | Davis-Monthan AFB | HC–130J Joint Use Fuel Cell | 12,500 | | 12,500 |
| AF | ARIZONA | Luke AFB | F–35 ADAL Aircraft Maintenance Unit | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| AF | ARIZONA | Luke AFB | F–35 Squad Ops/AMU 2 | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| AF | CALIFORNIA | Travis AFB | Dormitory (144 RM) | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| AF | CALIFORNIA | Vandenberg AFB | Education Center | 14,200 | | 14,200 |
| AF | COLORADO | U.S. Air Force Academy | Construct Large Vehicle Inspection Facility | 13,400 | | 13,400 |
| AF | DELAWARE | Dover AFB | C–5M Formal Training Unit Facility | 2,800 | | 2,800 |
| AF | FLORIDA | Patrick AFB | Air Force Technical Applications Ctr—Incr 2 | 79,000 | –30,000 | 49,000 |
| AF | GERMANY | Ramstein AB | Dormitory (192 RM) | 34,697 | | 34,697 |
| AF | GREENLAND | Thule AB | Dormitory (72 PN) | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| AF | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | Air Freight Terminal Complex | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| AF | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | Guam Strike Clear Water Rinse Facility | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| AF | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | Guam Strike Conventional Munitions Maintenanc | 11,700 | | 11,700 |
| AF | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | Guam Strike Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar, Incr 1 | 128,000 | –64,000 | 64,000 |
| AF | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | PRTC Combat Communications Combat Support | 9,800 | | 9,800 |
| AF | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | PRTC Combat Communications Transmission Syst | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| AF | GUAM | Joint Region Marianas | PRTC RED HORSE Cantonment Operations Facility | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| AF | ITALY | Sigonella | UAS SATCOM Relay Pads and Facility | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| AF | KANSAS | Fort Riley | Air Support Operations Center | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| AF | KOREA | Osan AB | Dormitory (156 RM) | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| AF | LOUISIANA | Barksdale AFB | Mission Support Group Complex | 23,500 | | 23,500 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AF | MISSOURI | Whiteman AFB | WSA Security Control Facility | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| AF | NEBRASKA | Offutt AFB | STRATCOM Replacement Facility Incr 1 | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| AF | NEVADA | Nellis AFB | Communications Network Control Center | 11,600 | | 11,600 |
| AF | NEVADA | Nellis AFB | F–35 Add/Alter Engine Shop | 2,750 | | 2,750 |
| AF | NEVADA | Nellis AFB | F–35A AGE Facility | 21,500 | | 21,500 |
| AF | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | ADAL Wastewater Treatment Plant | 7,598 | | 7,598 |
| AF | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | Dormitory (96 RM) | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| AF | NEW MEXICO | Holloman AFB | Child Development Center | 11,200 | | 11,200 |
| AF | NEW MEXICO | Holloman AFB | F–16 Academic Facility | 5,800 | | 5,800 |
| AF | NEW MEXICO | Holloman AFB | F–16 SEAD Training Facility | 4,200 | | 4,200 |
| AF | NEW MEXICO | Holloman AFB | Parallel Taxiway 07/25 | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| AF | NEW MEXICO | Kirtland AFB | AFNWC Sustainment Center | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| AF | NORTH CAROLINA | Pope AFB | C–130 Flight Simulator | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| AF | NORTH DAKOTA | Minot AFB | B–52 3–Bay Conventional Munitions Maintenance | 11,800 | | 11,800 |
| AF | NORTH DAKOTA | Minot AFB | B–52 Two-Bay Phase Maintenance Dock | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| AF | NORTH DAKOTA | Minot AFB | Dormitory (168 RM) | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| AF | QATAR | Al Udeid | Blatchford Preston Complex, Phase IV | 37,000 | | 37,000 |
| AF | TEXAS | Joint Base San Antonio | Adv Indiv Training (AIT) Barracks (300 RM) | 46,000 | | 46,000 |
| AF | TEXAS | Joint Base San Antonio | BMT Recruit Dormitory 4, Phase IV | 64,000 | | 64,000 |
| AF | UTAH | Hill AFB | F–22 System Support Facility | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| AF | UTAH | Hill AFB | F–35 ADAL Hangar 45E/AMU | 6,800 | | 6,800 |
| AF | VIRGINIA | Joint Base Langley Eustis | AIT Barracks Complex, Ph 2 | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| AF | WASHINGTON | Fairchild AFB | SERE Force Support Ph 2 | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| AF | WASHINGTON | Fairchild AFB | Wing Headquarters | 13,600 | | 13,600 |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Community Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Community Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance & Production Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Operational Facilities | 0 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | PLANNING & DESIGN | 81,913 | | 81,913 |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Supporting Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| **Total Military Construction, Air Force** | | | | **1,364,858** | **–34,000** | **1,330,858** |
| Def-Wide | ALABAMA | Redstone Arsenal | Von Braun Complex Phase IV | 58,800 | | 58,800 |
| Def-Wide | ALASKA | Anchorage | SOF Cold Weather Maritime Training Facility | 18,400 | | 18,400 |
| Def-Wide | ALASKA | Eielson AFB | Upgrade Rail Line | 14,800 | | 14,800 |
| Def-Wide | ARIZONA | Davis-Monthan AFB | REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Def-Wide | BELGIUM | Brussels | NATO Headquarters Facility | 24,118 | | 24,118 |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | SOF Military Working Dog Facility | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA | Camp Pendleton | SOF Range 130 Support Projects | 8,641 | | 8,641 |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA | Coronado | SOF Support Activity Operations Facility | 42,000 | | 42,000 |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA | Defense Distribution Depot-Tracy | Replace Public Safety Center | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA | Point Loma Annex | Replace Fuel Storage Facilities Incr 4 | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA | San Clemente | REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS & PIPELINE | 21,800 | | 21,800 |
| Def-Wide | COLORADO | Buckley AFB | Mountainview Operations Facility, Incr 1 | 140,932 | –70,000 | 70,932 |
| Def-Wide | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | Bolling AFB | Cooling Tower Expansion | 2,070 | | 2,070 |
| Def-Wide | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | Bolling AFB | DIAC Parking Garage | 13,586 | | 13,586 |
| Def-Wide | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | Bolling AFB | Electrical Upgrades | 1,080 | | 1,080 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | FLORIDA | Eglin AFB | Medical Clinic | 11,600 | | 11,600 |
| Def-Wide | FLORIDA | Eglin AFB | SOF Company Operations Facility (GSB) | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Def-Wide | FLORIDA | Eglin AFB | SOF Company Operations Facility (GSTB) | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Def-Wide | FLORIDA | Eglin AUX 9 | SOF Enclosed Engine Noise Suppressors | 3,200 | | 3,200 |
| Def-Wide | FLORIDA | Eglin AUX 9 | SOF Simulator Facility | 6,300 | | 6,300 |
| Def-Wide | FLORIDA | MacDill AFB | SOF Acquisition Center (Phase II) | 15,200 | | 15,200 |
| Def-Wide | FLORIDA | Whiting Field | TRUCK LOAD/UNLOAD FACILITY | 3,800 | | 3,800 |
| Def-Wide | GEORGIA | Fort Benning | Replace McBride Elementary School | 37,205 | | 37,205 |
| Def-Wide | GEORGIA | Fort Gordon | WHITELAW WEDGE BUILDING ADDITION | 11,340 | | 11,340 |
| Def-Wide | GEORGIA | Fort Stewart | Hospital Addition/Alteration Phase 2 | 72,300 | | 72,300 |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY | Ansbach | Ansbach Middle/High School Addition | 11,672 | | 11,672 |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY | Baumholder | Replace Wetzel-Smith Elementary Schools | 59,419 | | 59,419 |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY | Grafenwoehr | Netzaberg MS School Addition | 6,529 | | 6,529 |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY | Rhine Ordnance Barracks | Medical Center Replacement Incr 1 | 70,592 | | 70,592 |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY | Spangdalem AB | Replace Bitburg Elementary School | 41,876 | | 41,876 |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY | Spangdalem AB | Replace Bitburg Middle & High School | 87,167 | | 87,167 |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY | Stuttgart-Patch Barracks | DISA Europe Facility Upgrades | 2,434 | | 2,434 |
| Def-Wide | HAWAII | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | Alter Warehouse Space | 9,200 | | 9,200 |
| Def-Wide | HAWAII | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | UPGRADE REFULER TRUCK PARKING AREA | 5,200 | | 5,200 |
| Def-Wide | ILLINOIS | Great Lakes | Health Clinic Demolition | 16,900 | | 16,900 |
| Def-Wide | ITALY | Vicenza | Replace Vicenza High School | 41,864 | | 41,864 |
| Def-Wide | JAPAN | Yokota AB | Replace Temp Classrm/Joan K. Mendel ES | 12,236 | | 12,236 |
| Def-Wide | JAPAN | Yokota AB | Replace Yokota High School | 49,606 | | 49,606 |
| Def-Wide | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | Hospital Addition/Alteration | 56,600 | | 56,600 |
| Def-Wide | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | SOF MH47 Aviation Facility | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Def-Wide | KENTUCKY | Fort Campbell | SOF Rotary Wing Hangar | 38,900 | | 38,900 |
| Def-Wide | KENTUCKY | Fort Knox | Replace Kingsolver-Pierce Elementary Schools | 38,845 | | 38,845 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | LOUISIANA | Barksdale AFB | Hydrant Fuel System | 6,200 | | 6,200 |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND | Aberdeen Proving Ground | USAMRICD Replacement, Inc 4 | 22,850 | | 22,850 |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND | Bethesda Naval Hospital | Child Development Center Addition/Alteration | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND | Fort Detrick | USAMRIID Stage I, Inc 6 | 137,600 | | 137,600 |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND | Fort Meade | High Performance Computing Capacity Inc 1 | 29,640 | | 29,640 |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND | Joint Base Andrews | Ambulatory Care Center, Incr 1 | 242,900 | –73,300 | 169,600 |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND | Joint Base Andrews | Dental Clinic Replacement | 22,800 | | 22,800 |
| Def-Wide | MASSACHUSETTS | Hanscom AFB | Replace Hanscom Middle School | 34,040 | | 34,040 |
| Def-Wide | MASSACHUSETTS | Westover ARB | REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM | 23,300 | | 23,300 |
| Def-Wide | MISSISSIPPI | Columbus AFB | REPLACE REFUELER PARKING FACILITY | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| Def-Wide | MISSISSIPPI | Gulfport | Medical Clinic Replacement | 34,700 | | 34,700 |
| Def-Wide | MISSOURI | Arnold | Data Ctr West #1 Power & Cooling Upgrade | 9,253 | | 9,253 |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | SOF ADAL Simulator Facility | 9,600 | | 9,600 |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | SOF Aircraft Maintenance Squadron Facility | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | SOF Apron And Taxiway | 28,100 | | 28,100 |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | SOF C–130 Squadron Operations Facility | 10,941 | | 10,941 |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | SOF C–130 Wash Rack Hangar | 10,856 | | 10,856 |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | SOF Hangar Aircraft Maintenance Unit | 41,200 | | 41,200 |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO | Cannon AFB | SOF Squadron Operations Facility | 17,300 | | 17,300 |
| Def-Wide | NEW YORK | Fort Drum | Dental clinic Addition/Alteration | 4,700 | | 4,700 |
| Def-Wide | NEW YORK | Fort Drum | Medical Clinic | 15,700 | | 15,700 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Camp Lejeune | SOF Armory Facility Expansion | 6,670 | | 6,670 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | Hospital Alteration | 57,600 | | 57,600 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | Replace District Superintendant's Office | 3,138 | | 3,138 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Administrative Annex | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Battalion Operations Complex | 23,478 | | 23,478 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Battalion Operations Facility | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Brigade Headquarters | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Communications Training Complex | 10,758 | | 10,758 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Entry Control Point | 2,300 | | 2,300 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Group Headquarters | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Fort Bragg | SOF Squadron HQ Addition | 11,000 | | 11,000 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | New River | Replace Delalio Elementary School | 22,687 | | 22,687 |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA | Pope AFB | SOF Training Facility | 5,400 | | 5,400 |
| Def-Wide | OHIO | Columbus | Security Enhancements | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Def-Wide | OKLAHOMA | Altus AFB | Replace Fuel Transfer Pipeline | 8,200 | | 8,200 |
| Def-Wide | PENNSYLVANIA | DEF Distribution Depot New Cumberland | Enclose Open-Sided Shed | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Def-Wide | PENNSYLVANIA | DEF Distribution Depot New Cumberland | Replace General Purpose Warehouse | 25,500 | | 25,500 |
| Def-Wide | PENNSYLVANIA | DEF Distribution Depot New Cumberland | UPGRADE ACCESS CONTROL POINTS | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Def-Wide | PENNSYLVANIA | Philadelphia | Upgrade HVAC System | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| Def-Wide | SOUTH CAROLINA | Joint Base Charleston | REPLACE FUEL STORAGE & DISTRIBUTION FACILITY | 24,868 | | 24,868 |
| Def-Wide | TEXAS | Fort Bliss | Hospital Replacement Incr 3 | 136,700 | –50,000 | 86,700 |
| Def-Wide | TEXAS | Joint Base San Antonio | Ambulatory Care Center Phase 3 | 161,300 | | 161,300 |
| Def-Wide | TEXAS | Joint Base San Antonio | Hospital Nutrition Care Department Add/Alt | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| Def-Wide | UNITED KINGDOM | Menwith Hill Station | MHS PSC CONSTRUCTION GENERATOR PLANT | 68,601 | | 68,601 |
| Def-Wide | UNITED KINGDOM | Royal Air Force Alconbury | Replace Alconbury High School | 35,030 | | 35,030 |
| Def-Wide | UTAH | Camp Williams | IC CNCI Data Center 1 Inc 3 | 246,401 | | 246,401 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Charlottesville | Remote Delivery Facility | 10,805 | | 10,805 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Dahlgren | Dahlgren E/MS School Addition | 1,988 | | 1,988 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Dam Neck | SOF Building Renovation | 3,814 | | 3,814 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Dam Neck | SOF Logistic Support Facility | 14,402 | | 14,402 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Dam Neck | SOF Military Working Dog Facility | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Fort Belvoir | Technology Center Third Floor Fit-out | 54,625 | | 54,625 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story | SOF Seal Team Operations Facility | 37,000 | | 37,000 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Pentagon | Heliport Control Tower/Fire Station | 6,457 | | 6,457 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Pentagon | Pentagon Memorial Pedestrian Plaza | 2,285 | | 2,285 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Quantico | Defense Access Road Improvements-Telegraph Rd | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA | Quantico | DSS Headquarters Addition | 42,727 | | 42,727 |
| Def-Wide | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | REPLACE FUEL DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Def-Wide | WASHINGTON | Joint Base Lewis McChord | SOF Company Operations Facility | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Def-Wide | WASHINGTON | Whidbey Island | Replace Fuel Pipeline | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Def-Wide | WEST VIRGINIA | Camp Dawson | REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Contingency Construction | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Defense Access Roads | 0 | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Energy Conservation Investment Program | 135,000 | | 135,000 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Exercise Related Construction | 8,417 | | 8,417 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Minor Construction | 6,100 | | 6,100 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning And Design | 31,468 | | 31,468 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 3,043 | | 3,043 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 52,974 | | 52,974 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning And Design | 8,368 | | 8,368 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 5,277 | | 5,277 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning And Design | 48,007 | | 48,007 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 1,993 | | 1,993 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | SOF Land Acquisition | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Supporting Activities | 0 | | 0 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 8,876 | | 8,876 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Milcon | 6,365 | | 6,365 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Various Worldwide Locations | Planning And Design | 66,974 | | 66,974 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Various Worldwide Locations | Planning And Design | 227,498 | | 227,498 |
| Def-Wide | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Various Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 6,571 | | 6,571 |
| **Total Military Construction, Defense-Wide** | | | | **3,848,757** | **–143,300** | **3,705,457** |
| Chem Demil | COLORADO | Pueblo Depot | Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph XIII | 15,338 | | 15,338 |
| Chem Demil | KENTUCKY | Blue Grass Army Depot | Ammunition Demilitarization Ph XII | 59,974 | | 59,974 |
| **Total Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense** | | | | **75,312** | **0** | **75,312** |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NATO | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | NATO Security Investment Program | Nato Security Investment Program | 272,611 | | 272,611 |
| **Total NATO Security Investment Program** | | | | **272,611** | **0** | **272,611** |
| Army NG | ALABAMA | Fort McClellan | Readiness Center PH2 | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| Army NG | ARIZONA | Papago Military Reservation | Readiness Center | 17,800 | | 17,800 |
| Army NG | ARKANSAS | Fort Chaffee | Convoy Live Fire/Entry Control Point Range | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| Army NG | CALIFORNIA | Camp Roberts | Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility | 6,160 | | 6,160 |
| Army NG | CALIFORNIA | Camp Roberts | Utilities Replacement Ph1 | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| Army NG | CALIFORNIA | Camp San Luis Obispo | Field Maintenance Shop | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| Army NG | COLORADO | Alamosa | Readiness Center | 6,400 | | 6,400 |
| Army NG | COLORADO | Aurora | Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility | 3,600 | | 3,600 |
| Army NG | COLORADO | Fort Carson | Barracks Complex (ORTC) | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army NG | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | Anacostia | US Property & Fiscal Office Add/Alt | 5,300 | | 5,300 |
| Army NG | FLORIDA | Camp Blanding | Convoy Live Fire/Entry Control Point Range | 2,400 | | 2,400 |
| Army NG | FLORIDA | Camp Blanding | Live Fire Shoot House | 3,100 | | 3,100 |
| Army NG | GEORGIA | Atlanta | Readiness Center | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Army NG | GEORGIA | Hinesville | Maneuver Area Training & Equipment Site Ph1 | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Army NG | GEORGIA | Macon | Readiness Center Ph1 | 14,500 | | 14,500 |
| Army NG | HAWAII | Kalaeloa | Readiness Center Ph1 | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| Army NG | ILLINOIS | Normal | Readiness Center | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Army NG | INDIANA | Camp Atterbury | Deployment Processing Facility | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| Army NG | INDIANA | Camp Atterbury | Operations Readiness Training Cmplx 2 | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Army NG | INDIANA | Camp Atterbury | Operations Readiness Training Complex 1 | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Army NG | INDIANA | Camp Atterbury | Railhead Expansion & Container Facility | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Army NG | INDIANA | Indianapolis | JFHQ Add/Alt | 25,700 | | 25,700 |
| Army NG | MAINE | Bangor | Readiness Center | 15,600 | | 15,600 |
| Army NG | MAINE | Brunswick | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Army NG | MARYLAND | Dundalk | Readiness Center Add/Alt | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| Army NG | MARYLAND | La Plata | Readiness Center | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| Army NG | MARYLAND | Westminster | Readiness Center Add/Alt | 10,400 | | 10,400 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army NG | MASSACHUSETTS | Natick | Readiness Center | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| Army NG | MINNESOTA | Camp Ripley | Multipurpose Machine Gun Range | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| Army NG | MISSISSIPPI | Camp Shelby | Deployment Processing Facility | 12,600 | | 12,600 |
| Army NG | MISSISSIPPI | Camp Shelby | Operational Readiness Training Cmplx Ph1 | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Army NG | MISSISSIPPI | Camp Shelby | Troop Housing (ORTC) Ph1 | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Army NG | NEBRASKA | Grand Island | Readiness Center | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| Army NG | NEBRASKA | Mead | Readiness Center | 9,100 | | 9,100 |
| Army NG | NEVADA | Las Vegas | Field Maintenance Shop | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Army NG | NEW JERSEY | Lakehurst | Army Aviation Suport Facility | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Army NG | NEW MEXICO | Santa Fe | Readiness Center Add/Alt | 5,200 | | 5,200 |
| Army NG | NORTH CAROLINA | Greensboro | Readiness Center Add/Alt | 3,700 | | 3,700 |
| Army NG | OKLAHOMA | Camp Gruber | Live Fire Shoot House | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Army NG | OKLAHOMA | Camp Gruber | Upgrade-Combined Arms Collective Training Fac | 10,361 | | 10,361 |
| Army NG | OREGON | The Dalles | Readiness Center | 13,800 | | 13,800 |
| Army NG | PUERTO RICO | Fort Buchanan | Readiness Center | 57,000 | | 57,000 |
| Army NG | SOUTH CAROLINA | Allendale | Readiness Center Add/Alt | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| Army NG | UTAH | Camp Williams | Multi Purpose Machine Gun Range | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| Army NG | VIRGINIA | Fort Pickett | Combined Arms Collective Training Facility | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Army NG | WEST VIRGINIA | Buckhannon | Readiness Center Ph1 | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Army NG | WISCONSIN | Camp Williams | Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| Army NG | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance & Production Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Army NG | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance & Production Facilities | 0 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Army NG | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Operational Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army NG | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 20,671 | | 20,671 |
| Army NG | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Training Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Army NG | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 11,700 | | 11,700 |
| Army NG | WYOMING | Cheyenne | Readiness Center | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| **Total Military Construction, Army National Guard** | | | | **773,592** | **50,000** | **823,592** |
| Army Res | CALIFORNIA | Fort Hunter Liggett | Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun (MPMG) | 5,200 | | 5,200 |
| Army Res | COLORADO | Fort Collins | Army Reserve Center | 13,600 | | 13,600 |
| Army Res | ILLINOIS | Homewood | Army Reserve Center | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| Army Res | ILLINOIS | Rockford | Army Reserve Center/Land | 12,800 | | 12,800 |
| Army Res | INDIANA | Lawrence | Army Reserve Center | 57,000 | | 57,000 |
| Army Res | KANSAS | Kansas City | Army Reserve Center/Land | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Army Res | MASSACHUSETTS | Attleboro | Army Reserve Center/Land | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| Army Res | MINNESOTA | Saint Joseph | Army Reserve Center | 11,800 | | 11,800 |
| Army Res | MISSOURI | Weldon Springs | Army Reserve Center | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Army Res | NEW YORK | Schenectady | Army Reserve Center | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Army Res | NORTH CAROLINA | Greensboro | Army Reserve Center/Land | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Army Res | SOUTH CAROLINA | Orangeburg | Army Reserve Center/Land | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Army Res | WISCONSIN | Fort McCoy | Automated Record Fire Range | 4,600 | | 4,600 |
| Army Res | WISCONSIN | Fort McCoy | Container Loading Facility | 5,300 | | 5,300 |
| Army Res | WISCONSIN | Fort McCoy | Modified Record Fire Known Distance Range | 5,400 | | 5,400 |
| Army Res | WISCONSIN | Fort McCoy | NCOA Phase III—Billeting | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Army Res | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 28,924 | | 28,924 |
| Army Res | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,925 | | 2,925 |
| **Total Military Construction, Army Reserve** | | | | **280,549** | **0** | **280,549** |
| N/MC Res | PENNSYLVANIA | Pittsburg | Armed Forces Reserve Center (Pittsburgh) | 13,759 | | 13,759 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N/MC Res | TENNESSEE | Memphis | Reserve Training Center | 7,949 | | 7,949 |
| N/MC Res | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| N/MC Res | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning And Design | 2,591 | | 2,591 |
| **Total Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps Reserve** | | | | **26,299** | **0** | **26,299** |
| Air NG | CALIFORNIA | Beale AFB | Wing Operations and Training Facility | 6,100 | | 6,100 |
| Air NG | CALIFORNIA | Moffett Field | Replace Pararescue Training Facility | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Air NG | HAWAII | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | TFI—F–22 Combat Aircraft Parking Apron | 12,721 | –12,721 | 0 |
| Air NG | HAWAII | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | TFI—F–22 Flight Simulator Facility | 19,800 | | 19,800 |
| Air NG | HAWAII | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | TFI—F–22 Weapons Load Crew Training Facilit | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| Air NG | INDIANA | Fort Wayne IAP | A–10 Facility Conversion—Munitions | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| Air NG | MARYLAND | Martin State Airport | TFI—C–27 Conversion - Squadron Operations | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| Air NG | MASSACHUSETTS | Otis ANGB | TFI—cNAF Beddown - Upgrade Facility | 7,800 | | 7,800 |
| Air NG | OHIO | Springfield Beckley-MAP | Alter Predator Operations Center | 6,700 | | 6,700 |
| Air NG | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance & Production Facilities | 0 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Air NG | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Operational Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Air NG | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Various Worldwide Locations | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| Air NG | WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED | Various Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 12,225 | | 12,225 |
| **Total Military Construction, Air National Guard** | | | | **116,246** | **17,279** | **133,525** |
| AF Res | CALIFORNIA | March AFB | Airfield Control Tower/Base Ops | 16,393 | | 16,393 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AF Res | SOUTH CAROLINA | Charleston AFB | TFI Red Horse Readiness & Trng Center | 9,593 | | 9,593 |
| AF Res | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning & Design | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| AF Res | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Training Facilities | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| AF Res | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 5,434 | | 5,434 |
| **Total Military Construction, Air Force Reserve** | | | | **33,620** | **10,000** | **43,620** |
| FH Con Army | BELGIUM | Brussels | Land Purchase for GFOQ (10 units) | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| FH Con Army | GERMANY | Grafenwoehr | Family Housing New Construction (26 units) | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| FH Con Army | GERMANY | Illesheim | Family Housing Replacement Construc(80 units) | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| FH Con Army | GERMANY | Vilseck | Family Housing New Construction (22 units) | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| FH Con Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Construction Improvements (276 units) | 103,000 | | 103,000 |
| FH Con Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Family Housing P&D | 7,897 | | 7,897 |
| **Total Family Housing Construction, Army** | | | | **186,897** | **0** | **186,897** |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account | 14,256 | | 14,256 |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing | 204,426 | | 204,426 |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance of Real Property | 105,668 | | 105,668 |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account | 54,728 | | 54,728 |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Miscellaneous Account | 605 | | 605 |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Privatization Support Costs | 25,741 | | 25,741 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Services Account | 15,797 | | 15,797 |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities Account | 73,637 | | 73,637 |
| **Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Army** | | | | **494,858** | **0** | **494,858** |
| FH Con AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Classified Improvements | 50 | | 50 |
| FH Con AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Construction Improvements | 80,546 | | 80,546 |
| FH Con AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 4,208 | | 4,208 |
| **Total Family Housing Construction, Air Force** | | | | **84,804** | **0** | **84,804** |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account | 35,290 | | 35,290 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Housing Privatization | 47,571 | | 47,571 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing | 80,775 | | 80,775 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing Account | 122 | | 122 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance (RPMA & RPMC) | 98,132 | | 98,132 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance Account | 2,001 | | 2,001 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account | 1,996 | | 1,996 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account | 55,395 | | 55,395 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Miscellaneous Account | 2,165 | | 2,165 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Services Account | 13,675 | | 13,675 |
| FH Ops AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities Account | 67,639 | | 67,639 |
| **Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Air Force** | | | | **404,761** | **0** | **404,761** |
| FH Con Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Design | 3,199 | | 3,199 |
| FH Con Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Improvements | 97,773 | | 97,773 |
| **Total Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps** | | | | **100,972** | **0** | **100,972** |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account | 15,979 | | 15,979 |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing | 79,798 | | 79,798 |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance Of Real Property | 97,231 | | 97,231 |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account | 61,090 | | 61,090 |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Miscellaneous Account | 476 | | 476 |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Privatization Support Costs | 28,582 | | 28,582 |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Services Account | 14,510 | | 14,510 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities Account | 70,197 | | 70,197 |
| **Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps** | | | | **367,863** | **0** | **367,863** |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account | 70 | | 70 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account | 19 | | 19 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account | 2,699 | | 2,699 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing | 36,552 | | 36,552 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing | 10,100 | | 10,100 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance Of Real Property | 70 | | 70 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance Of Real Property | 546 | | 546 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account | 347 | | 347 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Services Account | 30 | | 30 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities Account | 280 | | 280 |
| FH Ops DW | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities Account | 10 | | 10 |
| **Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide** | | | | **50,723** | **0** | **50,723** |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HOAP | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Homeowers Assistance Program | 1,284 | | 1,284 |
| **Total Homeowners Assistance Fund** | | | | **1,284** | **0** | **1,284** |
| FHIF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Family Housing Improvement Fund | 2,184 | | 2,184 |
| **Total DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund** | | | | **2,184** | **0** | **2,184** |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | COMM ADD 3: GALENA FOL, AK | 933 | | 933 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–100: PLANING, DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT | 6,090 | | 6,090 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–101: VARIOUS LOCATIONS | 5,021 | | 5,021 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–126: NSCS, ATHENS, GA | 325 | | 325 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–138: NAS BRUNSWICK, ME | 421 | | 421 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–157: MCSA KANSAS CITY, MO | 1,442 | | 1,442 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–158: NSA NEW ORLEANS, LA | 2,056 | | 2,056 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–172: NWS SEAL BEACH, CONCORD, CA | 9,763 | | 9,763 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–2: NS PASCAGOULA, MS | 515 | | 515 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON–84: JRB WILLOW GROVE & CAMBRIA REG AP | 196 | | 196 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | IND–106: KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, KS | 45,769 | | 45,769 |

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | House Change | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | IND–110: MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMO PLANT, MS | 122 | | 122 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | IND–112: RIVER BANK ARMY AMMO PLANT, CA | 320 | | 320 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | IND–117: DESERET CHEMICAL DEPOT, UT | 34,011 | | 34,011 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | IND–119: NEWPORT CHEMICAL DEPOT, IN | 467 | | 467 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | IND–120: UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT, OR | 9,092 | | 9,092 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | IND–122: LONE STAR ARMY AMMO PLANT, TX | 19,367 | | 19,367 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | INT–4: NGA ACTIVITIES | 1,791 | | 1,791 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | MED–2: WALTER REED NMMC, BETHESDA, MD | 18,586 | | 18,586 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | MED–57: BROOKS CITY BASE, TX | 205 | | 205 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS | 32,298 | | 32,298 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS | 828 | | 828 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–113: FORT MONROE, VA | 23,601 | | 23,601 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–121: FORT GILLEM, GA | 8,903 | | 8,903 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–131: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL -SE | 250 | | 250 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–166: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—NW | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–167: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—NE | 250 | | 250 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–168: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—SW | 250 | | 250 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–222: FORT MCPHERSON, GA | 9,921 | | 9,921 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–223: FORT MONMOUTH, NJ | 21,908 | | 21,908 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–242: RC TRANSFORMATION IN NY | 259 | | 259 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–36: RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT | 1,207 | | 1,207 |
| BRAC 05 | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | USA–63: U.S. ARMY GARRISON (SELFRIDGE) | 1,609 | | 1,609 |
| **Total Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005** | | | | **258,776** | **0** | **258,776** |
| BRAC IV | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, AIR FORCE | Base Realignment & Closure | 123,476 | | 123,476 |
| BRAC IV | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, ARMY | Base Realignment & Closure | 70,716 | | 70,716 |
| BRAC IV | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, NAVY | Base Realignment & Closure | 129,351 | | 129,351 |
| **Total Base Realignment and Closure Account 1990** | | | | **323,543** | **0** | **323,543** |
| **Total Military Construction** | | | | **14,766,047** | **–21** | **14,766,026** |

# TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

## SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Discretionary Summary By Appropriation** | | | |
| **Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies** | | | |
| **Appropriation Summary:** | | | |
| **Energy Programs** | | | |
| ENERGY SECURITY AND ASSURANCE | 6,187 | | 6,187 |
| **Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | | | |
| **National nuclear security administration:** | | | |
| WEAPONS ACTIVITIES | 7,629,716 | | 7,629,716 |
| DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION | 2,549,492 | | 2,549,492 |
| NAVAL REACTORS | 1,153,662 | | 1,153,662 |
| OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR | 450,060 | | 450,060 |
| **Total, National nuclear security administration** | **11,782,930** | **0** | **11,782,930** |
| **Environmental and other defense activities:** | | | |
| DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP | 5,406,781 | | 5,406,781 |
| OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES | 859,952 | | 859,952 |
| DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL | 0 | | 0 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total, Environmental & other defense activities | 6,266,733 | | 6,266,733 |
| Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities | 18,049,663 | | 18,049,663 |
| **Total, Discretionary Funding** | **18,055,850** | **0** | **18,055,850** |
| | | | |
| **Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability** | | | |
| Infrastructure security & energy restoration | 6,187 | **0** | 6,187 |
| | | | |
| **Weapons Activities** | | | |
| **Directed stockpile work** | | | |
| **Life extension programs** | | | |
| B61 Life extension program | 223,562 | | 223,562 |
| W76 Life extension program | 257,035 | | 257,035 |
| **Total, Life extension programs** | **480,597** | **0** | **480,597** |
| | | | |
| **Stockpile systems** | | | |
| B61 Stockpile systems | 72,396 | | 72,396 |
| W76 Stockpile systems | 63,383 | | 63,383 |
| W78 Stockpile systems | 109,518 | | 109,518 |
| W80 Stockpile systems | 44,444 | | 44,444 |
| B83 Stockpile systems | 48,215 | | 48,215 |
| W87 Stockpile systems | 83,943 | | 83,943 |
| W88 Stockpile systems | 75,728 | | 75,728 |
| **Total, Stockpile systems** | **497,627** | **0** | **497,627** |
| | | | |
| **Weapons dismantlement and disposition** | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 56,770 | | 56,770 |
| **Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition** | **56,770** | **0** | **56,770** |
| | | | |
| **Stockpile services** | | | |
| Production support | 354,502 | | 354,502 |
| Research and development support | 30,264 | | 30,264 |
| R&D certification and safety | 190,892 | | 190,892 |

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Program | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Management, technology, and production | 198,700 | | 198,700 |
| Plutonium sustainment | 154,231 | | 154,231 |
| **Total, Stockpile services** | **928,589** | **0** | **928,589** |
| **Total, Directed stockpile work** | **1,963,583** | **0** | **1,963,583** |
| **Campaigns:** | | | |
| **Science campaign** | | | |
| Advanced certification | 94,929 | | 94,929 |
| Primary assessment technologies | 86,055 | | 86,055 |
| Dynamic materials properties | 111,836 | | 111,836 |
| Advanced radiography | 27,058 | | 27,058 |
| Secondary assessment technologies | 86,061 | | 86,061 |
| **Total, Science campaign** | **405,939** | **0** | **405,939** |
| **Engineering campaign** | | | |
| Enhanced surety | 41,696 | | 41,696 |
| Weapon systems engineering assessment technology | 15,663 | | 15,663 |
| Nuclear survivability | 19,545 | | 19,545 |
| Enhanced surveillance | 66,174 | | 66,174 |
| **Total, Engineering campaign** | **143,078** | **0** | **143,078** |
| **Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign** | | | |
| Ignition | 109,888 | | 109,888 |
| Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support | 86,259 | | 86,259 |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion | 4,997 | | 4,997 |
| Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas | 9,100 | | 9,100 |
| Facility operations and target production | 266,030 | | 266,030 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign** | **476,274** | **0** | **476,274** |
| **Advanced simulation and computing campaign** | **628,945** | **0** | **628,945** |
| **Readiness Campaign** | | | |
| Nonnuclear readiness | 65,000 | | 65,000 |
| Tritium readiness | 77,491 | | 77,491 |
| **Total, Readiness campaign** | **142,491** | **0** | **142,491** |
| **Total, Campaigns** | **1,796,727** | **0** | **1,796,727** |
| **Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)** | | | |
| **Operations of facilities** | | | |
| Kansas City Plant | 156,217 | | 156,217 |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | 83,990 | | 83,990 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory | 318,526 | | 318,526 |
| Nevada Test Site | 97,559 | | 97,559 |
| Pantex | 164,848 | | 164,848 |
| Sandia National Laboratory | 120,708 | | 120,708 |
| Savannah River Site | 97,767 | | 97,767 |
| Y–12 National security complex | 246,001 | | 246,001 |
| Institutional site support | 199,638 | | 199,638 |
| **Total, Operations of facilities** | **1,485,254** | **0** | **1,485,254** |
| Program readiness | 74,180 | | 74,180 |
| Material recycle and recovery | 85,939 | | 85,939 |
| Containers | 28,979 | | 28,979 |
| Storage | 31,272 | | 31,272 |
| **Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities** | **1,705,624** | **0** | **1,705,624** |
| **Construction:** | | | |
| 12–D–301 TRU waste facilities, LANL | 9,881 | | 9,881 |
| 11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project, LANL | 19,402 | | 19,402 |
| 10–D–501 Nuclear facilities risk reduction Y–12 National security complex, Oakridge, TN | 35,387 | | 35,387 |
| 09–D–404 Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM | 25,168 | | 25,168 |

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Program | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 08–D–802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 66,960 | | 66,960 |
| 07–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | 3,518 | | 3,518 |
| 06–D–141 Project engineering & design (PED) Y–12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN | 160,194 | | 160,194 |
| 04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| **Total, Construction** | **620,510** | **0** | **620,510** |
| **Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities** | **2,326,134** | **0** | **2,326,134** |
| **Secure transportation asset** | | | |
| Operations and equipment | 149,274 | | 149,274 |
| Program direction | 101,998 | | 101,998 |
| **Total, Secure transportation asset** | **251,272** | **0** | **251,272** |
| **Nuclear counterterrorism incident response** | **222,147** | | **222,147** |
| **Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program** | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 96,380 | | 96,380 |
| **Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program** | **96,380** | **0** | **96,380** |
| **Site stewardship** | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 104,002 | | 104,002 |
| **Total, Site stewardship** | **104,002** | **0** | **104,002** |
| **Safeguards and security** | | | |
| **Defense nuclear security** | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 711,105 | | 711,105 |
| **Construction:** | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 08–D–701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory | 11,752 | | 11,752 |
| **Total, Construction** | **11,752** | **0** | **11,752** |
| **Total, Defense nuclear security** | **722,857** | **0** | **722,857** |
| Cyber security | 126,614 | | 126,614 |
| **Total, Safeguards and security** | **849,471** | **0** | **849,471** |
| **National security applications** | **20,000** | | 20,000 |
| **Subtotal, Weapons activities** | **7,629,716** | **0** | **7,629,716** |
| | | | |
| **Adjustments** | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | 0 | | 0 |
| **Total, Weapons Activities** | **7,629,716** | **0** | **7,629,716** |
| | | | |
| **Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | | | |
| **Nonproliferation and verification R&D** | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 417,598 | | 417,598 |
| **Total, Operations and maintenance** | **417,598** | **0** | **417,598** |
| **Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D** | **417,598** | **0** | **417,598** |
| | | | |
| **Nonproliferation and international security** | **161,833** | | **161,833** |
| | | | |
| **International nuclear materials protection and cooperation** | **571,639** | | **571,639** |
| | | | |
| **Fissile materials disposition** | | | |
| **U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition** | | | |
| **Operations and maintenance** | | | |
| U.S. plutonium disposition | 274,790 | | 274,790 |
| U.S. uranium disposition | 26,435 | | 26,435 |
| **Total, Operations and maintenance** | **301,225** | **0** | **301,225** |
| **Construction:** | | | |
| 99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC | 385,172 | | 385,172 |
| 99–D–141–01 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC | 176,000 | | 176,000 |
| 99–D–141–02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC | 17,582 | | 17,582 |

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Program | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total, Construction** | **578,754** | **0** | **578,754** |
| **Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition** | **879,979** | **0** | **879,979** |
| Russian surplus materials disposition | 10,174 | | 10,174 |
| **Total, Fissile materials disposition** | **890,153** | **0** | **890,153** |
| Global threat reduction initiative | 508,269 | | 508,269 |
| **Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | **2,549,492** | **0** | **2,549,492** |
| **Naval Reactors** | | | |
| **Naval reactors development** | | | |
| **Operation and maintenance** | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,069,262 | | 1,069,262 |
| **Total, Operation and maintenance** | **1,069,262** | **0** | **1,069,262** |
| **Construction:** | | | |
| 10–D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL | 100 | | 100 |
| 10–D–904, NRF infrastructure upgrades, Idaho | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| 08–D–190 Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID | 27,800 | | 27,800 |
| **Total, Construction** | **39,900** | **0** | **39,900** |
| **Total, Naval reactors development** | **1,109,162** | **0** | **1,109,162** |
| Program direction | 44,500 | | 44,500 |
| **Total, Naval Reactors** | **1,153,662** | **0** | **1,153,662** |
| **Office Of The Administrator** | | | |
| Office of the administrator | 450,060 | | 450,060 |
| Congressionally directed projects | 0 | | 0 |
| **Subtotal, Office of the Administrator** | **450,060** | **0** | **450,060** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Adjustments:** | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | 0 | | 0 |
| **Subtotal, Office of the Administrator** | **450,060** | **0** | **450,060** |
| Transfer of prior year balances (OMB scoring) | 0 | | 0 |
| **Total, Office Of The Administrator** | **450,060** | **0** | **450,060** |
| | | | |
| **Defense Environmental Cleanup** | | | |
| **Closure sites:** | | | |
| Closure sites administration | 5,375 | | 5,375 |
| **Total, Closure sites** | **5,375** | **0** | **5,375** |
| | | | |
| **Hanford site:** | | | |
| Nuclear facility D&D—remainder of Hanford | 56,288 | | 56,288 |
| Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project | 330,534 | | 330,534 |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition PFP | 48,458 | | 48,458 |
| SNF stabilization and disposition | 112,250 | | 112,250 |
| Soil and water remediation—groundwater vadose zone | 222,285 | | 222,285 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition 200 area | 143,897 | | 143,897 |
| **Total, Hanford site** | **913,712** | **0** | **913,712** |
| | | | |
| **Idaho National Laboratory:** | | | |
| SNF stabilization and disposition—2012 | 20,114 | | 20,114 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | 165,035 | | 165,035 |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 110,169 | | 110,169 |
| Soil and water remediation—2012 | 87,451 | | 87,451 |
| **Total, Idaho National Laboratory** | **382,769** | **0** | **382,769** |
| | | | |
| **NNSA sites** | | | |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | 873 | | 873 |

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Program | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nuclear facility D & D Separations Process Research Unit | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| Nevada | 63,380 | | 63,380 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory | 357,939 | | 357,939 |
| **Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites** | **423,692** | **0** | **423,692** |
| **Oak Ridge Reservation:** | | | |
| Nuclear facility D & D ORNL | 44,000 | | 44,000 |
| Nuclear facility D & D Y–12 | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Nuclear facility D & D, E. Tennessee technology park | 100 | | 100 |
| OR reservation community and regulatory support Soil and water remediation—offsites | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition—2012 | 99,000 | | 99,000 |
| **Total, Oak Ridge Reservation** | **176,100** | **0** | **176,100** |
| **Office of River Protection:** | | | |
| **Waste treatment and immobilization plant** | | | |
| ORP–0060 / Major construction Waste treatment plant (WTP) | 840,000 | | 840,000 |
| **Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant** | **840,000** | **0** | **840,000** |
| **Tank farm activities** | | | |
| Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 521,391 | | 521,391 |
| **Total, Tank farm activities** | **521,391** | **0** | **521,391** |
| **Total, Office of River protection** | **1,361,391** | **0** | **1,361,391** |
| **Savannah River site:** | | | |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition | 235,000 | | 235,000 |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 748,896 | | 748,896 |
| 05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River | 170,071 | | 170,071 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| SNF stabilization and disposition | 40,137 | | 40,137 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | 30,040 | | 30,040 |
| **Total, Savannah River site** | **1,224,144** | **0** | **1,224,144** |
| **Waste Isolation Pilot Plant** | | | |
| Waste isolation pilot plant | 147,136 | | 147,136 |
| Central characterization project | 23,975 | | 23,975 |
| Transportation | 29,044 | | 29,044 |
| Community and regulatory support | 28,771 | | 28,771 |
| **Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant** | **228,926** | **0** | **228,926** |
| Program direction | 321,628 | | 321,628 |
| Community, regulatory and program support | 91,279 | | 91,279 |
| **Safeguards and Security:** | | | |
| Oak Ridge Reservation | 17,300 | | 17,300 |
| Paducah | 9,435 | | 9,435 |
| Portsmouth | 16,412 | | 16,412 |
| Richland/Hanford Site | 69,234 | | 69,234 |
| Savannah River Site | 130,000 | | 130,000 |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Project | 4,845 | | 4,845 |
| West Valley | 1,600 | | 1,600 |
| **Total, Safeguards and Security** | **248,826** | **0** | **248,826** |
| Technology development | 32,320 | | 32,320 |
| **Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup** | **5,410,162** | **0** | **5,410,162** |
| Use of prior year balances | –3,381 | | –3,381 |
| **Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup** | **5,406,781** | **0** | **5,406,781** |
| **Other Defense Activities** | | | |
| **Health, safety and security** | | | |
| Health, safety and security | 349,445 | | 349,445 |

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
**(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Program | FY 2012 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program direction | 107,037 | | 107,037 |
| **Total, Health, safety and security** | **456,482** | **0** | **456,482** |
| | | | |
| **Office of Legacy Management** | | | |
| Legacy management | 157,514 | | 157,514 |
| Program direction | 12,586 | | 12,586 |
| **Total, Office of Legacy Management** | **170,100** | **0** | **170,100** |
| | | | |
| **Defense-related activities** | | | |
| **Infrastructure** | | | |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security | 98,500 | | 98,500 |
| **Total, Defense-related activities** | **98,500** | **0** | **98,500** |
| | | | |
| Defense related administrative support | 118,836 | | 118,836 |
| Acquisitions workforce improvement | 11,892 | | 11,892 |
| Office of hearings and appeals | 4,142 | | 4,142 |
| **Total, Other Defense Activities** | **859,952** | **0** | **859,952** |

# DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

MARCH 17, 2011.

HON. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find a draft of proposed legislation, titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012", which the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress.

The purpose of each provision in the proposed bill is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

MARCH 25, 2011.

HON. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find four legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-one to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

APRIL 1, 2011.

HON. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find seven legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the corning weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

APRIL 7, 2011.

HON. JOHN BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find eight legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

APRIL 12, 2011.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find three legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

APRIL 15, 2011.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

Included in this transmittal is a proposal to transition future enrollees in the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan to TRICARE for Life once they become Medicare-eligible due to age. Because this proposal would affect direct spending, it is subject to Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) requirements. This proposal is estimated to decrease direct spending by $34 million over five years and $279 million over ten years, which would result in savings on the five-and ten-year PAYGO scorecards.

| Fiscal Years (dollars in millions) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **Total** |
| Receipts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outlays | | -l | -4 | -12 | -4 | -13 | -18 | -29 | -47 | -63 | -88 | -279 |
| Net Deficit impact | | -1 | -4 | -12 | -4 | -13 | -18 | -29 | -47 | -63 | -88 | -279 |

Also included in this transmittal is a proposal to allow funds collected for damage to all Government property controlled by the Department of Defense to be deposited into and obligated from the account responsible for the repair or replacement of the damaged Government property. This proposal also affects direct spending and is therefore subject to PAYGO requirements. This proposal is estimated to increase direct spending by $10 million over five years and $20 million over ten years, which would result in costs on the five-and ten-year PAYGO scorecards.

| Fiscal Years (dollars in millions) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **Total** |
| Receipts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outlays | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |
| Net Deficit impact | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 20 |

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

MAY 3, 2011.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

MAY 6, 2011.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense*
*(Legislative Affairs).*

Enclosure: As Stated

---

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year of 2011.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1540 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This is, of course, conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Science, Space, and Technology Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest be placed in the legislative report on H.R. 1540 and the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

RALPH M. HALL,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. RALPH HALL,
*Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning the Committee on Natural Resources' jurisdiction interest in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

To allow the Armed Services Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, the Committee on Natural Resources will waive its right to a sequential referral of H.R. 1540. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill that fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee named to consider H.R. 1540.

I would appreciate you including this letter in the Armed Service Committee's report on H.R. 1540. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you and your able staff have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. DOC HASTINGS,
*Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of House Veterans' Affairs Committee. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. JEFF MILLER,
*Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. However, in order to expedite Floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee will not markup this bill.

The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over this, and similar legislation, is in no way diminished or altered. That understanding includes the agreement reached with the Armed Services Committee on the provisions provided under separate cover.

However, of particular concern to the Committee is Section 1034: Affirmation of Armed Conflict with al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated Forces.

The Committee agrees to the language in this provision. The Armed Services Committee has recognized, and reaffirmed in this exchange of letters, that the War Powers Resolution and associated Authorizations for the Use of Military Force, such as those contained in Public Law 107-40 (post-9/11) and Public Law 107-243 (Iraq), are within the primary jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Clause 1(i)(9) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that the Foreign Affairs Committee is assigned jurisdiction over "Intervention abroad and declarations of war." Authorizations for the use of military force (such as H.J. Res. 64 and H.J.Res. 114 in the 107th Congress) have been referred by the Parliamentarian solely to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Foreign Affairs Committee therefore requests that it be included in any briefing by any Executive Branch agency, including the Department of Defense, relating to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force, including operations or activities conducted pursuant to the Authorization of Use of Military Force.

The Committee reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation, and requests your support if such a request is made. I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*

*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration, I am willing to waive the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the *Congressional Record* during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. JOHN MICA,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,

*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing concerning H.R. 1540, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012." There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means under Rule X of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over part A of Title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), and a provision in H.R. 1540 concerning the transition of future Medicare eligible Uniformed Services Family Health Plan enrollees to TRICARE for life would fall within that jurisdiction. Additionally, a provision requiring the assessment of the national security risk of the United States' debt owned by the People's Republic of China would fall under the Committee's jurisdiction over the issuance and sale of bonded U.S. debt. Lastly, the Committee has jurisdiction over matters related to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and a provision amending grants made in lieu of tax credits under Section 1603 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 would also fall under the Committee's jurisdiction.

In order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to a sequential referral. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means' jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of conferees to any House-Senate conference and requests your support if such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1540, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the *Congressional Record* during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. DAVE CAMP,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to

request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
*Washington, DC, May 10, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of Committee on the Judiciary in matters being considered in H.R. 1540, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1540 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I do not intend to request a sequential referral in order that this bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1540 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

I appreciate your including this letter and a copy of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest on this matter in your committee report and in the *Congressional Record* during floor consideration of H.R. 1540.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. LAMAR SMITH,

*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. DARRELL ISSA,
*Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Education and the Workforce in matters being considered in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1540 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Education and the Workforce Committee also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. JOHN KLINE,
*Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm my understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this legislation, the Committee waives consideration of those provisions in the jurisdiction of our Committee where we reviewed your language and reached an agreement on the wording. The provisions where we waiver our right to a referral include:

- The travel, transportation, pay, and bonus provisions for uniformed service members (Title VI);
- Assessment of Hugh-Performance Computing (Sec. 31); and
- An amendment allowing utilities to pass through tax benefits to ratepayers in a lump sum.

For these negotiated provisions, the Committee on Energy and Commerce takes this action only with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in now way diminished or altered. For any other provision that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and where our mutual Committees have not come to a resolution, I reserve the right to seek a referral of H.R. 1540 to consider those provisions.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. FRED UPTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recognition of the importance of expediting the passage of H.R. 1540, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012," the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in H.R. 1540, including intelligence and intelligence-related authorizations and provisions contained in the bill.

The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's jurisdictional interest over this bill or any similar bill and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during the House debate on H.R. 1540. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MIKE ROGERS,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. MIKE ROGERS,
*Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 10, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing concerning the jurisdiction interest of the Committee on Financial Services in an amendment to be offered by Rep. Walter Jones at your scheduled mark-up of H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, on Wednesday, May 11, 2011. Rep. Jones' amendment would allow the military exchanges to have access to credit available through the Federal Financing Bank. The As such, the amendment clearly falls within the Committee on Financial Services' jurisdiction over banks, banking, money and credit pursuant to rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1540 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while the Committee on Financial Services has jurisdiction over the subject matter of Rep. Jones' amendment under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I do not intend to request a sequential referral of the legislation if it includes the amendment. By agreeing to waiver its right to a sequential referral of the bill, the Committee on Financial Services does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 1540 if Rep. Jones' amendment or other similar amendment is adopted. In addition, I make this commitment with the understanding that this will not prejudice the Committee on Financial Services with respect to its prerogatives on this or similar legislation. Further, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 1540 or related legislation.

Lastly, I request that you include this letter and your response in your committee's report on and in the *Congressional Record* during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

SPENCHER BACHUS,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. SPENCER BACHUS,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,*

*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to a certain provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Financial Services is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within Rule X (p) of the Committee on Small Business.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral as a result of the agreement to address my concerns with respect to section 804 of the bill. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Small Business does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall with its Rule X (p) jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this issue and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

SAM GRAVES,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. SAM GRAVES,
*Chairman, Committee on Small Business,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on the Budget takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. PAUL RYAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the Budget,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
*Washington, DC, May 4, 2011.*

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to you regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I am aware that there are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously with consideration of this important legislation, I am waiving the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdiction pertaining to a sequential referral. However, I do so with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional claims over subject matters contained in this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter in the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the *Congressional Record* during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,
CHAIRMAN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.*

HON. PETER KING,
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
CHAIRMAN.

---

## FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2012 and each of the following five fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE

MAY 16, 2011.

HONORABLE HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed a preliminary estimate of the direct spending effects of H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 11, 2011. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 1540, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

Based on legislative language for H.R. 1540 that was provided to CBO from May 9th through May 11th, CBO estimates that this bill would have an insignificant effect on direct spending in 2012 and would, on net, decrease such spending by $1 million over the 2012-2016 period and $3 million over the 2012-2021 period. The largest costs over that 10-year period would result from an increase in the special survivor allowance paid to certain beneficiaries of the military Survivor Benefit Plan, and from a change in the growth rate of enrollment fees charged to certain retirees who use TRICARE Prime, a health benefit plan for both active-duty and retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents.

Those costs would be offset by new receipts from additional sales of material in the National Defense Stockpile and savings from a provision to limit enrollment in the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan.

Enacting the bill would not affect revenues.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Schmit, who can be reached at 226-2840.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF, *Director*.

cc: Honorable Adam Smith
Ranking Member

## STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

Pursuant to clause (3)(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344):

(1) This legislation does not provide budget authority subject to an allocation made pursuant to section 302(b) of Public Law 93-344;

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Estimate included in this report pursuant to clause (3)(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives contains CBO's projection of how this legislation will affect the levels of budget authority, budget outlays, revenues, and tax expenditures for fiscal year 2012 and for the ensuring five fiscal years; and

(3) The CBO Estimate does not identify any new budget authority for assistance to state and local governments by this measure at the time that this report was filed.

## COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(2)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Budget Office Estimate included in this report satisfies the requirement for the committee to include an estimate by the committee of the costs incurred in carrying out this bill.

## ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

The committee finds that H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as reported, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

With respect to clause 3(c) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the committee under clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the general goal and objective of H.R. 1540 is to meet the national security needs of a nation at war while preparing our warfighters for the threats of tomorrow wherever and whenever they might emerge. This legislation meets that goal while making the difficult choices of fiscal stewardship incumbent upon the Congress in a time of economic stress. Only by providing for the common defense in an efficient, fiscally responsible manner can the nation address the breathtaking size and scope of our national security challenges.

The bill mandates fiscal responsibility, transparency, and accountability within the Department of Defense.

The bill strengthens oversight of financial management at the Department of Defense and insists upon reliable financial statements. The bill establishes a financial management certification program, requires a financial management personnel competency assessment, and enhances oversight of the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan.

The bill sustains equipment and weapons systems vital to the success of our servicemen and women while taking steps to provide them more efficiently. The bill strengthens our military depots and arsenals and requires competition throughout the life-cycle of weapons systems.

The bill takes steps to enhance total workforce management at the Department of Defense with a holistic review of its manpower and elimination of arbitrary cost targets. The bill requires the Department of Defense to project the annual civilian personnel and contractor requirements for support services and determine the appropriate mix of military, civilian and contractor personnel to meet those projected requirements.

The bill reforms Department of Defense reporting requirements by repealing redundant or irrelevant reports and requiring electronic transmission of required reports to Congress.

The bill takes steps to strengthen the 2011 Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review in order to provide a solid basis for reducing waste while protecting the joint warfighting capability of the Department of Defense from arbitrary cuts.

In recognition of the service and sacrifice of the men and women of our armed forces and their families, the bill includes a 1.6 percent increase in military pay. While

the bill does allow for modest increases in TRICARE fees, it recognizes the service of our servicemen and women as a down payment for their healthcare benefits. Therefore, the bill caps future fee increases to cost of living adjustments.

The death of Osama bin Laden underscores the evolving and continuing nature of the terrorist threat to the United States. Therefore, the bill strengthens policies and procedures used to prosecute and detain terrorists. The bill affirms the President's authority pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force. The bill requires national security protocols governing detainee communications to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of classified information as well as the establishment of a reviews process to evaluate detentions at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The bill clarifies the right to plead guilty in a trial of a capital offense by military commission. The bill prohibits family member visitation of Guantanamo detainees. The bill prohibits the transfer or release of certain detainees to or within the United States, as well as to or within foreign countries or entities without certification from the Secretary of Defense. The bill also prohibits funds for the housing of Guantanamo detainees in the United States.

The bill accounts for the warnings of top military leaders that the burden of federal debt is a national security concern that must be addressed. The bill requires a national security risk assessment on the amount of U.S. Federal debt owned by the People's Republic of China.

## STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104-4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

## FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act are created by this legislation.

## APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee finds that this legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104-1).

# COMMITTEE VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 1540. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 1540 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60-1, a quorum being present.

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112th Congress**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 274** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Provides support and allows use, at no cost to US Government of property with the F-136 Engine** **Offered by: Mr. Andrews**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | X | | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | X | | |
| Mr. Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | X | | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | X | | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | X | | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | X | | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | X | | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | X | | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | X | | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | X | | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | X | | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | X | | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | X | | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | X | | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | X | | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **55** | **5** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 142** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Guidelines regarding nuclear stockpiles.** **Offered by: Mr. Lamborn**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **35** | **26** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 261** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of US nuclear forces from Europe/NATO.** **Offered by: Mr. Turner**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Mike Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **35** | **26** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 248R** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** Presidential requirements for changes to US nuclear employment strategy **Offered by: Dr. Fleming**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Mike Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **35** | **26** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 267** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Second degree amendment to Ms. Sanchez amendment #227** **Offered by: Mr. Turner**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr.Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | | X | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | | X | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **33** | **28** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 250** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Limitations of Administration on US missile defense international agreements** **Offered by: Mr. Turner**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | 35 | 26 | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 213R** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Pilot program on scholarships for military dependents with special needs** **Offered by: Mr. Hunter**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | | X | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Turner | | X | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | | X | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | | X | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | | X | | Mr. Ruppersberger | X | | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | | X | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **26** | **34** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 210** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Requires all service chiefs to certify repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell** **Offered by: Mr. Hunter**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Turner | | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | | X | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | | X | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **33** | **27** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 98R** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Defines 'marriage' as a legal union between one man and one woman throughout DOD** **Offered by: Mrs. Hartzler**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | X | | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | | X | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **39** | **22** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 205** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Prohibits military facilities/ employees facilitating marriages except as provided by DoMA** **Offered by: Mr. Akin**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | | X | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | | X | |
| Mr. Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | | X | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | | X | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | | X | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | | X | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | X | | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | | X | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | X | | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | | X | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | | X | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | | X | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | | X | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | | X | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **38** | **23** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 265** **Date: May 11, 2011**

**Description:** **Strikes Section 1039 - Transfer of Guantanamo detainees to the U.S.** **Offered by: Mr. Smith**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Andrews | X | | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | | X | | Mrs. S. Davis | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Larsen | X | | |
| Mr. Turner | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | Mr. Courtney | X | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | Mr. Loebsack | X | | |
| Mr. Shuster | | X | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | | X | | Ms. Tsongas | X | | |
| Mr. Lamborn | | X | | Ms. Pingree | X | | |
| Mr. Wittman | | X | | Mr. Kissell | | X | |
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Heinrich | X | | |
| Dr. Fleming | | X | | Mr. Owens | | X | |
| Mr. Coffman | | X | | Mr. Garamendi | X | | |
| Mr. Rooney | | X | | Mr. Critz | X | | |
| Mr. Platts | | X | | Mr. Ryan | X | | |
| Mr. Rigell | | X | | Mr. Ruppersberger | | X | |
| Mr. Gibson | | X | | Mr. Johnson | X | | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | | X | | Mr. Castor | X | | |
| Dr. Heck | | X | | Mr. Sutton | X | | |
| Mr. Schilling | | X | | Ms. Hanabusa | X | | |
| Mr. Runyan | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. West | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | | X | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **22** | **38** | |

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**112TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Description:** **Final passage of H.R. 1540** **Date: May 11, 2011**
**and order to be reported, as amended**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Andrews | X | | |
| Mr. Jeff Miller | X | | | Mrs. S. Davis | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Larsen | X | | |
| Mr. Turner | X | | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | Mr. Courtney | X | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | Mr. Loebsack | X | | |
| Mr. Shuster | X | | | Ms. Giffords | | | |
| Mr. Conaway | X | | | Ms. Tsongas | X | | |
| Mr. Lamborn | X | | | Ms. Pingree | X | | |
| Mr. Wittman | X | | | Mr. Kissell | X | | |
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Heinrich | X | | |
| Dr. Fleming | X | | | Mr. Owens | X | | |
| Mr. Coffman | X | | | Mr. Garamendi | | X | |
| Mr. Rooney | X | | | Mr. Critz | X | | |
| Mr. Platts | X | | | Mr. Ryan | X | | |
| Mr. Rigell | X | | | Mr. Ruppersberger | X | | |
| Mr. Gibson | X | | | Mr. Johnson | X | | |
| Mrs. Hartzler | X | | | Mr. Castor | X | | |
| Dr. Heck | X | | | Mr. Sutton | X | | |
| Mr. Schilling | X | | | Ms. Hanabusa | X | | |
| Mr. Runyan | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Scott | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Griffin | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Palazzo | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. West | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Roby | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Brooks | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Young | X | | | | | | |

| | Ayes | Noes | Present |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Roll Call Vote Total:** | **60** | **1** | |

## CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee has taken steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and will make the analysis available as soon as possible.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT J. WITTMAN

I have deep concerns regarding the increase in federal spending and growth of federal deficits. I believe spending in Washington has spiraled out of control. It is imperative that Congress turn its attention to controlling federal spending and addressing growing federal deficits. There is no question that efficiencies and savings should and can be found across the federal government and that tough decisions have to be made. However, the responsibility of curtailing our out of control spending should not solely ride on the shoulders of those who have sacrificed for their country, our nation's military members and veterans.

I am disappointed that the committee did not debate an amendment offered by Military Personnel Subcommittee Chairman Joe Wilson that would have stripped the increase in TRICARE Prime fees from the bill. I remain adamantly opposed to raising TRICARE fees or premiums on our veterans and current servicemembers. I have long held the belief that the benefits afforded our men and women in uniform have been earned through sacrifice and hardship. Of the benefits provided to our military members and retirees, one of the most important is the medical benefit. It is our job to protect the TRICARE system now and for future generations, as it is unique and designed to fulfill certain requirements that are not shared by the private sector.

Sadly, the TRICARE system as it exists today is not sustainable. Fees and copayments within the TRICARE system have not been increased since inception 16 years ago while the cost of medical care in our country has significantly increased. There is no doubt that TRICARE will not be sustainable into the future unless Congress implements a change today. While I am adamantly against changing the benefit for current military members and retirees, I believe we must explore options to ensure that TRICARE is viable for future servicemembers while holding current and near-term retirees harmless. We must maintain this Nation's commitment to support our bravest men and women who risk their lives to defend our freedom. The only way to keep our all volunteer force staffed with the best and brightest is honesty. Let us not break promises, and instead, let us focus on how to recalibrate the benefit for our nation's next generation of warriors.

ROB WITTMAN.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MIKE COFFMAN

Although I am supportive of House Resolution 1540, I remain concerned about some of the provisions in the bill. While I believe that the House Armed Services Committee has produced a bill that streamlines the operations of the Department of Defense and cuts unnecessary and redundant programs, there are still perfections to be made to this legislation.

I am specifically concerned about language in Section 215 of this bill that sends an ambiguous message to the Department of Defense and industry regarding the F-136 propulsion system for the F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter.

The Secretary of Defense and senior leadership of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps have repeatedly testified before the House Armed Services Committee that they do not require the F-136 engine and believe it to be an unnecessary and extravagant expense. Congress has also extensively analyzed and debated this issue, ultimately resolving to strip funding for the F-136 program in February 2011. I believe that this issue has been decided and any provision that sends an unclear message to the Department of Defense on Congress' view on the F-136 program will only cause further unnecessary spending.

I also believe that more should be done to end the outdated and unneeded Selective Service System. I am pleased the committee included an amendment that would require the Comptroller General to conduct a comprehensive study of the System, but I believe that will merely postpone the obvious.

The United States has not had a draft since 1973. In 1979, Jimmy Carter reinstated the requirement for men to register with Selective Service in response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This requirement to register was meant to be for a limited period and has never been used. The Selective Service system has cost the taxpayers over $700 million since it was reinstated, and ending the program will result in annual savings of $25 million that can be used to pay down our national debt.

I will continue to press to end this System, but in the meantime I am confident this Government Accountability Office report will provide more proof that it is the right thing to do.

MIKE COFFMAN.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS GIBSON

I greatly appreciate the efforts made by the Chairman to address the shortcomings of the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review as identified in the Independent Panel chartered by the U.S. Congress. Earlier this year, the Administration came before the House Committee on Armed Services, and put forth a proposal to cut billions from the Department of Defense budget over a series of several years. While I believe that our country's federal debt represents a significant national security threat and concur that significant savings are possible, I was disappointed to learn that the Administration's proposed reductions were not supported by any significant long-term analysis of the nation's security threats, capabilities and priorities. The document tasked with providing this level of comprehensive analysis by law, the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), did not fully accomplish this purpose. Decisions regarding our security threats and capabilities should not be made without thorough supporting analysis, something the Independent Panel clearly identifies.

Going forward, my preference would be to adopt the Independent Panel's recommendation that moves us beyond the QDR, towards an Independent Strategic Review Panel comprised of experts appointed by the Executive and Legislative branches. The Strategic Review Panel would review the global security environment; assess the existing national security strategy; assess our roles, missions and organizations; and, in turn, provide a list of goals, recommendations and analysis that Congress and the Administration can use when adapting our national security strategy. In this way, the Strategic Review Panel would work in concert with the Planning Programming Budgeting and Execution Process at the Pentagon.

In closing, I wish to thank the Chairman, the ranking member, all the members of the committee, and the staff for their leadership and hard work. This is a bill we can all be proud of, and I look forward to working with the Committee to implement recommendations of the Independent Panel and to reform the national security establishment.

CHRIS GIBSON.