

113TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

{ REPORT  
113-446

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON  
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

---

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4435

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]



MAY 13, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the  
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

**HOWARD P. 'BUCK' MCKEON  
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015**

113TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

{ REPORT  
113-446

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON  
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

---

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4435

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]



MAY 13, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the  
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

87-824

WASHINGTON : 2014

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

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

|                                 |                                       |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| MAC THORNBERRY, Texas           | ADAM SMITH, Washington                |
| WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina | LORETTA SANCHEZ, California           |
| J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia       | MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina         |
| JEFF MILLER, Florida            | ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania         |
| JOE WILSON, South Carolina      | SUSAN A. DAVIS, California            |
| FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey   | JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island       |
| ROB BISHOP, Utah                | RICK LARSEN, Washington               |
| MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio         | JIM COOPER, Tennessee                 |
| JOHN KLINE, Minnesota           | MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam           |
| MIKE ROGERS, Alabama            | JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut             |
| TRENT FRANKS, Arizona           | DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa                  |
| BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania      | NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts           |
| K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas       | JOHN GARAMENDI, California            |
| DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado          | HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia |
| ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia     | COLLEEN W. HANABUSA, Hawaii           |
| DUNCAN HUNTER, California       | JACKIE SPEIER, California             |
| JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana         | RON BARBER, Arizona                   |
| MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado          | ANDRÉ CARSON, Indiana                 |
| E. SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia       | CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire      |
| CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York | DANIEL B. MAFFEI, New York            |
| VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri        | DEREK KILMER, Washington              |
| JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada          | JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas                 |
| JON RUNYAN, New Jersey          | TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois             |
| AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia           | SCOTT H. PETERS, California           |
| STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi  | WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois           |
| MO BROOKS, Alabama              | PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas                |
| RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida      | MARC A. VEASEY, Texas                 |
| KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota    | TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii                 |
| PAUL COOK, California           |                                       |
| JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma       |                                       |
| BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio          |                                       |
| JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana        |                                       |
| BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama          |                                       |

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*

# CONTENTS

---

|  | Page      |
|--|-----------|
| Purpose of the Legislation .....   | 1         |
| Rationale for the Committee Bill .....   | 2         |
| Hearings .....   | 9         |
| Committee Position .....   | 9         |
| Explanation of the Committee Amendments .....  | 9         |
| Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations .....  | 9         |
| Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill .....  | 9         |
| Budget Authority Implication .....   | 10        |
| <b>DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS .....</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>TITLE I—PROCUREMENT .....</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| OVERVIEW .....   | 11        |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army .....   | 11        |
| Overview .....   | 11        |
| Items of Special Interest .....  | 11        |
| Armed aerial scout strategy .....  | 11        |
| Army Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance aircraft .....   | 12        |
| Army Signals Intelligence modernization .....  | 12        |
| Divestiture of rotorcraft through Army’s Aviation Restructure Initiative .....                                 | 12        |
| Improved MQ–1C Gray Eagle modifications .....  | 13        |
| Missile Procurement, Army .....  | 13        |
| Overview .....   | 13        |
| Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army .....   | 13        |
| Overview .....   | 13        |
| Items of Special Interest .....  | 14        |
| Combat vehicle industrial base management .....  | 14        |
| Abrams tank upgrades .....   | 15        |
| Hercules recovery vehicle .....  | 16        |
| Stryker combat vehicle modifications .....   | 16        |
| M9 upgrades .....  | 17        |
| Transmission industrial base .....   | 17        |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army .....  | 18        |
| Overview .....   | 18        |
| Items of Special Interest .....  | 18        |
| Munitions industrial base management .....   | 18        |
| M982 Excalibur program .....   | 19        |
| Utilization of Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support initiative .....                                   | 19        |
| Other Procurement, Army .....  | 20        |
| Overview .....   | 20        |
| Items of Special Interest .....  | 20        |
| Army ultra-light reconnaissance robot programs .....   | 20        |
| Body armor industrial base risk mitigation .....   | 21        |
| Tactical generator recapitalization .....  | 22        |
| Family of heavy tactical vehicles .....  | 22        |
| Family of medium tactical vehicles .....   | 22        |
| Military combat eye protection program .....   | 23        |
| Mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles .....   | 24        |
| Personal dosimetry for protection in Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear and Explosive environments ..... | 24        |
| Replacement of Enhanced Position Location Reporting system .....   | 25        |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy .....   | 26        |
| Overview .....   | 26        |

IV

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 26   |
| EA-18G Stretch .....  | 26   |
| H-1 engine program upgrade .....  | 26   |
| MQ-8 Fire Scout .....   | 27   |
| MV-22 carrier onboard delivery .....  | 27   |
| UH-1 Mobile Aircrew Restraint System retrofits .....  | 27   |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy .....   | 28   |
| Overview .....  | 28   |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps .....  | 28   |
| Overview .....  | 28   |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy .....   | 28   |
| Overview .....  | 28   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 28   |
| Integrated communication systems .....  | 28   |
| Joint High Speed Vessel .....   | 29   |
| Littoral Combat Ship .....  | 29   |
| Mobile Landing Platform Afloat Forward Staging Base .....   | 30   |
| Moored Training Ship .....  | 30   |
| National Defense Sealift Fund .....   | 30   |
| Shipbuilding warranties and guarantees .....  | 31   |
| Surface ship test platform .....  | 31   |
| Other Procurement, Navy .....   | 32   |
| Overview .....  | 32   |
| Procurement, Marine Corps .....   | 32   |
| Overview .....  | 32   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 32   |
| Marine Corps Video Scout MC/3 System .....  | 32   |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force .....   | 32   |
| Overview .....  | 32   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 33   |
| Air National Guard MQ-1/MQ-9 ground-based sense and avoid systems .....                                   | 33   |
| Battlefield Airborne Communications Node program .....  | 33   |
| C-130H Avionics Modernization Program and propulsion system upgrades .....                                | 33   |
| F-16 block 40/50 mission training centers .....   | 35   |
| F-16 modernization .....  | 35   |
| High-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance .....  | 36   |
| KC-10 Aerial Refueling Aircraft Force Structure .....   | 37   |
| KC-46 Aerial Refueling Aircraft program .....   | 38   |
| Spare engine requirements and inventory for F-15E and F-16 aircraft .....                                 | 39   |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force .....  | 39   |
| Overview .....  | 39   |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force .....  | 39   |
| Overview .....  | 39   |
| Other Procurement, Air Force .....  | 39   |
| Overview .....  | 39   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 40   |
| Air Force explosive ordnance disposal unmanned systems repairs and upgrades .....                         | 40   |
| Aircraft tug vehicles .....   | 40   |
| Beyond line of sight command and control for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems ..... | 40   |
| Emergency Airfield Lighting System .....  | 41   |
| Joint threat emitter procurement .....  | 41   |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide .....   | 41   |
| Overview .....  | 41   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 42   |
| Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system and U.S.-based co-production .....                            | 42   |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 43   |
| Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....  | 43   |
| Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations .....   | 43   |
| Subtitle B—Army Programs .....  | 43   |
| Section 111—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Airborne Reconnaissance Low Aircraft .....            | 43   |

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Section 112—Plan on Modernization of UH-60A Aircraft of Army National Guard .....   | 44   |
| Subtitle C—Navy Programs .....  | 44   |
| Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Tomahawk Block IV Missiles .....  | 44   |
| Section 122—Construction of San Antonio Class Amphibious Ship .....   | 44   |
| Section 123—Additional Oversight Requirements for the Undersea Mobility Acquisition Program of the United States Special Operations Command ..... | 44   |
| Section 124—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Moored Training Ship Program .....  | 44   |
| Section 125—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Mission Modules for Littoral Combat Ship .....  | 44   |
| Section 126—Extension of Limitation on Availability of Funds for Littoral Combat Ship .....   | 45   |
| Subtitle D—Air Force Programs .....   | 45   |
| Section 131—Prohibition on Cancellation or Modification of Avionics Modernization Program for C-130 Aircraft .....                                | 45   |
| Section 132—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of A-10 Aircraft .....  | 45   |
| Section 133—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of U-2 Aircraft .....  | 46   |
| Section 134—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment or Transfer of KC-10 Aircraft .....  | 46   |
| Section 135—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment of E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System Aircraft .....                          | 46   |
| Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters .....  | 46   |
| Section 141—Comptroller General Report on F-35 Aircraft Acquisition Program .....   | 46   |
| TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION .....  | 47   |
| OVERVIEW .....  | 47   |
| Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army .....   | 47   |
| Overview .....  | 47   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 47   |
| Active protective system .....  | 47   |
| Applied Communication Information Network .....   | 47   |
| Combat feeding research and development .....   | 48   |
| Combat identification for dismounted users .....  | 48   |
| Dual mode tactical missiles .....   | 49   |
| Electronic Warfare Advanced Technology .....  | 49   |
| Expeditionary communications .....  | 50   |
| Fabric-based respiratory protective equipment .....   | 50   |
| High explosive guided mortar program .....  | 50   |
| High Performance Computing Modernization program .....  | 51   |
| Improved Turbine Engine Program .....   | 52   |
| Joint Air-to-Ground Missile program .....   | 52   |
| Joint Light Tactical Vehicle .....  | 53   |
| Lightweight segmented tactical ladders .....  | 53   |
| Non-invasive medical diagnostic tools .....   | 54   |
| Operational testing of High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator .....  | 54   |
| Rotorcraft hostile fire protection .....  | 54   |
| Small Airborne Networking Radio program .....   | 55   |
| Soldier protection system and weight reduction for personnel protection equipment .....   | 55   |
| Stryker Vehicle Survivability Upgrades .....  | 56   |
| Transparent armor technology development .....  | 56   |
| UH-72 Helicopter health monitoring system .....   | 57   |
| Universal tactical controller for unmanned systems .....  | 57   |
| Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy .....   | 58   |
| Overview .....  | 58   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 58   |
| Amphibious Combat Vehicle increment 1.1 program .....   | 58   |
| Briefing on the Navy Laser Weapon System .....  | 59   |
| Marine Corps Rifle Mounted Optical Systems and Modifications .....  | 59   |
| MQ-4C Triton program .....  | 60   |
| Navy deployment of the laser weapon system .....  | 60   |
| Navy reimbursable work for other Federal agencies .....   | 61   |

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Next Generation Land Attack and Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare<br>weapon development .....                | 61   |
| Oceanographic research .....  | 63   |
| Precision extended range munition program .....   | 64   |
| Submarine detection research .....  | 64   |
| University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System ships .....   | 65   |
| Unmanned aerial system electronic attack demonstration .....  | 65   |
| Unmanned Carrier-Launched Surveillance and Strike Program .....   | 65   |
| Virginia Payload Module program .....   | 67   |
| Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force .....  | 67   |
| Overview .....  | 67   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 67   |
| Additive manufacturing .....  | 67   |
| Air Force tactical exploitation of national capabilities talon hate pro-<br>gram .....                    | 68   |
| Air Force weapons simulation framework .....  | 68   |
| B-52 Strategic Radar Replacement program .....  | 69   |
| Common airborne sense and avoid .....   | 69   |
| Cyber operations program elements .....   | 69   |
| E-8 Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System replacement<br>program .....                        | 70   |
| EC-130 Compass Call aircraft replacement program .....  | 71   |
| Ejection seat safety and reliability improvement program .....  | 71   |
| F-35 25mm cannon ammunition .....   | 72   |
| F-35 aircraft program .....   | 72   |
| F-35 block 4 program .....  | 73   |
| Ground Moving Target Indicator Way Ahead .....  | 74   |
| Metals Affordability Initiative .....   | 75   |
| Nuclear command and control for enduring tanker aircraft .....  | 75   |
| Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization program .....  | 75   |
| Wide area surveillance .....  | 76   |
| Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide .....   | 77   |
| Overview .....  | 77   |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 77   |
| Analysis of Alternatives for Undersea Clandestine Insertion of Spe-<br>cial Operations Forces .....       | 77   |
| Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Segment .....   | 77   |
| Bioforensic threat detection .....  | 78   |
| Biosecurity in Department of Defense research facilities .....  | 78   |
| Capabilities to experimentally study militarily-relevant High Rey-<br>nolds Numbers .....                 | 79   |
| Chemical Biological Defense Program threat priorities .....   | 79   |
| Combat helmet test and evaluation protocols .....   | 80   |
| Combatant commands and science and technology Communities of<br>Interest .....                            | 80   |
| Combating Terrorism and Technology Support Office .....   | 81   |
| Conference restrictions for scientists and engineers .....  | 81   |
| Coordination of efforts for advanced manufacturing of medical coun-<br>termeasures .....                  | 82   |
| Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Spectrum Challenge .....  | 83   |
| Development of antibiotics against biotreats .....  | 83   |
| Development of innovative detection and threat identification tech-<br>nologies .....                     | 84   |
| Electronic warfare roadmap .....  | 84   |
| Expeditionary airfield technology .....   | 85   |
| Field-programmable gate arrays for defense .....  | 85   |
| Future vertical lift .....  | 86   |
| Guidance on utilizing non-profit research institutes .....  | 86   |
| Health of the research and development enterprise .....   | 87   |
| High-efficiency, conventional missile propulsion .....  | 87   |
| Hypersonics research .....  | 88   |
| Internet access on Kwajalein Atoll .....  | 88   |
| Leveraging commercial technology for directed energy .....  | 89   |
| Military service coordination and transition efforts for the chemical<br>biological defense program ..... | 89   |
| Minority science and technology programs .....  | 90   |
| Multi-aircraft control of unmanned aerial vehicles .....  | 91   |



VII

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Multi-mission airborne radio frequency systems for unmanned aerial systems .....  | 91   |
| National Defense Education Program .....  | 91   |
| Neuroplasticity research partnerships .....   | 92   |
| Optics and photonics for defense applications .....   | 92   |
| Prosthesis research .....   | 93   |
| Redesigned Kill Vehicle for Homeland Missile Defense .....  | 94   |
| Space weather events research .....   | 94   |
| Special Operations developmental efforts for Tactical Assault Light Operator Suit .....   | 95   |
| Special Operations Forces Survival, Support, and Equipment Systems Program Management Office .....  | 96   |
| Technologies to improve spectrum efficiency .....   | 96   |
| Three-dimensional integrated circuits .....   | 97   |
| U.S.-Israel missile defense cooperation .....   | 97   |
| Vaccine research for equine encephalitis .....  | 98   |
| Validation of near-term counter-electronics capability .....  | 98   |
| Vapor compression cooling systems technology .....  | 99   |
| Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense .....  | 100  |
| Overview .....  | 100  |
| Items of Special Interest .....   | 100  |
| Information Assurance and Interoperability Program .....  | 100  |
| Program reporting and metrics on penetration testing .....  | 100  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 101  |
| Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....  | 101  |
| Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations .....   | 101  |
| Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations .....  | 101  |
| Section 211—Preliminary Design Review of Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization Program .....   | 101  |
| Section 212—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle Program .....   | 101  |
| Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike System .....   | 102  |
| Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Airborne Reconnaissance Systems .....   | 102  |
| Section 215—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Weather Satellite Follow-On System .....  | 102  |
| Section 216—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Space-Based Infrared Systems Space Data Exploitation .....  | 103  |
| Section 217—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Hosted Payload and Wide Field of View Testbed of the Space-Based Infrared Systems .....   | 103  |
| Section 218—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Protected Tactical Demonstration and Protected Military Satellite Communications Testbed of the Advanced Extremely High Frequency Program ..... | 103  |
| Subtitle C—Other Matters .....  | 104  |
| Section 221—Revision to the Service Requirement under the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Education Program .....   | 104  |
| Section 222—Revision of Requirement for Acquisition Programs to Maintain Defense Research Facility Records .....  | 104  |
| Section 223—Modification to Cost-sharing Requirement for Pilot Program to Include Technology Protection Features during Research and Development of Certain Defense Systems .....                   | 104  |
| TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....   | 104  |
| OVERVIEW .....  | 104  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 106  |
| Budget Request Adjustments .....  | 106  |
| Base Realignment and Closure 2018 .....   | 106  |
| Corrosion Prevention .....  | 106  |
| Marine Corps Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Forces .....  | 107  |
| Support for International Sporting Competitions .....   | 107  |
| Energy Issues .....   | 108  |
| Comptroller General Utilities Disruption and Energy Security Mandate .....  | 108  |
| Marine Hydrokinetic Technology .....  | 109  |
| Unmanned Aerial Vehicles Energy Efficiencies .....  | 109  |

VIII

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Logistics and Sustainment Issues .....   | 109  |
| Army Workload and Performance System .....   | 109  |
| Auditability of Data Used to Measure Depot Maintenance Workload<br>Distribution .....  | 110  |
| Comptroller General Review of Forward Deployed Naval Forces and<br>Associated Sustainment Issues .....   | 111  |
| Department of Defense Inspector General Determination of Fair and<br>Reasonable Cost of Spare Parts .....  | 112  |
| Eligibility and Performance of Carriers Who Transport Hazardous Ma-<br>terials for the Department of Defense .....   | 113  |
| F117 Engine Sustainment Strategy .....   | 113  |
| Manufacturing Infrastructure Investment .....  | 114  |
| Public-Private Partnerships at Centers of Industrial and Technical Ex-<br>cellence .....   | 115  |
| Report on the Department of Defense's Transportation of Hazardous<br>Materials .....   | 115  |
| Report on the Eligibility and Performance of Carriers Who Transport<br>Security-Sensitive Materials for the Department of Defense .....                            | 116  |
| Submarine Propeller Repair and Overhaul .....  | 117  |
| Sustainment of Deployed Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense .....  | 117  |
| Readiness Issues .....   | 118  |
| Adequacy of Airlift and Refueling Capabilities in the Western Pacific ....   | 118  |
| Advanced Situational Awareness Training Assessment .....   | 118  |
| Army Aviation Range Safety Improvements .....  | 119  |
| Army Aviation Training .....   | 119  |
| Commercially Augmented Tactical Airborne Training .....  | 119  |
| Common Range Integrated Instrumentation System .....   | 120  |
| Comptroller General Report on Readiness Metrics .....  | 120  |
| Other Matters .....  | 121  |
| Arctic Center of Excellence .....  | 121  |
| Army Combat Shirt Fielding Strategy .....  | 122  |
| Briefing on Invasive Species Management .....  | 122  |
| Cold-Weather Protective Clothing .....   | 123  |
| Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense's Arctic Capa-<br>bilities .....   | 123  |
| Comptroller General Review of Process for the Disposition of Excess<br>Defense Articles .....  | 124  |
| Office of Net Assessment .....   | 125  |
| Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers .....  | 126  |
| Report on Emerging Technologies for Flame Resistant Uniforms .....   | 126  |
| Training, Travel, and Conference Restrictions .....  | 127  |
| U.S. Special Operations Command National Capital Region Office .....   | 127  |
| United States Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force<br>and Families Program .....   | 128  |
| United States Special Operations Command Proposed Sponsorship of<br>U.S. Naval Ship Sumner .....   | 129  |
| Waste Disposal Technologies in Contingency Operations .....  | 130  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 131  |
| Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....   | 131  |
| Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding .....  | 131  |
| Subtitle B—Energy and Environmental Provisions .....   | 131  |
| Section 311—Elimination of Fiscal Year Limitation on Prohibition of<br>Payment of Fines and Penalties from the Environmental Restoration<br>Account, Defense ..... | 131  |
| Section 312—Biannual Certification by Commanders of the Combatant<br>Commands Relating to the Prohibition on the Disposal of Waste<br>in Open-Air Burn Pits .....  | 131  |
| Section 313—Exclusions from Definition of "Chemical Substance"<br>Under Toxic Substances Control Act and Report on Lead Ammu-<br>nition .....                      | 131  |
| Section 314—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative<br>Fuel Procurement Requirement .....  | 132  |
| Section 315—Congressional Notice of Bulk Purchase of Alternative<br>Fuels for Operational Use .....  | 132  |
| Section 316—Limitation on Procurement of Biofuels .....  | 132  |
| Section 317—Limitation on Plan, Design, Refurbishing, or Construction<br>of Biofuels Refineries .....  | 132  |

## IX

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment .....  | 132  |
| Section 321—Additional Requirement for Strategic Policy on Prepositioning of Materiel and Equipment .....   | 132  |
| Section 322—Comptroller General Reports on Department of Defense Prepositioning Strategic Policy and Plan for Prepositioned Stocks .....                            | 132  |
| Section 323—Pilot Program on Provision of Logistic Support for the Conveyance of Excess Defense Articles to Allied Forces .....                                     | 132  |
| Subtitle D—Reports .....  | 133  |
| Section 331—Repeal of Annual Report on Department of Defense Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums .....   | 133  |
| Section 332—Report on Enduring Requirements and Activities Currently Funded Through Amounts Authorized to Be Appropriated for Overseas Contingency Operations ..... | 133  |
| Section 333—Army Assessment of the Regionally Aligned Force .....   | 133  |
| Section 334—Report on Impacts of Funding Reductions on Military Readiness .....   | 134  |
| Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority .....  | 134  |
| Section 341—Limitation on Authority to Enter into a Contract for the Sustainment, Maintenance, Repair, or Overhaul of the F117 Engine .....                         | 134  |
| Subtitle F—Other Matters .....  | 134  |
| Section 351—Clarification of Authority Relating to Provision of Installation-Support Services through Intergovernmental Support Agreements .....                    | 134  |
| Section 352—Sense of Congress on Access to Training Ranges within United States Pacific Command Area of Responsibility .....  | 135  |
| Section 353—Management of Conventional Ammunition Inventory .....   | 135  |
| TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS .....  | 135  |
| OVERVIEW .....  | 135  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 136  |
| Subtitle A—Active Forces .....  | 136  |
| Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces .....   | 136  |
| Section 402—Revisions in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels .....  | 136  |
| Subtitle B—Reserve Forces .....   | 136  |
| Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve .....  | 136  |
| Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves .....  | 137  |
| Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) .....  | 137  |
| Section 414—Fiscal Year 2015 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians .....  | 137  |
| Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support .....   | 138  |
| Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations .....  | 138  |
| Section 421—Military Personnel .....  | 138  |
| TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY .....   | 138  |
| OVERVIEW .....  | 138  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 139  |
| Analysis for Change in Basic Allowance for Housing .....  | 139  |
| Arlington National Cemetery Advisory Committee .....  | 140  |
| Briefing on Sexual Assault Prevention and Response .....  | 140  |
| Comptroller General Review of Army National Guard Recruiting Practices .....  | 140  |
| Comptroller General Review of Army Reserve and Army National Guard Non-Availability for Mobilization .....  | 141  |
| Comptroller General Review Regarding Department of Defense and Military Departments Professionalism and Ethics Programs .....                                       | 142  |
| Continuum of Service and Reserve Component Duty Statuses .....  | 142  |
| Department of Defense Hair and Grooming Standards .....   | 143  |
| Diversity of the Armed Forces .....   | 143  |
| Medal of Honor Process .....  | 143  |
| Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System Firefighting Mission .....  | 144  |
| Recognizing Military Chaplains .....  | 144  |
| Report on Need for Uniform Code of Military Justice Punitive Article ...  | 145  |
| Report on the Sufficiency of Department of Defense Chaplain Guidance in Response to the Independent Review Related to Fort Hood .....                               | 145  |
| Support to Youth and Charitable Organizations .....   | 145  |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Transition Assistance Program .....  | 145  |
| U.S. Air Force Academy Reductions .....  | 146  |
| U.S. Special Operations Command Education Initiatives .....  | 146  |
| Unmanned Aerial System Transition of Personnel .....   | 147  |
| Use of Reserve Officers Training Corps Scholarships to Increase Cyber<br>Security Expertise .....  | 148  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 148  |
| Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally .....  | 148  |
| Section 501—Authority to Limit Consideration for Early Retirement<br>by Selective Retirement Boards to Particular Warrant Officer Year<br>Groups and Specialties .....   | 148  |
| Section 502—Relief from Limits on the Percentage of Officers Who<br>May Be Recommended for Discharge during a Fiscal Year Using<br>Enhanced Authority for Selective Early Discharges .....   | 148  |
| Section 503—Repeal of Requirement for Submission to Congress of<br>Annual Reports on Joint Officer Management and Promotion Policy<br>Objectives for Joint Officers .....  | 149  |
| Section 504—Options for Phase II of Joint Professional Military Edu-<br>cation .....   | 149  |
| Section 505—Limitation on Number of Enlisted Aides Authorized for<br>Officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps .....   | 149  |
| Section 506—Required Consideration of Certain Elements of Command<br>Climate in Performance Appraisals of Commanding Officers .....  | 149  |
| Subtitle B—Reserve Component Personnel Management .....  | 149  |
| Section 511—Retention on the Reserve Active-Status List Following<br>Nonselection for Promotion of Certain Health Professions Officers<br>and First Lieutenants and Lieutenants (Junior Grade) Pursuing Bac-<br>calaureate Degrees ..... | 149  |
| Section 512—Chief of the National Guard Bureau Role in Assignment<br>of Directors and Deputy Directors of the Army and Air National<br>Guards .....  | 150  |
| Section 513—National Guard Civil and Defense Support Activities and<br>Related Matters .....   | 150  |
| Subtitle C—General Service Authorities .....   | 150  |
| Section 521—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel De-<br>cisions Relating to Correction of Military Records .....   | 150  |
| Section 522—Additional Required Elements of Transition Assistance<br>Program .....   | 150  |
| Section 523—Extension of Authority to Conduct Career Flexibility Pro-<br>grams .....   | 151  |
| Section 524—Provision of Information to Members of the Armed Forces<br>on Privacy Rights Relating to Receipt of Mental Health Services .....   | 151  |
| Section 525—Protection of the Religious Freedom of Military Chaplains<br>to Close a Prayer Outside of a Religious Service According to the<br>Traditions, Expressions, and Religious Exercises of the Endorsing<br>Faith Group .....     | 151  |
| Section 526—Department of Defense Senior Advisor on Profes-<br>sionalism .....   | 151  |
| Section 527—Removal of Artificial Barriers to the Service of Women<br>in the Armed Forces .....  | 151  |
| Subtitle D—Military Justice, Including Sexual Assault and Domestic Vi-<br>olence Prevention and Response .....   | 152  |
| Section 531—Improved Department of Defense Information Reporting<br>and Collection of Domestic Violence Incidents Involving Members<br>of the Armed Forces .....   | 152  |
| Section 532—Additional Duty for Judicial Proceedings Panel Regarding<br>Use of Mental Health Records by Defense during Preliminary Hear-<br>ing and Court-Martial Proceedings .....  | 152  |
| Section 533—Applicability of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response<br>and Related Military Justice Enhancements to Military Service Acad-<br>emies .....  | 152  |
| Section 534—Consultation with Victims of Sexual Assault Regarding<br>Victims' Preference for Prosecution of Offense by Court-Martial or<br>Civilian Court .....  | 152  |
| Section 535—Enforcement of Crime Victims' Rights Related to Protec-<br>tions Afforded by Certain Military Rules of Evidence .....  | 153  |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Section 536—Minimum Confinement Period Required for Conviction of Certain Sex-Related Offenses Committed by Members of the Armed Forces .....  | 153  |
| Section 537—Modification of Military Rules of Evidence Relating to Admissibility of General Military Character Toward Probability of Innocence .....   | 153  |
| Section 538—Confidential Review of Characterization of Terms of Discharge of Members of the Armed Forces Who Are Victims of Sexual Offenses .....  | 153  |
| Section 539—Consistent Application of Rules of Privilege Afforded Under the Military Rules of Evidence .....   | 153  |
| Subtitle E—Military Family Readiness .....   | 153  |
| Section 545—Earlier Determination of Dependent Status with Respect to Transitional Compensation for Dependents of Members Separated for Dependent Abuse .....  | 153  |
| Section 546—Improved Consistency in Data Collection and Reporting in Armed Forces Suicide Prevention Efforts .....   | 154  |
| Section 547—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces .....   | 154  |
| Subtitle F—Education and Training Opportunities .....  | 154  |
| Section 551—Authorized Duration of Foreign and Cultural Exchange Activities at Military Service Academies .....  | 154  |
| Section 552—Pilot Program to Assist Members of the Armed Forces in Obtaining Post-Service Employment .....   | 154  |
| Subtitle G—Defense Dependents’ Education .....   | 155  |
| Section 561—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees .....                           | 155  |
| Section 562—Authority to Employ Non-United States Citizens as Teachers in Department of Defense Overseas Dependents’ School System .....   | 155  |
| Section 563—Expansion of Functions of the Advisory Council on Dependents’ Education to Include Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools .....   | 155  |
| Section 564—Support for Efforts to Improve Academic Achievement and Transition of Military Dependent Students .....  | 155  |
| Section 565—Amendments to the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012 .....   | 155  |
| Subtitle H—Decorations and Awards .....  | 156  |
| Section 571—Medals for Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense Who Were Killed or Wounded in an Attack Inspired or Motivated by a Foreign Terrorist Organization ..... | 156  |
| Section 572—Retroactive Award of Army Combat Action Badge .....  | 156  |
| Section 573—Report on Navy Review, Findings, and Actions Pertaining to Medal of Honor Nomination of Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta .....   | 156  |
| Subtitle I—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements .....  | 156  |
| Section 581—Secretary of Defense Review and Report on Prevention of Suicide Among Members of United States Special Operations Forces .....   | 156  |
| Section 582—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Review of Separation of Members of the Armed Forces Who Made Unrestricted Reports of Sexual Assault .....   | 157  |
| Section 583—Comptroller General Report Regarding Management of Personnel Records of Members of the National Guard .....  | 157  |
| Section 584—Study on Gender Integration in Defense Operation Planning and Execution .....  | 157  |
| Section 585—Deadline for Submission of Report Containing Results of Review of Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity Role in Sexual Harassment Cases .....                                       | 157  |
| Subtitle J—Other Matters .....   | 158  |
| Section 591—Inspection of Outpatient Residential Facilities Occupied by Recovering Service Members .....   | 158  |
| Section 592—Working Group on Integrated Disability Evaluation System .....   | 158  |
| Section 593—Sense of Congress Regarding Fulfilling Promise to Leave No Member of the Armed Forces Unaccounted in Afghanistan .....   | 158  |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS .....   | 158  |
| OVERVIEW .....   | 158  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 159  |
| Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances .....  | 159  |
| Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase<br>in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Cir-<br>cumstances .....   | 159  |
| Section 602—No Fiscal Year 2015 Increase in Basic Pay for General<br>and Flag Officers .....   | 159  |
| Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays .....  | 159  |
| Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay<br>Authorities for Reserve Forces .....  | 159  |
| Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay<br>Authorities for Health Care Professionals .....   | 160  |
| Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities<br>for Nuclear Officers .....  | 160  |
| Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37<br>Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities .....   | 160  |
| Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment<br>of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays .....  | 160  |
| Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation .....   | 161  |
| Section 621—Authority to Enter into Contracts for the Provision of<br>Relocation Services .....  | 161  |
| Subtitle D—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality<br>Benefits and Operations .....  | 161  |
| Section 631—Authority of Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities to<br>Enter into Contracts with Other Federal Agencies and Instrumental-<br>ities to Provide and Obtain Certain Goods and Services ..... | 161  |
| Section 632—Review of Management, Food, and Pricing Options for<br>Defense Commissary System .....   | 161  |
| Section 633—Restriction on Implementing Any Department of Defense<br>Policy to Limit, Restrict, or Ban the Sale of Certain Items on Military<br>Installations .....                                      | 162  |
| Subtitle E—Other Matters .....   | 162  |
| Section 641—Anonymous Survey of Members of the Armed Forces Re-<br>garding Their Preferences for Military Pay and Benefits .....   | 162  |
| TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS .....   | 162  |
| OVERVIEW .....   | 162  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 163  |
| Air Force Critical Care Training .....   | 163  |
| Canine Therapy for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic<br>Brain Injury .....  | 163  |
| Collaboration on Trauma Research .....   | 163  |
| Deployment Health for Women .....  | 164  |
| Early Autism Diagnosis and Assistance for Families .....   | 165  |
| Healthy Base Initiative .....  | 165  |
| Infectious Disease Surveillance Testing .....  | 165  |
| Integrated Scheduling System .....   | 165  |
| Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs<br>Healthcare in Colorado Springs .....   | 166  |
| Joint Medical Kits .....   | 166  |
| Military and Academic Research Partnership .....   | 167  |
| Military Contributions to Breast Cancer Research .....   | 167  |
| Military Health Care Team Model .....  | 167  |
| Military Innovations in Suicide Research .....   | 168  |
| Report on Implementation Plans for the Defense Health Agency .....   | 168  |
| Review of Defense Health Agency Progress .....   | 169  |
| Review of TRICARE Reimbursement Rules for Sole Community Hos-<br>pitals .....  | 169  |
| Sleep Health .....   | 170  |
| Surgical Critical Care Institute .....   | 170  |
| US Family Health Plans .....   | 170  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 171  |
| Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits .....  | 171  |
| Section 701—Mental Health Assessments for Members of the Armed<br>Forces .....   | 171  |

XIII

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Section 702—Clarification of Provision of Food to Former Members and Dependents Not Receiving Inpatient Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities ..... | 171  |
| Subtitle B—Health Care Administration .....   | 171  |
| Section 711—Cooperative Health Care Agreements Between the Military Departments and Non-Military Health Care Entities .....                                 | 171  |
| Section 712—Surveys on Continued Viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra .....  | 171  |
| Section 713—Limitation on Transfer or Elimination of Graduate Medical Education Billets .....   | 171  |
| Section 714—Review of Military Health System Modernization Study ...  | 172  |
| Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters .....  | 172  |
| Section 721—Extension of Authority for Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund .....                 | 172  |
| Section 722—Designation and Responsibilities of Senior Medical Advisor for Armed Forces Retirement Home .....   | 172  |
| Section 723—Research Regarding Alzheimer’s Disease .....  | 172  |
| Section 724—Acquisition Strategy for Health Care Professional Staffing Services .....   | 173  |
| Section 725—Pilot Program on Medication Therapy Management Under TRICARE Program .....  | 173  |
| Section 726—Report on Reduction of Prime Service Areas .....  | 173  |
| Section 727—Comptroller General Report on Transition of Care for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Traumatic Brain Injury .....                             | 173  |
| Section 728—Briefing on Hospitals in Arrears in Payments to Department of Defense .....   | 173  |
| TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS .....  | 174  |
| OVERVIEW .....  | 174  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 175  |
| Acquisitions Involving Reverse Auctions .....   | 175  |
| Briefing on Impact of Foreign Military Sales and Direct Commercial Sales on Industrial Base Sustainment .....   | 176  |
| Briefing on the Impact of the Budget Control Act on High Risk Sectors of the Defense Industrial Base .....  | 176  |
| Comptroller General Assessment of Department of Defense Processes for the Acquisition of Services .....   | 177  |
| Comptroller General Review of Compliance with Limitations on Contract Services Spending .....   | 178  |
| Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Trusted Foundry and Supply Chain Risk Management Programs .....   | 179  |
| Comptroller General Review of Rulemaking Practices of the Department of Defense .....   | 179  |
| Export Controls and the Small Arms Industrial Base .....  | 180  |
| Independent Assessment of Department of Defense Cloud Computing Acquisition and Brokerage Policies .....  | 181  |
| Industrial Base Risks Associated with Negotiated Standards of Production .....  | 181  |
| Operational Contract Support .....  | 182  |
| Rare Earth Elements Supply Chain Review .....   | 183  |
| Regional Commercialization Activities .....   | 184  |
| Use of National Security Waiver to Specialty Metals Clause .....  | 184  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 185  |
| Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations .....   | 185  |
| Section 801—Extension to United States Transportation Command of Authorities Relating to Prohibition on Contracting with the Enemy ...                      | 185  |
| Section 802—Extension of Contract Authority for Advanced Component Development or Prototype Units .....   | 185  |
| Section 803—Amendment Relating to Authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects .....                  | 185  |
| Section 804—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services .....  | 185  |
| Subtitle B—Industrial Base Matters .....  | 186  |

XIV

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Section 811—Three-Year Extension of and Amendments to Test Program for Negotiation of Comprehensive Small Business Subcontracting Plans .....                                       | 186  |
| Section 812—Improving Opportunities for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses .....   | 187  |
| Section 813—Plan for Improving Data on Bundled and Consolidated Contracts .....   | 187  |
| Section 814—Authority to Provide Education to Small Businesses on Certain Requirements of Arms Export Control Act .....   | 187  |
| Section 815—Prohibition on Reverse Auctions for Covered Contracts .....   | 188  |
| Section 816—SBA Surety Bond Guarantee .....   | 188  |
| Subtitle C—Other Matters .....  | 188  |
| Section 821—Certification of Effectiveness for Air Force Information Technology Contracting .....   | 188  |
| Section 822—Airlift Service .....   | 188  |
| Section 823—Compliance with Requirements for Senior Department of Defense Officials Seeking Employment with Defense Contractors ..  | 189  |
| Section 824—Procurement of Personal Protective Equipment .....  | 189  |
| Section 825—Prohibition on Funds for Contracts Violating Executive Order No. 11246 .....  | 189  |
| Section 826—Requirement for Policies and Standard Checklist in Procurement of Services .....  | 189  |
| TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT .....  | 190  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 190  |
| Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Headquarters Reductions .....   | 190  |
| Comptroller General Review of Operational Test and Evaluation Processes and Activities .....  | 191  |
| Department of Defense Unmanned Systems Office .....   | 192  |
| Global Response Force .....   | 192  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 193  |
| Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management .....   | 193  |
| Section 901—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps .....  | 193  |
| Section 902—Additional Responsibility for Director of Operational Test and Evaluation .....   | 193  |
| Section 903—Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment .....  | 193  |
| Section 904—Requirement for Congressional Briefing before Divesting of Defense Finance and Accounting Service Functions .....   | 193  |
| Section 905—Combatant Command Efficiency Plan .....   | 194  |
| Section 906—Requirement for Plan to Reduce Geographic Combatant Commands to Four by Fiscal Year 2020 .....  | 194  |
| Section 907—Office of Net Assessment .....  | 194  |
| Section 908—Amendments Relating to Organization and Management of the Office of the Secretary of Defense .....  | 195  |
| Section 909—Periodic Review of Department of Defense Management Headquarters .....  | 195  |
| Subtitle B—Total Force Management .....   | 195  |
| Section 911—Modifications to Biennial Strategic Workforce Plan Relating to Senior Management, Functional, and Technical Workforce of the Department of Defense .....                | 195  |
| Section 912—Repeal of Extension of Comptroller General Report on Inventory .....  | 195  |
| Section 913—Assignment of Certain New Requirements Based on Determinations of Cost-Efficiency .....   | 196  |
| Section 914—Prohibition on Conversion of Functions Performed by Civilian or Contractor Personnel to Performance by Military Personnel ..  | 196  |
| Section 915—Notification of Compliance with Section Relating to Procurement of Services .....   | 196  |
| Subtitle C—Other Matters .....  | 196  |
| Section 921—Extension of Authority to Waive Reimbursement of Costs of Activities for Nongovernmental Personnel at Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies ..... | 196  |



|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Section 923—Authority to Require Employees of the Department of Defense and Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to Occupy Quarters on a Rental Basis while Performing Official Travel ..... | 196  |
| Section 924—Single Standard Mileage Reimbursement Rate for Privately Owned Automobiles of Government Employees and Members of the Uniformed Services .....   | 197  |
| TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS .....   | 197  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 197  |
| Counter-Drug Activities .....  | 197  |
| Afghanistan Counternarcotics Strategy Post-2014 .....  | 197  |
| National Guard Counterdrug Programs .....  | 198  |
| U.S. Southern Command Asset Resourcing .....   | 198  |
| Other Matters .....  | 199  |
| Army Force Structure .....   | 199  |
| Assessment of Counterfeit Detection Efforts .....  | 200  |
| Cargo Unmanned Aerial Systems .....  | 201  |
| Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Antiterrorism and Force Protection Efforts .....   | 201  |
| Coordination of Efforts to Track and Counter Weapons of Mass Destruction .....   | 202  |
| Cross-Service Wargaming Capability .....   | 202  |
| Department of Defense Humanitarian Mine Action and Conventional Munitions Assistance Program .....   | 203  |
| Department of Defense Installation Security .....  | 204  |
| Economic Warfare Policy .....  | 204  |
| Force Structure Assessment .....   | 205  |
| Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account .....   | 206  |
| Information Management Systems for Response Forces .....   | 207  |
| Inspector General’s Report on Over-Classification of National Security Information .....   | 207  |
| Internet Governance .....  | 207  |
| Inventory of Counter Threat Finance Programs and Capabilities .....  | 208  |
| Military Auxiliary Radio System .....  | 208  |
| Nuclear Monitoring and Verification Technologies .....   | 209  |
| Personnel Protection Equipment Budget Justification Material .....   | 210  |
| Phased Modernization of Certain Navy Ships .....   | 210  |
| Recognizing the Importance of Professional Military Education Concerning Nuclear Deterrence Operations and Policy .....  | 211  |
| Reconstitution of Air Force Weapons Storage Areas .....  | 212  |
| Report on National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force Recommendations .....  | 212  |
| Review of Military Standard to Protect Systems Against Electromagnetic Pulse .....   | 213  |
| Security Risks Related to Foreign Investment in the United States .....  | 214  |
| Spectrum Operations Centers .....  | 215  |
| Standing Joint Force Headquarters for Elimination .....  | 216  |
| Transfer of Coast Guard HC-130H Aircraft to the Air Force for U.S. Forest Service Equipment Modifications .....  | 216  |
| U.S. Transportation Command Report on Operational and Tactical Control of All Department of Defense Executive Airlift Aircraft .....   | 217  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 218  |
| Subtitle A—Financial Matters .....   | 218  |
| Section 1001—General Transfer Authority .....  | 218  |
| Section 1002—Repeal of Limitation on Inspector General Audits of Certain Financial Statements .....  | 218  |
| Section 1003—Authority to Transfer Funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to Sustain Nuclear Weapons Modernization and Naval Reactors .....   | 218  |
| Section 1004—Management of Defense Information Technology Systems .....  | 218  |
| Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities .....   | 218  |
| Section 1011—Extension of Authority to Support Unified Counter-drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia .....  | 218  |
| Section 1012—Three-Year Extension of Authority of Department of Defense to Provide Additional Support for Counterdrug Activities of Other Governmental Agencies .....  | 219  |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Section 1013—Submittal of Biannual Reports on Use of Funds in the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide Account on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate ..... | 219  |
| Section 1014—National Guard Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities .....  | 219  |
| Section 1015—Sense of Congress on Mexico and Central America .....   | 219  |
| Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards .....   | 219  |
| Section 1021—Definition of Combatant and Support Vessel for Purposes of the Annual Plan and Certification Relating to Budgeting for Construction of Naval Vessels .....  | 219  |
| Section 1022—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund .....  | 220  |
| Section 1023—Elimination of Requirement that a Qualified Aviator or Naval Flight Officer Be in Command of an Inactivated Nuclear-Powered Aircraft Carrier Before Decommissioning .....   | 220  |
| Section 1024—Limitation on Expenditure of Funds until Commencement of Planning of Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. George Washington .....   | 220  |
| Section 1025—Sense of Congress Recognizing the Anniversary of the Sinking of the U.S.S. Thresher .....   | 220  |
| Section 1026—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships .....  | 220  |
| Subtitle D—Counterterrorism .....  | 220  |
| Section 1031—Extension of Authority to Make Rewards for Combating Terrorism .....  | 220  |
| Section 1032—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States to House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba .....  | 221  |
| Section 1033—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba .....  | 221  |
| Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations .....   | 221  |
| Section 1041—Modification of Department of Defense Authority for Humanitarian Demining Assistance and Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance Programs .....  | 221  |
| Section 1042—Authority to Accept Voluntary Services of Law Students and Persons Studying to be Paralegals .....  | 221  |
| Section 1043—Expansion of Authority for Secretary of Defense to Use the Department of Defense Reimbursement Rate for Transportation Services Provided to Certain Non-Department of Defense Entities .....  | 221  |
| Section 1044—Repeal of Authority Relating to Use of Military Installations by Civil Reserve Air Fleet Contractors .....  | 222  |
| Section 1045—Certification and Limitation on Availability of Funds for Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program .....   | 222  |
| Section 1046—Submittal of Procedures and Reports Relating to Sensitive Military Operations .....   | 222  |
| Section 1047—Limitation on Use of Russian-Flagged Airlift Aircraft to Support the Airlift Movement Requirements of the United States Transportation Command .....  | 222  |
| Section 1048—Prohibition on Reduction of Force Structure at Lajes Air Force Base until Completion of Assessments by Secretary of Defense and General Accounting Office .....   | 223  |
| Section 1049—Limitation on Removal of C-130 Aircraft .....   | 223  |
| Section 1050—Conditions on Army National Guard and Active Army Force Structure Changes Pending Comptroller General Report .....  | 223  |
| Subtitle F—Studies and Reports .....   | 224  |
| Section 1061—Protection of Defense Mission-Critical Infrastructure from Electromagnetic Pulse and High-Powered Microwave Systems .....   | 224  |
| Section 1062—Response of the Department of Defense to Compromises of Classified Information .....  | 224  |
| Section 1063—Report and Briefing to Congress on Procurement and Inspection of Armored Commercial Passenger-Carrying Vehicles to Transport Civilian Employees of Department of Defense .....  | 224  |
| Section 1064—Study on Joint Analytic Capability of the Department of Defense .....   | 225  |
| Subtitle G—Other Matters .....   | 225  |
| Section 1071—Technical and Clerical Amendments .....   | 225  |

XVII

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Section 1072—Sale or Donation of Excess Personal Property for Border Security Activities .....   | 225  |
| Section 1073—Revision to Statute of Limitations for Aviation Insurance Claims .....  | 225  |
| Section 1074—Pilot Program for the Human Terrain System .....  | 225  |
| Section 1075—Unmanned Aircraft Systems and National Airspace .....   | 226  |
| Section 1076—Sense of Congress on the Life and Achievements of Dr. James R. Schlesinger .....  | 226  |
| Section 1077—Reform of Quadrennial Defense Review .....  | 226  |
| Section 1078—Resubmission of 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review .....   | 227  |
| Section 1079—Sense of Congress Regarding Counter-Improvised Explosive Devices .....  | 228  |
| Section 1080—Enhancing Presence and Capabilities and Readiness Posture of United States Military in Europe .....   | 228  |
| Section 1081—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by the Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States .....                     | 228  |
| TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS .....  | 228  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 228  |
| Furlough of Employees Compensated Through Working Capital Funds ..   | 228  |
| Overtime Pay for Department of the Navy Employees Performing Maintenance on the Nuclear Aircraft Carrier Forward Deployed in Japan .....   | 229  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 229  |
| Section 1101—One-Year Extension of Authority To Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas .....       | 229  |
| Section 1102—One-Year Extension of Discretionary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone .....                      | 230  |
| Section 1103—Revision to List of Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories .....   | 230  |
| Section 1104—Permanent Authority for Experimental Personnel Program for Scientific and Technical Personnel .....   | 230  |
| Section 1105—Temporary Authorities for Certain Positions at Department of Defense Research and Engineering Facilities .....  | 230  |
| Section 1106—Judicial Review of Merit Systems Protection Board Decisions Relating to Whistleblowers .....  | 230  |
| TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS .....  | 231  |
| OVERVIEW .....   | 231  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 233  |
| Additional Reporting on the Transfer of International Traffic in Arms Regulations Controlled Missile Defense Technology to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ..... | 233  |
| Aggression by the Russian Federation .....   | 234  |
| Briefings on Arms Control Inspections and Potential Inconsistencies .....  | 235  |
| Conflict in Syria .....  | 236  |
| Department of Defense Arctic Collaboration with International Partners .....   | 237  |
| Foreign Military Sales of U.S. Air and Missile Defense Systems and Interoperability with Friendly and Allied States .....  | 238  |
| Global Security Contingency Fund .....   | 239  |
| Missile Defense Cooperation with Japan .....   | 239  |
| Missile Defense Cooperation with the Republic of Korea .....   | 240  |
| Monitoring of Ongoing Construction Activities in Afghanistan .....   | 240  |
| National Guard State Partnership Program .....   | 240  |
| National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking .....   | 241  |
| Non-Lethal Weapons for Contingency Operations .....  | 241  |
| North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014 Summit .....   | 242  |
| North Atlantic Treaty Organization Center of Excellence on Deterrence .....  | 243  |
| Oversight of United States-Russian Federation Missile Defense Cooperation Discussions .....  | 244  |
| Report on Countering Violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty .....  | 244  |
| Report on Financial Management Capacity of Afghan Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Interior .....   | 246  |

XVIII

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Report on Foreign Ballistic Missile Defense Programs .....  | 247  |
| Report on Operational Contract Support in U.S. Africa Command .....   | 248  |
| Report on the Proliferation Activities of Karl Lee and the Support<br>of the Chinese Government .....   | 249  |
| Report on U.S. Army Regionally Aligned Brigade in Africa .....  | 249  |
| Report on U.S. Government Comprehensive Approach to Strengthen<br>Its Strategic Partnership with Djibouti .....   | 250  |
| Report on Updated Independent Cost Estimate of the European Phased<br>Adaptive Approach .....   | 251  |
| Republic of China Radar Interoperability .....  | 252  |
| Transfers of Excess Defense Articles .....  | 252  |
| United States Security Assistance to the Government of Egypt .....  | 252  |
| United States Security Policy and Posture in the Middle East and<br>North Africa .....  | 253  |
| Updated Report on Russian Tactical Nuclear Weapons Developments ...   | 255  |
| Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace .....  | 255  |
| <b>LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS</b> .....   | 256  |
| <b>Subtitle A—Assistance and Training</b> .....   | 256  |
| Section 1201—One-Year Extension of Global Security Contingency<br>Fund .....  | 256  |
| Section 1202—Notice to Congress on Certain Assistance Under Author-<br>ity to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Coun-<br>tries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction                      | 257  |
| Section 1203—Enhanced Authority for Provision of Support to Foreign<br>Military Liaison Officers of Foreign Countries While Assigned to<br>the Department of Defense .....  | 257  |
| Section 1204—Annual Report on Human Rights Vetting and<br>Verification Procedures of the Department of Defense .....  | 257  |
| <b>Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan and Pakistan</b> .....  | 258  |
| Section 1211—Extension of Commanders’ Emergency Response Pro-<br>gram in Afghanistan .....  | 258  |
| Section 1212—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain<br>Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military<br>Operations .....  | 258  |
| Section 1213—Extension of Certain Authorities for Support of Foreign<br>Forces Supporting or Participating with the United States Armed<br>Forces .....   | 258  |
| Section 1214—Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in<br>Afghanistan under Operation Resolute Support .....  | 259  |
| Section 1215—Requirement to Withhold Department of Defense Assis-<br>tance to Afghanistan in Amount Equivalent to 150 Percent of All<br>Taxes Assessed by Afghanistan to Extent Such Taxes Are Not Reim-<br>bursed by Afghanistan ..... | 259  |
| Section 1216—United States Plan for Sustaining the Afghanistan Na-<br>tional Security Forces Through the End of Fiscal Year 2018 .....  | 260  |
| Section 1217—Sense of Congress on United States Military Commit-<br>ment to Operation Resolute Support in Afghanistan .....   | 260  |
| Section 1218—Extension of Afghan Special Immigrant Program .....  | 261  |
| <b>Subtitle C—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation</b> .....  | 261  |
| Section 1221—Limitation on Military Contact and Cooperation between<br>the United States and the Russian Federation .....   | 261  |
| Section 1222—Limitation on Use of Funds With Respect to Certifi-<br>cation of Certain Flights by the Russian Federation Under the Treaty<br>on Open Skies .....   | 262  |
| Section 1223—Limitations on Providing Certain Missile Defense Infor-<br>mation to the Russian Federation .....  | 262  |
| Section 1224—Limitation on Availability of Funds to Transfer Missile<br>Defense Information to the Russian Federation .....   | 263  |
| Section 1225—Report on Non-Compliance by the Russian Federation<br>of Its Obligations under the INF Treaty .....  | 263  |
| Section 1226—Sense of Congress Regarding Russian Aggression To-<br>ward Ukraine .....   | 263  |
| Section 1227—Annual Report on Military and Security Developments<br>Involving the Russian Federation .....  | 263  |
| <b>Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region</b> .....   | 264  |

XIX

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Section 1231—Strategy to Prioritize United States Interests in the United States Pacific Command Area of Responsibility and Implementation Plan .....  | 264  |
| Section 1232—Modifications to Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China .....   | 264  |
| Section 1233—Report on Goals and Objectives Guiding Military Engagement with Burma .....   | 264  |
| Section 1234—Report on Department of Defense Munitions Strategy for United States Pacific Command .....  | 265  |
| Section 1235—Missile Defense Cooperation .....   | 265  |
| Section 1236—Maritime Capabilities of Taiwan and Its Contribution to Regional Peace and Stability .....  | 265  |
| Section 1237—Independent Assessment on Countering Anti-access and Area-denial Strategies and Capabilities in the Asia-Pacific Region .....   | 265  |
| Section 1238—Sense of Congress Reaffirming Security Commitment to Japan .....  | 266  |
| Section 1239—Sense of Congress on Opportunities to Strengthen Relationship between the United States and the Republic of Korea .....   | 266  |
| Subtitle E—Other Matters .....   | 266  |
| Section 1241—Extension of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism .....  | 266  |
| Section 1242—One-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities .....   | 266  |
| Section 1243—Extension and Modification of Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq ..   | 266  |
| Section 1244—Modification of National Security Planning Guidance to Deny Safe Havens to Al-Qaeda and Its Violent Extremist Affiliates ...  | 267  |
| Section 1245—Enhanced Authority to Acquire Goods and Services of Djibouti in Support of Department of Defense Activities in United States Africa Command Area of Responsibility .....                                | 267  |
| Section 1246—Strategic Framework for United States Security Force Assistance and Cooperation in the European and Eurasian Regions ...  | 268  |
| Section 1247—Requirement of Department of Defense to Continue Implementation of United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally and Participation in Interagency Working Group ..... | 269  |
| Section 1248—Department of Defense Situational Awareness of Economic and Financial Activity .....  | 269  |
| Section 1249—Treatment of the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan Under the Immigration and Nationality Act .....  | 269  |
| Section 1250—Prohibition on the Integration of Certain Missile Defense Systems .....   | 269  |
| Subtitle F—Reports and Sense of Congress Provisions .....  | 270  |
| Section 1261—Report on “New Normal” and General Mission Requirements of United States Africa Command .....   | 270  |
| Section 1262—Report on Contractors with the Department of Defense That Have Conducted Significant Transactions with Iranian Persons or the Government of Iran .....  | 270  |
| Section 1263—Reports on Nuclear Program of Iran .....  | 271  |
| Section 1264—Sense of Congress on United States Presence and Cooperation in the Arabian Gulf Region to Deter Iran .....  | 271  |
| Section 1265—Sense of Congress on Modernization of Defense Capabilities of Poland .....  | 272  |
| TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION .....  | 272  |
| OVERVIEW .....   | 272  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 273  |
| Cooperative Biological Engagement Program .....  | 273  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 273  |
| Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds .....  | 273  |
| Section 1302—Funding Allocations .....   | 274  |
| Section 1303—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cooperative Threat Reduction Activities with Russian Federation .....   | 274  |
| TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....   | 274  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 274  |

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Progress on Determining Sufficient Working Capital Fund Cash Balances .....   | 274  |
| Secure Sources of Materials Critical to National Security .....   | 275  |
| Upgrading Beryllium within the National Defense Stockpile .....   | 276  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 276  |
| Subtitle A—Military Programs .....  | 276  |
| Section 1401—Working Capital Funds .....  | 276  |
| Section 1402—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense .....   | 276  |
| Section 1403—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide .....  | 276  |
| Section 1404—Defense Inspector General .....  | 276  |
| Section 1405—Defense Health Program .....   | 277  |
| Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile .....   | 277  |
| Section 1411—Revisions to Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile .....   | 277  |
| Subtitle C—Other Matters .....  | 277  |
| Section 1421—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois ..... | 277  |
| Section 1422—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home .....   | 277  |
| TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS .....   | 277  |
| OVERVIEW .....  | 277  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 278  |
| National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment .....  | 278  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 278  |
| Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations .....   | 278  |
| Section 1501—Purpose .....  | 278  |
| Section 1502—Procurement .....  | 279  |
| Section 1503—Operation and Maintenance .....  | 279  |
| Section 1504—Military Personnel .....   | 279  |
| Section 1505—Other Appropriations .....   | 279  |
| Subtitle B—Financial Matters .....  | 279  |
| Section 1511—Treatment as Additional Authorizations .....   | 279  |
| Section 1512—Special Transfer Authority .....   | 279  |
| Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters .....  | 279  |
| Section 1521—Continuation of Existing Limitations on the Use of Funds in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund .....   | 279  |
| Section 1522—Use of and Transfer of Funds from Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund .....  | 279  |
| TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS .....   | 280  |
| OVERVIEW .....  | 280  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 280  |
| Additional Homeland Missile Defense Interceptor Site .....  | 280  |
| Air Force Cyber .....   | 281  |
| Air Force Distributed Common Ground/Surface System .....  | 281  |
| Assessment of Foreign Nuclear Weapons Programs .....  | 282  |
| Biometrics for Identity and Access Management .....   | 283  |
| Briefing and Report on the Implementation of the Secretary of Defense's Plans for Cruise Missile Defense of the United States .....   | 283  |
| Briefing on Funding Modernization of the Nuclear Deterrent .....  | 284  |
| Briefing on Number of B61-12 Nuclear Gravity Bombs to Be Produced .....   | 285  |
| Briefing on Plutonium Strategy .....  | 285  |
| Comptroller General Assessment of U.S. Cyber Command .....  | 286  |
| Comptroller General Assessment on Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance .....   | 287  |
| Comptroller General Evaluation on Department of Defense Efforts to Protect Information and Systems from Insider Threats .....   | 287  |
| Comptroller General Review of Nuclear Weapons Council .....   | 288  |
| Conventional Prompt Strike Capability Research, Development, and Acquisition .....  | 289  |
| Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation Review of Missile Defense Agency Tests and Targets Efficiencies .....  | 290  |
| Defense Industrial Base Information Sharing for Cybersecurity .....   | 290  |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Defense Intelligence Priorities .....  | 291  |
| Directed Energy for Missile Defense .....  | 291  |
| E4-B and Assessments on Nuclear Command and Control .....  | 292  |
| Encrypted Key Delivery .....   | 292  |
| Fielding of Global Positioning System Military Code .....  | 293  |
| Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests for Trident II D5 Missiles .....  | 293  |
| Geospatial Intelligence for Disadvantaged Users .....  | 294  |
| Global Positioning System Denied Environments .....  | 294  |
| Global Positioning System Replenishment .....  | 294  |
| High Capacity Satellite Communications .....   | 295  |
| Human Intelligence Training Joint Center of Excellence .....   | 295  |
| Information Assurance Training and Certification .....   | 295  |
| Inspector General Review of the Activities Supporting the Joint Information Environment .....  | 296  |
| Investments for Joint Information Environment Activities .....   | 296  |
| Kestrel Eye Joint Capability Technology Demonstration .....  | 297  |
| Long Range Discriminating Radar for Homeland Missile Defense .....   | 297  |
| Metrics of Trust in Cybersecurity .....  | 298  |
| Military Intelligence Program and Defense Input to the National Intelligence Program .....   | 299  |
| Missile Defense Applications for Electro Magnetic Rail Gun Technology .....  | 299  |
| Mobile User Objective System .....   | 300  |
| Nuclear Detonation Detection System .....  | 301  |
| Operationally Responsive Space .....   | 301  |
| Plan for Improving Cyber Situational Awareness .....   | 302  |
| Processing, Exploitation and Dissemination .....   | 303  |
| Provision of Finished Intelligence Products on the CAPITOL NETWORK .....   | 303  |
| Remote Sensing Technology Education Programs .....   | 304  |
| Report and Plan for Minuteman III Sustainment .....  | 304  |
| Report on Aegis Ashore Missile Defense Test Complex .....  | 305  |
| Report on Balance in Nuclear Weapons Program .....   | 305  |
| Report on International Agreements Concerning Outer Space Activities .....   | 306  |
| Report on Reliability, Modernization and Refurbishment of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense Segment .....   | 306  |
| Report on Satellite Positioning Ground Monitoring Stations Near U.S. Overseas Military Installations .....   | 307  |
| Report on Strategic Submarine Command and Control in the People's Republic of China .....  | 308  |
| Requirement for Plan for Use of Highly Accelerated Life Testing and Highly Accelerated Stress Screening .....  | 309  |
| Responses to Foreign Hypersonic Weapons Threats .....  | 309  |
| Retirement of B83 Nuclear Gravity Bombs .....  | 309  |
| Revision to the Integrated Master Test Plan .....  | 310  |
| Shortfalls in Headquarters Cyber Support Personnel .....   | 310  |
| Space-Based Reconnaissance .....   | 311  |
| Special Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Exploitation Program .....  | 311  |
| Standard Missile 3 Block IB .....  | 312  |
| Targeting Enterprise .....   | 312  |
| U.S. Transportation Command Joint Intelligence and Operations Center .....   | 313  |
| University Affiliated Research Centers for the Missile Defense Agency .....  | 313  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 314  |
| Subtitle A—Space Activities .....  | 314  |
| Section 1601—Department of Defense Space Security and Defense Program .....  | 314  |
| Section 1602—Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Notification .....  | 314  |
| Section 1603—Satellite Communications Responsibilities of Executive Agent for Space .....  | 315  |
| Section 1604—Liquid Rocket Engine Development Program .....  | 315  |
| Section 1605—Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communication Services .....  | 315  |
| Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities .....  | 316  |
| Section 1611—Assessment and Limitation on Availability of Funds for Intelligence Activities and Programs of United States Special Operations Command and Special Operations Forces ..... | 316  |

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Section 1612—Annual Briefing on the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Requirements of the Combatant Commands .....                                       | 316  |
| Section 1613—One-Year Extension of Report on Imagery Intelligence and Geospatial Information Support Provided to Regional Organizations and Security Alliances .....  | 317  |
| Section 1614—Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities Executive Agent .....   | 317  |
| Section 1615—Air Force Intelligence Organization .....  | 317  |
| Section 1616—Prohibition on National Intelligence Program Consolidation .....   | 317  |
| Subtitle C—Cyberspace-related Matters .....   | 318  |
| Section 1621—Executive Agency for Cyber Test and Training Ranges ...  | 318  |
| Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces .....   | 318  |
| Section 1631—Preparation of Annual Budget Request Regarding Nuclear Weapons .....   | 318  |
| Section 1632—Independent Review of the Personnel Reliability Program of the Department of Defense and the Human Reliability Program of the Department of Energy ..... | 319  |
| Section 1633—Assessment of Nuclear Weapon Secondary Requirement .   | 319  |
| Section 1634—Retention of Missile Silos .....   | 320  |
| Section 1635—Certification on Nuclear Force Structure .....   | 320  |
| Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs .....   | 321  |
| Section 1641—Theater Air and Missile Defense of Allies of the United States .....   | 321  |
| Section 1642—Sense of Congress on Procurement and Deployment of Capability Enhancement II Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle .....   | 321  |
| TITLE XVII—DEFENSE AUDIT ADVISORY PANEL ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDITABILITY .....   | 321  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 321  |
| Section 1701—Findings and Purposes .....  | 321  |
| Section 1702—Establishment of Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Audit Readiness .....   | 322  |
| Section 1703—Duties of the Advisory Panel .....   | 322  |
| Section 1704—Powers of the Advisory Panel .....   | 322  |
| Section 1705—Advisory Panel Personnel Matters .....   | 322  |
| Section 1706—Termination of the Advisory Panel .....  | 322  |
| DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS .....   | 322  |
| PURPOSE .....   | 322  |
| MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW .....   | 322  |
| Section 2001—Short Title .....  | 323  |
| Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law .....   | 323  |
| Section 2003—Effective Date .....   | 323  |
| TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....  | 323  |
| SUMMARY .....   | 323  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 323  |
| Explanation of Funding Adjustments .....  | 323  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 324  |
| Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects .....   | 324  |
| Section 2102—Family Housing .....   | 324  |
| Section 2103—Authorization of Appropriations, Army .....  | 324  |
| Section 2104—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Project .....  | 324  |
| Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects .....   | 324  |
| Section 2106—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project .....   | 325  |
| Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects .....   | 325  |
| TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....   | 325  |
| SUMMARY .....   | 325  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....   | 325  |
| Explanation of Funding Adjustment .....   | 325  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....  | 326  |
| Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects .....   | 326  |



XXIII

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Section 2202—Family Housing .....  | 326  |
| Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units .....   | 326  |
| Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy .....   | 326  |
| Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal<br>Year 2012 Projects .....   | 326  |
| Section 2206—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal<br>Year 2014 Project .....  | 326  |
| Section 2207—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011<br>Projects .....   | 326  |
| Section 2208—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012<br>Projects .....   | 327  |
| TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....  | 327  |
| SUMMARY .....  | 327  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 327  |
| Air Force Strategic Basing Process .....   | 327  |
| Infrastructure Deficiencies of Dining Facilities .....   | 327  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 328  |
| Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition<br>Projects .....  | 328  |
| Section 2302—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force .....  | 328  |
| Section 2303—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal<br>Year 2008 Project .....  | 328  |
| Section 2304—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011<br>Project .....   | 328  |
| Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012<br>Projects .....   | 328  |
| TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....  | 328  |
| SUMMARY .....  | 328  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 329  |
| Explanation of Funding Adjustments .....   | 329  |
| Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility .....   | 330  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 330  |
| Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations .....   | 330  |
| Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Ac-<br>quisition Projects .....   | 330  |
| Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects .....   | 330  |
| Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies .....   | 331  |
| Section 2404—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011<br>Projects .....   | 331  |
| Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012<br>Projects .....   | 331  |
| Section 2406—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Cer-<br>tain Fiscal Year 2015 Projects Pending Submission of Required Re-<br>ports ..... | 331  |
| Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations .....  | 331  |
| Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitariza-<br>tion Construction, Defense-Wide .....  | 331  |
| Section 2412—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal<br>Year 2000 Project .....  | 331  |
| TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY<br>INVESTMENT PROGRAM .....  | 332  |
| SUMMARY .....  | 332  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 332  |
| Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition<br>Projects .....   | 332  |
| Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO .....   | 332  |
| TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES .....   | 332  |
| SUMMARY .....  | 332  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 332  |
| Explanation of Funding Adjustments .....   | 332  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 333  |
| Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ...  | 333  |
| Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and<br>Land Acquisition Projects .....  | 333  |
| Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acqui-<br>sition Projects .....   | 333  |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| 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—Other Matters .....   | 00   |
| Section 2611—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects .....  | 00   |
| Section 2612—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project .....   | 00   |
| Section 2613—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project .....  | 00   |
| TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES .....  | 00   |
| SUMMARY .....  | 00   |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 00   |
| Base Closure and Realignment Disposal Assessment .....   | 00   |
| Joint Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations .....   | 00   |
| Property Disposal Methods .....  | 00   |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 00   |
| Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....   | 00   |
| Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account ..... | 00   |
| Subtitle B—Prohibition on Additional BRAC Round .....  | 00   |
| Section 2711—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round .....  | 00   |
| Subtitle C—Other Matters .....   | 00   |
| Section 2721—Force-Structure Plans and Infrastructure Inventory and Assessment of Infrastructure Necessary to Support the Force Structure .....          | 00   |
| Section 2722—Modification of Property Disposal Procedures Under Base Realignment and Closure Process .....   | 00   |
| Section 2723—Final Settlement of Claims Regarding Caretaker Agreement for Former Defense Depot Ogden, Utah .....   | 00   |
| TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS .....  | 00   |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 00   |
| Army Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment .....  | 00   |
| Cyber and Electromagnetic Open-Air Test Ranges .....   | 00   |
| Deployment of Secure Work Environments .....   | 00   |
| Facilities Modernization Model .....   | 00   |
| Family Housing at Camp Humphreys, Korea .....  | 00   |
| High Performance Facades for Department of Defense Installations .....   | 00   |
| Innovative Building Materials and Design Techniques .....  | 00   |
| Joint Land Use Study .....   | 00   |
| Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization .....  | 00   |
| Performance-Based Standards for Building System Components .....   | 00   |
| Public-Private Family Housing on Guam .....  | 00   |
| Real Property Management .....   | 00   |
| Report on Circumvention of Military Construction Laws .....  | 00   |
| Type I and Type III Retro-Reflective Glass Beads .....   | 00   |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 00   |
| Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes .....   | 00   |
| Section 2801—Prevention of Circumvention of Military Construction Laws .....   | 00   |
| Section 2802—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction .....  | 00   |
| Section 2803—Use of One-Step Turn-Key Contractor Selection Procedures for Additional Facility Projects .....   | 00   |
| Section 2804—Extension of Limitation on Construction Projects in European Command Area of Responsibility .....   | 00   |
| Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration .....   | 00   |
| Section 2811—Consultation Requirement in Connection with Department of Defense Major Land Acquisitions .....   | 00   |

|   | Page      |
|---|-----------|
| Section 2812—Renewals, Extensions, and Succeeding Leases for Financial Institutions Operating on Military Installations .....   | 00        |
| Section 2813—Arsenal Installation Reutilization Authority .....   | 00        |
| Section 2814—Deposit of Reimbursed Funds to Cover Administrative Expenses Relating to Certain Real Property Transactions .....  | 00        |
| Section 2815—Special Easement Acquisition Authority, Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii .....   | 00        |
| Section 2816—National Security Considerations for Inclusion of Federal Property on National Register of Historic Places or Designation as National Historic Landmark under the National Historic Preservation Act ..... | 00        |
| Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment .....  | 00        |
| Section 2831—Repeal or Modification of Certain Restrictions on Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region .....  | 00        |
| Subtitle D—Land Conveyances .....   | 00        |
| Section 2841—Land Conveyance, Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial, La Jolla, California .....   | 00        |
| Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Former Walter Reed Army Hospital, District of Columbia .....  | 00        |
| Section 2843—Transfers of Administrative Jurisdiction, Camp Frank D. Merrill and Lake Lanier, Georgia .....   | 00        |
| Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii .....  | 00        |
| Section 2845—Modification of Conditions on Land Conveyance, Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois .....  | 00        |
| Section 2846—Land Conveyance, Robert H. Dietz Army Reserve Center, Kingston, New York .....   | 00        |
| Section 2847—Exercise of Reversionary Interest, Camp Gruber, Oklahoma .....   | 00        |
| Section 2848—Land Conveyance, Hanford Site, Washington .....  | 00        |
| Subtitle E—Other Matters .....  | 00        |
| Section 2861—Memorial to the Victims of the Shooting Attack at the Washington Navy Yard .....   | 00        |
| Section 2862—Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies .....   | 00        |
| Section 2863—Redesignation of Pohakuloa Training Area in Hawaii as the Pohakuloa Training Center .....  | 00        |
| Section 2864—Designation of Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in Riverside, California .....   | 00        |
| Section 2865—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio .....   | 00        |
| Section 2866—Manhattan Project National Historical Park .....   | 00        |
| <b>TITLE XXIX—MILITARY LAND TRANSFERS AND WITHDRAWALS TO SUPPORT READINESS AND SECURITY .....</b>   | <b>00</b> |
| <b>LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....</b>   | <b>00</b> |
| Subtitle A—Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada .....   | 00        |
| Section 2901—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada .....  | 00        |
| Section 2902—Water Rights .....   | 00        |
| Section 2903—Withdrawal .....   | 00        |
| Subtitle B—Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms, California .....   | 00        |
| Section 2911—Redesignation of Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area, California .....  | 00        |
| Subtitle C—Bureau of Land Management Withdrawn Military Lands Efficiency and Savings .....  | 00        |
| Section 2921—Elimination of Termination Date for Public Land Withdrawals and Reservations Under Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 .....   | 00        |
| Subtitle D—Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California .....   | 00        |
| Section 2931—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Land for Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California .....   | 00        |
| Subtitle E—White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico .....  | 00        |
| Section 2941—Additional Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Land to Support White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico .....  | 00        |

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| 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   |
| Weapons Activities .....   | 00   |
| B61-12 and W76-1 Life Extension Programs .....   | 00   |
| Deferral of the W78/88-1 Life Extension Program .....  | 00   |
| Deferred maintenance .....   | 00   |
| Implementation of Center for Security Technology, Analysis, Response, and Testing .....  | 00   |
| Plan for Public-Private Partnerships .....   | 00   |
| Weapons Activities and budget prioritization .....   | 00   |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....   | 00   |
| Adopting the Gold Standard for section 123 agreements .....  | 00   |
| Explanation of Funding Adjustments for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....  | 00   |
| Nuclear Security Summit 2014 .....   | 00   |
| Naval Reactors .....   | 00   |
| Briefing on requirements and gaps for preserving the capability to study the use of Low-Enriched Uranium for Naval Reactors .....            | 00   |
| Naval Reactors .....   | 00   |
| Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project .....   | 00   |
| Office of the Administrator .....  | 00   |
| Improvements to National Nuclear Security Administration budget structure .....  | 00   |
| Reorganization and reform .....  | 00   |
| Environmental and Other Defense Activities .....   | 00   |
| Overview .....   | 00   |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup .....  | 00   |
| Environmental Management technology development program .....  | 00   |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Plant .....  | 00   |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 00   |
| Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations .....  | 00   |
| Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration .....  | 00   |
| 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—Design and Use of Prototypes of Nuclear Weapons for Intelligence Purposes .....   | 00   |
| Section 3112—Authorized Personnel Levels of National Nuclear Security Administration .....   | 00   |
| Section 3113—Cost Containment for Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project .....   | 00   |
| Section 3114—Plutonium Pit Production Capacity .....   | 00   |
| Section 3115—Definition of Baseline and Threshold for Stockpile Life Extension Project .....   | 00   |
| Section 3116—Production of Nuclear Warhead for Long-Range Standoff Weapon .....  | 00   |
| Section 3117—Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium .....   | 00   |
| Section 3118—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security .....                                  | 00   |
| Section 3119—Additional Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security .....                       | 00   |
| Section 3120—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Non-Proliferation Activities Between the United States and the Russian Federation ..... | 00   |
| Section 3121—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Activities at Sites in Russian Federation .....        | 00   |
| Subtitle C—Plans and Reports .....   | 00   |
| Section 3131—Cost Estimation and Program Evaluation by National Nuclear Security Administration .....  | 00   |
| Section 3132—Analysis and Report on W88 Alt 370 Program High Explosives Options .....  | 00   |

XXVII

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Section 3133—Analysis of Existing Facilities .....   | 369  |
| Subtitle D—Other Matters .....   | 369  |
| Section 3141—Technical Corrections to Atomic Energy Defense Act .....  | 369  |
| Section 3142—Technical Corrections to National Nuclear Security Administration Act .....                                     | 369  |
| TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD .....  | 369  |
| OVERVIEW .....   | 369  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 369  |
| Section 3201—Authorization .....   | 369  |
| Section 3202—Inspector General of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....  | 369  |
| Section 3203—Number of Employees of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....  | 370  |
| TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES .....   | 370  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 370  |
| Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations .....   | 370  |
| TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION .....   | 370  |
| ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST .....  | 370  |
| Obsolete Vessel “Best Value” Contracts .....   | 370  |
| Recapitalization of the U.S. Maritime Ready Reserve Force Fleet .....  | 371  |
| LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS .....   | 371  |
| Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2015 ..... | 371  |
| Section 3502—Special Rule for DD-17 .....  | 371  |
| Section 3503—Sense of Congress on the Role of Domestic Maritime Industry in National Security .....                          | 371  |
| DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES .....  | 371  |
| Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables .....  | 371  |
| Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2015 .....  | 372  |
| National Defense Budget Authority Implication .....  | 376  |
| TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT .....  | 377  |
| Section 4101—Procurement .....   | 377  |
| TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION .....   | 418  |
| Section 4201—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation .....   | 418  |
| TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....  | 450  |
| Section 4301—Operation and Maintenance .....   | 450  |
| TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL .....  | 476  |
| Section 4401—Military Personnel .....  | 476  |
| TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....   | 477  |
| Section 4501—Other Authorizations .....  | 477  |
| TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....   | 480  |
| Section 4601—Military Construction .....   | 480  |
| TABLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS .....  | 491  |
| Section 4701—Department of Energy National Security Programs .....   | 491  |
| Department of Defense Authorization Request .....  | 503  |
| Communications from Other Committees .....   | 504  |
| Fiscal Data .....  | 518  |
| Congressional Budget Office Estimate .....   | 518  |
| Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act .....   | 521  |
| Committee Cost Estimate .....  | 521  |
| Advisory of Earmarks .....   | 521  |
| Oversight Findings .....   | 521  |
| General Performance Goals and Objectives .....   | 521  |
| Statement of Federal Mandates .....  | 522  |
| Federal Advisory Committee Statement .....   | 523  |
| Applicability to the Legislative Branch .....  | 523  |
| Duplication of Federal Programs .....  | 523  |
| Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings .....  | 523  |
| Committee Votes .....  | 523  |
| Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported .....  | 539  |
| Additional Views .....   | 540  |



HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE  
AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

---

MAY 13, 2014.—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. 4435]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and 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.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2015: (a) the personnel strength for each Active Duty component of the military departments; (b) the

personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Maritime Administration.

#### RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides the House Committee on Armed Services with jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally and over the military application of nuclear energy. The committee bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

The bill reflects the committee's steadfast support of the courageous, professional, and dedicated men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces and the committee's appreciation for the sacrifices they make to accomplish their required missions. Events of the last year, ranging from on-going operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, robust counter-terrorism efforts around the globe, to time-sensitive disaster and humanitarian responses, serve to highlight the U.S. military's flexibility and responsiveness in defending the Nation's interests and addressing security challenges. The committee understands that the capabilities of the Armed Forces are underpinned by the dedicated civilian employees of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, as well as the defense industrial base. Each of these elements is required to enable the U.S. military to be the guarantor of peace and economic security that it has been for generations. The committee is committed to providing full authorization for the funding required to restore the readiness of the 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 would balance the force with constrained resources; support and protect the Nation's warfighters and their families; support a continued military commitment and U.S. presence in Afghanistan; begin the process of reforming Department of Defense institutions and processes; and assure that America's Armed Forces maintain the vital global presence that allows them to face current threats and prepare for new ones.



*Resources for Warfighters and Families*

The committee remains committed to providing America's warfighters, veterans, and their families with the care and support they need, deserve, and have earned. This bill would authorize an extension of a wide array of bonuses, special and incentive pays for the Nation's men and women in uniform.

The committee continues to maintain a focus on sexual assault prevention and prosecution. This bill would continue to refine the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program, while at the same time requiring continued monitoring of the Department's implementation of the significant reforms enacted by Congress over the past 2 years.

While the committee recognizes the need for compensation reform, it believes such reforms must be examined holistically before proceeding with wide-impacting changes, and it looks forward to reviewing the recommendations provided by the congressionally directed Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. Thus, the committee rejects the Department's proposed piecemeal cuts to TRICARE, housing allowances, and commissary benefits contained in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request.

The committee is troubled by the growing suicide rate among members of the Armed Forces, to include the Nation's special operations forces. This bill would require standardization of the collection, reporting, and assessment of suicide data involving members of the Armed Forces and their family members, including Reserve Components, and provide enhanced tracking of suicide data within the Department. Additionally, this bill would require a review of Department of Defense efforts regarding suicide prevention among members of the special operations forces and their family members.

This bill would also express the sense of Congress that the United States has a responsibility to continue to search for missing or captured members of the Armed Forces while transitioning from combat operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Lastly, the committee maintains serious reservations about the end strength and force structure reduction plans for the military. America remains at war today and will continue at some level of persistent global conflict with a committed enemy for the foreseeable future. Further end strength reductions could put at risk the military's ability to meet its global commitments.

*Continuing Commitment to Afghanistan*

The committee recognizes that the gains in Afghan security, governance, and society have come as a result of the immense sacrifices made by U.S. and coalition forces and the Afghan people. The committee continues to believe that the United States has a vital national security interest in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and that Al Qaeda and its affiliates must be denied safe havens in Afghanistan and elsewhere to launch attacks against the United States and its allies. The committee, therefore, supports the post-2014 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) mission known as Operation Resolute Support, and it urges the President to announce a residual U.S. presence in Afghanistan to demonstrate U.S. commitment, reassure the Afghan people, and encourage other NATO and coalition partners to commit to a post-

2014 mission and presence in Afghanistan. The committee remains optimistic that a new Afghan president will sign the Bilateral Security Agreement between the United States and Afghanistan, which would serve as a framework should also pave the way for a post-2014 NATO-Afghanistan status of forces agreement.

As the United States transitions from Operation Enduring Freedom to Operation Resolute Support, the committee expects the Administration to have a clear understanding of the missions, authorities, plans, and resources necessary to support Operation Resolute Support. The committee has carefully reviewed the authorities for which it recommends extension, such as the Commanders' Emergency Response Program and reimbursement of coalition nations for support provided to U.S. military operations. The committee would require a revised "Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan Under Operation Resolute Support" to inform its understanding of the post-2014 security and economic environment in Afghanistan, and a plan for sustaining the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) through fiscal year 2018. Additionally, the committee continues to leverage important oversight tools, such as the Department of Defense Inspector General, to ensure Department of Defense funds for Afghanistan are properly managed to protect against waste, fraud, and abuse. In this vein, the committee would require the Department of Defense to reduce the amount of assistance provided to the Government of Afghanistan during fiscal year 2015, as a result of improper taxation of Department of Defense assistance by the Government of Afghanistan during fiscal year 2014. The committee also recognizes the service performed by many Afghans in support of U.S. military and diplomatic efforts, and it would authorize additional special immigrant visas for Afghans who were employed by or on behalf of the U.S. Government in Afghanistan.

#### *Preserving Key Capabilities in a Time of Fiscal Austerity*

In April 2011, the President announced his intention to seek over \$400.0 billion in savings within the Department of Defense over the next decade. Subsequently, Congress passed the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) in August 2011. Public Law 112-25 significantly reduced discretionary spending across the Federal Government and for the military in particular. The Department of Defense noted that cuts relating to Public Law 112-25 amounted to \$489.0 billion. In addition, sequestration went into effect across the Federal Government on March 1, 2013, immediately reducing funds for the Department by \$37.3 billion for fiscal year 2013. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67) provided National Defense some relief from sequestration-level funding for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, but funding for those fiscal years remained relatively flat when compared to fiscal year 2013 levels. If sequestration-level budget caps remain in effect for fiscal year 2016 and beyond, the decrease to National Defense spending will total over \$1.0 trillion, a decrease of 19 percent when compared to projections for defense spending less than 4 years ago.

The committee recognizes that its goal of providing for the common defense is becoming increasingly difficult in an era of fiscal austerity. This bill aims to balance the force with constrained resources. The committee sought to find savings in less critical areas

that do not pose the threat of irrevocable damage to the force or the potential to harm recruiting or retention. Still, at current resource levels tough choices had to be made.

The committee remains concerned about readiness levels and their continued impact to the force in the out years unless sequestration is addressed. The committee is mindful that when readiness is low and the military is ill-equipped and unprepared to fight, it is the troops who pay the ultimate price with their lives.

This bill would prohibit the Department from pursuing an additional Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round, or any other effort, aimed at locking in force structure reductions during a time of accelerated transition and the withdrawal of troops from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. It would address deficiencies in the Air Force's nuclear enterprise by resourcing several unfunded requirements for the Nuclear Force Improvement Program, while also addressing nuclear security forces equipment shortfalls which have exacerbated the challenges. Additionally, it would address the Marine Corps' requirement to establish two new special Marine Air-Ground Task Forces in U.S. Southern Command and U.S. Central Command which are needed to support U.S. diplomatic and military installations around the world, requirements made exceptionally clear after the 2012 attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi. This bill would also take steps to enhance the hard-won readiness of the Army by funding unmet requirements for training, flying hours, and depot maintenance necessary to support ongoing and future operations.

The committee has also sought to preserve key naval capabilities to ensure a ready and robust Navy that is prepared to support global combatant commander requirements. This bill would support the refueling of the USS *George Washington*, a carrier with 25 years of useful life left; prevent the early retirement of 11 cruisers and 3 dock landing ships; and mitigate shortfalls in the Navy's aviation depot maintenance accounts.

The decrease in defense resources has resulted in tough choices between important programs. While this bill is able to fund many important programs with savings from across the defense enterprise, there simply was not enough to save every program.

This bill would make prudent investments designed to preserve the integrity of the industrial base while delivering needed equipment to all elements of U.S. forces. These include Abrams tank upgrades, the Hercules and Stryker vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles and the Grey Eagle program.

In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, America's citizen soldiers have made repeated, heroic sacrifices in service to their country. Their service has made the Guard more than an operational reserve, but also a strategic resource. As funding cuts force difficult choices, the committee is working to preserve the appropriate balance between the active force and the National Guard and Reserve.

The committee is concerned that foreign-controlled entities may be acquiring property near critical military assets, installations, and training facilities with the intent to monitor defense activities. Therefore, this bill would require a Department of Defense study that looks at gaps and vulnerabilities in the interagency process for public property estate transactions, and task the Government Accountability Office to review the study.

Lastly, the committee would fund the Overseas Contingency Operations at \$79.4 billion, consistent with the House-passed fiscal year 2015 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 96.

#### *Reforming the Department Of Defense*

In an era of fiscal austerity, the committee recognizes the need to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the defense enterprise to get more defense for the dollar. Therefore, the committee recently initiated a comprehensive reform effort to improve the management culture, structure, and practices of the Department of Defense. The committee believes that any lasting reform will only be successful if it is crafted by a solid partnership between both the House of Representatives and Senate committees of jurisdiction, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, each of the military departments, and the defense industrial base. The committee looks forward to working with all stakeholders on this long-term effort. Many of the defense reform efforts included in this bill are informed by the beginning stages of this bipartisan effort, to include acquisition, institutional, security, and strategy reforms.

In the area of acquisition reform, the committee aims to identify and drive out disincentives that increase cost and schedule of major programs and delay delivery of capabilities to the warfighter. The reform effort also identifies services contracting as an area where major improvements can be made. This bill would encourage the Secretary of Defense to improve data collection for services contracting and conduct better analysis of the data to identify waste. It would also task the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to report on opportunities to improve services contract processes. Additionally, this bill would direct the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to consider the potential for increase in program cost estimates or delays in schedule estimates in the implementation of policies, procedures, and activities related to operational test and evaluation.

Furthermore, as part of the ongoing effort to review the processes that often keep the Department of Defense from operating efficiently, and unintentionally create barriers to meaningful small business participation in the defense industrial base, the committee has worked closely with the House Committee on Small Business and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a result of this bipartisan cooperation, the bill includes provisions that would remove duplicative processes, erase meaningless distinctions between competing programs, leverage procurement best practices, and better use the programs already in place.

In the area of institutional reform, the committee seeks to ensure that any organizational changes and personnel reductions implemented to achieve cost savings and management efficiencies are being applied in the right places and are informed by a comprehensive assessment of mission and functional requirements, critical capability and skillset requirements, and cost drivers. This bill would direct the Secretary of Defense to report on combining combatant command back office functions to achieve greater efficiencies and cost savings, and task GAO to assess the Department's headquarters reduction efforts, building off its previous work conducted for the committee on examining growth in Department of Defense headquarters. This bill would also restore the Office of Net Assess-

ment to its independent status, with the Office reporting directly to the Secretary of Defense.

Additionally, the committee continues to build on its prior work to improve the Department's fiscal responsibility, transparency, and accountability, and as part of the broader reform effort, it recommends the establishment of an advisory panel on Department of Defense audit readiness. The purpose of the panel would be to actively monitor the Department's audit readiness and audit work and to report on problems that need to be resolved with the intention to shed light on the best, most efficient path forward to meet the 2017 and 2019 deadlines relating to auditability. The advisory panel would be granted authority to hold hearings and receive information directly from the Department of Defense and would terminate in April 2019.

In the area of security reform, the committee is deeply concerned about the grave impact to U.S. national security caused by the unauthorized disclosure of classified information. Such disclosures not only jeopardize U.S. military operations, capabilities, and technology, they ultimately lead to the loss of lives. This bill, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the committee with frequent reports on its damage assessment resulting from these unauthorized disclosures and steps the Department is taking to mitigate the damage.

Lastly, in the area of strategy reform, the committee notes that the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) has grown less compliant with the law over time and strayed further from the intent of Congress. The committee believes the QDR should provide a mechanism for setting the priorities of the Department of Defense, shaping the force, guiding capabilities and resources, and adjusting the organization to respond to changes in the strategic environment. In addition, it should assist Congress in better understanding the relationships and tradeoffs between missions, risks, and resources, particularly in light of geopolitical changes and domestic developments in the last few years. Therefore, this bill would require the Secretary to resubmit the 2014 QDR and it would propose sweeping changes to the Department's defense strategy review process and reporting elements.

#### *Addressing Current Threats and Preparing for New Challenges*

The committee recognizes that it must focus not only on addressing current threats, but also on preparing for emerging and evolving challenges in an increasingly uncertain global security environment, and it must ensure that defense resources are balanced between the two objectives.

The committee remains concerned about U.S. posture and presence in the Asia-Pacific region to deter aggression and reassure allies and partners. The committee conducted an Asia-Pacific oversight series, focusing largely on these developments and the implications of the Administration's rebalance to Asia on Department of Defense capabilities and investments. Many of the Asia-Pacific-related provisions contained in this bill reflect the findings and recommendations that emerged from the oversight series.

As the mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan transitions and the military rebalances towards Asia, the committee remains concerned about the persistent Al Qaeda threat. This bill would re-

quire a report on the national security planning guidance to address Al Qaeda safe havens, and maintain prohibitions associated with the Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility, including the bi-partisan prohibitions on the transfer of detainees to the United States and on the construction of terrorist detention facilities in the United States.

The committee believes that an enduring presence in the Middle East is vital, to include maintaining a robust forward presence and posture to support U.S. allies and partners in the region and to deter the Islamic Republic of Iran. This bill would express congressional concern that many key bases are funded through Overseas Contingency Operations funding and not supported by status of forces agreements (SOFA). The committee urges the President to shift to an enduring posture in the Middle East and seek SOFA agreements with Gulf Cooperation Council states. This bill would also recognize the President's determination that the Arab Republic of Egypt is progressing in its democratic transition and supports the President's decision to deliver 10 Apache helicopters to Egypt for counterterrorism operations. This bill further reflects congressional concern regarding the influx of foreign fighters in the Syrian Arab Republic and the committee's belief that "prudent planning" to support regional allies impacted by the Syria conflict is warranted. The bill would also reflect the committee's belief that an American presence in the Arabian Gulf is vital to deter Iran as well as its belief that any comprehensive deal on Iran's nuclear program should address past and present issues of concern with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and should require Iran to cease enrichment of uranium, address ballistic missile and conventional military systems, and stop support for international terrorism.

Shifting to Africa, the committee believes that U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) is on the front lines of the next phase of the terrorist threat, and this bill would seek to reinforce AFRICOM's capabilities while also demanding accountability. It recognizes the contributions the Republic of Djibouti has made as a key strategic partner and establishes a number of programs to ensure the relationship is enduring. It further requires a report on the "New Normal" and general mission requirements for AFRICOM, as well as a report on the readiness implications of the Army's Regionally Aligned Brigade concept in Africa.

The committee condemns the recent aggressive actions undertaken by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, which include Russia's illegal occupation of Crimea, deployment of tens of thousands of Russian soldiers near the Ukrainian border, and its infiltration and destabilization of eastern Ukraine. The committee therefore would limit U.S.-Russia military contact and cooperation and limit the use of funds for Department of Defense and National Nuclear Security Administration activities with Russia. The NATO alliance remains a cornerstone of international security, and the committee would seek to further strengthen the alliance and reassure U.S. allies and partners in Europe through measures such as requiring a comprehensive strategic framework for security force assistance to European and Eurasian forces and providing additional funds for the Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace program.

Lastly, in the area of missile defense, the bill would fully fund the redesigned kill vehicle for the Ground-based Missile Defense system and the new long-range discriminating sensor, as well as support steps to ensure greater reliability and maintenance of the system. This bill would support the Israeli Cooperative and Iron Dome programs, recognizing the importance of missile defense capabilities for U.S. allies and partners, and provide increased investment for directed energy and other next-generation technologies for missile defense.

#### HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 results from hearings that began on March 5, 2014, and that were completed on April 10, 2014. The full committee conducted seven sessions. In addition, a total of 16 sessions were conducted by 6 different subcommittees.

#### COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 7, 2014, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 4435, as amended, by a vote of 61–0.

#### EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 4435. 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 \$592.9 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the committee for fiscal year 2015. Of this amount, \$495.6 billion was requested for “base” Department of Defense programs, \$79.4 billion was re-

requested for the Overseas Contingency Operations requirements covering the entire fiscal year, and \$17.9 billion was requested for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of \$592.9 billion in fiscal year 2015, including \$79.4 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations. The base committee authorization of \$513.4 billion is a \$31.0 billion decrease below the levels provided for in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

The table preceding the detailed program adjustments in division D of this report summarizes the committee’s recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2015 and compares these amounts to the President’s request.

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President’s total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2015 is \$609.1 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 2015, and mandatory programs.

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



## **DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS**

### **TITLE I—PROCUREMENT**

#### **OVERVIEW**

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$90.6 billion for procurement. This represents a \$3.0 billion decrease over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends authorization of \$91.0 billion, an increase of \$1.5 billion from the fiscal year 2015 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 procurement program are identified in division D of this Act.

#### **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY**

##### **Overview**

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$5.1 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$5.3 billion, an increase of \$147.4 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

##### **Items of Special Interest**

###### *Armed aerial scout strategy*

The committee notes that because of sequestration and limited resources, the Army has announced the Aviation Restructure Initiative (ARI) which retires older platforms and defers the armed reconnaissance requirement for a replacement to the current OH-58 Kiowa series helicopter. The committee understands that as a result of the ARI, the Army will utilize AH-64 Apache helicopters, teamed with the Shadow Unmanned Aerial Systems, as an interim solution to meet the armed reconnaissance mission. However, the committee is concerned that the Army's plan does not address how the Army intends to eventually meet the enduring requirement for a manned armed scout helicopter.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 15, 2015, that includes a description of the interim Apache scout implementation plan, as well as the concept for what a follow-on plan and necessary resources would be required to replace the interim solution with a platform that fully meets the validated requirement.

*Army Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance aircraft*

The committee is aware of the Department of the Army's Aerial Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) 2020 vision. The committee recognizes that there are a variety of platforms and capabilities, both Government and contractor owned, that are being transitioned from a wartime environment to a more stable strategic posture, but the committee is concerned that the Army has not clearly identified the current and future capacity and capability requirements for Aerial ISR. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2014, on the Army's Aerial ISR requirements and how those requirements will be addressed in the future.

*Army Signals Intelligence modernization*

The committee understands that there are at least six Army Signal Intelligence (SIGINT) programs in use or planned for near-term fielding, including: Guard Rail Common Sensor; Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System; Tactical SIGINT Program; Quick Reaction Capability C-12s; Airborne Reconnaissance Low; and the Prophet ground SIGINT collection platform. The committee is concerned that maintaining six different SIGINT collection systems for these platforms is costly and inefficient, as well as potentially unsustainable given the current fiscal environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by February 16, 2015, that would present a SIGINT modernization plan, including a detailed plan of action and milestones with anticipated costs and schedules. The report should also consider the advisability and feasibility of potentially converging all six Army SIGINT programs to a common hardware baseline that is contractor independent, with open architecture that could allow for the use of software reprogrammable radios, as well as provide the capability for insertion of emerging technologies and collection capabilities.

*Divestiture of rotorcraft through Army's Aviation Restructure Initiative*

The committee is aware of the Army's plan to divest certain rotorcraft, such as the OH-58D Kiowa Warrior, OH-58 A/C, and TH-67 primary training helicopters, as part of its Aviation Restructure Initiative. While the committee understands the fiscal pressures facing the Army and supports its efforts to restructure the rotorcraft force, the committee is concerned that the planned divestiture of more than 750 aircraft between fiscal years 2015-19 could have a negative impact on the rotorcraft industrial base which has already been impacted by declining defense spending.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2014, on the criteria for transferring these helicopters as excess defense articles into the domestic and international markets. As part of this briefing, the Army should include an assess-

ment of how its criteria for divestiture meet all Federal laws and regulations governing such equipment, including:

(1) A statement outlining the purposes for which the article is being provided to any foreign country, including whether such article has been previously provided to that country;

(2) An assessment of the impact of the transfer on the military readiness of the United States;

(3) An assessment of the impact of the transfer on the national technology and industrial base and, particularly, the impact on opportunities of entities in the national technology and industrial base to sell new or used equipment to foreign countries to which such articles might be transferred; and

(4) A statement describing the current value of such articles and the value of such articles at acquisition.

*Improved MQ-1C Gray Eagle modifications*

The budget request contained \$190.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army for the MQ-1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial System.

The committee notes that the MQ-1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aircraft System provides critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities to combatant commanders. The committee understands that development efforts have already been completed to modify the current Gray Eagle platform in order to provide extended range capabilities. This capability, known as the Improved Gray Eagle, includes significant expansion of the fuselage to accommodate larger fuel capacity and additional payloads as well as integration of an improved heavy fuel engine to support takeoff at heavier weights. However, funding for these modifications was not included in the budget request. The committee believes the increased endurance of a modified Gray Eagle would provide combatant commanders greater employment options at increased ranges, expanded payload options, and improved basing flexibility in support of the Global ISR mission.

The committee recommends \$239.5 million, an increase of \$49.0 million, for improved MQ-1C Gray Eagle modifications.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$1.0 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.0 billion, full funding of the request, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES,  
ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$1.5 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.7 billion, an increase of \$230.2 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

#### Items of Special Interest

##### *Combat vehicle industrial base management*

The committee notes that as a result of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), the Army is in the process of reducing its Active Duty end strength to 420,000, unless sequestration is resolved. In addition, the Army has also announced plans to reduce Active Component Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) from 45 to 32. The active Army has 17 Armor BCTs (ABCT), 20 Infantry BCTs, and 8 Stryker BCTs. The committee notes that the ABCT, which is comprised of Abrams tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles, is the only full-spectrum force in the Army's force structure. With regard to the future utility of armored forces, the committee notes that a RAND Corporation report from 2010 concluded that, "Heavy forces—based on tanks and infantry fighting vehicles—are key elements of any force that will fight hybrid enemies that have a modicum of training, organization, and advanced weapons. Light and medium forces can complement heavy forces, particularly in urban and other complex terrain; they do not provide the survivability, lethality, or mobility inherent in heavy forces. Quite simply, heavy forces reduce operational risks and minimize friendly casualties."

The committee remains concerned that the Army may eliminate too many ABCTs based on resource constraints rather than meeting the needs of combatant commanders. Although the committee has been informed that the Army will add a third maneuver battalion back into the Active Component Armor and Infantry BCTs, the committee has not been briefed on final force structure and BCT mix decisions. The committee is supportive of all BCTs having a third maneuver battalion and notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the committee opposed the Army's original decision of having two maneuver battalions per BCT.

In addition to the mix of BCTs, the committee needs to better understand the ramifications to the future combat vehicle industrial base capabilities with regard to the Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, Paladin howitzer, Hercules recovery vehicle, Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle, and the Stryker combat vehicle. Specifically, the committee is concerned about the Army's position that Foreign Military Sales (FMS) alone is sufficient to sustain the viability of the combat vehicle industrial base. The committee believes that the associated impact this position has on the industrial base at both the prime contractor and vendor level poses an unacceptable level of risk. The committee acknowledges that the Army has made positive strides in regards to FMS cases. However, FMS cases often take years longer than originally planned to materialize. In addition, many FMS cases procure less capable variants which do not always equate to positive workload at the prime and vendor levels. The committee continues to believe that insufficient information is available to Congress to make an informed decision

regarding current and potential future risks to the combat vehicle industrial base at the prime and vendor levels. The committee commends the Army for beginning the process to finally collect the necessary analytical information required to make informed decisions about the long-term sustainment of the combat vehicle industrial base.

Finally, the committee applauds the Army for its efforts to accelerate the Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) programs for the M1 Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle and Stryker combat vehicle. The out-year funding reflected in the budget request for fiscal year 2015 indicates a commitment by the Army to move forward with the next major technology upgrades for the existing fleet of weapons systems that would ensure fielding of the highest quality combat vehicles to a smaller force and also sustain the fragile industrial base. However, the committee remains concerned about the stability of Army modernization funding in fiscal year 2016 and beyond given the implications of sequestration. The committee believes multiyear procurement contracts may reduce overall cost and help stabilize the industrial base and notes that there is precedent for successful Army combat vehicle multiyear procurements. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, to request multiyear procurement authority in future budget requests for the Abrams ECP 1, Bradley ECP 2, and Stryker ECP 1 programs.

#### *Abrams tank upgrades*

The budget request contained no funding for the M1A2 Abrams tank upgrade program.

The committee continues to believe that the Army must maintain the capability of Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) formations to over match any possible threat. The committee notes that in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, senior Army officials testified that the Army does not plan to close down the industrial facilities used to upgrade M1 Abrams tanks. In addition, the same senior Army officials testified that these critical industrial base facilities would have been at serious risk had it not been for additional funding authorized and appropriated by Congress. The committee understands the next scheduled upgrade for the Abrams tank has been moved up to 2017 from 2019. The committee commends the Army's decision to accelerate this upgrade, and notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee encouraged the Army take this action. The committee continues to believe this course of action will mitigate risk within the combat vehicle industrial base.

While the committee understands that the Army believes that Foreign Military Sales (FMS) alone are enough to keep the Abrams tank line “warm” until the 2017 time frame, based on current world events, the committee continues to believe that reliance upon FMS alone poses an unacceptable level of risk to our combat vehicle industrial base and thus to our national security. As a result, the committee believes that the best course of action would be a combination of continued tank upgrades for the Abrams tank pro-

gram and ongoing FMS; the combination of which should maintain production lines and suppliers until the next Abrams tank upgrade program begins. The committee acknowledges that if all FMS cases materialize as planned, the Army may not need additional funding in fiscal year 2015 in order to mitigate risk through the 2017 time frame. However, according to the information provided to the committee by the Army, the committee will not know if these FMS cases have been funded until the December 2014 time frame.

With regard to the military need for more M1A2 Abrams tank upgrades, the committee notes that six National Guard ABCTs are currently equipped with a less capable version of the Abrams tank. Therefore, the committee believes that as long as the National Guard has a less capable version of the Abrams tank, there will be a requirement for additional modernized M1A2 Abrams tanks.

The committee recommends \$120.0 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

#### *Hercules recovery vehicle*

The budget request contained \$50.5 million for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

The committee is aware that in order to provide greater protection for soldiers, the Army's current and future fleet of combat vehicles has grown significantly in weight. As a result, the current fleet of M88A1 recovery vehicles is approaching its maximum capability, and its capability will be greatly exceeded by the future fleet of combat vehicles. The committee notes that the M88A2 is the only vehicle that can single-handedly recover a main battle tank, and that it was the only vehicle in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan that could recover larger mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles. The committee understands that the Army has recently increased the M88A2 acquisition objective to 933 systems, of which only 749 have been funded for procurement through fiscal year 2015. The committee supports the Army's decision to include funding in the budget request for procurement of M88A2 vehicles, but believes additional funding is necessary to maintain production. The committee encourages the Army to pursue a "pure fleet" strategy in future budget requests.

The committee recommends \$121.2 million, an increase of \$70.7 million, for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

#### *Stryker combat vehicle modifications*

The budget request contained \$385.1 million in Weapons and Tracked Compact Vehicles, Army for continued procurement of upgraded Stryker combat vehicles and \$90.2 million in PE 23735A to continue the Stryker Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) program.

The committee continues to support the Army's Stryker program and in particular the Double-V Hull (DVH) program that makes Stryker one of the most survivable and mobile vehicles in the Army's inventory. The budget request included funding for the second year of a 3-year procurement of DVH Strykers for a third brigade set. The committee is aware the Army has a documented requirement to equip all nine of its Stryker Brigade Combat Teams with the DVH Stryker. The committee understands the Army

wants to begin procurement of a fourth brigade set of DVH Strykers starting in fiscal year 2016. The Army also has an unfunded requirement to accelerate the Stryker ECP program. The Stryker ECP effort includes increased horsepower, network integration, and other improvements. The committee notes that the Army wants to accelerate Stryker ECP development in order to produce DVH Strykers for the fourth brigade set that incorporate the ECP upgrade.

The committee supports this initiative and recommends \$435.1 million, an increase of \$50.0 million, for Stryker procurement and \$115.2 million, an increase of \$25.0 million, in PE 23735A to accelerate Stryker ECP development.

#### *M9 upgrades*

The committee understands the Army is preparing to competitively pursue a non-developmental item, commercial-off-the-shelf replacement handgun for the current M9 pistol. The committee notes that the Army's modular handgun system (MHS) is intended to provide soldiers with improved lethality, accuracy, ergonomics, reliability, durability, and maintainability over current systems. While the committee supports the MHS program, the committee is aware that there may be an upgrade configuration for the M9 that could provide increased operational effectiveness while reducing life-cycle costs as well as enhancing training capabilities. The committee notes that because there are approximately 240,000 M9 pistols in the current inventory and that the current procurement objective for the MHS is still being determined, the committee encourages the Army to consider an M9 upgrade program as a potential complementary program to the MHS.

#### *Transmission industrial base*

The committee notes that the Army commissioned a comprehensive assessment of the combat vehicle industrial base to better understand the issues and challenges facing the vendor industrial base. The first phase of the assessment, which was completed last year, identified combat vehicle transmissions as a significant area of concern. The assessment concluded that combat vehicle transmissions are unique in that they not only provide power to combat vehicles but also control braking and steering. In other words, combat vehicle transmissions are entirely different than commercial transmissions, such as those that power the military's tactical wheeled vehicle fleet. Although it has not been provided the Army's final report, the committee understands the assessment and recommends mitigation measures for the tracked combat vehicle transmission industrial base.

The committee notes that although the Army has terminated the Ground Combat Vehicle program, the Army has several tracked vehicle programs in development or production. These include the Armored Multi-purpose Vehicle (AMPV) program, the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program, M88 recovery vehicle program and major upgrades called "Engineering Change Proposals" (ECP) for both the Abrams tank and Bradley fighting vehicle. All of these vehicles are eligible for upgraded or improved transmissions. The committee understands there are only a few companies that

produce transmissions for tracked combat vehicles within the United States. Based on the results of the Army's assessment, the committee is concerned about the future viability of transmissions for tracked combat vehicles based on low production rates and projected levels of funding in the out years that may not support minimum sustaining rates of production. The committee believes it may be necessary to consider consolidation of production capabilities through a partnership with existing suppliers.

The committee notes the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy continues to direct a sector-by-sector, tier-by-tier review of the defense industrial base and includes findings from that review in the annual Industrial Base Capabilities Report to Congress, which is required by section 2504 of title 10, United States Code. However, the last annual report, delivered to Congress in October 2013, did not specifically address the committee's concerns related to combat vehicle transmissions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 15, 2015, on the combat vehicle transmission industrial base. The report should not continue to summarize the challenges confronting the U.S. tracked vehicle transmission industrial base, but should instead detail specific mitigation measures and their implementation. Specifically, the report should include the Army's plans and potential funding profile that would be necessary to procure new or improved combat vehicle transmissions for the AMPV, PIM, M88 and Abrams and Bradley ECP programs, to include the opportunity to exploit new technologies such as electric drives. In addition, the report should include an assessment of the potential to begin a 2-year pilot combat vehicle transmission program that would address the feasibility of consolidating production capabilities through a partnership with existing and potential suppliers.

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$1.0 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.0 billion, a decrease of \$23.4 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

### Items of Special Interest

#### *Munitions industrial base management*

The committee notes that declining defense resources will likely result in a smaller munitions industrial base and that efforts are on-going to achieve a right-sized base that remains fully capable and viable. The committee is aware of the collaborative work being done by the Single Manager for Conventional Ammunition (SMCA) and industry to develop management tools to help manage the in-



dustrial base. In particular, the committee notes that the Industrial Base Assessment Tool (IBAT) and the Minimum Sustaining Rate (MSR) database will use an iterative process to enable analysis of proposed ammunition procurement to identify potential negative impacts on the viability or capability of the munitions industrial base. The committee understands that avoidance of such impacts is essential for a base that, although considerably smaller, must continue to meet the many, varied needs of the military services. To that end, the committee believes that early knowledge of the budgetary plans of the military services would allow the SMCA to assess the capability of the munitions industrial base to respond, identify potential impacts, and point out alternatives for meeting immediate needs that do not jeopardize long-term viability of the munitions industrial base.

The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to ensure that adequate funds are made available through the annual budget process to develop, operate, and maintain the management tools required to support the foregoing iterative process, including but not limited to, the IBAT and the MSR database.

#### *M982 Excalibur program*

The budget request contained \$35.6 million for 416 Excalibur precision guided artillery Ib rounds.

The M982 Excalibur round is a precision guided 155mm artillery round that is used by the Army and the Marine Corps. The committee notes that over 745 Excalibur rounds have been used by the Army and the Marine Corps in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom with high success rates.

The committee supports the Excalibur program and believes that this precision guided capability is a combat multiplier. The committee understands the program remains on cost and schedule with a full-rate production decision scheduled for June 2014. The committee also understands that the Army is now procuring the Excalibur Ib round, which has significantly decreased program costs, while also providing increased performance and reliability. The committee notes the Army is currently conducting a comprehensive precision fires capability portfolio review and that the total procurement objective for Excalibur rounds could increase in future years. The committee encourages the Army to consider, as part of this precision fires capability portfolio review, the advisability and feasibility of replacing the current inventory of Excalibur Ia-1 and Ia-2 rounds with Ib rounds.

The committee recommends \$35.6 million, the full amount of the request, for the procurement of Excalibur Ib rounds.

#### *Utilization of Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support initiative*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on potential improvements to the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) program initiative. The committee has not received this report and understands the Secretary of the Army plans to deliver it in June 2014.

The committee continues to believe the Army's Government-owned ammunition plants are critical to the Nation's readiness and to equipping the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee understands the ARMS program was created to allow the Army to rent to commercial companies portions of its Army Ammunition Plants (AAPs) that were not being used in production. The committee notes that revenues from the property rental are used to pay for the operation, maintenance and environmental clean-up at the facilities, and that the savings in overhead cost lowers the production cost of the goods manufactured, as well as funds the environmental clean-up at no cost to the taxpayer. The committee understands the following AAPs are participating in the ARMS program: Hawthorne Army Depot, Holston AAP, Iowa AAP, Lake City AAP, Milan AAP, Radford AAP, and Scranton AAP. The committee encourages the Army to maximize available capacity at these AAPs. For example, the committee notes that Milan AAP is using over 800,000 square feet for ARMS activities.

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to continue to effectively utilize the ARMS program, and encourages the Army to find new and effective ways to improve upon cooperation and coordination among the Army, property managers, commercial interests, local and state agencies, and local economic development organizations to promote effective utilization of ARMS.

#### OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

##### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$4.9 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of \$4.7 billion, a decrease of \$192.4 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

##### Items of Special Interest

###### *Army ultra-light reconnaissance robot programs*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on the advisability and feasibility of incorporating ultra-light reconnaissance robot (ULRR) capability as an enduring requirement. The report submitted to the committee by the Secretary stated that the current Army Unmanned Systems Management Plan validated the advisability of developing a variety of ULRR sensors to operate at the lowest tactical levels as part of an enduring requirement for all Active and Reserve Component units. In addition, the Secretary's report noted that tactical micro-robotic systems could free soldiers from direct exposure to a multitude of lethal threats across a host of common, squad-level mission sets. However, the report also noted some technical challenges, including radio frequency spectrum issues involved in systems used during Operation Enduring Freedom, once back in the United States.

Given the substantial investment in ULRR by the Army to-date and the conclusions provided in the report, the committee encourages the Army to transition ULRR into a formal program-of-record so that any technical, logistical, or training issues associated with incorporation of ULRR into Army units may be resolved.

*Body armor industrial base risk mitigation*

The committee understands that the body armor industrial base includes the combat helmet industrial base, soft armor industrial base, and hard body armor industrial base. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide an assessment of the long term sustainment requirements for the body armor industrial base, to include supply chains for combat helmets, soft armor, and hard armor components. The committee received this assessment in March 2014.

The committee understands that the military services would prefer to maintain at least two viable industrial base vendors for each area of the industrial base in order to mitigate serious risk, maintain competition for better body armor technology, as well as to retain required surge capacity. The committee is concerned that current funding profiles may not allow for two viable vendors in each area. The committee understands that without additional resources or additional contracts the industrial base would default to only one supplier in August 2015. The committee understands that specialty materials such as ballistic fibers and ceramics are raw material building blocks for body armor systems, and that few profitable applications for these materials exist outside of Department of Defense body armor programs. While foreign military sales (FMS) could offer industry an additional means for the manufacture and sale of various body armor components, there has been limited FMS interest from foreign countries.

Based on this required assessment, as well as other assessments the committee has reviewed from the Defense Logistics Agency, the committee understands that there is significant risk to the hard armor industrial base both in the near-term and the long-term. The committee is concerned that the two qualified manufacturers are producing at below minimum sustaining rates, and that this could jeopardize their financial stability and viability beginning in fiscal year 2015. The committee also notes that one of the hard armor vendors is the sole supplier of a particular ceramic raw material to the Department of Defense and believes that the Department of Defense may lose the capability to meet surge requirements beginning in fiscal year 2015. The committee is concerned that once a capability, such as hard body armor, disappears and production lines are dismantled, it is projected that it would take at least 18 months to reconstitute that capability.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends an increase of \$80.0 million in operation and maintenance, Army, to help mitigate risk to the hard armor industrial base and maintain two viable vendors.

*Tactical generator recapitalization*

The committee is aware that generators are the biggest consumers of diesel fuel in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Army and Marine Corps. Given Department of Defense directives to reduce costs through increased fuel efficiency, the committee supports service decisions to procure next generation tactical generators like the Advanced Medium Mobile Power Sources (AMMPS), which could produce over 20 percent greater fuel efficiency and 40 percent greater reliability than the current fleet of Tactical Quiet Generators (TQGs). The committee understands that when the AMMPS fleet is fully deployed and operating, the Department of Defense estimates it will realize an annual savings of \$745.0 million and 52.0 million gallons of diesel fuel over TQGs.

The committee expects the military services to consider robust goals for increased fuel efficiency and reliability as part of any tactical generator recapitalization strategy. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees no later than November 3, 2014 on service plans to recapitalize tactical generator systems, associated fuel efficiency and reliability targets, and the financial impact that achieving these targets would have on fuel expenditures.

*Family of heavy tactical vehicles*

The budget request contained \$28.4 million for the family of heavy tactical vehicles (FHTV). The budget request also contained \$89.2 million for the Palletized Load System (PLS) Extended Service Program (ESP). The budget request contained no funding for the Heavy Expanded Mobile Tactical Truck (HEMTT) extended service program (ESP).

The committee notes with concern that the budget request included no funding for the HEMTT ESP within the FHTV program. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned about the long-term viability of the tactical wheeled vehicle industrial base. The committee notes the Army had originally programmed \$250.0 million for HEMTT ESP over the Future Years Defense Program, but that funding has now been reinvested into other outstanding, higher-priority requirements within FHTV, notably the PLS ESP. The committee understands that there still remains at least a 3-year requirement for HEMTT ESP.

The committee is aware that based on the HEMTT ESP requirement identified in previous Army budget submissions, the Secretary of the Army does plan to include funding for HEMTT ESP in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget request for fiscal year 2015. While the actual timing of the submission of the OCO budget request is still uncertain, the committee believes additional funding would be required to help maintain balance in the heavy tactical wheeled vehicle industrial base.

The committee recommends \$50.0 million, an increase of \$50.0 million, for continued production of HEMTT ESP vehicles.

*Family of medium tactical vehicles*

The budget request contained no funds for the family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTVs).

The committee is concerned about the current and future viability of the tactical wheeled vehicle industrial base. The committee is concerned that while budget request justification materials indicate that no funding is required for new FMTV procurement in fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016, the out-year funding requests include \$248.9 million and \$249.1 million in fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018, respectively. The committee believes that this strategy of stopping and restarting mature production lines is inefficient and problematic for the medium tactical wheeled vehicle industrial base.

The committee believes that smooth and predictable funding levels, and not abrupt and large swings in funding and production requirements, would result in the best outcome for taxpayers, the industrial base, the military services, and, ultimately, the warfighter. The committee recommends mitigating any unnecessary breaks in FMTV production, and where possible, encourages the Army to maintain at least minimum sustaining rates of production. The committee understands the Secretary of the Army has requested additional funding for new FMTV production in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget request. The committee believes that these funds would help to mitigate some breaks in FMTV production, but notes that there is uncertainty over the timing of the OCO budget request. The committee believes the Army should realign the current funding profile for FMTV production across the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee recommends \$50.0 million, an increase of \$50.0 million, for continued production of new FMTVs.

#### *Military combat eye protection program*

The budget request contained no funds for a military combat eye protection program.

The committee notes that requests for military combat eyewear are usually included in the Rapid Fielding Initiative (RFI) Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget request, which is based on providing RFI equipment to all deploying soldiers. The committee has not yet received the OCO budget request for fiscal year 2015. The committee understands the RFI leverages current programs, lessons learned from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, as well as commercial-off-the-shelf technology to give soldiers increased survivability, lethality, and mobility. The committee expects funding for military combat eyewear to be requested through the OCO budget request.

The committee understands the Army's military combat eye protection program was developed to ensure a standardized level of ballistic and environmental performance for protective eyewear. The committee understands the Army has created an Authorized Protective Eyewear List (APEL) that allows Program Executive Office-Soldier to offer more choices in combat ballistic eyewear, which improves soldier acceptance and use of protective eyewear.

The committee commends the Army for establishing the APEL, encourages the continued rapid fielding of ballistic protective eyewear to all military personnel so that they can "train as they fight", as well as to provide protection against a wide array of threats while deployed and in training. The committee encourages

the Secretaries of the military departments to consider the potential training and operational benefits of issuing combat protective eyewear to all basic military trainees.

*Mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles*

The budget request contained \$14.7 million for mine-resistant ambush-protected (MRAP) vehicle modifications.

The committee recognizes that mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles were rapidly procured to address critical warfighter requirements in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. The committee notes these vehicles proved invaluable at protecting military service personnel from improvised explosive devices, and saved lives. The committee understands that current MRAP vehicle quantities exceed future requirements set forth by the military services. The committee recognizes the military services have carefully considered current and future requirements, as well as their ability to man, equip, train, and sustain MRAP vehicles to determine which vehicles should be retained as part of their enduring capability of protected mobility, route clearance, and Explosive Ordnance Disposal platforms. The committee understands the military services will retain the most capable MRAP vehicles to meet military operational and training needs.

The committee notes that approximately 13,000 excess MRAP vehicles will first be offered to other U.S. Government entities and then to potential foreign military sales (FMS) or excess defense article (EDA) customers. The committee understands that if there are no U.S. Government, FMS, or EDA claimants, the vehicles will follow approved disposition procedures for demilitarization.

The committee believes there may be some operational value in using MRAP vehicles as mobile command posts at echelons above brigade. Therefore, the committee directs the Chief of Staff of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 13, 2015, on the advisability and feasibility of using MRAP vehicles as part of current mobile command post modernization strategies. The briefing should include the following:

- (1) An assessment of the potential cost savings, manpower requirement reductions, and other associated operations and maintenance savings;
- (2) The status and results of vehicle testing to meet the goals of mobile command post modernization;
- (3) An assessment of the current status of command vehicle configurations, including age of the vehicles, number of vehicles required, manpower requirements per command post, and guidance on active fielding timelines for replacement vehicles; and
- (4) The suitability, cost, and cost avoidance available through adaptive reuse of existing vehicles, including the MRAP vehicle.

*Personal dosimetry for protection in Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear and Explosive environments*

The committee remains concerned about the increasing proliferation of Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear and Explosive (CBRNE) Weapons of Mass Destruction, and believes that maintaining adequate modern protective equipment is of critical impor-

tance for the safety of U.S. forces in CBRNE environments. The committee notes that in regard to radiological hazards, accurate dosimetry is critical to the forecast of type, severity, and expected time of onset of symptoms, information needed to predict a person's fitness for duty, and the provision of combat readiness information. The committee notes that the Department of the Army last validated a requirement for Individual Personal Dosimeters in 1975. However, the nuclear and radiological threat environment facing the Joint Force has changed dramatically over the past four decades and dosimeter technology has also improved. The committee is aware of efforts within the Department of Defense to develop a Joint Personal Dosimeter (JPD) and validate an updated requirement for the JPD. The committee understands that the JPD is expected to enter milestone C late in fiscal year 2015. The committee is concerned, however, that procuring JPDs to replace legacy Army systems will not begin until 2020, at the earliest. In addition, the committee notes that the Army currently has nearly 8,500 legacy systems programmed for replacement.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to begin JPD procurement to replace legacy Army systems as soon after the milestone C decision as the availability of funds will allow. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the committee by September 1, 2014, on the status of the JPD program and the efforts to validate an updated dosimetry requirement for the JPD. The briefing should include any recommendations that the Secretary has to begin procurement of JPDs earlier than 2020.

#### *Replacement of Enhanced Position Location Reporting system*

The committee notes that the Army currently has a mix of brigade combat teams (BCTs) with different tactical communications architectures, with most Army BCTs equipped with the Blue Force Tracker system. Some Army units, and elements of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force still use the Enhanced Position Location Reporting system (EPLRS) for certain communications functions. In addition, some allied nations also use EPLRS. The committee understands that the Army intends to retire the remaining EPLRS systems it uses between fiscal years 2014–17.

Overall, the committee supports the Army's plan to modernize its tactical communications network. However, the committee is concerned about the potential impact the retirement that the EPLRS system may have on the Army's ability to operate effectively in joint and combined operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2014, on the details of the Army's plan to retire the EPLRS system. The briefing should address any potential joint or combined operational issues with other military services and allied nations that may result from the Army retiring the system while it remains in use. In addition, the briefing should be coordinated with the appropriate Joint Staff offices that oversee requirements in the area of tactical communications.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$13.1 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$13.5 billion, an increase of \$411.6 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

## Items of Special Interest

*EA-18G Stretch*

The committee understands and supports the Department of the Navy's requirement for additional airborne electronic attack (AEA) aircraft; based on the Department's Congressional testimony and formal war fighting campaign analysis. Controlling the electromagnetic spectrum is paramount to strike capability in future contested environments. The EA-18G Growler provides full spectrum capabilities for the Navy and Joint Forces. However, the Department insufficiently funded the Growler requirement, threatening shutdown of the manufacturing line. In concert with the procurement of 5 Growlers in FY15, the committee encourages the Chief of Naval Operations to utilize the Advanced Procurement funds for F/A-18 E/F aircraft in FY14 (\$75 million) to extend the production line to a minimum production rate of 2 aircraft per month. This extended production will ensure an AEA manufacturing line is in place for future procurement. The committee directs the Department of the Navy to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2014 on the ability to extend the production line to a minimum production rate of 2 aircraft per month. The committee urges the Navy to provide the necessary funds to fulfill its AEA requirement in Fiscal Year 2016, and if needed, beyond.

*H-1 engine program upgrade*

The budget request contained \$45.0 million for H-1 upgrades, but included no funding to upgrade the AH-1Z's legacy T700-401 engine to the T700-401C configuration.

The T700-401C engine is used in the Marine Corps' AH-1Z and UH-1Y helicopters, has unique parts and provides improved power compared to the older T700-401 engine. The committee notes that the Marine Corps plans to procure 189 AH-1Z helicopters, and understands that 36 of those aircraft are not currently planned to be upgraded with T700-401C engines. The committee further understands that having 2 different engines for the fleet of 180 AH-1Zs will result in a reduction of available helicopters since the T700-401 engine is becoming increasingly obsolete.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 19, 2014, on the Marine Corps' plan for either upgrading the 36 AH-1Z helicopters to the T700-401C engine configuration, or how the Marine Corps plans to incorporate the 36 AH-1Z helicopters with the T700-401 engine into the AH-1Z fleet with maintenance and logistic support.



*MQ-8 Fire Scout*

The budget request contained \$40.7 million for MQ-8 Fire Scout procurement.

The MQ-8 Fire Scout is vertical take-off and landing unmanned aerial vehicle (VTUAV) which provides real-time and non-real time intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) data to tactical users without the use of manned aircraft or reliance on limited theater or national assets. The committee notes that the budget request contained no funds for procurement of MQ-8 Fire Scout VTUAVs, but contained funds for procurement of MQ-8 control stations, ancillary equipment, training equipment, support equipment, technical support and logistics, which are critically needed to outfit the ships on which the MQ-8 is deployed.

While the committee supports the budget request, it is disappointed that the Department of the Navy has chosen not to fund procurement of aerial vehicles in fiscal year 2015. The committee continues to view the MQ-8 VTUAV as a critical ISR asset and encourages the Department of the Navy to fully execute its fiscal year 2015 budget request, and include the procurement of additional MQ-8 VTUAVs in the budget request for fiscal year 2016 as well as in subsequent years.

*MV-22 carrier onboard delivery*

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy has conducted an assessment of whether the MV-22 could be used to replace the C-2A Greyhound aircraft currently performing the carrier onboard delivery (COD) mission for the Department of the Navy. The committee further understands that the MV-22's unique combination of speed, range, and vertical agility creates possibilities for transforming the way that carrier onboard delivery is accomplished.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 24, 2014, on the Department of the Navy's assessment of the MV-22 to perform the COD mission, any analysis of alternatives accomplished to replace the C-2A aircraft, key performance parameters required of a C-2A replacement aircraft, health and status of the C-2A fleet, and the current schedule to procure a C-2A Greyhound replacement aircraft.

*UH-1 Mobile Aircrew Restraint System retrofits*

The committee understands that aircrew members have been ejected from helicopters and seriously injured during crashes and hard landings. The committee notes that the Mobile Aircrew Restraint System (MARS) is a device developed and designed to prevent highly mobile aircrew from being ejected during a crash event and to provide fall protection when working near open aircraft doors or hatches. The committee encourages the Marine Corps to use available funding to procure and install additional MARS kits in Marine Corps UH-1Y and other aircraft.

## WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$3.2 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$3.3 billion, an increase of \$63.0 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 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 2015 contained \$771.9 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of \$771.9 million, full funding of the request, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

## SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$14.4 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$15.1 billion, an increase of \$659.6 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

## Items of Special Interest

*Integrated communication systems*

The committee is aware that advances in technology have enabled the development and fielding of integrated communications systems that combine the capabilities of legacy platforms, including Integrated Voice Communications System, Tactical Variant Switch and Secure Voice System, into a single system. Examples in the U.S. inventory include the U.S. Coast Guard's newly fielded National Security and Fast Response Cutter program.

The committee recognizes that the combination of legacy systems into one system has the potential to reduce acquisition and maintenance costs while simplifying training and providing increased operational effectiveness to ship commanders and crews. These benefits apply to both retrofit of legacy platforms and the outfitting of new platforms.

The committee encourages the Navy to examine these new integrated communications systems, and if proven cost effective and beneficial, to consider changing program requirements to specify the use of such systems.

*Joint High Speed Vessel*

The committee is aware of the premium that the Department of Defense places on the ability of U.S. military forces to deploy quickly to a full spectrum of engagements. In addition, the Department values the ability of U.S. forces to debark and embark in a wide range of port environments, from modern to austere.

The committee notes that the Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV), crewed by Military Sealift Command mariners, has demonstrated the ability to transport military forces, as well as humanitarian relief personnel and materiel, in a manner that is responsive, deployable, agile, versatile, and sustainable. The USNS Spearhead (JHSV-1) is currently deployed to the U.S. 6th Fleet area of responsibility.

The JHSV is designed to transport 600 short tons of military cargo 1,200 nautical miles at an average speed of 35 knots in sea state 3. JHSVs support Navy Expeditionary Combat Command and riverine forces, theater cooperating missions, Seabees, and Marine Corps and Army transportation. The original procurement objective for the JHSV was 18 ships. This procurement number was lowered to 10 JHSVs as part of the budget request for fiscal year 2013.

The committee notes that the JHSV has the ability to support multiple branches of the military services, provide high-speed intra-theater sealift, operate in littoral environments and austere port environments, and support humanitarian and disaster relief activities. The committee also notes that the ship's construction line is still operational. For these reasons, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015, on the operational benefits and cost savings associated with continuing to procure JHSVs. The report should specifically address the costs and benefits of buying the eight additional JHSVs that were originally part of the program.

*Littoral Combat Ship*

The committee is concerned about the survivability, lethality and endurance of the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship (LCS), as noted by the Government Accountability Office and others. In February 2014, after reviewing preliminary assessments and evaluations of the LCS, the Secretary of Defense reduced the total number of LCS seaframes to 32 from the planned procurement of 52 and also directed the Navy to submit alternate proposals to procure "a capable and lethal small surface combatant generally consistent with the capabilities of a frigate." The Secretary noted the importance of not only presence but capability and power projection as the foundation of the Navy's effectiveness and directed the Navy to study options to include a completely new design, existing ship designs (including the LCS), and a modified LCS. The Chief of Naval Operations has directed a Small Surface Combatant Task Force to report on these results by July 31, 2014.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015, that examines the Department of the Navy's study and its implications for the procurement of future small surface combatants. This report should assess:

- (1) The study's methodologies and key assumptions;
- (2) Any alternate ship design(s) and modifications to the Littoral Combat Ship that the Navy evaluated, including expectations of cost, schedule, and requirements; and
- (3) The extent to which the study was consistent with the approach of a formal analysis of alternatives, as set forth in the Department of Defense acquisition policy.

#### *Mobile Landing Platform Afloat Forward Staging Base*

The committee notes that the most recent 30-year shipbuilding plan projects a requirement for a third Mobile Landing Platform (MLP) Afloat Forward Staging Base (AFSB) variant ship in fiscal year 2017. Full funding for the second MLP AFSB ship was provided in fiscal year 2014. No advance procurement funds for the third MLP AFSB ship are currently programmed in either fiscal year 2015 or fiscal year 2016. Considering the expanded requirement for the MLP AFSB variant ships and the success of the ongoing shipbuilding program, the committee is concerned that a 3-year procurement gap between ships will increase costs, impact the industrial base, and delay delivery of important capabilities. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to explore possible approaches to minimize a production break between ships, including advance procurement funding, for the third AFSB ship.

#### *Moored Training Ship*

The budget request contained \$801.7 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, for the Moored Training Ship program.

The committee notes that the Moored Training Ship program is intended to convert two decommissioned nuclear attack submarines into training platforms for nuclear propulsion crew members. The committee also notes that this program has experienced a \$556.8 million cost overrun for the two conversions compared to fiscal year 2014 budget projections, and that this represents an 34 percent cost increase. The committee further notes that \$229.7 million of this cost increase is included in the fiscal year 2015 budget request. While the committee understands that the Moored Training Ship program is not a formal acquisition program, the committee remains concerned that the 34 percent cost increase would be significantly over the critical cost growth threshold for major defense acquisition programs, established pursuant to section 2433, title 10, United States Code, also known as a "Nunn-McCurdy breach". As a result, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require a review to be provided to Congress similar to that required for a "Nunn-McCurdy breach".

The committee recommends \$572.0 million, a decrease of \$229.7 million, in shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, for the Moored Training Ship program.

#### *National Defense Sealift Fund*

The committee notes that the Navy is proposing to disestablish the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) and, as part of this, is proposing to shift funding for new construction ships from the NDSF to the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) account.

NDSF was created by section 1077 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484) in part to fund new ship construction related to Department of Defense sealift ships and was later amended to permit the funding of new construction Navy auxiliary ships. NDSF is not a procurement account, but a revolving fund, and appropriations made available to the fund are not executed in the same way as dollars made available to SCN. In addition, new-construction ships funded through the NDSF, unlike SCN-funded ships, must have certain major components manufactured in the United States. The committee is concerned that transferring appropriations from NDSF to SCN for certain ships could result in potential cost increases as well as a reduction in major shipboard components that are manufactured in the United States.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to review the proposal to disestablish the NDSF and the budget recommendation to appropriate new construction Navy auxiliary ships through the SCN account. The Secretary is directed to prepare a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, detailing how the Navy would proceed if the NDSF were disestablished, how the Navy would ensure that there would be no cost increases, and how the Navy would plan to maximize the use of major shipboard components manufactured in the United States in the construction of Department of Defense sealift and Navy auxiliary ships.

#### *Shipbuilding warranties and guarantees*

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office recently reported that the Navy continues to accept delivery of ships with large numbers of deficiencies. Depending on the contract type under which the ships were constructed, the Government may share a significant portion of the costs associated with fixing these deficiencies. In order to better assess the magnitude of this issue, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2015, on the efficacy of warranties, guarantees, and other such mechanisms that are used in U.S. shipbuilding programs. This report should have a particular focus on:

- (1) The extent to which these mechanisms are used in Government and commercial shipbuilding programs;
- (2) How the Government assigns responsibility for a defect and corrects such problems; and
- (3) The extent to which these mechanisms may reduce the Government's exposure to additional costs resulting from defective workmanship or equipment.

#### *Surface ship test platform*

The committee notes that the Manta test platform concept has been successfully used to evaluate submarine sensors at a greatly reduced cost compared to using a full-size submarine for test and evaluation. The committee believes that a similar surface ship test system could be utilized to test and evaluate existing and emerging sonar systems for surface ships. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional

defense committees by March 1, 2015, to include a cost-benefit assessment of designing and fabricating a purpose-built surface ship test craft that could be utilized to test and evaluate existing and emerging sonar systems for surface ships.

#### OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

##### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$6.0 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of \$6.2 billion, an increase of \$222.3 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

#### PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

##### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$983.4 million for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of \$958.2 million, a decrease of \$25.1 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

##### Items of Special Interest

###### *Marine Corps Video Scout MC/3 System*

The committee supports the potential procurement and rapid fielding of the Marine Corps Video Scout MC/3 Remote Video Viewing Terminal (RVVT) to provide full motion video communications and improve tactical processing exploitation and dissemination capability. The committee notes that RVVT systems allow viewing and exploitation of video and metadata from multiple unmanned air, ground, surface, sub-surface systems. The committee understands that the Video Scout MC/3 RVVT program is intended to be an element of the Marine Corps air operations command and control system and is intended to increase Marine Corps intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and direct fire effectiveness through improved software capability, two-way communications, and smart antenna capability.

#### AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

##### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$11.5 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$11.4 billion, a decrease of \$122.7 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

## Items of Special Interest

*Air National Guard MQ-1/MQ-9 ground-based sense and avoid systems*

The committee acknowledges that the operating configuration and equipment for Air National Guard (ANG) MQ-1/9 units, along with international and Federal aviation safety requirements, may limit the ability to operate in international and domestic airspace outside of military restricted areas. MQ-1/9 flight operations require specific, International Civil Aviation Organization, Federal Aviation Administration, or foreign authority approval which restricts the aircraft to insufficient airspace, and specific or limited routing and altitudes. Such restrictions prevent optimal aircrew training and degrade operational flexibility during Federal and state missions. However, the committee notes that the Department of Defense has made significant progress developing ground-based sense and avoid (GBSAA) systems, and that the Department of the Army is expected to begin GBSAA operations at five locations in fiscal year 2015. The committee believes that ANG MQ-1/9 operations centers configured with a GBSAA system could improve and expedite the assimilation of the MQ-1/9 into operations in both international and domestic airspace, and encourages the Department of the Air Force to work with the Department of the Army to deploy GBSAA systems where appropriate.

*Battlefield Airborne Communications Node program*

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force Battlefield Airborne Communication Node (BACN) program has been an effective program fielded through rapid acquisition authorities to support Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn. The BACN program currently uses EQ-4B and E-11A aircraft to host the BACN communications relay system. The committee is concerned, however, that in the absence of continued Overseas Contingency Operations funding that the program may be at risk.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to rapidly transition the BACN program to a base budget program of record to ensure that this capability is maintained in the Department of the Air Force for the long term.

*C-130H Avionics Modernization Program and propulsion system upgrades*

The budget request contained \$35.9 million for C-130H aircraft modifications, but contained no funding for the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) or propulsion system upgrades.

The committee notes that the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) states that the Air Force will maintain 300 combat-coded C-130H and C-130J aircraft in the tactical airlift fleet inventory to support requirements and objectives in support of the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113-76), Congress authorized and appropriated \$47.7 million for AMP and \$41.7 million for propulsion system upgrades.

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of the Air Force invested nearly \$1.5 billion of taxpayer dollars for engineering, manufacturing, development, and testing of the C-130H AMP program, but has no plans to continue procurement and installation of C-130H AMP onto C-130H aircraft. In addition, the committee notes that the Secretary has no plans to modernize or upgrade the C-130H propulsion system in order to increase reliability, capability, fuel efficiency and on-wing time of the engine, as well as decrease the overall cost and maintenance burden of the current propulsion system. The Secretary has not provided the committee with a coherent plan for fleet-wide recapitalization of the C-130H fleet or explained how the Air Force plans to maintain medium-sized intra-theater airlift capacity and capability within both the Active and Reserve Components. The committee understands that the cost to continue the C-130 AMP program, as compared to the costs to individually complete modernization and upgrade requirements to keep the C-130H aircraft capable and relevant, are roughly the same. However, the committee believes that by failing to take actions to modernize the C-130H fleet in the very near term with C-130 AMP and propulsion systems upgrades, recapitalization costs, mitigation of obsolescence and diminishing manufacturing sources costs, or operating and sustainment costs will become so cost prohibitive in the future that the only course of action available to the Secretary will result in the divestiture of the C-130H aircraft from the Air Force inventory. Knowing that the majority of the C-130H fleet resides within the Reserve Components of the Air Force and that the C-130H should remain reliable, capable, and relevant to meeting current and future warfighter needs, the committee is concerned with the approach that the Secretary has taken with regard to the lack of robust modernization and upgrade of C-130H aircraft, if the aircraft is to have a service-life through 2040 as currently planned. Furthermore, C-130 AMP is estimated to reduce total ownership costs of the C-130H fleet by over 25 percent as compared to not modernizing the aircraft. The committee believes that if the Secretary is willing to expend at least \$3.2 billion for two new presidential aircraft to achieve a benefit of a modernized and digital cockpit for the aircrew to execute an important mission in a benign flight environment, the Secretary should apply similar logic by spending significantly less than \$3.2 billion for 179 C-130H aircraft that would provide a modernized and digital cockpit for C-130 aircrews that are required to tactically employ in more strenuous and dangerous flight conditions.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would preserve the \$1.5 billion taxpayer investment in the C-130 AMP program and would prohibit the Secretary from canceling the C-130 AMP program. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to notify the congressional defense committees at any time the combat-coded fleet of C-130H and C-130J aircraft decreases below the 300 combat-coded aircraft prescribed in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review. Finally, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Secretary of the Air Force to immediately obligate authorized appropriations pro-



vided in fiscal year 2013 and fiscal year 2014 to continue C-130 AMP.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$109.7 million, an increase of \$73.8 million, for C-130H propulsion system propeller and engine control upgrades, continued acquisition and installation of C-130 AMP kits, and no funding to begin an alternative communications, navigation, surveillance and air traffic management (CNS/ATM) system program.

*F-16 block 40/50 mission training centers*

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of F-16 block 40/50 mission training centers for the Air National Guard.

An F-16 block 40/50 mission training center (MTC) is a distributed mission operations-capable flight simulator for F-16 block 40 and 50 weapon systems. Each MTC includes high-fidelity simulator cockpits, instructor operator stations, a threat server, and briefing and debriefing capability. Each MTC is also capable of linking to geographically distributed high-fidelity combat and combat support training devices, including command and control and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems. This capability allows warfighters at home station to exercise and train at the operational and strategic levels of war as well as to conduct networked unit-level training.

The committee notes that F-16 block 40/50 MTCs are currently planned in the continental United States for Hill Air Force Base (AFB) in Utah, Shaw AFB in South Carolina, and Holloman AFB in New Mexico. The committee understands that other F-16 block 40 or 50 pilots located in the continental United States would need to travel to one of the three MTC locations, and believes that locating two additional MTCs in the Midwestern United States would save travel costs and make the F-16 block 40/50 MTC more available to Active Duty, Reserve and Air National Guard F-16 block 40 and 50 pilots, resulting in decreased travel costs and enhanced readiness.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to budget for two additional MTCs which would be located at F-16 Air National Guard units in the Midwestern United States.

*F-16 modernization*

The budget request contained \$133.1 million in PE 27133F for development of F-16 capabilities, but contained no funds for the development of the combat avionics programmed extension suite (CAPES), development of the computer modular receiver exciter (C-MoRE), or for development of the scalable agile beam radar (SABR) upgrade.

CAPES would upgrade the F-16 blocks 40, 42, 50, and 52 with a new active electronically-scanned array (AESA) radar, a new electronic warfare system, an integrated broadcast system, and a center display unit. The CAPES upgrade would increase the F-16's survivability against emerging threats. C-MoRE is a reliability improvement demonstration program for the APG-68(V1) radar of the Air National Guard's F-16 block 30 aircraft fleet that would demonstrate an electronic system upgrade while retaining the radar's

mechanically-scanned array. SABR is an F-16 radar modernization program that would replace the mechanically-scanned array with an AESA radar that would enhance F-16 mission capabilities, provide improved electronic protection, and provide a three-fold increase in radar reliability.

The committee notes that the budget request proposes the cancellation of CAPEP. While the committee is disappointed that CAPEP could not be funded, it understands that difficult choices were required due to budget reductions. The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force is reviewing future F-16 capability upgrade options for fiscal year 2016, and believes that the Department of the Air Force may have more affordable options to improve the capability of the F-16 fleet. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to consider both the C-MoRE and the SABR upgrade.

The committee further notes that the Department of the Air Force's 976-aircraft F-16 fleet is 50 percent of the Department's fighter force, and that the F-16 block 40, 42, 50, and 52 fleets are likely to remain in the Department's inventory for the next 15 to 20 years. The committee believes that capability upgrades to the F-16 fleet are vitally important to address future threats. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 16, 2015, that describes the plan for capability upgrades to the F-16 fleet including costs by year and by appropriation, risks of not upgrading the F-16 block 40, 42, 50, and 52 fleets with the CAPEP upgrade, and the effect of the cancellation of CAPEP on the Air National Guard's F-16 fleet.

#### *High-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance*

Over the past 2 years, the committee has supported the Global Hawk Block 30 high-altitude unmanned aerial system and supports the current Department of the Air Force plan to retain the Global Hawk Block 30 for the high-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) mission. The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has determined that Global Hawk operating costs have decreased while the Global Hawk Block 30 fleet has flown an increased number of hours compared to previous years in support of the combatant commanders.

While the committee was pleased that the Air Force requested funding for Global Hawk Block 30 in the budget request for fiscal year 2015, the committee is concerned with the Department of the Air Force's plan to retire the U-2 fleet in fiscal year 2016. While the committee realizes that the Department can never fully meet the ISR demand of combatant commanders, reasonable and necessary ISR requests appear very likely to go unfilled if the current high-altitude airborne ISR collection capabilities of the U-2 are terminated. The committee notes that section 143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) required the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report on all high-altitude ISR systems. The committee has not yet received this report and believes that any action to retire, or prepare to retire U-2 aircraft would be premature prior to the committee's review of the re-

port. To ensure that no actions are taken to retire or prepare to retire the U-2 aircraft in fiscal year 2015, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 to make significant changes to retire, prepare to retire, or place U-2 aircraft in storage.

The committee also notes that section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) limits the retirement of U-2 aircraft until equal or greater ISR capability is available to commanders of the combatant commands, and believes that the Department of the Air Force plan to retire the entire fleet of U-2s in fiscal year 2016 is inconsistent with this provision.

The committee supports the Department of the Air Force efforts to upgrade the Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft to meet the requirements of the combatant commanders, but notes that this will take several years beyond the planned retirement of the U-2. In light of the known gaps, the committee has concerns with any plan that will leave the combatant commanders with less overall capacity and capability than they have today.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by February 16, 2015, that would establish a phased high-altitude airborne ISR transition plan which fields capability at the same time or before the U-2 aircraft retirement, and which would result in equal or greater capability available to the commanders of the combatant commands. This plan should include the costs, schedule, and identification of fielded high-altitude ISR capability and capacity. If retirement of the U-2 would result in decreased capability or capacity for high-altitude reconnaissance, the report should also include the Department of the Air Force plans to mitigate the effects of the decreased capability or capacity.

#### *KC-10 Aerial Refueling Aircraft Force Structure*

The committee notes that the President's request for the Future Years Defense Program 2016-19 did not take into account Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) sequestration level Department of Defense spending limitations.

The committee understands that if the spending limitations in Public Law 112-25 are imposed on the Department of the Air Force beyond fiscal year 2015, then additional reductions in critical capabilities and aircraft force structure will likely be necessary in order for the Department of the Air Force to comply with its share of spending authority. The committee understands from briefings and discussions with Air Force officials that the KC-10 Stratotanker aircraft could succumb to sequestration impacts. The committee is concerned that a divestment of a high-demand, low-density aircraft such as the KC-10 could have detrimental impacts for the Department of Defense in meeting its global reach and global power objectives, as it relates to supporting the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance. The committee also notes that the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command (CUSTC) has validated that the requirement

for aerial refueling aircraft capability is 567 aircraft. The Department of the Air Force currently has only 454 aerial refueling aircraft, resulting in a deficit of 113 aircraft short of the CUSTC requirement. The Air Force is not projected to have 567 aerial refueling tankers in its inventory, assuming that no KC-10 or KC-135 are divested, prior to delivery of the 112th KC-46 tanker aircraft in the next decade.

Therefore, elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from using any funds or taking any action during fiscal year 2015 to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any KC-10 aerial refueling aircraft of the Air Force. In addition, if the President's request for fiscal year 2016 proposes to divest the KC-10 aerial refueling aircraft from the Department of the Air Force, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit to the congressional defense committees at the time of the fiscal year 2016 budget submission, an operational risk assessment and mitigation strategy that evaluates the military's ability to meet the requirements and objectives stipulated in the Department's Guidance for Employment of the Force, the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan, and all geographical combatant commander steady-state rotational and warfighting surge contingency operational planning documents.

#### *KC-46 Aerial Refueling Aircraft program*

The budget request contained \$1.6 billion for KC-46 Low-Rate Initial Production Lot 1 (LRIP 1) procurement of seven aircraft.

The committee notes that the KC-46 program has been executing to date without any requirements changes, and appreciates the requirements discipline that the Secretary of the Air Force has maintained since the beginning of the program. The committee supports the KC-46 program and the capability the aircraft will bring to the Air Force when it is eventually fielded. The committee also realizes that fiscal efficiencies can be garnered from the program at this point in time without a significant impact to program execution.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$1.4 billion, a decrease of \$226.1 million, for KC-46 LRIP 1 procurement of six aircraft to support higher priorities contained elsewhere in this Act. The committee expresses that the Secretary of the Air Force should not consider this as punitive action against the KC-46 program, and the committee expects the Secretary to maintain the same Future Years Defense Program procurement quantity of aircraft despite the one aircraft decrease in the fiscal year 2015 budget. The committee understands from discussions with Air Force program officials that a decrease of 1 aircraft in LRIP 1 will not have a significant impact to program execution and should not hinder the ability for 18 KC-46 aircraft to be delivered by the contractual required assets availability date of the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2017.

*Spare engine requirements and inventory for F-15E and F-16 aircraft*

The committee is aware that the Air Force has established a requirement for 25 additional spare engines for its F-15E and F-16 aircraft fleets, as validated by the Propulsion Requirements Study (PRS). The committee believes that, given the key role that the F-15 and F-16 aircraft will play in meeting fighter requirements until the F-35 aircraft is fielded in sufficient numbers, the extension of the F-15 and F-16 fleets will require a reliable base of spare engines. The committee is concerned, however, that while the Department of the Air Force has identified this requirement, it has not yet taken action to fulfill it. In addition, the committee understands that the F-100 production line is currently planned to terminate at the end of 2016 based on current orders.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2014, which details the Department of the Air Force's plan to address the unfulfilled requirement for F-15 and F-16 spare engines.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$677.4 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$677.4 million, full funding of the request, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 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 2015 contained \$4.7 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$4.8 billion, an increase of \$132.0 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$16.6 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of \$16.5 billion, a decrease of \$64.0 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

## Items of Special Interest

*Air Force explosive ordnance disposal unmanned systems repairs and upgrades*

The committee notes that over the past 10 years, the Department of the Air Force has invested in hundreds of unmanned systems to support critical explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) missions. The committee also notes that many of these systems are in need of repair and upgrade after being used extensively in deployed environments. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a formal acquisition program for fiscal year 2016 to properly facilitate and manage the repair, maintenance, and upgrade of the Department of the Air Force's EOD unmanned systems.

*Aircraft tug vehicles*

The committee supports the Air Force's goal to develop advanced power and energy technologies that promote energy efficiency and allow the force to meet mission objectives. To this end, the committee supports further study of the battery powered towbarless tow vehicles. The committee is aware that in a preliminary Air Force study, a battery powered towbarless tow vehicle demonstrated an ability to complete the same task as current aircraft tow vehicles using less energy while saving money and creating a safer work environment. The committee believes that if further studies confirm initial assessments of this capability, the Air Force should explore replacing additional existing aircraft tow vehicles with the new electric towbarless alternatives.

*Beyond line of sight command and control for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems*

The committee is encouraged by the advances in distribution of full motion video and the bridging of disparate radio wave forms for enhanced interoperability as part of the Joint Aerial Layered Network. The committee recognizes that the fielding of beyond line of sight command and control and associated tactical pods in support of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance will provide valuable capabilities in response to stated urgent combatant commander requirements.

Yet, the committee is concerned that a joint capability, called Tactical Airborne Communications Pod (TACPod) was developed using Air Force Quick Reaction Capability funding and processes, but is not being used across the military services. Rather than deploying the capability to meet combatant commander validated requirements, TACPod is instead being stored indefinitely. Separately, the committee is concerned that the Air Force is procuring an entirely different capability to meet essentially the same requirements that TACPod was originally developed to fulfill.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to provide a briefing to the committee by November 1, 2014, on the existing and planned activities in support of beyond line of sight com-

mand and control for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems.

*Emergency Airfield Lighting System*

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force awarded a small-business set-aside contract to develop the Emergency Airfield Light System II (EALS II), but subsequently canceled the program after a successful 2013 operational utility evaluation where only minor deficiencies were found. The committee believes that the capability of the EALS II will be a lasting requirement and is concerned that the costs associated with a new development effort for a system with comparable requirements to EALS II may have significant schedule and cost risks. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than July 30, 2014, on the decision not to proceed with EALS II production. The briefing should include the Air Force's current plan to meet requirements for emergency airfield lighting and the projected funding required through fiscal year 2019.

*Joint threat emitter procurement*

The budget request contained \$26.6 million in other procurement, Air Force, for combat training range equipment. Of this amount, \$13.5 million was requested for procurement of one joint threat emitter (JTE).

The committee is aware of the importance of maintaining the proficiency of combat aircrews and their capability to respond to, survive and defeat the most advanced enemy air defenses they could encounter on any current battlefield. The committee is also aware that the JTE is intended to provide realistic electronic warfare training that can simulate the multiple threat scenarios of a hostile integrated air defense system. In addition, while older emitters are employed at numerous training ranges, the committee notes that they mostly simulate antiquated Soviet air defense systems designed during the Cold War. The committee believes that these older legacy emitters may not be adequate to train aircrews expected to challenge the most sophisticated enemy systems, such as the SA-20, SA-23 or HQ-9 surface-to-air missile systems. Given the importance of the JTE, the committee is concerned that the Air Force Budget request only includes funding to procure one JTE in fiscal year 2015. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to evaluate options for potentially accelerating the production and fielding of JTE units and brief the committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the program by January 31, 2015.

The committee recommends \$26.6 million, the full amount requested, for combat training range equipment.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$4.2 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authoriza-

tion of \$4.4 billion, an increase of \$172.1 million, for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

#### Items of Special Interest

##### *Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system and U.S.-based coproduction*

The budget request contained \$176.0 million in PE 28866C for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

The committee has supported the Iron Dome Weapons System since the State of Israel's first request for U.S. funding in fiscal year 2011. Since the first authorization of Missile Defense Agency (MDA) funding, U.S. taxpayers have provided \$720.0 million for the program. The committee is aware that the Israeli requirement may necessitate up to \$175.0 million in addition to the \$176.0 million contained in the President's request.

The committee has received "The Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement," signed on March 5, 2014. The committee is pleased that this agreement resolves many details of U.S. coproduction of Iron Dome components and interceptors in the United States. The committee is aware that MDA and the Israeli Missile Defense Organization (IMDO) have entered into an international agreement to govern how the United States funds up to \$680 million between fiscal years 2012–15 for Iron Dome. The committee is concerned that the agreement does not cover the full amount it recommends for fiscal year 2015. Given the significant U.S. taxpayer investment in this system, the committee believes that coproduction of parts and components should be done in a manner that will maximize U.S. industry participation in interceptor and battery deliveries for Israel's defense needs. The committee recommends \$351.0 million, an increase of \$175.0 million, in PE 28866C for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

However, the committee expects that the Director, Missile Defense Agency will not obligate or expend \$175.0 million of that amount, and instead hold it in reserve and disburse it incrementally until receipt and acceptance by the MDA of sufficiently detailed cost and schedule justification from the Government of Israel. Such detailed cost and schedule justification must include:

(1) A timeline for Iron Dome expenditure of funds above the President's request for the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated or made available;

(2) Copies of signed and ratified contracts, subcontracts, and teaming arrangements between Israeli and U.S. industry for all Iron Dome coproduction efforts;

(3) Delivery to MDA of all technical data packages as accepted by U.S. industry suppliers for coproduction; and

(4) A common cost model of Iron Dome components, to be jointly developed and agreed upon by MDA and IMDO that includes: recurring and non-recurring engineering costs; estimates for future



buys and actual costs beginning with fiscal year 2013; the required quantities for all components through fiscal year 2019; and component lead-times and delivery schedules.

Additionally, the committee expects the Director, Missile Defense Agency will ensure that: Iron Dome operational data has been provided per previous commitments; this additional funding be applied to the work share percentage for fiscal year 2015 funding between U.S. and Israeli industry as proscribed under the recently signed Iron Dome Procurement Agreement; and that the additional funds are required to meet Israeli defense needs. Any funds found to be in excess of Israel's justified and documented needs during fiscal year 2015 may be transferred by the MDA to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment according to priority needs.

The committee also believes that if there is a request for Iron Dome funding for fiscal year 2016, the Director, Missile Defense Agency must establish for the committee how those funds will resolve details and agreements needed for U.S.-based coproduction of all-up-rounds and cover the export of Iron Dome technology to U.S. and Israeli allies, including coproduction of parts, components, and all-up-rounds of those exports.

The committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 1, 2014, on the information provided in the required detailed cost and schedule justification, including the views of the Director and the Under Secretary on its sufficiency.

Further, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not less than once each quarter in fiscal year 2015, starting October 1, 2014, on the progress in achieving the requirements established in "The Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement."

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations

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

### SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

#### Section 111—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Airborne Reconnaissance Low Aircraft

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds for the communications intelligence subsystem of the airborne reconnaissance low program until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the congressional defense committees on the plan to in-

tegrate such subsystem into the signals intelligence modernization plan of the Army.

Section 112—Plan on Modernization of UH–60A Aircraft of Army National Guard

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a plan to the congressional defense committees on the Army’s strategy to modernize the National Guard’s fleet of UH–60A Black Hawk helicopters.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Tomahawk Block IV Missiles

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract for up to 5 years beginning in fiscal year 2015, pending submission to Congress of the certification requirements of section 2306b, title 10, United States Code, not later than 45 days prior to entering into the multiyear procurement contract.

Section 122—Construction of San Antonio Class Amphibious Ship

This section would provide the Secretary of the Navy incremental funding authority to enter into a contract for the ship construction of a *San Antonio* class amphibious ship.

Section 123—Additional Oversight Requirements for the Undersea Mobility Acquisition Program of the United States Special Operations Command

This section would modify the current oversight requirements for the undersea mobility acquisition program of U.S. Special Operations Command, and require the Secretary of the Navy to review a transition plan for the undersea mobility capabilities developed by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command. This section would also repeal section 144 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Section 124—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Moored Training Ship Program

This section would limit the obligation to no more than 80 percent of the fiscal year 2015 shipbuilding and conversion, Navy funding for the Moored Training Ship program until certain certifications and reviews regarding requirements and cost growth are provided to the congressional defense committees.

Section 125—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Mission Modules for Littoral Combat Ship

This section would limit fiscal year 2015 funds for the procurement of additional mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship program until the Secretary of the Navy submits milestone B program goals for cost, schedule, and performance for each mission module increment, and certification by the Director of Operational

Test and Evaluation that sufficient mission modules are available to perform all necessary operational testing.

Section 126—Extension of Limitation on Availability of Funds for Littoral Combat Ship

This section would amend section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) and extend the funds limitation to include funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for fiscal year 2015. This section would therefore prohibit the expenditure of funds associated with Littoral Combat Ship 25 and 26 until the Secretary of the Navy submits a report of the Littoral Combat Ship program that was requested in section 124 of Public Law 113–66.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Prohibition on Cancellation or Modification of Avionics Modernization Program for C–130 Aircraft

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from modifying or canceling the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program in fiscal year 2015 and would also prohibit the Secretary from beginning an alternative C–130H modernization program (except for developing and installing an Automatic Dependent Surveillance Broadcast system modification for the C–130H). The committee is concerned that any alternative modernization program the Air Force would pursue would offer less capability than the program of record.

This section would also limit the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for operation and maintenance of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force to not more than 75 percent until a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary has obligated the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 2015 for the avionics modernization program of record for C–130 aircraft.

Section 132—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of A–10 Aircraft

This section would prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense to be obligated or expended to retire A–10 aircraft. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study evaluating the platforms of the Air Force used, as of the date of the study, to conduct close air support missions, and submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, which would include the cost per airframe carrying out the close air support missions, the capabilities of each platform evaluated under such study, and a determination by the Comptroller General with respect to whether such airframes other than A–10 aircraft are able to successfully carry out such close air support missions.

Section 133—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of U-2 Aircraft

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 to make significant changes to retire, prepare to retire, or place U-2 aircraft in storage.

Section 134—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment or Transfer of KC-10 Aircraft

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from using any funds or taking any action during fiscal year 2015 to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any KC-10 aerial refueling aircraft of the Air Force.

Section 135—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment of E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System Aircraft

This section would limit funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense to be obligated or expended to divest more than four E-3 airborne warning and control system aircraft, or disestablish any units of the active or reserve components associated with such aircraft, until a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees a report consisting of a certification that the Secretary is able to meet all priority requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands relating to such aircraft with a planned force of 24 such aircraft and a detailed explanation how the Secretary will meet such requirements with such planned force.

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

Section 141—Comptroller General Report on F-35 Aircraft Acquisition Program

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the F-35 acquisition program, and to submit a report not later than April 15, 2015, and each year thereafter until the F-35 acquisition program enters full rate production. Each report would include the extent to which the F-35 aircraft acquisition program is meeting cost, schedule and performance goals; the progress and results of developmental and operational testing; the progress of the procurement and manufacturing of the F-35 aircraft; and an assessment of any plans or efforts of the Secretary of Defense to improve the efficiency of the procurement and manufacturing of the F-35 aircraft.

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

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained \$63.5 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation. This represents a \$600.0 million increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends \$63.8 billion, an increase of \$257.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 research, development, test, and evaluation program are identified in division D of this Act.

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

#### Overview

The budget request contained \$6.6 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army. The committee recommends \$6.6 billion, a decrease of \$13.9 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 research, development, test, and evaluation, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

#### Items of Special Interest

##### *Active protective system*

The budget request contained \$53.7 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advance technology, which includes funding for Active Protection System (APS) research and development.

The committee is encouraged that funding for APS research and development was included in the fiscal year 2015 budget request. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee noted that a lack of investment could soon create a critical capability gap for Army combat vehicles due to the rapid proliferation of advanced anti-tank guided missiles and next-generation rocket propelled grenades. The committee notes that there are numerous types of APS available, including some that have already been fielded on operational vehicles in other countries and have performed well in recent demonstrations. It is crucial the Army keeps momentum going in this important effort; therefore, the committee encourages the Army to establish a program of record to develop, procure and equip required combat vehicles with APS as soon as feasible based on availability of funding.

The committee recommends \$53.7 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advance technology.

##### *Applied Communication Information Network*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has been conducting research on a suite of capabilities that provides real time information on vessels of interest in a riverine environ-

ment. The objective of this research, which is part of the Applied Communication Information Network (ACIN), is to integrate Government off-the-Shelf, Commercial off-the-Shelf and emerging technologies to provide integrated command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR) capabilities in a scalable, low-risk, cost-effective and user-friendly system. The committee recognizes the need for a laboratory and test-bed capabilities with proven management and systems administration to support such efforts. The committee is aware that ACIN has demonstrated expertise in this area with a track record of transitioning its research into operational use. The committee encourages continued support for the ACIN to advance fielding of critical C4ISR technologies to military users in the riverine environment.

*Combat feeding research and development*

The budget request contained \$10.9 million across several Army program elements for research and development of combat feeding technologies.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense Combat Feeding Research and Engineering Program (CFREP) is the only program within the Department of Defense that engages in research and development, to include high-risk, high payoff science and technology, for combat rations, field food service equipment and combat feeding systems to support the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Defense Logistics Agency, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The committee is aware the budget request for fiscal year 2015 reflects a significant reduction when compared to projections for fiscal year 2015 in last year's budget request. The committee is concerned that the proposed reductions could have a disproportionate impact on CFREP's ability to perform its mission. The committee understands the reduced funding level may decrease CFREP's ability to support requirements of future operating environments; develop innovative products that improve warfighter physical and cognitive performance; supply the military services with world-class products leading to an increasing dependence on industry that has no incentive to innovate due to lack of a market; contribute to reducing cost to the services over the long-term due to increasingly inefficient supply chains and reliance on commercial solutions. In developing its fiscal year 2016 budget, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to increase funding for combat feeding technology projects.

The committee recommends \$16.3 million, an increase of \$5.4 million, for Army combat feeding research and development.

*Combat identification for dismounted users*

The committee recognizes the importance of developing and deploying combat identification systems for dismounted users that utilize both radio frequency and infrared laser technologies to provide an all-weather, day-night, high-reliability individual kit to address specific anti-fratricide factors in dismounted operations. The committee is concerned that "friendly fire" incidents continue to be a source of casualties between U.S. forces, as well as partners and

allies, due to the lack of such capabilities. The committee believes such capabilities exist and have been successfully demonstrated, and encourages the Department of Defense to proceed with further testing and evaluation to determine if these capabilities can be more widely fielded.

#### *Dual mode tactical missiles*

The committee continues to recommend that the Department of Defense pursue an all-weather, moving target-capable tactical missile that could be integrated on different military platforms. While the committee understands that certain capabilities, such as a single mode seeker missile, are appropriate when prosecuting certain targets, the committee is concerned that current capabilities may have difficulties defeating other targets in a cost-efficient and precise manner, while also ensuring low collateral damage.

The committee is particularly interested in capabilities to counter high-speed, erratically maneuvering targets on land and at sea, as well as understanding how dual mode missiles could be used in counterterrorism (CT) operations. The committee notes the use of dual mode missiles, to include allied missile programs, could potentially close existing operational gaps, reduce the risk of collateral damage, and may result in cost savings relative to current Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures used as part of current direct action CT operations. The committee is aware of the recent integration and successful testing of a fully operational dual mode missile off an MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial vehicle system for the United Kingdom Ministry of Defense. The committee notes the Royal Air Force has used this dual mode missile extensively in overseas contingency operations and have reported positive feedback. Further, the committee is also aware that the Secretary of the Navy is funding an initial analysis of dual mode missile integration on the F/A-18 Super Hornet aircraft, and that initial feedback has been positive.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2015, on the capabilities of existing U.S. and allied missile programs which utilize dual mode seeker technology. The briefing should also include an assessment of the applicability of current dual-mode missiles within the Nation's counterterrorism efforts, including against high-speed, rapidly moving targets on land and sea, as well as an update of U.S. and allied efforts to integrate dual-mode missile technologies onto the MQ-9 Reaper weapon system.

#### *Electronic Warfare Advanced Technology*

The committee is aware that the budget request for research, development test, and evaluation, Army included PE 63008A, "Electronic Warfare Advanced Technology." According to the budget justification documents, this program element "matures and demonstrates software, algorithms and services that focus on tactical cyber situational awareness, autonomous network defense, cross domain security and encryption solutions." The committee believes that the title for this program element is misleading and does not adequately describe or justify the way these funds are used. The committee urges the Army to appropriately title this program ele-

ment in future budget submissions to properly identify the scope of work being conducted.

*Expeditionary communications*

The committee understands that expeditionary missions, such as non-combatant evacuation operations or humanitarian assistance, present unique communication challenges as they can often take place in austere environments where little or no communications infrastructure remains intact. Moreover, the U.S. military often has a distinct requirement to communicate with other elements of the U.S. Government, non-governmental organizations, and host nation officials, and this must be facilitated with sufficient capability to do so effectively and securely. As the Department of Defense works to improve its expeditionary communications infrastructure, the committee urges the Department to explore the availability of secure, commercial cellular wireless networks that have been successfully deployed by the Department in tactical theaters of operation.

*Fabric-based respiratory protective equipment*

The committee notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2014, evaluating the potential utility of fabric-based solutions to address soldier and civilian personnel exposure to inhaled hazards, including sand, dust, smoke, and pollutants, such as diesel exhaust and lead. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Army has failed to deliver this report to the congressional defense committees. Further, the committee understands that no substantive evaluation of potential protective technologies has taken place. The committee has been informed by the Program Executive Office-Soldier that the proper entity to evaluate fabric-based solutions is the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Research, Development, and Engineering Center (NSRDEC) in Natick, Massachusetts. The committee understands that NSRDEC has technical and scientific expertise in the areas of environmental protection, protective clothing, multi-functional textiles, materials, and fibers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than December 1, 2014, containing NSRDEC's evaluation of the capabilities of known fabric-based solutions to mitigate soldier exposure to the inhalation of sand, dust, smoke, and pollutants.

*High explosive guided mortar program*

The budget request contained no funding for the High Explosive Guided Mortar (HEGM) program. The budget request contained no funding for the XM395 Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative (APMI).

The APMI round is a precision guided 120mm mortar munition that was procured to address an operational need from forces in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). The committee notes the Army procured 5,480 APMI rounds to address the operational need, and that to date, approximately 2,328 have been fielded in OEF,



and the remaining are part of the war reserve inventory. The committee notes the Army has chosen not to transition this program to an official program of record, and that the Army does not anticipate a requirement to procure additional APMI rounds. The committee understands that based on positive feedback from OEF on APMI performance, the Army is moving forward with the HEGM program and anticipates starting the program in fiscal year 2016, with fielding beginning around 2022. Based on information provided by the Army, the committee understands HEGM would provide for increased capabilities over those demonstrated by APMI.

Given the continued constrained budget environment, the committee expects the military services to maximize research and development funding, reduce procurement costs, and when possible develop joint requirements, instead of resourcing duplicative, stand-alone programs. The committee would expect the Army to conduct a comprehensive analysis of alternatives that would include the APMI and Marine Corps precision extended range munition program before initiating a next generation precision guided mortar program.

#### *High Performance Computing Modernization program*

The committee is aware that the Army Corps of Engineers serves as executive agent for the Department of Defense High Performance Computing Modernization (HPCM) program, a responsibility that devolved from the Office of the Secretary of Defense in fiscal year 2012. The purpose of this program is to apply supercomputing resources to solve Department of Defense problems in research, development, test, and evaluation, and acquisition engineering. To meet this mission, the HPCM program must maintain state-of-the-art supercomputing resource centers, as well as software engineering talent to maintain modern and secure software applications for the user community.

The committee is also aware that the HPCM program has been operating at a level not currently supported by the level of funding requested in the President's request. The committee is concerned that the shortfall has only been mitigated by the repeated intervention of Congress to get the program to a sustainable level. The committee believes that the Department should conduct a thorough assessment of the program to ensure future budget requests are sufficient to right-size the budget to the needed infrastructure and support capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, to review the HPCM program, and to submit a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees not later than September 30, 2014. The review should examine the following:

- (1) Identify the capabilities that will be lost and the impact on Department if the HPCMP is funded at the budget request for fiscal year 2015 level throughout the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP);

- (2) Identify the resources reduced, including manpower, in order to operate at the budget request for fiscal year 2015 level throughout the FYDP; and

(3) A strategy for closing the gap between the budget requests and the fiscal year 2012 HPCMP funding level throughout the FYDP.

*Improved Turbine Engine Program*

The committee continues to support the budget request for the Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP). ITEP is a competitive acquisition that is based on current research efforts and is designed to develop a more fuel efficient and powerful engine for the current Black Hawk and Apache helicopter fleets. The committee notes the benefits of improved fuel efficiencies through lower, specific fuel consumption that ITEP brings to the battlefield. In addition, the committee encourages the Army to consider maintenance and sustainment costs for ITEP and specifically, how these calculations would drive affordability of the program.

The committee believes it is important that ITEP transition from Science and Technology to the Preliminary Design phase of Engineering and Manufacturing Development as soon as possible. Providing adequate funding for ITEP to maintain or accelerate the schedule will reduce risk and ensure continued program advancement and success. The committee encourages the Army to maintain its schedule to control development and program costs, mitigate technical risk, validate performance, and ensure the warfighter receives the best possible solution.

The committee, however, believes that the ITEP Business Case Analysis and Cost Estimate may be outdated and is concerned that it might not sufficiently factor in the total fuel savings or maintenance and logistics cost savings associated with the engine. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2014, on a path to update the study.

*Joint Air-to-Ground Missile program*

The budget request contained \$83.8 million in PE 65450A for Joint Air-to-Ground Missile (JAGM) research and development.

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

The committee has received the briefing as required in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. The committee notes the Army continues to pursue a “dual mode” seeker as part of Increment 1 of the new acquisition strategy, with a milestone B decision planned in fiscal year 2015. From this briefing, the committee also understands the JAGM program completed a successful Critical Design Review in January 2014, and the program remains on cost, schedule and performance. The committee notes there will be a full and open competition for the engineering and manufacturing development contract award. The committee acknowledges that

Army funding is constrained by the current budget environment, however, given current technology readiness levels as demonstrated during the technology development phase, the committee encourages acceleration of the Increment I program.

The committee recommends \$83.8 million, the full amount requested, in PE 65450A for continued JAGM research and development.

#### *Joint Light Tactical Vehicle*

The budget request contained \$45.7 million in PE 65812A, and \$11.5 million in PE 65812M to complete the engineering and manufacturing development phase of the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program. The budget request also contained \$164.6 million in Other Procurement, Army, and \$7.5 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for the procurement of 183 low-rate initial production JLTVs.

The Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) will complement the current fleet of Up-Armor high mobility, multi-purpose wheeled vehicles and would provide improved protection, payload, and performance to the Army's and the Marine Corps' light tactical wheeled vehicle fleets.

The committee notes the budget request would mark the first year of procurement for JLTV, and would also complete limited user testing. The committee supports the JLTV program and recognizes that the program remains on schedule despite the impacts resulting from the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25), and understands a milestone C decision is scheduled for June 2015. The committee notes that JLTV does not have any significant technology issues that would preclude development. Therefore, the committee expects the program to remain on schedule. The committee notes the JLTV program is the only new tactical wheeled vehicle modernization program for the foreseeable future, and the committee believes the JLTV program will be critical for maintaining the viability of the industrial base.

The committee recommends \$45.7 million in PE 65812A, \$11.5 million in PE 65812M, and elsewhere in this report, \$164.6 million in Other Procurement, Army, and \$7.5 million in Procurement, Marine Corps, the full amount of the total request, for the JLTV program.

#### *Lightweight segmented tactical ladders*

The committee acknowledges that improved mobility of the soldier increases safety and improves mission capability. The committee is aware that the tactical ladder is an important piece of equipment that is critical to many missions throughout the world. The committee understands that current tactical ladder systems are made from metal or fiberglass, weigh 40 pounds or more, and are often cumbersome to transport, especially on foot. The committee is also aware there may be commercially available, lightweight carbon fiber composite ladders that reduce ladder weight load to 11 pounds or less, while maintaining the strength and durability of heavier ladders. The committee also notes that current telescoping and foldout tactical ladders require a single soldier to carry the entire load, whereas a segmented ladder provides the op-

tion for weight distribution among members of a group to improve portability.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 31, 2014, on the potential benefits of lightweight segmented tactical ladders. The briefing should include an overview of the current military inventory and a review of available carbon fiber commercial ladder options that may reduce weight and provide additional flexibility to soldiers.

*Non-invasive medical diagnostic tools*

The committee recognizes the value in developing high-fidelity medical instruments to provide diagnostic analysis through non-invasive means. The committee believes that such tools lend themselves to use in austere environments like combat zones, natural and civil disasters, and settings where rapid and accurate diagnostic data must be obtained in an unsettled, often chaotic, environment where standard clinical support may be lacking. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to explore development of such non-invasive medical diagnostic tools for use in austere and highly unstable environments.

*Operational testing of High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator*

The committee believes that the High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator (HEL-MD) is of great value to the Army and to the Department of Defense's efforts to develop directed energy weapons. The committee is concerned that the Army does not have a clear plan for the future of the HEL-MD. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing on the plan for the future of the HEL-MD to the House Armed Services Committee by December 1, 2014. This plan shall include an analysis on the feasibility of operational testing of the HEL-MD, including the possibility of operational testing of the HEL-MD in international locations such as Israel.

*Rotorcraft hostile fire protection*

The committee is encouraged by the continued effort of the Army and other military services to develop a hostile fire detection and defeat system that will function in the harsh environments produced by rotorcraft operations. In the past, hostile fire detection systems for rotorcraft have been limited to acoustic-based technologies even though rotor noise, wind noise and echoing off of topography restricts the system's accuracy. The committee wants to ensure that the Army is considering advanced technologies, like radar, that will pinpoint and integrate the location of hostile fire into the aircraft's defeat systems for engagement of incoming projectiles. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 9, 2015, that details the Army's efforts to potentially implement a radar, ultraviolet and infrared based hostile fire detection and defeat system into existing rotorcraft platforms.

*Small Airborne Networking Radio program*

The budget request contained no funding for the Small Airborne Networking Radio (SANR).

The committee is aware that the Army has deferred the SANR program indefinitely while moving forward with the less ambitious Small Airborne Link-16 Terminal. The committee is concerned regarding the lack of information from the Army on the future of the SANR program and believes that full integration of the soldier radio waveform, originally intended to be provided by the SANR program, into Army airborne platforms will be essential in the future.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 1, 2014, with an update on the status of the SANR program.

*Soldier protection system and weight reduction for personnel protection equipment*

The budget request contained \$27.8 million in PE 64601A for Infantry Support Weapons. Of this amount, \$7.5 million supports the continued development of the Army's Soldier Protection System (SPS). Elsewhere in this report, the committee notes that the budget request contained \$63.1 million in Operations and Maintenance, Army for the initial procurement of SPS components.

The SPS provides a lighter weight modular, scalable integrated system of mission tailorable personnel protection equipment (PPE) while also improving the level of mobility, form, fit, and function for both male and female soldiers. The committee is aware the SPS includes subsystems such as protection for the head, eyes, extremities, torso, and other integrated sensor packages. The committee notes a milestone C decision is expected in fiscal year 2015. The committee notes the Army would field two to three brigade combat team sets per year and has programmed approximately \$575.0 million for SPS across the Future Years Defense Program. While the committee commends the Army on their SPS effort, the committee encourages the Army to provide enough funding to maintain two vendors for competitive purposes, and also encourages the accelerated fielding of SPS to all soldiers.

The committee has long championed the importance of reducing the weight of current body armor and personnel protection equipment systems, as well as stressing the critical need for robust investment in weight reduction initiatives, along with technology insertions to improve performance and survivability. The committee believes current body armor systems provide outstanding protection to the warfighter, but their weight contributes to the over-burden issue and decline in performance. The committee understands that body armor system weights have remained relatively constant over the last decade in spite of advances in materials technologies because protection levels have also increased in response to threats.

The committee commends the Army for addressing this challenge by shifting from a more discrete component level development strategy to a more systems engineering and system level approach to body armor and PPE development as a means to improve soldier

capabilities. The committee believes the Department must maintain significant investment in near-term solutions that can effectively reduce the weight of body armor, while also investing in the development of revolutionary new material technologies that could provide for significant breakthroughs in weight and performance.

The committee recommends \$7.5 million in PE 64601A for SPS, and elsewhere in this report recommends \$63.1 million for the procurement and fielding of SPS, the full amount of the budget request.

#### *Stryker Vehicle Survivability Upgrades*

The committee supports efforts to increase the protection level of Army Stryker vehicles and believes there is a need for additional innovation and competition within the program. In particular, the committee continues to support the ongoing Program Executive Officer, Ground Combat Systems, Stryker Vehicle Survivability Systems Integration Study program. The committee notes that this program has performed several integration studies reviewing the potential for incorporating occupant-centric survivability technologies onto Stryker vehicles. In addition, the committee understands that these kit-based solutions may potentially be installed during depot reset or in the field, and could enhance Stryker survivability and mobility across the fleet. The committee also notes that there are two variants of the Stryker vehicle, the Mobile Gun System (MGS) and the NBC Reconnaissance Vehicle (NBCRV), that do not have the same level of protection as “Double V” equipped variants and that may immediately benefit from Stryker upgrades explored as part of the study program. The committee encourages the Army to test and evaluate these technologies on the Stryker platform, with emphasis on the MGS and NBCRV variants that currently lack the same protection levels as other Stryker vehicles. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the committee by December 15, 2014 describing the technologies identified within the Stryker Vehicle Survivability Systems Integration Study program, as well as the outcomes of any testing of these technologies on the Stryker platform.

#### *Transparent armor technology development*

The budget request contained \$110.0 million in PE 63005A for Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology. Of this amount, \$53.7 million was requested for combat vehicle survivability research and development to include transparent armor technology.

This program element matures, integrates and demonstrates combat and tactical vehicle automotive technologies that enable a lighter, more mobile and more survivable force. The combat vehicle survivability project matures and demonstrates protection and survivability technologies such as active protection systems, advanced vehicle armors, blast mitigation and safety devices to address both traditional and asymmetric threats to ground vehicles. The committee believes this project should also consider emerging technologies in the fields of glass, polymers, and coatings to field more resilient and lightweight transparent armor.

The committee notes that improved transparent armor materials are required for improved durability and survivability of combat and tactical vehicles, as well as potentially reducing overall life-cycle and repair costs. The committee encourages the Tank Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center to engage in cooperative agreements with industry and academia in order to further the development of transparent armor material technology.

The committee recommends \$110.0 million, the full amount of the request, in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology.

#### *UH-72 Helicopter health monitoring system*

The committee is aware that the UH-72 Light Utility Helicopter (LUH) is not currently equipped with a health monitoring system. However, the committee has been informed that the commercial variant of the UH-72, the EC-145, is currently being outfitted with a Next Generation Health Monitoring System (NGHMS).

The committee understands that a NGHMS could provide total aircraft monitoring and diagnostics of mechanical and electrical systems within a lightweight distributed architecture consisting of miniature sensors that contain processing and analysis functions operating with non-proprietary data protocols in a secure cloud management infrastructure. NGHMS maintenance intelligence could provide early warning for failing systems that may reduce costly emergency maintenance, improving UH-72 maintenance schedules and fleet readiness.

Therefore, the committee encourages Army Program Executive Officer Aviation and Program Manager Utility Helicopter, to engage in a demonstration of NGHMS on the UH-72. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2015, that describes the potential for integrating and demonstrating NGHMS on the UH-72 platform. However, the committee expects that if the Army makes the decision to proceed with a program of record that it will be done using full and open competition in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations.

#### *Universal tactical controller for unmanned systems*

The budget request contained no funding for a universal tactical controller for unmanned systems.

The committee is aware that there is not presently a documented roadmap for acquiring a universal tactical controller for unmanned air and ground assets because there is neither a validated requirement, nor specific funding programmed. However, in the committee report (H. Rept. 112-479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, to conduct an advisability and feasibility study for developing a universal controller for Class I unmanned aerial systems and unmanned ground systems.

As a result of this report, the committee recognizes the Army and the Marine Corps have collaborated to experiment with the feasibility of a universal tactical robotic controller for unmanned air and ground systems at the battalion and below echelons, with the re-

sults being viewed favorably. The committee notes that a draft Army Capabilities Development Document (CDD) for the Common Robotic System–Individual (CRS–I) has been generated which includes the capability for a common tactical controller that can control both air and ground assets. The committee understands that once the CRS–I CDD is validated, funding is programmed, and the program is initiated, acquisition of such a controller would likely be achieved through full and open competition and fielded as part of the CRS–I program.

Given these findings and the military services’ growing reliance on unmanned systems for a variety of missions, the committee encourages the Army and the Marine Corps to accelerate the development of a universal common tactical controller, to generate an acquisition roadmap, and to program funding for this initiative in the fiscal year 2016 Future Years Defense Program.

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

##### Overview

The budget request contained \$16.3 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy. The committee recommends \$16.2 billion, a decrease of \$82.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy are identified in division D of this Act.

##### Items of Special Interest

###### *Amphibious Combat Vehicle increment 1.1 program*

The budget request contained \$105.7 million in PE 63611M for the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (ACV) program.

The committee understands that the Marine Corps has significantly changed its acquisition strategy for the ACV program and will now use an incremental approach to developing, procuring, and fielding a next generation family of amphibious combat vehicles. The committee notes that in the near term, the Marine Corps is planning to use the first vehicle increment, ACV increment 1.1, as an armored personnel carrier that would deliver marines from ship-to-shore by means of a connector craft, and be used for inland missions. The committee recognizes this would address an immediate near-term, urgent capability gap for improved tactical mobility and survivability for deployed Marine infantry units.

The committee notes that while the proposed schedule for ACV increment 1.1 is aggressive, the committee expects the Marine Corps to benefit from lessons learned from previous next generation assault amphibious vehicle programs that suffered from requirements creep and immature technology readiness levels that led to significant cost overruns and schedule delays. The committee understands that results from previous developmental testing conducted on vehicles participating in the former Marine Personnel Carrier (MPC) vehicle program, to include limited user demonstrations, have informed the Marine Corps that the technology for these potential vehicles is highly mature and is consistent with a stable set of requirements for this vehicle. Accordingly, the com-



mittee understands that the Marine Corps is recommending a streamlined procurement and fielding strategy for the ACV increment 1.1 vehicle. The committee supports the intent to streamline the procurement and fielding of the ACV increment 1.1 vehicle, and believes this program could potentially serve as an example for future major defense acquisition program reform. However, the committee notes that this streamlined approach to ACV increment 1.1 is contingent on mature technology and validated and stabilized requirements. The committee will continue to closely monitor this program under the auspices of the committee's ongoing comprehensive acquisition reform effort.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition), in coordination with Headquarters Marine Corps, to brief the committee not later than September 1, 2014, on the justification used to streamline the ACV increment 1.1 vehicle program, to include the documented results from the Marine Requirements Oversight Council and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council reviews, as well as the documented results from the Materiel Development Decision. The committee also directs the Assistant Secretary to brief the committee on any potential procedural and/or regulatory barriers that may prevent the Marine Corps from streamlining the ACV increment 1.1 program. Based on information already provided to the committee by the Marine Corps regarding the streamlined procurement strategy for the ACV increment 1.1 program, the committee understands additional funds would also be required in fiscal year 2015 to support a contract award in fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends \$190.8 million, an increase of \$85.1 million, in PE 63611M for the ACV Increment 1.1 vehicle program.

#### *Briefing on the Navy Laser Weapon System*

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by March 2, 2015, on the performance of the Navy Laser Weapon System (LaWS) after deployment aboard the USS *Ponce*. The committee requests the following development groups be represented at this brief: Directed Energy and Electric Weapons, Office of Naval Research; Naval Surface Warfare Center; Ship Command of the USS *Ponce* while testing LaWS; the actual operators of LaWS aboard the USS *Ponce*; and any other briefers the Secretary deems appropriate. This brief shall include: the preparation of the weapon system for deployment at sea, structural and power accommodations on the USS *Ponce*, any special training for the officers and crew, performance of LaWS from the perspective of the operators, recommendations for future pre-deployment training, and an assessment on the feasibility of near-term deployment of a directed energy ship defense system across the Navy.

#### *Marine Corps Rifle Mounted Optical Systems and Modifications*

The committee continues to support the Commandant of the Marine Corps's ongoing efforts to lighten the combat carrying load of Marines, as well as efforts to modernize individual warfighter equipment. The committee understands the Marine Corps is developing the Family of Optical Systems and Modifications (FOSAM) in

response to a universal urgent need from deployed Marines. The FOSAM is a suite of multi-functional weapon optical systems to include various thermal, image intensifier, magnified optical, laser range-finding, illuminating, and pointer functionalities that would replace multiple single-purpose systems. The committee understands the FOSAM could improve functional capability for the warfighter, lessen the weight of individual equipment items, reduce the number of equipment items requiring field maintenance, and drive down operating costs. The committee encourages the Marine Corps to execute their current acquisition strategies for FOSAM and expects any future contracts to be competitively awarded.

#### *MQ-4C Triton program*

The budget request contained \$498.0 million in PE 35220N for research and development of the MQ-4C Triton unmanned aerial system (UAS).

The committee notes that low rate initial production for the MQ-4C has been delayed one year to fiscal year 2016. The committee believes that this is a prudent delay that will allow sufficient development and testing to be completed and to minimize the risks of concurrent development and production. In addition, the committee is encouraged that the Department of the Navy has maintained stable requirements for the MQ-4C Triton. The Department of Defense's history of rushing complex systems into production before adequate testing has occurred and constantly changing requirements has resulted in excessive cost growth and unnecessary schedule delays. The committee encourages the Navy to continue with a conservative approach to the schedule and requirements for the MQ-4C in order to ensure that the program remains on a realistic path to providing the Navy with initial operational capability in 2018.

Additionally, the committee is concerned about significant delays in the research and development funding profile for development of the multi-intelligence (Multi-INT) signals intelligence (SIGINT) suite for the Triton aircraft. Sliding the development of this capability significantly elevates the risks associated with integrating SIGINT capabilities into the baseline aircraft ahead of the planned Milestone C event, the full rate production decision for the Multi-INT capability. Further, the committee is concerned about the maturity of the Triton Multi-INT concept of operations and resourcing with respect to integration of the ground station within the national and Department of the Navy processing, exploitation and dissemination enterprise.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$530.4 million, an increase of \$32.4 million, for MQ-4C baseline Triton research and development to return the development schedule of the Multi-INT Triton sensor suite back to the plan proposed by the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2014.

#### *Navy deployment of the laser weapon system*

The committee commends the Navy on its recent efforts to operationally deploy a directed energy laser weapon system. The Department of Defense has invested significant resources in directed energy weapon system research and development (R&D) with lim-

ited success at fielding an operational system. The committee recognizes the challenges posed by these R&D efforts, and understands the complexity of the issues that still need to be addressed in order to transition directed energy technology to viable weapon systems. Recent demonstrations within the directed energy community, such as the Counter-electronics High Power Advanced Missile Project (CHAMP) by the Air Force and the High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator (HEL-MD) by the Army, have shown significant progress toward addressing these issues. The committee notes that the deployment of the Laser Weapon System (LaWS) by the Navy onboard the USS *Ponce*, which will occur late in 2014, was the first deployment of a high energy laser system on a U.S. vessel in a realistic maritime environment. The committee congratulates the Navy on the achievement of this major milestone and looks forward to seeing the results of this deployment and how it will inform future decisions related to directed energy weapons.

*Navy reimbursable work for other Federal agencies*

The committee is aware that the Chief of Naval Operations recently issued guidance to Navy working capital funded entities, including the science and technology laboratories and test and evaluation centers, to cease conducting reimbursable work for other Federal agencies. The committee is concerned that such a moratorium ignores how working capital funded entities operate and the value that outside, reimbursable work can have on reducing the overall rate structure for entities like the naval warfare centers. The committee also believes that such a move could be detrimental to the overall efficiency of the Federal research and test enterprise by forcing other Federal partners to rely on contractors to provide these services, or to build additional, redundant scientific and test capabilities. For example, the Department of Homeland Security works very closely with the naval warfare centers to provide science, technology, test and evaluation capabilities for its programs, and without that support, the Department of Homeland Security would have to devote a larger percentage of its research, development, test, and evaluation budget to providing those services itself.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Chief of Naval Operations, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2015, on the rationale for the decision to cease reimbursable work for Federal agencies outside of the Navy, and an analysis of the policy impacts of this decision, including the ability to facilitate interagency work and fully utilize existing infrastructure. The briefing should also examine the anticipated effect on Navy working capital fund rates if the policy is enforced, as well as the impact if the policy is rescinded. Finally, the briefing should examine the impact on each naval warfare center, and the role of the warfare center's commanding officers in making decisions related to reimbursable work.

*Next Generation Land Attack and Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare weapon development*

The budget request contained \$32.4 million in PE 24229N for Tomahawk and Next Generation Land Attack Weapon (NGLAW)

development. The budget request also contained \$194.3 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy for procurement of 100 Tomahawk missiles, which is a decrease of 96 missiles from what had been planned for procurement in the fiscal year 2014 budget request. The budget request also proposes to terminate Tomahawk Block IV procurement beginning in fiscal year 2016. In addition, the budget request contained \$203.0 million in PE 64786N for development of Increment I and Increment II of the Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare (OASUW) weapon.

The committee is concerned by the Secretary of the Navy's recommendation to terminate procurement in 2016 of the Nation's only long-range, surface-launched land-attack cruise missile production capability prior to finalizing concept development of NGLAW, which is not planned to be operationally fielded until 2024 at the earliest. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the capability to recertify current inventory Block IV Tomahawk missiles could be put at risk if the Secretary of the Navy decides to shutter the Tomahawk Block IV production line in fiscal year 2016. The committee is also concerned that the Secretary has not clearly articulated a medium- to long-range conventional cruise missile requirements and capabilities strategy or roadmap that explains the bridge between production of current missiles to the development, production, and fielding of OASUW and NGLAW. The Secretary has also not clearly articulated how the missile requirements and capabilities differ between OASUW and NGLAW in meeting combatant commander requirements, or the reason that a separate missile is needed for OASUW and NGLAW in order to meet offensive surface-attack mission requirements. Further, the Secretary has not clearly articulated how the inventory stock of long-range cruise missiles will be replenished if the current stock of Tomahawk missiles is utilized to fulfill test, training, and warfighting requirements between 2016–24. The committee is also concerned that the Navy is well below all categories of inventory requirements and is discouraged that the Navy is only using one category of inventory requirements in stating that there is no risk by terminating Tomahawk Block IV production in fiscal year 2016.

The recommendation to shutter the Tomahawk Block IV production line is further compounded by the fact that OASUW Increment I is just beginning to transition to a program of record, and OASUW Increment II is still in the concept definition and refinement phase. The committee supports current efforts to develop an OASUW Increment I capability to fulfill the urgent operational need of the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and encourages the Secretary to aggressively pursue fielding this capability.

Therefore, the committee is skeptical of the Secretary of the Navy's decision to cease production of Tomahawk Block IV in 2016. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees in conjunction with the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2016, that articulates the following: (1) a 15-year medium to long-range land attack cruise missile strategy and roadmap; (2) known or anticipated shortfalls and capability gaps of current cruise missiles; (3) an explanation of requirement differences between OASUW and NGLAW missile capabilities; (4) a transition strategy from current

production land-attack cruise missiles to recertification of current inventory cruise missiles that discusses anticipated cost, schedule, and execution risks and issues; and (5) the cost, schedule, and execution risk associated with replenishment of current inventory cruise missiles that may be used for test, training, and operational requirements in order to maintain a sufficient inventory of cruise missiles until NGLAW is operationally fielded. The report may contain a classified annex or any other information that the Secretary desires to convey to the congressional defense committees.

The committee recommends \$32.4 million, the full amount requested, in PE 24229N for Tomahawk and Next Generation Land Attack Weapon (NGLAW) development. The committee recommends \$276.3 million, an increase of \$82.0 million, in Weapons Procurement, Navy for procurement of 196 Tomahawk missiles and to reduce risk to the Tomahawk missile industrial base. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize multi-year procurement authority for Tomahawk Block IV missiles if the Secretary of the Navy determines during deliberations of the fiscal year 2016 budget request that it is not prudent to shutter the production line at this time. The committee would support the Secretary's decision to procure the maximum amount of additional missiles to fully satisfy inventory requirements and bridge transition to Tomahawk Block IV recertification and modernization in the most cost-effective manner possible, and especially during periods of constrained fiscal resources. Finally, the committee recommends \$203.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64786N for development of Increment I and Increment II of the Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare weapon.

#### *Oceanographic research*

The budget request contained \$45.4 million in PE 62435N for the Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research program.

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

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$65.4 million, an increase of \$20.0 million, in PE 62435N for Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research, to procure the entirety of a mid-life overhaul. The committee notes that the inclusion of this authorization of appropriations is predicated on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures.

The committee continues to believe that oceanographic research is a core function of the Navy, and remains committed to ensuring the ability of the Navy to sustain its research priorities, even in the face of fiscally constrained budgets. The committee is concerned that the Navy has been decreasing funding in oceanographic research, especially sea-going research, and about the negative long-term implications these trends are likely to have on areas like anti-

submarine warfare and battlespace awareness. The committee believes that the Navy infrastructure such as the AGOR vessels, deep submergence facilities such as the Hawaii Undersea Research Laboratory, or the instrumentation investments made by the Defense University Research Instrumentation Program are vital components to the Navy's program. Navy science and technology funding also plays a key role in information stewardship, including ocean mapping, oceanographic and meteorological data, that supports Navy, national and international scientific goals.

*Precision extended range munition program*

The budget request contained \$156.6 million in PE 26623M for Marine Corps Ground Combat/Supporting Arms Systems. Of this amount, \$11.6 million was for the 120mm Precision Extended Range Munition (PERM) program.

The PERM is a GPS-guided, precision munition that consists of a propelling system, warhead, guidance system, fuze and container, and will be fired from a 120mm Rifled Towed Mortar.

Section 216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) required the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to certify to the congressional defense committees the stand-alone operational need for PERM, as well as a sufficient business case for PERM, as opposed to not using existing precision munitions in the war reserve. The committee notes this certification has not yet been provided, however, the committee has been informed by the Marine Corps, as well as the Joint Staff, that a favorable certification is imminent.

The committee is aware that the PERM program is the only 120mm extended range precision guided mortar program of record. The committee understands the PERM program is currently on schedule and a milestone C decision is currently scheduled for first quarter fiscal year 2015. The committee expects the Army and Marine Corps to continue to coordinate efforts for next generation precision guided munition programs.

The committee recommends \$11.6 million, full funding of the request, in PE 26623M for PERM development and low rate initial production.

*Submarine detection research*

The committee is concerned about the emerging threat of submarines that could potentially be deployed by adversaries in littoral areas of the United States. These platforms are expected to employ sophisticated quieting technologies to mask operations and deployment patterns. However, the committee understands that such submarines create wakes that can alter water column stresses and seafloor roughness over movable sediment beds, and that alteration of this roughness could leave a detectable non-acoustical signature that can be exploited to identify and track enemy forces in littoral zones, and also help to guide mobility operations of U.S. forces. The committee notes that recent advancements in multi-beam sonar processing technologies may allow for the near real-time detection of the small mobile roughness elements. Therefore, the committee encourages the Navy to evaluate advanced concepts

and technologies for non-acoustic submarine detection focused on littoral zone seafloor scarring.

*University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System ships*

The committee recognizes that there is a growing need for at-sea research and development platforms, especially with regard to the development and testing of new anti-submarine warfare technologies. In particular, the committee understands that there is a focus on new operational concepts that promise to improve wide area surveillance, detection, and attack capabilities against quiet adversary submarines operating in noisy and shallow water environments. A key element of this assessment process is support provided by the University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System ships and their research base to assist in anti-submarine warfare research. The committee supports continued investment in the University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System ships and would urge the Department of the Navy to continue this critical research.

*Unmanned aerial system electronic attack demonstration*

The budget request contained \$7.8 million in PE 64376M for Marine Air-Ground Task Force electronic warfare development, but included no funds for an unmanned aerial system (UAS) electronic attack demonstration.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy conducted a demonstration of an unmanned MQ-9 Reaper in a weapons and tactics instructor exercise at the Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California, in October 2013, which included 86 aircraft, over 200 aircrew members and over 3,000 ground forces in a realistic threat environment. The committee understands that the MQ-9 was configured with a prototype stand-off jamming system which was able to defeat early warning threat radars, allowing the F/A-18 and AV-8B aircraft to penetrate the simulated enemy air defenses. The committee further notes that the unmanned MQ-9 Reaper would provide over 20 hours of on-station time, which is about 15 hours longer than manned aircraft with similar capabilities, and would require less logistical support in a deployed location.

Based on the results of the October 2013 demonstration and the ability of a UAS to perform an airborne electronic warfare mission, the committee encourages the Department of the Navy to continue to pursue this capability by conducting a more sophisticated demonstration in fiscal year 2015 that would include multiple UAS electronic attack aircraft with a UAS mission package that includes electronic attack, electronic support measures and communication features.

*Unmanned Carrier-Launched Surveillance and Strike Program*

The budget request contained \$403.0 million in PE 64404N for Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) development.

The committee believes that current UCLASS Air System Segment requirements will not address the emerging anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) challenges to U.S. power projection that originally

motivated creation of the Navy Unmanned Combat Air System (N-UCAS) program during the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), and which were reaffirmed in both the 2010 QDR and 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance. In particular, the disproportionate emphasis in the requirements on unrefueled endurance to enable continuous intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) support to the Carrier Strike Group (CSG), a capability need presumably satisfied by the planned acquisition of 68 MQ-4C Tritons, would result in an aircraft with serious deficiencies in both survivability and internal weapons payload capacity and flexibility. Further, the cost limits for the aircraft are more consistent with a much less capable aircraft and will not enable the Navy to build a relevant vehicle that leverages readily available and mature technology. As planned, UCLASS appears unsupportive of the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance for the United States to “maintain its ability to project power in areas in which our access and freedom to operate are challenged.”

The committee believes that the Navy needs a long-range, survivable unmanned ISR-strike aircraft as an integral part of the carrier air wings as soon as possible. However, investing in a program today that does not adequately address the threat will only delay, and could preclude, investment in and fielding of the right system later. Therefore, the committee believes special attention needs to be paid to threshold UCLASS requirements.

Finally, the committee is concerned with multiple aspects of the proposed UCLASS acquisition strategy, including: insufficient time and funding for contractors to mature their designs in support of a full-scope Preliminary Design Review, due in part to late-developing and still-evolving air system performance requirements; the additional risk to the program associated with the Navy’s decision to abandon the precision landing system developed and successfully tested during the UCAS-D effort; and the potential risk associated with NAVAIR developing the UCLASS Mission Control System internally.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the requirements for a carrier-based unmanned aircraft system to extend the ISR and precision strike reach of the carrier air wing in A2/AD threat environments projected for 2025–2035, and to provide a report on the review to the congressional defense committees by December 30, 2014. The review should pay special attention to revised threshold requirements for unrefueled mission endurance, automated aerial refueling, refueled mission endurance, survivability, internal weapons carriage and flexibility, and autonomy/mission control system functionality. It should include mission- and campaign-level quantitative analysis of representative carrier-based unmanned air system missions in the 2025–2035 timeframe, including but not limited to ISR, precision strike, and electronic attack. It should also consider the overall composition of the future carrier air wing, including the optimal mix of manned and unmanned squadrons, for conducting representative joint ISR-strike campaigns in the 2030 timeframe. The committee also includes a provision elsewhere in this Act that would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from awarding a contract for the UCLASS air vehicle segment until the Secretary of Defense com-



pletes the requirements review and provides the report to the congressional defense committees.

*Virginia Payload Module program*

The budget request contained \$132.6 million in PE 64580N for development of the Virginia Payload Module (VPM) program.

The committee believes that undersea strike capability will be a critical capability for the U.S. military in the future, as U.S. forces begin to operate in increasingly contested environments. In addition, the committee notes that with the pending retirement of the four guided-missile nuclear submarines (SSGN), the U.S. military will lose a significant portion of its undersea strike capability. The committee believes that the VPM program is the lowest risk, lowest cost, and best path for maintaining, and eventually expanding, critical undersea strike capabilities. The committee also notes that by integrating the new strike capability into Block V Virginia-class submarines, the Navy is avoiding having to start an entirely new program that could take decades to come to fruition, whereas in contrast, the VPM program could provide this new capability to the fleet in time to partially compensate for the retirement of the SSGNs. Therefore the committee continues to support the VPM program.

The committee recommends \$132.6 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64580N for development of the VPM program.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained \$23.7 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force. The committee recommends \$23.9 billion, an increase of \$125.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

*Additive manufacturing*

The committee is aware that additive manufacturing techniques and capabilities have the potential to dramatically lower the cost of maintaining aging weapon platforms for the defense sustainment community. Currently, the Air Force uses additive manufacturing for design iteration, prototyping, tooling and fixtures, and for some noncritical parts. However, in the future, the Air Force hopes to use additive manufacturing for building actual aerospace parts. The Air Force anticipates soon using additive manufacturing for parts like fuel nozzles and heat exchangers. The committee believes that the Air Force, and the rest of the Department of Defense, can utilize additive manufacturing improvements to save money in upfront manufacturing costs; improve fleet readiness by creating on-demand alternatives to current parts supply chain; reduce parts certification and transition costs; and reduce costs with creative improved weapon systems parts that are lighter and stronger. The committee encourages the Air Force to look at creative applications

of additive manufacturing technology to reduce sustainment costs for its weapon platforms and other systems.

*Air Force tactical exploitation of national capabilities talon hate program*

The Department of the Air Force Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities (AFTENCAP) project pursues a wide range of technological and operational objectives through transition of proven national capabilities to warfighters for operational use and participation in design of future national capabilities in order to leverage them for tactical users. The committee supports the TENCAP program.

The Talon Hate program, developed under AFTENCAP, fields in fiscal year 2015 and should provide a unique multi-domain capability to counter threats in the U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) area of responsibility (AOR). The committee understands the importance of reliable, jam-proof communications between 4th and 5th generation fighters, the need to broadcast multi-source information in a Link 16 compatible format, and the need to integrate national strategic data into that communication network. While the Talon Hate program will field four developmental pods for F-15s in the USPACOM AOR, the committee is concerned that a strategic plan to address this mission has not been developed, along with an analysis of alternative technical approaches to meeting the associated warfighter requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, by February 16, 2015, on the enduring military requirements associated with the Talon Hate program, a comprehensive cost and benefit analysis of the various technical approaches to solving those requirements, and the associated strategic plan to addressing the requirements including near and mid-term recommendations.

*Air Force weapons simulation framework*

The committee is aware that the Air Force ceded ownership of weapon system models to the prime contractors in the late 1980s. At the time, the Air Force decided to treat weapons as closed systems with the developer maintaining responsibility for every element of the system, to include all simulations. Government-owned models were relinquished and the government's ability to conduct independent studies atrophied. The committee is concerned that such processes put the Air Force at a disadvantage to the commercial providers in the weapons acquisition process, and run counter to trends like open architecture, which allow the government to provide broad architectural guidance but leave execution to the contractor.

The committee is aware, though, that the Army has maintained its development of Government-owned simulation resources in support of such programs as the Joint Common Missile. This has allowed the Air Force to regrow some of its modeling and simulation capability by working closely with the Army. The committee urges

the Air Force to continue to work with the Army, and industry, to develop a conventional weapons simulation framework to lower life-cycle costs for conventional weapons and conduct benchmark tests for programs such as the Small Diameter Bomb.

*B-52 Strategic Radar Replacement program*

The budget request contained \$55.5 million in PE 11113F for B-52 squadrons, but contained no funding for the B-52 Strategic Radar Replacement (SR2) program.

The committee notes that the B-52 SR2 program is a radar replacement program that could take advantage of the advanced capabilities of modern, non-developmental radars, and maximize commonality with other platforms. In April 2011, the Air Force Requirements Oversight Council recommended replacement of the existing B-52 radar with a non-developmental radar system. However, due to Air Force budget affordability concerns stemming from compliance with the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25), the B-52 Strategic Radar Replacement program was terminated in the fiscal year 2013 budget request. In 2013, the Air Force reported to the congressional defense committees that a radar replacement is estimated to be the lower cost option rather than sustaining the current radar over the projected service life of the B-52. The committee understands the sustainment costs for the legacy radar system are predicted to significantly increase after 2017 based on obsolescence and diminishing manufacturing sources issues.

Therefore, based on the projected savings, as well as the need for common conventional capability across the B-52 aircraft fleet, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to include funding in the fiscal year 2016 budget request that would begin replacement of the B-52 legacy radar system.

*Common airborne sense and avoid*

The budget request contained \$11.8 million in PE 35220F for the design, development, integration and testing of a common airborne sense and avoid (C-ABSAA) capability for unmanned aerial vehicles.

The C-ABSAA system would provide the capability to integrate unmanned aerial vehicles into United States national airspace system and globally. The committee notes that plans for fiscal year 2015 include continuing to refine C-ABSAA requirements and continuing to mature the C-ABSAA system with the Air Force Research Lab. The committee supports this plan and encourages the Department of the Air Force to continue annual funding to support a Milestone B decision in fiscal year 2019.

The committee recommends \$11.8 million, the full amount of the budget request, in PE 35220F for C-ABSAA design, development, integration and testing.

*Cyber operations program elements*

The committee notes that the Air Force has created specific program element and procurement lines for Offensive Cyber Operations (OCO) and Defense Cyber Operations (DCO). The committee is aware that this was done to consolidate the funding activities in

these areas into single program lines to allow for rapid technology development and deployment for offensive and defensive tools. The committee commends the Air Force for being proactive in consolidating its activities, providing transparency in oversight for Congress while also allowing for rapid acquisition on the part of the Air Force. The committee believes this is a model for program management and oversight that should be emulated by the other services and Defense Agencies, to the extent that is practicable.

*E-8 Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System replacement program*

The budget request contained \$73.1 million in PE 37581F for Next Generation (NextGen) Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) research and development. NextGen JSTARS would replace the current E-8C JSTARS aircraft and provide battle management, command and control, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance for the combatant commanders. The Department of the Air Force currently plans to attain initial operational capability with four NextGen JSTARS aircraft in fiscal year 2022, and to attain full operational capability with 16 aircraft in fiscal year 2025.

The committee notes that the E-8C JSTARS aircraft has provided effective joint air command and control in both land and maritime arenas. However, current JSTARS platforms are aging and the sustainment costs have increased. The committee also notes that the budget request includes a Department of the Air Force proposal to recapitalize the JSTARS fleet with a commercially available aircraft that will decrease the logistics footprint, decrease sustainment costs, increase operational flexibility, and operate in an anti-access/area denial environment. The committee supports this decision. However, the committee notes that past intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft programs have failed due to the selection of platforms too small to properly support the necessary mission equipment and crew. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force to carefully review its requirements for the crew size, electrical power, mission systems equipment, and aircraft performance to ensure that any new JSTARS platform can provide equal or better capability than the current E-8C aircraft.

The committee also notes that the Department of the Air Force currently plans to retire the JSTARS T-3 test aircraft in fiscal year 2015 and to retire five additional E-8C aircraft in fiscal year 2016. The committee further notes that that the NextGen JSTARS program is scheduled to release a request for proposal in late fiscal year 2015 and source selection is planned to be conducted in fiscal year 2016. The committee expects that the Department of the Air Force will take no action to prematurely retire E-8C aircraft before 2016, and before the committee is fully briefed on the acquisition strategy, schedule, costs, and key performance parameters of the NextGen JSTARS aircraft program.

Finally, the committee understands that the Department of the Air Force intends to leverage high technological-readiness-level communication, sensor, battle management and command and control system technologies to reduce program cost, reduce schedule

and reduce risk of the NextGen JSTARS aircraft program. The committee is concerned that a lengthy acquisition program will result in a capabilities gap which will leave the combatant commanders without an acceptable level of ground moving target indicator and battle management command and control capability for several years. The committee notes that the JSTARS analysis of alternatives described a need for the integration of existing technology rather than the acquisition of new systems, and believes that the use of existing technology combined with a commercially available aircraft can result in a significantly faster acquisition program. Accordingly, the committee urges the Department of the Air Force to accelerate the NextGen JSTARS program.

The committee recommends \$73.1 million, the full amount requested, in PE 37581F for NextGen JSTARS research and development.

*EC-130 Compass Call aircraft replacement program*

The committee notes that the current fleet of EC-130H “Compass Call” aircraft are the Air Force’s only wide-area, airborne Command and Control Warfare/Information Operations weapon system, and that the Air Force plans to retire seven Compass Call aircraft in fiscal year 2016. In addition, the committee understands that the Air Force is conducting an analysis of alternatives (AOA) on a follow-on capability to replace the current Compass Call aircraft. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than June 1, 2015, on the status and content of the AOA.

*Ejection seat safety and reliability improvement program*

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of modernized and upgraded ejection seats for Department of the Air Force fighter and bomber aircraft.

The committee understands that aircraft aging and heavy operations tempo have produced fatigue and corrosion in legacy ejection seat designs which were designed and procured by the Department of the Air Force in the mid-1970s. The committee further understands that the incorporation of modern helmet mounted displays creates significant risk to pilot survival during high-speed ejections because aerodynamic forces at high speeds within the current ejection seat operational envelope lift the modern helmet off the pilot, generating high-neck tension loads. Data indicates that the Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System and helmet mounted displays in tactical fighter aircraft can structurally fail above 450 knots, which causes wind-stream aerodynamics on the pilot’s helmet to generate neck tension loads over 700 pounds, well above risk-of-injury thresholds to the pilot. The committee notes that the Department of Defense Military Handbook 516B (MIL-HDBK-516B) for Airworthiness Certification Criteria prescribes a requirement for less than 5 percent risk of major injury resulting from an aircraft ejection event, but that the requirement stipulated is not being met today for ejection seats in legacy fighter aircraft or fifth generation tactical aircraft. The committee understands that state-of-the-art upgraded ejection seats can effectively address these risks while at the same time providing significantly improved ease of mainte-

nance and increased aircraft availability, but the Department of the Air Force has failed to take advantage of the new and improved ejection seat technology that would greatly enhance protection of pilots in ejection seat aircraft during emergency situations. The committee notes that the high-speed ejection of a tactical fighter pilot in January 2014 resulted in a pilot fatality because of the ejection's high-neck tension load encountered during the ejection.

Subsequently, the committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to develop a strategy to begin replacing the 1970s-designed ejection seats equipped in most legacy fighter and bomber aircraft as soon as possible. The committee believes that minimizing sustainment life-cycle costs through commonality with currently-fielded components should also be included as a prime determinant in selecting an upgraded ejection seat.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the President's fiscal year 2016 budget to Congress, that articulates which Department of Defense type, model, series ejection seat equipped aircraft meet the aircrew survivability and equipment airworthiness requirements stipulated by current policy and regulation of the Department for pilots and aircrew that wear advanced helmet display equipment, night vision goggles, or both, during flying operations.

Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee establishes two budget lines in research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force account, and the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force account titled "Ejection Seat Reliability Improvement Program". The committee recommends \$10.5 million, an increase of \$10.5 million, of which \$3.5 million is for initial qualification in the research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force account, and \$7.0 million is for initial installation of upgraded ejection seats in the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force account.

#### *F-35 25mm cannon ammunition*

The committee is concerned about the Air Force's plans for evaluating and fielding 25mm cannon ammunition for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter. Specifically, the committee is concerned about the procurement of some types of 25mm ammunition, potentially at the exclusion of any alternative North American National Technology Industrial Base offerings. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than August 1, 2014, on the Air Force's plans to evaluate, test, and field 25mm cannon ammunition for the Air Force's F-35 fleet.

#### *F-35 aircraft program*

The F-35 aircraft program is the largest acquisition program within the Department of Defense, with a current planned procurement of 2,443 aircraft for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to meet fifth generation U.S. fighter requirements. The committee notes that despite the decreased budget authority contained in the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25), the Department has not decreased its planned procurement of 2,443 aircraft. The committee strongly supports the requirement for fifth generation

fighter aircraft due to projected increases in the effectiveness and quantities of threat anti-aircraft ground systems and adversary aircraft and their associated air-to-air weapons. The committee believes that without advanced fifth generation aircraft, the United States may be significantly limited in its ability to project power in the future.

The F-35 program is approximately 50 percent through its flight test program which is planned to be completed in the first quarter of fiscal year 2018. At a hearing held by the House Committee on Armed Services' Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on March 26, 2014, the F-35 program executive officer testified that the F-35 program is making slow but steady progress. The committee notes that the F-35 program executive officer has identified the software development for the final development software block, known as block 3F, as an area with some risk remaining, which could result in a 4- to 6-month delay in delivery of software block 3F. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee expressed a concern about delayed software development and recommended a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to establish an independent team consisting of subject matter experts to review the development of F-35 software and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees. This provision was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66). The committee expects this report to be submitted by June 2014, and will consider future actions based on the recommendations submitted by the independent team of subject matter experts.

#### *F-35 block 4 program*

The budget request contained \$71.8 million in PE 20714F, PE 64800N, and PE 64800M for development of the F-35 block 4.

The F-35 block 4 program is planned to provide follow-on F-35 capabilities after completion of the engineering and manufacturing development program, currently scheduled for October 2017, which would include the integration of additional U.S. and partner nation weapons into the F-35 aircraft. The block 4 program would also provide a dual-capable F-35A aircraft for the Air Force, allowing it to perform both conventional and nuclear strike missions. Currently, the dual-capable mission is performed by both F-16 and F-15E aircraft.

The committee supports the F-35 block 4 program, which is developing a streamlined approach to deliver capabilities as soon as feasible. The committee notes that the block 4 development program would be completed in two parts, a block 4A and block 4B, and further notes that the block 4B program is currently expected to achieve its initial operational capability in fiscal year 2024. The committee understands that the dual-capable F-35 aircraft would be included in block 4B, and to replace the aging F-16 fleet, the committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to accelerate the completion of block 4B with future budget requests.

*Ground Moving Target Indicator Way Ahead*

Combat Operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq have highlighted a growing demand for airborne ground moving target indicator (GMTI) sensing as well as significant phenomenologically-driven performance limitations in counter-insurgency and counter-terrorism operation environments. The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force intends to recapitalize the E-8C joint surveillance and targeting radar attack system (JSTARS) fleet on a more efficient airframe with modern radar, avionics, and communication systems, and on-board battle management and command and control (BMC2) and Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance capability. Well ahead of the initial operating capability (IOC) of any replacement platform, the Department of the Air Force intends to reduce the E-8C fleet by nearly one third, by reducing the E-8C JSTARS fleet from 16 to 11 aircraft, and to begin incrementally reducing associated E-8C JSTARS manpower.

At the same time, the committee notes that the Department of the Air Force continues to test and field Global Hawk Block 40 aircraft with the multi-platform radar technology insertion program (MP-RTIP) MTI radar, eventually fielding 11 high-altitude, long endurance aircraft. The committee also notes that the Department of the Air Force development efforts relating to the vehicle dismount and exploitation radar (VADER) transitioned to the Army with no apparent plan to field a capability on Department of the Air Force remotely piloted aircraft (RPA).

The committee is concerned that the volume and pace of change in the GMTI development and fielding may be indicative of a lack of precision in the underlying requirement set. Clearly, the need to recapitalize the current JSTARS aircraft is urgent, and the committee believes a rapid acquisition to achieve the required BMC2 and ISR capabilities is necessary. While the JSTARS recapitalization platform is planned to achieve far better performance in the areas of higher altitudes, superior sensing, increased operational availability and speed, the number of platforms to be fielded is identical to that of the current JSTARS fleet. However, the requirement for the number of JSTARS was established long before 11 long-endurance high altitude GMTI platforms were developed. Also, limitations in GMTI performance against dismounts that led to the development of the VADER have not been fully addressed as part of the JSTARS recapitalization plan.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by February 16, 2015, that captures the aggregate requirement for GMTI capability and capacity for the Department of Defense. The report should detail the current validated requirements for GMTI capabilities and capacities. Requirements should be expressed in terms of sensor fidelity using metrics such as ground radar coverage area, revisit rate, minimum detection velocity, target locating error, radar imaging, hours on-station per mission per month per year, sorties per month and per year, and anticipated targets types and density. The report should also highlight the degree to which the current Air Force plan, in-



cluding the near-term reductions in JSTARS capacity and the end-state aggregate of 27 MTI aircraft compare to the underlying requirements.

*Metals Affordability Initiative*

The budget request contained \$32.2 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapons systems. Of this amount, \$5.4 million is estimated for the Metals Affordability Initiative (MAI).

The committee notes that the MAI is a public-private partnership that includes the entire domestic specialty aerospace metals industrial manufacturing base. Air Force participation with MAI has resulted in significant improvement in the manufacture of specialty metals for aerospace applications, including aluminum, beryllium, nickel-based superalloys and titanium. Due to the widespread use and need for the Department of Defense, the committee encourages the Air Force to engage with the other military departments and agencies to ensure they are able to leverage MAI for their specific needs. In addition, the committee encourages the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy to examine the MAI partnership model to determine if it might be integrated into the work of the Lightweight and Modern Metals Manufacturing Innovation Institute in the advanced manufacturing initiative.

The committee recommends \$42.2 million, an increase of \$10.0 million, in PE 63112F for the MAI program.

*Nuclear command and control for enduring tanker aircraft*

As the Air Force recapitalizes its tanker fleet, the committee believes it is important that nuclear command and control requirements for tankers be revalidated and a long-term plan be developed to fulfill any unmet requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to review, and if appropriate update, the requirements contained in Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 6811.01C related to nuclear command, control, and communications for tanker aircraft. The committee further directs the Chairman to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015, on the results of this review.

Additionally, in the event that, subsequent to the Chairman's update, there are any unmet requirements contained in the updated 6811.01C for enduring tanker aircraft, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a plan to the congressional defense committees by November 1, 2015, to ensure that enduring tanker aircraft meet all requirements contained in CJCSI 6811.01C, as updated, related to nuclear command, control, and communications. The plan should include a schedule for updating all enduring tanker aircraft to meet any unmet requirements as well as associated costs and program details for such a plan.

*Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization program*

The budget request contained \$11.0 million in PE 41319F for the Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization (PAR) program.

The committee understands that the Air Force plans to develop the PAR acquisition strategy, complete milestone B documentation, continue market research, and develop the Systems Requirements Document in fiscal year 2014 and throughout fiscal year 2015. The committee is also concerned that the Air Force is planning to circumvent section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, regarding the requirement to complete a Preliminary Design Review prior to commencement of milestone B and contract award for the aircraft selection. As well, the Systems Requirements Review will not occur until at least 6 months after the aircraft selection. The committee also understands that the Secretary of the Air Force may attempt to assume the roles and responsibilities of PAR product support manager, system and subsystems integrator, and engineering systems and technical authority, which is a departure from past and current practices for those functions regarding presidential support aircraft. The committee believes this may increase risk to product development and execution of life-cycle sustainment activities of the PAR program.

Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to complete a Preliminary Design Review for the PAR program prior to the Milestone Decision Authority awarding a milestone B and contract approval for the PAR program. Further, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to comprehensively reassess the risk in assuming the aforementioned product support and integration management responsibilities, that have otherwise been the responsibility of the Original Equipment Manufacturer, for presidential support airlift aircraft.

The committee recommends \$11.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 41319F for the PAR program.

#### *Wide area surveillance*

The budget request contained \$20.6 million in PE 35206F for development of airborne reconnaissance systems, but contained no funding for development of wide area surveillance.

The committee notes that persistent day and night wide-area motion imagery (WAMI) capability is flying in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and is considered by operational commanders to be a critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance program for combat units.

The committee also notes that Congress provided an increase of \$10.0 million in fiscal year 2014 to begin integration of a near-vertical direction finding capability into an existing WAMI-equipped MQ-9 unmanned aerial system, which is resulting in a multi-intelligence capability. The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force plans to fund a WAMI system in fiscal year 2016 to begin a program of record. The committee is concerned that without funding in fiscal year 2015 to continue development of the multi-intelligence capable wide-area surveillance system, engineering teams will be reduced or disbanded, technical support to deployed systems will be impacted, and program improvement efforts will be reduced or terminated. The committee further notes that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force included an

increase of \$10.0 million for a WAMI sensor program among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2015.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$30.6 million, an increase of \$10.0 million, in PE 35206F for further development of WAMI.

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

##### Overview

The budget request contained \$16.8 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends \$17.0 billion, an increase of \$223.3 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

##### Items of Special Interest

###### *Analysis of Alternatives for Undersea Clandestine Insertion of Special Operations Forces*

The committee is aware of a recently completed Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) for Undersea Clandestine Insertion of Special Operations Forces and that the review provides alternatives for continued operational capability as well as future growth for Navy Sea, Air, Land undersea insertion capabilities. The committee understands that this AOA included representatives from U.S. Special Operations Command, the Department of the Navy (Program Executive Officer, Submarines), and the Joint Staff and was coordinated by a study director from the RAND Corporation, a Federally Funded Research and Development Center. The committee understands that the final publication of the AOA was to be made available to the congressional defense committees in March 2014.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a copy of the Analysis of Alternatives report in its entirety and a briefing on the report to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2014. The report and briefing should be presented to the committees in unclassified and classified formats as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

###### *Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Segment*

The budget request includes \$1.004 billion for the Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment in PE 63882C for activities in research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide.

The committee observes that while this is an increase for this program element, also referred to as the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) segment, in the fiscal year 2015 budget request when compared to the fiscal year 2014 request, that this year's request also includes two new Missile Defense Agency (MDA) activities, "Improved Homeland Defense Interceptors" and "Discrimination Improvements for Homeland Defense", not found in the prior year's request. Thus, the basic GMD program funding has been cut in the proposed budget request for fiscal year 2015.

The request supports the MDA's top management focus areas: Capability Enhancement (CE) 2 Enhanced Kill Vehicle (EKV) return to intercept activities; interceptor reliability enhancements; sustainment of the weapons system; return to Ground-based Interceptor (GBI) deliveries; Missile Field 1 refurbishment. The committee is concerned that as the only operationally-deployed system for defense of the United States against growing intercontinental ballistic missile threats, additional investments are required to ensure GMD provides reliable capability with long-term sustainment and modernization of the Nation's most strategic defensive weapon system. The committee observes this system is approaching half of its life, 10 of 20 years, and additional funding may be required to conduct a robust reliability growth and testing program, and perform a modernization and technology refresh program.

The committee is aware that following two successive test failures of the CE-2 EKV (FTG-06 in January 2010 and FTG-06a in December 2010), MDA completed a successful non-intercept test on January 26, 2013. The next step for the CE-2 Return to Flight will be an intercept test scheduled for June of 2014. The committee is also aware that an attempted intercept test of the CE-1 EKV on July 5, 2013, which represents two-thirds of the operationally deployed GBI fleet but had not been tested since 2008, failed. The committee eagerly awaits the results of the Failure Review Board.

The committee recommends \$1.044 billion, an increase of \$40.0 million, in PE 63882C for the Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment in research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide. The committee expects these additional funds to begin to correct the short-fall present in the fiscal year 2015 budget request for the reliability, refresh and modernization of the GMD system, including to upgrade the Capability Enhancement-2 kill vehicle software and batteries, the Command Launch Equipment Ground Fire Control architecture that was begun in fiscal year 2014, and stockpile reliability efforts.

#### *Bioforensic threat detection*

The committee is aware that detecting, deterring, and defeating biological and physical agents used by terrorists is of critical importance to national security. The committee is aware that bioforensic detection capabilities can be helpful by identifying molecular markers in human cells following exposure to threat agents, and using suitable biomarkers for subsequent detection using field deployable equipment. Such methods can be used to rapidly identify and understand human individuals; drug plant sourcing; plant-based geographic locations; and the distribution routes of terrorist agents. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to develop combined government, academic, and industrial partnerships to field small, deployable, and rapid bioforensic analysis capabilities for Department operational forces.

#### *Biosecurity in Department of Defense research facilities*

The committee is concerned about the potential threat posed to the United States by biological weapons. The threat of a biological attack may come from a number of sources, including state, non-state and even lone actors, as was believed to be the case in the

2001 Anthrax attacks. The Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on October 11, 2013, that examined the state of U.S. efforts for biodefense. During that hearing, the panel of independent expert witnesses was critical of the biosafety and biosecurity procedures in medical research facilities, identifying a lapse of proper screening and consistent procedures as a potential risk with respect to lone actor threats. While the committee notes that the biological agents stored in medical research facilities are not the only source of weaponizable materials, the committee believes the Department of Defense should take all precautions possible to mitigate the risk of bioterrorism.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than September 30, 2014, on biosecurity procedures within Department of Defense biological research facilities which handle or store Category A, B, or C priority pathogens. The briefing should include a discussion of personnel screening procedures, security procedures, and the means for training personnel on safety and security procedures. The briefing should also highlight any inconsistencies or variability in procedures across the facilities.

*Capabilities to experimentally study militarily-relevant High Reynolds Numbers*

In Department of Defense Directive 4180.01, issued on April 16, 2014, the Department provides policy and guidance on energy planning, use, and management, and establishes an energy policy to “enhance military capability, improve energy security, and mitigate costs in its use and management of energy.” One of the means to achieve these ends will include “improv[ing] the energy performance of weapons systems, platforms, equipment, and products, and their modifications.”

The committee notes that mitigating turbulent boundary layer drag, which forms along the surfaces of all aircraft and marine platforms and produces a shear force that opposes the motion of the vehicle, is central to the goals of reducing fuel consumption and optimizing performance of military platforms, such as ships, submarines, and transport and fighter aircraft. Despite the critical and pervasive impact of these so-called “High Reynolds Number” turbulent boundary layers, the committee is concerned that only limited domestic capability exists to experimentally study them, though such studies are critical to developing and applying advanced computational techniques and empirical models to enhance the energy efficiency and performance of military platforms.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee on the Department’s technical capabilities to experimentally study military relevant High Reynolds Number turbulent boundary layers and any gaps in the capability to carry out such studies by February 1, 2015.

*Chemical Biological Defense Program threat priorities*

The committee is aware of significant efforts within the Chemical Biological Defense Program (CBDP) to develop medical counter-

measures to protect U.S. troops from chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) threats. The committee notes that the development of a drug or vaccine to treat or protect against a given threat in many cases will take up to a decade from the time of conception through the Food and Drug Administration approval process to be available for use. However, the committee recognizes that the CBRN threat space is constantly evolving in terms of the type and severity of threats U.S. troops are likely to encounter at any point in time. The committee is concerned about the mismatch in these timescales, and therefore directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2014, on the approved process for establishing and validating the priorities for the threats for medical countermeasures research and development. The briefing should include a list of the current threats, and the frequency with which the priority list is updated.

*Combat helmet test and evaluation protocols*

The committee recognizes the National Academies, at the request of Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E), has completed a study that reviewed current DOT&E test protocols for combat helmets.

The committee understands the study undertaken by the National Academies evaluated the adequacy of the Army's Combat Helmet test protocol for both first article testing and lot acceptance testing, including its use of the metrics of probability of no penetration and the upper tolerance limit used to evaluate backface deformation. The study also evaluated the adequacy of the current helmet testing procedures to determine the level of protection provided by current helmet performance specifications. The committee notes there appears to be a lack of biomedical connection between either brain injury and performance metrics or penetration and backface deformation, and no scientific basis for the choice of backface deformation thresholds.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to establish a research program to develop helmet test metrics that have a clear scientific link to the modes of human injury from ballistic impact, blast, and blunt trauma. The committee recommends the Secretary of Defense ensure that appropriate threats, in particular fragmentation threats, from current and emerging threat profiles are used in combat helmet testing. The committee also expects DOT&E to consider the findings and recommendations in the National Academies study and make a determination as to whether a new or modified first article test protocol for combat helmets is required.

*Combatant commands and science and technology Communities of Interest*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense engages in a science and technology (S&T) planning process known as Reliance 21, which was established to coordinate and reduce unwarranted duplication in service and agency S&T efforts. The technical groups known as Communities of Interest (COI) are the heart of the Reliance 21 process, and they cover 17 technical areas. The

committee recognizes that the COIs represent a key mechanism to assess programs, share information, and, when needed, to develop long-term roadmaps for key technology thrusts. However, the committee does not believe that all of the combatant commands are included in this COI process. Since most combatant commands have scientific advisers, and some have funds and authorities to carry out S&T programs, it appears to be an oversight for them not to be integrated into relevant COIs. The committee urges the Department to actively engage with combatant commands, such as Transportation Command and Cyber Command, in the S&T COIs to ensure their perspectives are included in current and future roadmapping and assessment activities.

#### *Combating Terrorism and Technology Support Office*

The budget request included \$69.7 million in PE 63122DZ8 for the Combating Terrorism and Technology Support Office (CTTSO).

The committee notes CTTSO's unique contributions in supporting the warfighter with the rapid acquisition of counterterrorism and irregular warfare technologies and capabilities. The committee supports CTTSO's unique business model that rapidly identifies and prioritizes Department of Defense requirements and conducts timely research, development, testing, and evaluation projects. The committee recognizes the important role CTTSO continues to play now and in the future given evolving threats from terrorism and irregular warfare challenges.

The committee recommends \$89.7 million, an increase of \$20 million, in 63122DZ8 for the Combating Terrorism and Technology Support Office.

#### *Conference restrictions for scientists and engineers*

The committee is aware that one of the areas where the Department of Defense has been trying to reduce its costs has been in conference travel. With recent advances in collaboration tools, video teleconferencing, and telepresence, such travel can be reasonably scaled back in some areas with little negative impact on the workforce.

However, the committee is concerned that blanket restrictions on conference travel are having an acute negative impact on the science and engineering workforce. The committee recognizes that such conferences are not just professional enrichment for this sector of the workforce, but are vital and mission-essential tools of the trade. For example, scientists and engineers use national and international sponsors of professional scientific societies to peer review their work, get exposed to the most recent advances in the international academic community, and better understand the technological advances of allies and adversaries alike. In addition, for many scientists and engineers, participation in these professional societies is essential for professional development in order to attain fellowships and recognition within their respective fields of endeavor. The committee is aware of anecdotal examples of these travel restrictions, coupled with furloughs and pay freezes, contributing to some members of the workforce leaving public service.

The committee applauds the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics for recognizing the problem and

issuing a memo on February 14, 2014, to clarify the guidance for technical and industry conferences. The committee urges the Under Secretary to continue to highlight this issue within the Department and to find appropriate mechanisms for tracking compliance with this guidance, and find additional means to support travel for the science and engineering workforce to attend technical conferences.

*Coordination of efforts for advanced manufacturing of medical countermeasures*

The committee is aware of multiple efforts in biological defense within several Government departments and agencies, in particular in the area of medical countermeasures (MCM). The Chemical Biological Defense Program (CBDP) within the Department of Defense has begun construction on an advanced manufacturing center for MCM in order to address the unique needs of the Department of Defense for medical countermeasures. However, the committee is also aware that the Department of Health and Human Services has also made significant investments in constructing its own centers for advanced manufacturing. In general, these centers will be focused on addressing the requirements of the Department of Health and Human Services for MCM.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities on October 11, 2013, the principal investigator for the Texas A&M Center for Innovation in Advanced Development and Manufacturing, one of the Department of Health and Human Services centers, testified that those centers were fully capable of meeting all Department of Defense requirements for MCM advanced manufacturing. This has raised questions regarding the need for the Department of Defense to fund what appears to be a duplicative effort. The committee notes that while there are differences in the capabilities between the Department of Defense and Department of Health and Human Services centers, there is also a significant amount of overlap.

The committee is aware that coordination on research and development of MCM is performed through the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise (PHEMCE), in which the Department of Defense is an active participant. These coordination efforts are laudable. However, the committee is aware that the PHEMCE is not directly managing the advanced manufacturing process and will instead rely on a separate governance board. In light of these facts, the committee is concerned that, although the Department of Defense center for advanced manufacturing is already designed and construction has begun, the ability to coordinate with and leverage the efforts of other Government agencies for advanced manufacturing does not yet appear to be fully established, and therefore, the possibility of inefficiency and unnecessary redundancy within the Department of Defense is still significant.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 30, 2014, on the status of the coordination process for the advanced manufacturing of medical countermeasures between the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services. This briefing should include the following:



(1) Details of the Department of Defense's role on the governance board which oversees the advanced manufacturing process, including frequency of meetings, level of interaction, etc.

(2) The degree to which the Department of Defense is able to utilize the Department of Health and Human Services advanced manufacturing centers, including a discussion of time and cost savings.

(3) Any application of best practices, lessons learned, etc. from past coordination efforts with the PHEMCE with respect to the current coordination efforts for advanced manufacturing.

(4) Any obstacles to the coordination process, including any issues which may prohibit or impede the Department of Defense's ability to utilize the Department of Health and Human Services advanced manufacturing centers.

#### *Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Spectrum Challenge*

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) conducted a competition in 2013 and 2014 to develop advanced radio techniques capable of communicating in congested and contested electromagnetic environments without direct coordination or spectrum preplanning. This DARPA Spectrum Challenge entailed head-to-head competitions between multiple industry and academic teams, including an opposing red team, in a structured testbed environment that required teams to compete against one another, as well as work cooperatively. The winning teams won prizes totaling \$150,000, and provided valuable insight for the Department of Defense into possible technical solutions for remedying the future spectrum crunch.

The committee applauds the creativity of DARPA in using its prize authority to explore novel techniques for addressing spectrum-sharing problems. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee is aware that spectrum is a vital national security resource which must be actively managed to ensure effective and efficient use that balances competing demands between the services, other Federal agencies, and the private sector. The committee sees this sort of competition as a useful tool to address broader national challenges related to spectrum. The committee encourages the Department of Defense, as well as other Federal agencies, to creatively use such prize and challenge authorities to find innovative solutions to growing problems like spectrum efficiency and sharing.

#### *Development of antibiotics against biotreats*

The committee is aware that Category A and B bacterial pathogens pose a significant risk to national security because they can be easily disseminated, result in high mortality rates, and require special action for public health preparedness. In addition to the Category A and B pathogens, the committee understands that there is a critical need for antibiotics against other highly resistant bacteria which also may pose a threat to the health and security of the Nation. These issues reinforce the committee's concern about the full spectrum of bacterial infectious diseases that pose significant threats to our military. The Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), together with the Chemical Biological Defense Program (CBDP), have the mission to safeguard the United States and its allies from chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and high-yield

explosive (CBRNE) weapons of mass destruction by providing capabilities to reduce, eliminate, and counter the threat and mitigate effects. The committee recognizes that there are ongoing efforts within DTRA and the CBDP to develop antibiotics to combat these pathogens. However, the committee is also aware that the current austere fiscal climate will require these organizations to make difficult decisions regarding funding and priorities for a number of efforts, which may result in funding cuts for important research and development. Given the threat posed by these Category A and B bacterial pathogens, the committee encourages DTRA and the CBDP to continue research on the development of antibiotics to combat these pathogens.

*Development of innovative detection and threat identification technologies*

The committee remains concerned about credible threats posed by state and non-state actors in their attempts to acquire and weaponize chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high-yield explosive (CBRNE) weapons of mass destruction (WMD) for use against the United States and its allies. The committee is aware that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) continues to develop and field technologies that reduce, counter, and eliminate the threat of CBRNE WMD. The committee is also aware that as part of these efforts, DTRA continues to invest in small lightweight, person-portable detection equipment to detect CBRNE materials. The committee recognizes the importance of this equipment as enabling a wide range of operations within CBRNE environments, and therefore encourages DTRA to continue the development, demonstration and deployment of innovative and emerging detection and threat identification technologies that are useful across the widest-spectrum of CBRNE threats. In addition, the committee directs the Director of DTRA to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2014, on their efforts to advance and make operational a light-weight, person-portable CBRNE detection and analysis device.

*Electronic warfare roadmap*

The committee recognizes the importance of electronic warfare (EW) technologies, both for irregular warfare challenges such as defeating improvised explosive devices, as well as for peer competitors where anti-access and area denial threats are paramount. As the technologies for electronic warfare, signals intelligence, and cyber operations increasingly converge, the committee believes that it will be important to prioritize and coordinate science and technological investments to maintain technological superiority. The committee commends service research labs and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency for making important EW technology investments, and recognizes the critical role that the Department of Defense's Reliance 21 Communities of Interest (COI) play in identifying the critical technologies that will be key for the United States to maintain its global advantage in EW operations out to 2025. The committee understands that the EW COI is working on an electronic warfare roadmap, and looks forward to seeing that document

to better understand where the Department will be making key investments across the Future Years Defense Plan.

*Expeditionary airfield technology*

The committee understands that Expeditionary Airfields (EAF) are used by all the military services to support forward deployed air operations, and that EAFs have the capability to support all types of aircraft from all the military services in full spectrum operations. The committee understands the military services may require new EAF technology, an investment that could be critical to enhancing forward deployed military readiness in an expeditionary environment. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 15, 2015, on the following:

- (1) The need for expeditionary airfields in the ongoing threat environment;
- (2) The capacity of existing EAF technology to support additional air assets;
- (3) The efficacy of expeditionary airfields in mobilization and demobilization in theater; and
- (4) The status of development of new matting technology that can support additional weight and accommodate increased thermal load and engine blast from vertical lift aircraft.

*Field-programmable gate arrays for defense*

The committee recognizes the importance of utilizing field-programmable gated arrays (FPGAs) for defense application in order to allow for greater flexibility in the processing power of some defense applications. The committee is aware, though, that such capability can also introduce vulnerabilities into defense systems, and the Department of Defense is challenged to find means to mitigate those potential vulnerabilities and ensure a high level of trust for this class of microcircuits. Further, the committee notes that the prevalence of foreign FPGA providers makes trusted sourcing for these microcircuits an additional security challenge that the Department must address.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to conduct an analysis of the Department's strategy for utilizing FPGAs and to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2015 on the results of the analysis. The briefing should address the following issues:

- (1) How FPGAs fit into both Department's microelectronics strategy, especially with regard to their use in both new and legacy systems;
- (2) How trust and security vulnerability can be mitigated by the Trusted Defense Systems strategy;
- (3) Any special budgeting, manpower, manufacturing or acquisition issues that may need to be addressed by the use and integration of FPGAs; and
- (4) Recommendations for how to increase utilization of FPGAs, and if necessary, production capacity.

*Future vertical lift*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to submit a report to the congressional defense committees providing the status of the Department’s engagement with the Vertical Lift Consortium on related technology requirements and development strategies for next-generation vertical lift aircraft.

The committee notes that the required report was delivered to the congressional defense committees on May 13, 2013. The committee recognizes incremental improvements or upgrades to current Department rotorcraft will not fully meet future joint service operational requirements. The committee supports the development of future vertical lift aircraft and encourages the Department to expand the prototyping program to include vertical lift aircraft. The committee also understands that a key aspect of this program is the Joint Multi-Role (JMR) Aircraft Demonstrator. The program includes related research on next-generation rotors, drive trains, engines, sensors, and survivability. The committee encourages the Department to provide additional funding for this program in the fiscal year 2016 budget request.

*Guidance on utilizing non-profit research institutes*

The committee recognizes that independent, non-profit research institutions provide value to the research and development portfolios of the Department of Defense. The committee believes that non-profit research institutions have unique capabilities, experience, and infrastructure that are well suited to technology maturation, risk reduction, and transition to programs of record.

As noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee is aware the Department is examining ways to better utilize the unique capabilities and expertise of non-profit research institutions, especially in the area of transitioning innovation to commercialization. Furthermore, the committee understands that the Department has been evaluating how to better utilize the special authorities within the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations in order to better leverage the capabilities of the non-profit research community. The committee is concerned that the Department has not clearly articulated that policy to the broader research and acquisition community to inform them of how they might best leverage those capabilities, and the special contracting authorities that might be used.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to issue updated policy guidance related to the use of non-profit research institutions that clarifies their role in the research ecosystem, as well as the special provisions within the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations that support their use. Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary to submit the updated policy guidance to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by March 1, 2015.

*Health of the research and development enterprise*

The committee remains concerned about the long-term health of the Department of Defense research and development enterprise. There are currently 67 Department laboratories across 22 states, 10 federally funded research and development centers (FFRDCs), and 13 university affiliated research centers, as well as a workforce of 60,000 employees, of which approximately 36,400 are degreed scientists and engineers. The committee recognizes the pivotal role these facilities and people play in maintaining the technological edge of the Department of Defense and providing the necessary tools for the warfighter. The committee is concerned that the declining state of much of the Department of Defense lab infrastructure, especially compared to academic, industrial, and international counterparts, can also serve to dispel many of the technology workforce that the Department would most like to attract.

The committee is determined to ensure that Department research and development capabilities remain robust in order to assure a vibrant and agile research and development enterprise. The committee is concerned that declining budgets and increasing threats are placing pressures on the Department that may lead it to make short-term decisions with long-term ramifications. The committee is unsure if the Department is striking the appropriate balance between near- and long-term objectives, which may negatively affect the overall health of the research and development enterprise.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to task the Defense Science Board to conduct an assessment of the organization, missions, authorities, and health of the defense research and development enterprise, and to submit a report on the findings of the assessment to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2015. The assessment should include the following:

(1) How well do the defense laboratories respond to the needs of the Department?

(2) What mechanisms exist to refurbish and recapitalize Department of Defense labs, and how do those mechanisms compare with other Government, academic, international and industrial counterparts?

(3) How well does the Department attract, recruit, retain, and train its workforce to remain technically current and flexible to respond to emerging national requirements?

(4) Does the appropriate balance exist in each service between service control and laboratory director discretion so as to maximize laboratory mission effectiveness?

*High-efficiency, conventional missile propulsion*

The committee notes that munitions to support contingency plans in the various combatant command areas of responsibility may require long-range munitions to ensure adequate penetration of anti-access, area-denial environments. The committee is aware that technology for high-efficiency, conventional missile propulsion subsystems necessary for such strike requirements is limited and may require further research and development. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to adequately resource efforts to mature high-efficiency conventional missile propul-

sion subsystems, and directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by August 1, 2014 on current research and development efforts in this area.

#### *Hypersonics research*

The committee recognizes that hypersonics technology represents an important game-changing technology for the Department of Defense. The committee is aware that the Army successfully tested its Advanced Hypersonic Weapon in 2011 and plans additional tests this year. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and the Air Force have cooperated on several hypersonics programs that have advanced the state of knowledge on materials and flight dynamics for such high-speed vehicles. Additionally, the committee understands that DARPA and the Air Force are beginning a new program to develop a high-speed strike weapon that will combine the characteristics of hypersonic flight with precision guidance to test a tactical weapon system. The committee believes that as such technology progresses, the Department will need to examine its test infrastructure to determine if additional investments and upgrades will be necessary.

The committee encourages the Department to continue to pursue advanced hypersonic technology to improve strike and reconnaissance capabilities, especially for denied areas. The committee believes that such investments are necessary to keep pace with foreign actors investing in similar capabilities, and should also examine methods for defending against hypersonic weapons as part of a balanced portfolio. The committee encourages the Department to closely monitor international hypersonics development efforts, as well as opportunities for cooperation with foreign allies. The committee applauds efforts such as the Hypersonic International Flight Research Experimentation program, which was a joint United States-Australian initiative to advance hypersonics technology, and utilized shared testing facilities like the Woomera Range in South Australia.

#### *Internet access on Kwajalein Atoll*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense maintains a significant presence on Kwajalein Atoll, including contractors and families, to support Department of Defense activities there. Further, the committee understands that data access for those families is limited to low-bandwidth phone modems, which can negatively impact the welfare of personnel and their families stationed at a remote location, where electronic communications are useful in maintaining personal and family relationships.

Furthermore, the committee notes that the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) maintains high-bandwidth network connections to the Atoll, which were designed with additional capacity to allow for future expansions. The committee is also aware of instances in the past when DISA has provided additional networking capacity for morale, welfare and recreation applications through base exchanges. The committee believes that DISA could provide such capacity to families on the Atoll with minimal effort and cost. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Defense Information

Systems Agency to submit a plan to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by March 15, 2015, on providing internet access to families on Kwajalein Atoll.

*Leveraging commercial technology for directed energy*

The committee is aware of recent advances amongst the military services to field directed energy weapons, including the upcoming deployment of the Laser Weapon System onboard the USS *Ponce* by the Navy, as well as the recent testing of the High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator by the Army at White Sands Missile Range. The committee congratulates the services on this progress. The committee is also aware that the laser systems used in both of these cases are commercial off-the-shelf industrial lasers which were purchased and modified by each service to be suitable for their respective military application. In many cases, these lasers do not provide enough power to achieve mission objectives, and there are several research and development efforts underway to develop laser systems which will be capable of fulfilling all mission requirements. However, the committee recognizes that there are many critical system engineering and integration problems that may be solved using these lower power systems in the interim, which will reduce both the time and cost associated with the deployment of directed energy systems. Therefore the committee encourages the Department of Defense agencies which are working to develop directed energy weapons to continue to examine the industrial base for technologies which may be utilized for these systems, and to leverage such technologies whenever possible.

*Military service coordination and transition efforts for the chemical biological defense program*

The Chemical Biological Defense Program (CBDP) has the primary responsibility to develop technologies to protect U.S. troops from the threats posed by Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear and Explosive (CBRNE) Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). The committee believes that frequent open communication between the CBBDP and the military services is critical during all phases of the research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) process for developing these technologies. Such communication is necessary to ensure not only that the warfighter requirements are being properly addressed in the early planning phases of the RDT&E process, but that the technology is transitioned to the military services on an adequate timescale to ensure the safety and protection of U.S. troops. Therefore, the committee encourages the CBBDP to continue to improve its communication with the military services during all phases of the RDT&E process.

In addition, the committee remains concerned about the level of protection currently available to U.S. troops who are at risk of being exposed to CBRNE WMD, in particular with regards to mission-oriented protective posture (MOPP) gear. The committee is concerned that in many cases the equipment available to the military units may be outdated or inadequate to address current requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed

Services by November 30, 2014, on the coordination between the military services and the CBDP. The briefing should include details on the process by which the CBDP solicits and incorporates input from the military services into its planning and prioritization of RDT&E efforts, as well as the current plans and efforts to transition the resultant technology, including MOPP gear for CBRNE environments to the military services.

*Minority science and technology programs*

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has been working for many years to strengthen its role with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Minority Serving Institutions (MIs), which not only support a broad range of research, but also creates a diverse pool of talented scientists and engineers that can support academic, industrial, and federal research needs. The committee also commends the Department for expanding partnerships with non-profit organizations (NPO) that have a history of providing scholarship, mentoring, and career advancement support to minorities pursuing science and technology careers consistent with Department mission and needs. The committee applauds the former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering for issuing guidance in December 2011 to reinvigorate the Department's relationship with HBCU/MIs. In particular, this memo reiterated that "[t]hese institutions offer a talented science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce that can benefit the research and educational efforts of the DoD and the nation." This memo focused on four areas of focus for action, including information collection to:

(1) Develop and maintain statistics on HBCU/MI success rates in response to competitive funding opportunities under broad agency announcements and other solicitations;

(2) Ensure that HBCU/MIs are made of aware of the opportunity for participation in all Department of Defense sponsored activities that invite participation of institutions of higher education;

(3) Encourage the use of Inter-governmental Personnel Act agreements or other personnel-detail mechanisms with HBCU/MIs;

(4) Ensure that emphasis is placed on recruiting and selecting HBCU/MI faculty to serve on Department of Defense STEM scholarship, fellowship, and research review panels and HBCU/MI students are informed of and encouraged to apply to STEM scholarship, fellowship, and internship programs.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by December 15, 2014 on the measures and metrics used by the Department to better understand how the Department is fulfilling the guidance from the December 2011 memo. In addition to demonstrating the Department's progress against the four goals above, this briefing should also examine what minority science and technology workforce, professional development, and technical assistance programs exist that could benefit from increased participation with HBCU/MIs, as well as what non-profit organizations exist that have a history of assisting minorities and HBCU/minority-serving institutions in expanding their participation in Department of Defense programs, including the leveraging



of both Defense and NPO scholarship funds to achieve these purposes.

*Multi-aircraft control of unmanned aerial vehicles*

The committee is aware of the enabling effects of employing large quantities of unmanned aerial vehicles on the battlefield. However, the availability of pilots, and the costs associated with training and employing pilots, has in some cases limited the ability of the Department of Defense to mass and capitalize on these capabilities.

Therefore the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report by February 15, 2015 detailing the Department of Defense's plans to operationally test and deploy multi-aircraft control technology. This report shall include a breakdown of the efforts of each of the services along with the Department of Defense's plan to integrate those efforts between the services in order to minimize inefficiencies. The report shall also address advanced technology development and experimentation as well as the potential manpower savings of multi-aircraft control.

*Multi-mission airborne radio frequency systems for unmanned aerial systems*

The committee is aware that unmanned aerial systems (UAS) are increasingly important in intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) missions. The committee also notes that while the use of multiple-input multiple-output systems is ubiquitous in commercial and some Department of Defense applications, it is largely absent in various Department of Defense airborne systems due to technological and operational challenges. The committee is aware that there is ongoing development of airborne radio frequency (RF) systems that could potentially improve the operation of airborne platforms, provide more robust anti-jamming capability, enable and enhance information collection and sensing of the operating environment, and incur minimum RF footprint to ensure a low probability of interception.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to leverage existing research and development to develop advanced, multi-mission, multi-antenna RF systems for UAS that will significantly enhance ISR capabilities in tactical networks resulting in improved mission success.

*National Defense Education Program*

The budget request contained \$45.5 million in PE 61120D8Z for the National Defense Education Program (NDEP) for the purposes of attracting, engaging, and developing current and future generations of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) talent to benefit the Department of Defense. Of this amount, no funds were requested for pre-kindergarten-to-12th grade (PK-12) STEM outreach programs.

The committee cannot stress enough that the recruitment, retention and development of an experienced, technical workforce is a critical national security requirement for the Department of Defense and that these efforts must start at the earliest stages of the STEM pipeline. The committee also stresses that growth in STEM

fields is important for the general economic health and competitiveness of the nation, but due to the special security requirements of Department of Defense employees, this need is especially acute.

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

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

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

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

The committee recommends \$55.5 million, an increase of \$10.0 million, in PE 61120D8Z for the National Defense Education Program. Of these funds, the committee recommends \$45.5 million, the requested amount for the SMART; and \$10.0 million for PK-12 STEM outreach programs, an increase of \$10.0 million. Of the funds requested for PK-12, the committee recommends the Department use some of the funds to carry out STEM activities that will support school districts with high concentrations of military dependent families. Such activities should include a focus on increasing teacher effectiveness as well as student achievement. The committee also believes that such outreach activities should look at opportunities to support the development of a cyber focused skill sets.

#### *Neuroplasticity research partnerships*

The committee is aware of advancements in neuroplasticity research made by university and non-governmental rehabilitation hospitals that have collaborated to maximize what can be learned regarding the brain's ability to develop and recover when it has become damaged. The committee encourages the Department of Defense's medical research and development organizations to establish research programs with university systems and non-governmental rehabilitation hospitals that have partnered in order to develop rapid and innovative outcomes in the treatment of service members with traumatic brain injury that may lead to efficiencies in restoring brain recovery and neurological function.

#### *Optics and photonics for defense applications*

The committee is aware of and recognizes the unique roles optics and photonics play in our Nation's security, including everything from information technology and communications to medicine and advanced manufacturing. The committee understands the United States has been the world pioneer in transitioning optics and photonics research to national security applications. Department of Defense contributions have been pivotal in laying the foundation of those capabilities, from early investments in lasers to the development of medical free electronic lasers for military photomedicine applications.

The committee also understands that increased competition has put America's leadership position at risk. Further, the committee is aware that the administration is attempting to address some of these competitiveness issues by creating a number of advanced manufacturing centers, and has expressed the intent in the fiscal year 2015 budget request to fund three to five additional centers.

The committee recognizes that the National Academy of Sciences report, "Optics and Photonics: Essential Technologies for Our Nation," emphasizes these findings. For example, among its other findings, it noted:

(1) The federal government should develop an integrated initiative in photonics that seeks to bring together academic, industrial, and government researchers, managers, and policy makers to develop a more integrated approach to managing industrial and government photonics research and development spending and related investments;

(2) "The U.S. government, and specifically the Department of Defense, should strive toward harmonizing optics with silicon-based electronics to provide a new, readily accessible and usable, integrated electronics and optics platform";

(3) The U.S. defense and intelligence agencies should fund the development of optical technologies to support future optical systems capable of wide-area surveillance, exquisite long-range object identification, high-bandwidth free-space laser communication, "speed-of-light" laser strike, and defense against both missile seekers and ballistic missiles; and

(4) "The United States should aggressively develop additive manufacturing technology and implementation."

Recognizing these imperatives, the committee encourages the Department to consider the establishment of a National Center for Optics and Photonics within its manufacturing mandate. The committee believes that doing so would allow the Department to create new opportunities for innovation, which will benefit the Department on multiple fronts. Specifically, the committee is interested in technological and manufacturing advances that a National Center for Optics and Photonics could make in critical defense applications such as advanced lasers, advanced optical materials, data storage, communication technologies, and sensors.

#### *Prosthesis research*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has made significant investments in research for next generation prostheses, particularly for upper and lower extremities. With operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan winding down and current fiscal constraints on the defense budget, the committee is concerned that the Department will begin to move away from this area of research in favor of new topics for a new security environment, leaving a void in this area. The committee notes that while medical advances have dramatically increased the survival rates of the warfighter, it has also dramatically increased the number of wounded warriors requiring intense, long-term therapeutic care. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue pushing the technical bounds of regenerative medicine and prostheses, including the development and refinement of new modalities for

control of neurological implants, in order to maintain its commitment to the care and welfare of the wounded warrior community and their families.

*Redesigned Kill Vehicle for Homeland Missile Defense*

The budget request contained \$1.0 billion in PE 63882C for the Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment. Of this amount, \$99.5 million was requested for Improved Homeland Defense (HLD) Interceptors development, which the committee will refer to as the Redesigned Kill Vehicle.

The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency's (MDA) fiscal year 2015 budget overview documents state that the budget request supports the initiation of the "redesign of the Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle (EKV) for GMD [Ground-based Midcourse Defense]. The redesigned EKV will be built with a modular, open architecture and designed with common interfaces and standards, making upgrades easier and broadening our vendor and supplier base. The redesigned EKV will increase performance to address the evolving threat; improve reliability, availability, maintainability, testability and producibility; and increase in-flight communications to improve usage of off-board sensors information and situational awareness to combatant commanders for enabling new tactics such as shoot-assess-shoot." The committee expects the redesign will also maintain the capability for the future modernization path for the common kill vehicle phase II efforts that should achieve the long-sought "volume kill" capability.

The committee has long believed that a new kill vehicle is required for the homeland missile defense system, mindful of the termination of one such modernization program in 2009, the Multiple Kill Vehicle. For example, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) directed the Director, MDA to develop a long-term plan for the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle. And, again, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) directed a plan, and authorized funding, for the development of an upgraded, enhanced exo-atmospheric kill vehicle for the GMD system that, "is capable of being deployed during fiscal year 2018." The committee expects the Director to proceed with the development, test, acquisition, and deployment of the redesigned kill vehicle as directed in that Act.

The committee recommends \$99.5 million, the full amount of the budget request, in PE 63882C for the Redesigned Kill Vehicle.

*Space weather events research*

The committee notes the value of the advice to the Department of Defense, including the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy, for the pursuit of space weather research and is aware of space weather impacts to the electric power grid, global satellite communications, global positioning system positioning and timing, space situational awareness, and potential loss or degradation of these capabilities. The committee is aware of the importance of observations and research of space weather phenomena to monitor and predict potential damage to the U.S. military and to protect national technological infrastructure. The committee is also aware that insufficient coordination and sharing

among the agencies could lead to duplication of effort and less effective allocation of limited resources for this critical research. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense coordinate with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Science Foundation to provide necessary observations and support for research that will lead to reliable forecasts of significant space weather events.

*Special Operations developmental efforts for Tactical Assault Light Operator Suit*

The budget request included \$10.0 million in PE 1160402BB, Special Operations Technology Development, and \$7.5 million in PE 1160402BB, Special Operations Special Technology, to support ongoing developmental efforts for the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) Tactical Assault Light Operator Suit (TALOS), designed to improve operator survivability in direct action or kinetic environments.

The committee notes that more than \$4.5 million of fiscal year 2013 and fiscal year 2014 Major Force Program–11 funding has been put towards TALOS efforts thus far. The committee also notes that despite aggressive marketing efforts by USSOCOM, TALOS is not a program of record, but rather “an overarching vision” that provides “a coordinating focus for many of USSOCOM’s science and technology efforts spanning multiple capability areas.” The committee understands that present efforts are being used to survey current technologies and to better inform future requirements documents, and that USSOCOM intends to deliver a fully functional prototype assault suit by August 2018.

The committee is concerned that these requirements are not being properly coordinated with related or complementary efforts at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Command. While USSOCOM is the proper authority to define Special Operations Forces peculiar requirements, it may not be the appropriate entity to lead such developmental technology efforts, like TALOS. While the committee understands that Natick Soldier Systems Command is currently developing and partially funding one of the two Generation I prototypes for USSOCOM, the committee is concerned that USSOCOM is also funding outside private sector research, and that overall efforts lack proper coordination and oversight, systems integration and collaboration, and prototype evaluation.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2014, on the TALOS project and similar efforts to include: (1) the overall TALOS requirement for U.S. Special Operations Forces, including requirements validation; (2) a list of funded activities for fiscal years 2013–14, as well as planned activities for fiscal year 2015 and beyond, including efforts through DARPA, Natick Soldier Systems Command, the other military services, the Rapid Innovation Fund, and industry; (3) coordination efforts undertaken with USSOCOM, DARPA, Natick Soldier Systems Command and other similar ongoing research and development activities; (4) project timelines including the development of prototypes and anticipated funding; (5)

any other developmental efforts underway that could satisfy USSOCOM TALOS-like requirements, and (6) any other items the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

*Special Operations Forces Survival, Support, and Equipment Systems Program Management Office*

The committee is aware of the research and development (R&D) contributions of the Special Operations Forces Survival, Support and Equipment Systems (SOF–SSES) Program Management Office. These R&D efforts focus on improving personal protective and individual support equipment as well as life support and tactical combat casualty care for the warfighter within the U.S. Special Operations Forces. The committee recognizes the importance of these efforts for the sustainment of the readiness and superiority of the Special Operations Forces (SOF), as well as for the continued successful completion of SOF missions. The committee encourages the U.S. Special Operations Command to continue to maintain the appropriate level of funding in order to sustain these important efforts within the SOF–SSES Program Management Office.

*Technologies to improve spectrum efficiency*

The committee is aware that spectrum is a vital national security resource which must be actively managed to ensure effective and efficient use that balances competing demands between the military services, other Federal agencies and the private sector. In the committee report accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (H. Rept. 110–652), the committee noted its concern over the availability of spectrum for defense applications and the increasing scarcity imposed by additional spectrum auctions and competition with commercial wireless providers. For this reason, the committee is pleased that the Department of Defense has recently issued an Electromagnetic Spectrum Strategy to provide more strategic guidance to shape the future of the Department’s spectrum operations. As noted in the new strategy, “[the Department of Defense] must act now to ensure access to the congested and contested electromagnetic environment of the future. Specifically, the Department must adapt how it acquires and uses spectrum resources. Our approach must include acquiring more efficient, flexible, and adaptable systems while developing more agile and opportunistic spectrum operations to ensure that our forces can complete their missions.”

The committee is also aware that this strategy is the first step in a longer process to develop a roadmap and action plan to inform future actions and resourcing. In addition, the committee believes that the Department needs to identify opportunities where it should focus research and development efforts to address any technological gaps, or where additional testing for commercial technologies may be needed to integrate into defense systems.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2015, on the status of the associated Spectrum Roadmap and Action Plan, as well as a science and technology roadmap for technologies that are needed to improve spectrum efficiency.

*Three-dimensional integrated circuits*

The committee is aware that the changing market dynamics of the microelectronics industry have led the Department of Defense from being a market driver to a market follower. Except in some highly advanced sectors requiring especially high levels of trust, the Department will most likely be highly dependent on outside market forces to supply its microelectronics needs. For example, newly emerging technology like three-dimensional (3D) integrated circuits (IC) are an important technology that the Department will need to understand and monitor in the future. Such complex, multi-layer chips will provide new useful functionality, but also make detection of supply chain vulnerabilities more difficult to detect than traditional ICs.

In a report provided to the committee, the Department indicated that there was a highly competitive supplier network and sufficient domestic capacity for 3D ICs, but that there were also “impressive capabilities for 3D ICs being developed and implemented overseas . . . largely through the support of foreign government investments.” The report also stated that, “While there does not appear to be an immediate need for creating any new domestic 3D IC manufacturing capabilities for defense applications, making better use of the existing domestic capability could be very beneficial for maintaining DOD [Department of Defense] technology leadership and to avoid surprises from potential adversaries.” The committee urges the Department to closely monitor developments with 3D ICs, not only to leverage rapidly evolving commercial capabilities for its own uses, but also to understand how potential adversaries use these technologies.

*U.S.-Israel missile defense cooperation*

The budget request contained \$96.8 million in PE 63913C for Israeli Cooperative Programs in missile defense for fiscal year 2015. Of this amount, \$10.7 million was requested for the Israeli Arrow program, \$54.4 million for the Israeli Upper Tier program (also known as Arrow III), and \$31.7 million for the Israeli Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense program (also known as David’s Sling Weapons System (DSWS)).

The committee supports these cooperative programs and is pleased with the record of success seen over the past year. For example, on January 3, 2014, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and the Israeli Missile Defense Organization (IMDO) successfully completed a flight test of the Arrow 3 Interceptor missile over the Mediterranean Sea. This test was an important step towards fielding an additional layer of defense, with exo-atmospheric capability, against ballistic missile threats to the State of Israel. Additionally, on November 20, 2013, MDA and IMDO successfully conducted an intercept test using the DSWS. This second intercept test of DSWS continues to prove out the lower-tier capability Israel and the United States have cooperatively developed for the defense of Israel.

The committee continues to support these cooperative programs being mindful of the January 29, 2014, Annual Threat Assessment testimony of the Director of National Intelligence before the Senate

Select Committee on Intelligence that, “Iran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East.”

The committee is also mindful of section 8070 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76), which noted that of the \$149.7 million provided for the DSWS, \$15.0 million was provided for production of its interceptors in the United States and in Israel. Given the significant ongoing U.S. taxpayer investment, the committee supports co-production of these programs, and the committee expects to be regularly updated on the implementation of these appropriated funds.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee addresses the Iron Dome system.

The committee recommends \$268.8 million, an increase of \$172.0 million, in PE 63913C for Israeli Cooperative Programs.

#### *Vaccine research for equine encephalitis*

The committee is aware that equine encephalitis is a serious health hazard with potentially fatal consequences that is prevalent in North, Central and South America, as well as the Caribbean. Because equine encephalitis is naturally occurring, but has also been investigated as a potential biological weapon, the Department of Defense is developing a vaccine for equine encephalitis that remains in Investigational New Drug Status. The committee also notes that while equine encephalitis is a high priority for the development of medical countermeasures for the Department of Defense, it has not been a priority for the Department of Health and Human Services due to the relatively small number of occurrences within the continental United States. The committee acknowledges that such an investigational new drug might have application for the civilian population, but the process for making a determination to use these vaccines in cases of civilian emergency is not well defined.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2014, on the coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services through the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise (PHEMCE). This briefing should discuss the mechanisms by which medical countermeasures, which are developed by the Department of Defense could be made available to the civilian population should the need arise, with emphasis on vaccines that may only exist in the Department of Defense stockpile. The briefing should also include any obstacles to employing such a process.

#### *Validation of near-term counter-electronics capability*

The committee is aware that the Air Force and the Department of Defense completed a Joint Concept Technology Demonstration (JCTD) for a high-powered microwave cruise missile in 2012. The Counter-electronics High power microwave Missile Project (CHAMP) JCTD demonstrated a multi-shot and multi-pulse high power microwave warhead integrated into an existing cruise missile which is capable of delivering low-collateral damage attacks against electronic systems in facilities. The committee understands



that such systems still require development to provide capabilities in a small form-factor and in a reusable platform, as well as additional modeling and simulation to better characterize effects and battle damage assessment.

Furthermore, the committee is aware that the Air Force is conducting an analysis of alternatives to determine if there is a need to develop a program of record for an enduring capability that would refine the technology demonstrated during the CHAMP JCTD, or look at other technologies to provide non-kinetic counter-electronic effects. As noted in Section 267 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), CHAMP (or a variant thereof) “should be considered among the options for a possible materiel solution in response to any near-term joint urgent operational need, joint emerging operational need, or combatant command integrated priority for a non-kinetic counter-electronic system.”

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the combatant commanders, to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by February 15, 2015 on the need for a near-term counter-electronics capability. This briefing should examine the combatant command integrated priority lists for each of the geographic and functional combatant commands to determine if there is an urgent or emerging need for CHAMP or a similar system that should be addressed within the next two to three years. If such needs exist, the briefing should also include a determination of whether or not a joint urgent operational need statement, or a joint emerging operational need statement, will be submitted by the affected combatant commands.

#### *Vapor compression cooling systems technology*

The committee notes that the majority of Department of Defense electronic systems intended for field use in harsh environments use thermoelectric cooling technology and that this method of cooling is often required in Department of Defense requests for proposals. The committee also notes that vapor compression electronic cooling technology may provide cooling systems that are smaller, more energy efficient, cost effective and reliable than the legacy systems.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 1, 2015, addressing where vapor compression thermal management systems may best be used in remote or mobile applications to cool electronics. The report should include, at a minimum, the process used to identify specific programs where these thermal management systems could be appropriate and examples of programs using deployed electronics that have effectively used vapor compression thermal management systems.

## OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

## Overview

The budget request contained \$167.7 million for operational test and evaluation, Defense. The committee recommends \$172.7 million, an increase of \$5.0 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2015 operational test and evaluation, Defense program are identified in division D of this Act.

## Items of Special Interest

*Information Assurance and Interoperability Program*

The committee is aware that the Director for Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) is responsible for the Information Assurance (IA) and Interoperability Program (IOP), which provides assessments of services and combatant command systems, networks, and procedures during training and exercise venues. The committee believes cyber-range capabilities which are beginning to be used in such assessments may also be employed to assess the cybersecurity and interoperability of acquisition systems during development and prior to fielding. The committee further believes that for many acquisition programs, having low-cost access to cyber-range environments that can replicate the characteristics of systems and their operational network could provide a safe and repeatable means to conduct more rigorous IA/IOP testing during development than is currently being done.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to work closely with major program offices, cyber ranges, and the DOT&E to identify such environments and develop opportunities to conduct early IA/IOP testing of those systems during development. The committee believes that earlier and closer cooperation can go a long way to better position programs for successful IA/IOP performance in operational tests and in the field.

*Program reporting and metrics on penetration testing*

The committee is aware that programs with significant software components often conduct a variety of red teaming and penetration testing to determine if there are cyber vulnerabilities that might be exploited by sophisticated adversaries. The committee is also aware that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Director for Operational Test and Evaluation are revising policies to ensure that such testing becomes a mandatory best practice. However, the committee is also aware that no mechanism exists to provide periodic follow-up to revisit testing to determine if the program has made any effort at remediation. The committee encourages the Department of Defense's acquisition and cyber authorities to develop some sort of report card for programs to track their progress when it comes to penetration testing and remediation to ensure security requirements are not being ignored or given short shrift when the pressures of budget, schedule, and performance come into conflict. The committee believes that such

measures could be incorporated into existing reporting requirements, such as the Selected Acquisition Reports.

## 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—Preliminary Design Review of Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization Program

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to complete a preliminary design review of the Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization program prior to receiving a milestone B approval from the Milestone Decision Authority.

#### Section 212—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle Program

This section would limit obligation or expenditure of funds to not more than 80 percent for the Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV) program until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the congressional defense committees on the Army's plan to eventually replace all M-113 Armored Personal Carriers (APC) within Echelons-Above-Brigade (EAB) formations.

The committee notes that in 2007, the Army identified the M-113 APC for replacement due to its inadequate survivability and force protection. The committee further notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 112-78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and in the committee report (H. Rept. 112-479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee provided numerous options for consideration by the Army to accelerate the AMPV program. The committee understands that the Army has released a Request for Proposal for the Echelons-Below-Brigade (EBB) requirement which is focused on survivability shortfalls within the Armor Brigade Combat Team. The committee continues to support the AMPV program and expects the Army to conduct the competition in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations.

However, the committee is concerned that although the Army's current plan addresses a critical shortfall within EBB formations, there is currently no plan to address the survivability shortfalls within Echelons-Above-Brigade formations. The committee understands that there are approximately 2,000 M-113's within existing EAB formations.

In addition, the committee notes that on at least one occasion, an Armor Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) deployed to the Republic of Iraq with Stryker Medical Evacuation Vehicles. Therefore, this sec-

tion would also require the Secretary of the Army to include as part of the report, an assessment for the feasibility of incorporating medical wheeled variants within the ABCT.

**Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike System**

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from awarding a contract for the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) system air vehicle segment until the Secretary of Defense completes a UCLASS requirements review and provides the results of that review to the congressional defense committees.

**Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Airborne Reconnaissance Systems**

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds to not more than 25 percent for the imaging and targeting support of airborne reconnaissance systems, until the Secretary of the Air Force delivers a report to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate. The elements of the report would include a detailed plan regarding using such funds for fiscal year 2015, and a strategic plan for the funding of advanced airborne reconnaissance technologies supporting manned and unmanned systems.

The committee notes that the Air Force did not provide substantive information for the proposed use of these funds, aside from the general area of imaging and targeting support.

**Section 215—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Weather Satellite Follow-On System**

This section would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to place the last remaining satellite of the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) on the launch manifest for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program. Additionally, this section would direct the Secretary to establish an additional launch, for acquisition in fiscal year 2015, under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program using full and open competition among certified providers. The Secretary would have the flexibility to determine the appropriate satellite launch to be competed.

This section would also limit 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the weather satellite follow-on system until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees the plan to meet the meteorological and oceanographic collection requirements validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. The plan must include how the Secretary will launch and use existing assets of the DMSP; how the Secretary will use other sources of data, such as civil, commercial satellite weather data, and international partnerships, to meet such requirements; an explanation of the relevant costs and schedule; and the requirements of the weather satellite follow-on system.

#### Section 216—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Space-Based Infrared Systems Space Data Exploitation

This section would limit obligation or expenditure of funds to not more than 50 percent for the data exploitation under the Space-Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS) space modernization initiative, which funds modernization and evolution of technologies to meet the SBIRS mission, until the Secretary of the Air Force delivers a certification to the congressional defense committees. The Secretary would be required to certify that the limited funds available for this effort will be used in support of data exploitation of the current SBIRS program of record, including the scanning and staring sensor; or that the data from the current SBIRS program of record, including the scanning and staring sensor, is being fully exploited and no further efforts are warranted.

The committee is concerned that the Air Force is not focusing on developing the capabilities to fully exploit the data from the existing SBIRS program. During the fiscal year 2014 budget request hearing for national security space activities, the Commander of Air Force Space Command was asked about SBIRS exploitation and responded that, “We have not even scratched the surface, I think, of the potential that’s there. We have another sensor that we haven’t fully exploited yet as part of that satellite. We’re doing a good job on the scanning sensor. The staring sensor, which has much better fidelity, we really haven’t fully wrung out yet, because we’ve been so focused on getting the scanning sensor calibrated and certified.” The committee supports the Commander of the Air Force Space Command’s stated comments, and encourages the Air Force to focus on achieving full performance and exploitation of SBIRS.

#### Section 217—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Hosted Payload and Wide Field of View Testbed of the Space-Based Infrared Systems

This section would limit 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for hosted payloads and wide field of view testbed alternative approaches to the Space-Based Infrared Systems program of record until completion of the ongoing analysis of alternatives (AOA). The funding would also be limited until 60 days following a briefing to the congressional defense committees and congressional intelligence committees on the AOA findings and recommendations of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, including a cost evaluation of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation. The limitation would not apply to efforts to examine and develop technology insertion opportunities for the program of record.

#### Section 218—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Protected Tactical Demonstration and Protected Military Satellite Communications Testbed of the Advanced Extremely High Frequency Program

This section would limit 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for protected tactical demonstration and protected military satellite communications testbed alternative approaches to the Advanced Extremely High Frequency program of

record until completion of the ongoing analysis of alternatives (AOA). The funding would also be limited until 60 days following a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the AOA findings and recommendations of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, including a cost evaluation of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation. The limitation would not apply to efforts to examine and develop technology insertion opportunities for the program of record.

#### SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

##### Section 221—Revision to the Service Requirement under the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Education Program

This section would amend subparagraph (B) of section 2192a(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by modifying the service obligation requirement to also include employment with a public or private sector entity or organization outside the Department of Defense if the Secretary of Defense determines that employment of the person with such entity or organization for the purpose of such obligated service would provide a benefit to the Department of Defense.

##### Section 222—Revision of Requirement for Acquisition Programs to Maintain Defense Research Facility Records

This section would modify the requirements of subsection (b) of section 2364 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the need for acquisition programs to maintain a record of all issue papers from a defense research facility related to said acquisition programs.

##### Section 223—Modification to Cost-sharing Requirement for Pilot Program to Include Technology Protection Features during Research and Development of Certain Defense Systems

This section would amend Section 243(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by striking “at least one half of the cost of such activities” and inserting “an appropriate share of the cost of such activities, as determined by the Secretary”.

### TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

#### OVERVIEW

While the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–67) and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) made notable progress in restoring critical levels of military readiness to more acceptable levels, challenges to full-spectrum readiness remain in fiscal year 2015. Department of Defense officials have highlighted persistent shortfalls in almost every area of operation and maintenance, the main funding component for force readiness, stating that, “despite progress in buying back lost readiness, current resources force a compromise of

future and non-deployed readiness to support today's forward operations. This has led to increased risk in the military departments' ability to meet new requirements or additional rotations that are beyond the scope of their currently planned training and deployment requirements."

To continue reducing risk and improving the readiness of the force, the bill would authorize additional budget authority for multiple unfunded priorities of the military departments, to include the restoration of funding for operational tempo, flying hour programs, facilities sustainment, and depot maintenance. The bill would also authorize additional budget authority for readiness initiatives such as corrosion prevention, control, and mitigation.

The Army has been in a state of continuous war for the past 13 years, the longest in the Nation's history. The Army also supports operations and worldwide requirements with more than 168,000 soldiers deployed or forward stationed in nearly 150 countries. This high operational tempo and a primary focus on counterinsurgency operations, coupled with tighter budgets, sequestration, and a shrinking force, will continue to challenge the Army's ability to provide a sufficient number of Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) trained for decisive action, an issue that must be addressed. While facing this challenge the Army must also find a way to reset and reconstitute the force, responsibly draw down operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and fully develop its role under the Defense Strategic Guidance. The Army must also find a way to keep the National Guard and the Army Reserve as viable components of the total Army.

The Navy has experienced 13-plus years of sustained combat operations, the last seven of which have seen a significant part of the force operating above a tempo level that is sustainable for the long term, and this elevated pace of operations is expected to persist in light of the combatant commander demand for maritime assets. The stress induced by this demanding operational tempo is reflected in a gradual, but persistent, decline in fleet readiness for non-deployed forces. Fiscal challenges and a limited budget continue to create backlogs for Navy maintenance, specifically in aircraft maintenance, and fiscal instabilities have resulted in de-scoped ship maintenance availabilities from the previous fiscal year. When coupled with the impacts of the sustained surge, which has taxed both equipment and personnel at rates significantly higher than anticipated, the tenuous progress the Navy has made over the past 2 years to reverse degraded surface fleet material readiness is threatened.

Despite slight improvements in Marine Corps readiness levels resulting from the ongoing drawdown of forces in Afghanistan, the Marine Corps will continue to be challenged in meeting global commitments, reconstituting the force, and sustaining high operational tempo as it downsizes to 182,000 personnel and faces a dramatic increase in demand for Marine capabilities around the world. In particular, the Marine Corps will be challenged to meet new crisis response force presence demands in Europe, South America, and the Middle East in support of Department of State and Department of Defense missions as well as the expansion of critical legacy mis-

sions such as the Marine Security Guard program, which is slated to grow at an increasing number of high-risk embassies.

The Air Force is still slowly recovering from the recent impacts of sequestration which led to one-third of Air Force fighter and bomber squadrons standing down, curtailment of training and lost qualifications, and adverse impacts on officer development. The Air Force's recovery will remain challenged with high operational tempo beyond the end of major combat operations in Afghanistan. The committee is concerned about Air Force estimates that it will be approximately 2023 before the Air Force fully recovers and operational risk is adequately addressed. The committee is concerned about the recovery of the Air Force, as its Flying Hour Program is currently operating at full capacity, leaving no ability to buy-down current backlogs in training.

The operation and maintenance funding authorized by this title seeks to address many of these areas of concern. It addresses depleted force readiness levels and related high levels of assumed risk and makes several requests of the Department of Defense to report on plans to address acutely challenged areas and return the force to full-spectrum readiness.

#### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

##### BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

##### Base Realignment and Closure 2018

The budget request included \$4.8 million, in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, to support a request to conduct a new round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) to align infrastructure with planned force structure changes. The requested funds would be used to develop recommendations and to manage BRAC efforts.

The committee recommends no funds to support the development of infrastructure recommendations prepared in the context of a new BRAC authorization.

##### Corrosion Prevention

The committee commends the Department of Defense on the formulation of policy and guidance to address corrosion, which costs the military departments more than \$20.0 billion annually and leads to decreased readiness, increased manpower requirements, and significantly higher life-cycle sustainment costs. However, despite addressing the issue in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), the committee is concerned about the pace of acquisition of proven anti-corrosion products and the resulting impacts on sustainment costs. The committee is also concerned about the impact inadequate resourcing may have on the pace of anti-corrosion technology development. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2015, on the implementation of corrosion prevention measures both within the military departments and the Corrosion Prevention Program Office.



Further, the budget request contained \$4.8 million in operation and maintenance funding for the Corrosion Prevention Program in addition to military department and departmental research efforts to combat corrosion, which the committee believes to be inadequate. The committee recommends an additional \$20.0 million to be divided equally among the military departments' corrosion prevention efforts and the defense-wide Corrosion Prevention Program.

#### Marine Corps Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Forces

The committee recognizes the importance of Marine Corps Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Forces (SPMAGTFs) in meeting emerging combatant commander operational and force-presence requirements. The committee understands that the Marine Corps intends to expand the current SPMAGTF-Crisis Response capability at Moron Air Base in Spain and stand up an additional SPMAGTF in both the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) and U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) areas of responsibility focused on crisis response, contingency, offensive and defensive, security, humanitarian, and non-combatant evacuation operations.

However, the committee is concerned that for the second fiscal year in a row the President's budget request failed to fully fund these critical requirements in the base budget. The committee notes that it authorized an additional \$40.6 million in fiscal year 2014 to help the Marine Corps fund this emerging requirement.

The fiscal year 2015 budget request contained \$905.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for Marine Operating Forces which compose the core elements of the MAGTF and SPMAGTF. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would authorize \$939.5 million, an increase of \$33.8 million, for Marine Operating Forces to support the operation and maintenance costs of creating the Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force-CENTCOM and the Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force-SOUTHCOM.

However, the committee expects the Marine Corps to fully fund all SPMAGTF operations in future fiscal year base budgets.

#### Support for International Sporting Competitions

The budget request contained \$10.0 million for Support for International Sporting Competitions (SISC). This is a no-year appropriation.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is working with Special Olympics International, Special Olympics North America, and the Games Organizing Committee for the 2015 Special Olympics World Summer Games in Los Angeles to determine the potential scope and scale of the Department's support. The Department expects it will spend between \$1.0 million and \$3.0 million in SISC funding to support the 2015 Special Olympics World Summer Games in Los Angeles.

The committee notes that as of March 2014, there is an obligated balance of \$3.8 million in this account, as well as \$4.3 million in allocated but unobligated funds. These unobligated funds were previously allocated for certain sporting events that have since con-

cluded; therefore, the funds are available for the next set of “logistical and security support for international sporting competitions,” which is the purpose of this fund.

Due to the availability of unobligated funds currently within the account, the committee recommends a decrease of \$4.3 million from the President’s budget request.

#### ENERGY ISSUES

##### Comptroller General Utilities Disruption and Energy Security Mandate

United States military installations consume large amounts of energy and water to maintain effective installation operations and ensure mission readiness and capability. At the same time, U.S. utilities systems may be at risk from civilian power grid failures due to natural or manmade threats, including cyber threats and electromagnetic pulse events. The United States experienced significant power disruptions from severe weather events in 2012, including Hurricane Sandy which affected the northeast region, and the derecho which affected the mid-Atlantic, including the National Capital Region, as well as late winter storms in February-March 2014 that left hundreds of thousands of customers without power in areas from the Northeast through the Midwest and parts of the Deep South. These weather events affected installations, housing, military logistics centers, training centers, military commands, and other critical military activities. As such the committee is concerned that the impact of such disruptions to an installation’s electricity, potable water, and wastewater services has a direct impact on critical mission readiness. It is vital that military installations have the ability to maintain effective operations and energy security despite such disruptions.

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense and the military services are focusing on the potential for utilities service disruptions to impact installation mission capability and consequently to ensure the ability of the installations to nonetheless maintain operations. Still, it is not clear what efforts the Department is undertaking to ensure and promote energy security across its facilities. Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake a study of the status of the Department’s and the military services’ actions to ensure mission capability and energy security in the event of potentially significant and long-term disruptions to electric, potable water, and wastewater services at domestic and overseas military installations. The study should address the following questions:

(1) What is the status of water and energy security plans, strategies, and related guidance to the military departments and the installations to ensure mission capability through the continued provision of electricity, potable water, and wastewater services in the event of natural or manmade disruptions?

(2) To what extent were domestic military installations able to maintain effective mission capability during natural or manmade utility service disruptions since 2012?

(3) How are the military departments and installations planning to continue ensuring mission capability and energy security despite

the threat to electric, potable water, and wastewater services posed by natural or manmade service disruptions? The Comptroller General should report the results of this study to the congressional defense committees by March 2, 2015.

#### Marine Hydrokinetic Technology

The committee commends the Navy for efforts to assess ocean energy technologies, as defined in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140), and encourages the Navy to continue its work with the Department of Energy and designated National Marine Renewable Energy Centers for marine hydrokinetic demonstration activities at or near Department of Defense facilities. Waves, tidal and ocean currents have the potential to significantly contribute to the country’s electricity production, and ultimately, help the Department of Defense reduce its energy costs on military installations. The committee recognizes the Navy’s efforts to further test, research, develop, and deploy maritime security systems, at-sea surveillance and communications systems, and advance opportunities to reduce the cost of energy and increase energy security at Department of Defense facilities. Therefore, the committee urges the Navy to continue their efforts in ocean energy research and development where cost effective.

#### Unmanned Aerial Vehicles Energy Efficiencies

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the energy efficiency initiatives, including non-conventional power sources, of unmanned aerial vehicles to extend range and endurance and increase speed. The review should also include an assessment on how the adoption of autonomous technology could reduce the demand for energy and logistics. The Secretary should submit the results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than April 1, 2015.

### LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT ISSUES

#### Army Workload and Performance System

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently issued a report criticizing the Army’s management of the Army Workload and Performance System (AWPS), the Army manpower requirements determination tool, and related matters. Remarkably, the Army failed to provide any responses to GAO’s findings. This report noted that the Army failed to submit annual progress reports regarding implementation of AWPS master plan or catalog any revisions of the master plan to Congress as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). The initial master plans submitted to the committee were responsive and compelling and evidenced high-level interest within the Department of the Army. As a result, the committee concluded from those early reports and system demonstrations that the Army was serious about installing time, workload, and performance management systems across the Army infrastructure for all categories of labor, including logistics and sustainment.

While the committee commends the Secretary of the Army for his recently released responses concerning the GAO report on AWPS and its coverage of important segments of the issues, the committee concludes that the Army's failure to comply with the directives in Public Law 107-107 requires a re-evaluation of how to complete this departmental task. The committee recommends that a high-priority Secretariat-level project office and reporting structure be established with sufficient authority to implement the original, responsive master plan and its revisions. Further, the Secretary should affix responsibility for an inclusive, annual master plan implementation reporting process.

The committee expects the Government Accountability Office, as required by law, to evaluate the master plan and report to Congress on the Army's progress. As stated in previous committee reports (as well as Army reports), evaluation should include not only implementation throughout Army commands and infrastructure, but also assess whether budget submissions are supported by this data. In the committee report (H. Rept 104-131) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public 104-106), the committee noted that the evaluation should include corporate-level systems and integration. Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States, as part of this ongoing work, to examine and report to the House Committee on Armed Services on how the workload and manpower data provided through the AWPS system could improve reporting and transparency for 50/50 workload reporting, including all maintenance activity in acquisition organizations, as well as Army Materiel Command.

#### Auditability of Data Used to Measure Depot Maintenance Workload Distribution

The committee has become aware that, apart from the Army, the military departments have not involved their audit agencies in validating the data submitted for incorporation into the annual report to Congress required by section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, also known as the "50/50 report," for several years. The committee is troubled by the finding that in the limited number of cases where auditors have been involved in reviewing these data, they identified significant errors. The committee is also aware that in some instances, the data included for submission related to depot-level workloads performed under contractor logistics support, interim contractor support, or other contractual arrangements are generated through the use of algorithms or other forms of cost estimation. In some cases, these estimates appear to have been generated using insufficiently rigorous methodologies.

These findings lead the committee to conclude the fidelity of the data supporting the annual "50/50 report" is questionable and could be distorting the true distribution of workload between the public and private sectors, reducing the committee's confidence in the report's accuracy and completeness, as well as inhibiting the military services from making fully informed decisions regarding source of repair in the context of section 2466 of title 10, United States Code.

The January 14, 2014, guidance titled “Reporting Guidance for the FY2013–2015 Report to Congress on the Distribution of Department of Defense Depot Maintenance Workloads,” issued by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness, states that “Military departments and Agencies shall obtain the assistance of internal audit agencies or an Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD)-agreed upon third party to conduct detailed reviews to validate the process for capturing depot maintenance expenditure data by reporting organizations.” The committee notes that this reporting guidance reflects a change from prior guidance, which did not include process validation, only data validation prior to OSD submission. In the committee’s view, it is imperative that the data submitted to the Congress be validated. Moreover, the committee believes that participation of the military departments’ audit agencies in validating the data submitted for the “50/50 report” will provide the greatest assurance that what is reported represents an accurate and complete picture of the distribution of depot-level workload between the public and private sectors.

Accordingly, the committee directs the military departments and defense agencies to comply with the guidance to the fullest extent, and, to the degree that it is practicable, ensure direct military department audit agency involvement in this effort. Specifically, this effort should provide assurance that the data submitted for inclusion in the “50/50 report” is accurate and complete. The Secretary of Defense, in the next two annual reports to Congress required under section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, should include a description of the efforts made by each of the military departments and defense agencies to comply with the validation requirement. The committee notes that if voluntary compliance is not evidenced, the committee will consider statutory enforcement.

#### Comptroller General Review of Forward Deployed Naval Forces and Associated Sustainment Issues

Forward presence is critical to the Navy’s goals of building partnerships, deterring aggression without escalation, defusing threats, and containing conflict without regional disruption. Naval forces provide forward presence through a combination of rotational deployments from the United States, Forward Deployed Naval Forces (FDNF) in Japan, Guam, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic, and forward stationing ships in places such as the Kingdom of Bahrain, the Republic of Singapore, and Diego Garcia. The Navy’s ability to implement these concepts depends on U.S. bases and strategic partnerships overseas that provide places where forces can rest, repair, refuel, and resupply. In the FDNF construct, the ships, crews and families all reside in the host nation. This construct is in contrast to forward stationing, where the ship’s families reside in the United States and the crew rotates to the ship’s overseas location for deployment.

The committee seeks a more detailed understanding of the Navy’s decision-making process to designate ships to be either FDNF or forward stationed and the relative costs and benefits of each approach. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense

committees by February 27, 2015. The report should include a review and analysis of:

(1) The Navy's process for determining the homeport locations of naval vessels, including FDNF;

(2) The Navy's process for stationing naval vessels outside the United States;

(3) How the Navy calculates deployment costs of vessels homeported inside and outside the United States;

(4) The extent to which the Navy has utilized rotational crewing to meet forward presence requirements;

(5) The operational availability achieved by rotational crewing, the savings achieved, and the limitations associated with directed rotational crewing;

(6) The operational support and sustainment effects of deploying U.S.-based vessels to a forward operating station as opposed to homeporting vessels outside the United States, including costs of complying with section 7310 of title 10, United States Code, maintenance requirements;

(7) The infrastructure requirements, as well as host-nation acceptance requirements to ensure the assets are received overseas; and

(8) Any other issue that the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

#### Department of Defense Inspector General Determination of Fair and Reasonable Cost of Spare Parts

The committee has received testimony that sustainment of military equipment is the most expensive phase of the Department of Defense's acquisition process. The committee is alarmed by frequent reports from the Department of Defense Inspector General (DODIG) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that the Department has paid hundreds of millions of dollars above what are considered fair and reasonable prices for weapon system spare parts and is missing opportunities for significant savings.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Department of Defense Inspector General to perform a comprehensive audit to determine if current Department of Defense guidance is sufficient to obtain fair and reasonable prices for equipment spare parts. The audit should assess the extent to which the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the military departments have put in place metrics for measuring:

(1) Guidance and efforts to improve demand forecasting are effective for ensuring appropriate and adequate provision of spare parts and other supplies needed to keep military equipment ready and operating; and

(2) Inventory management cost efficiency.

The DODIG should also assess the costs the Department of Defense has incurred by paying prices beyond what is fair and reasonable for spare parts and other supplies. The DODIG's audit should assess the prevalence of disparities between prices deemed to be fair and reasonable and those prices paid by the DLA and the military departments for spare parts or supplies, and potential cost savings if the parts or other supplies had been obtained by DLA and the military departments instead of through a performance-based logistics support contract. The DODIG should provide a re-

port on the results of the audit to the congressional defense committees not later than February 28, 2015.

#### Eligibility and Performance of Carriers Who Transport Hazardous Materials for the Department of Defense

The Department of Defense every year facilitates nearly 70,000 separate shipments of security sensitive material. Trucks carrying these shipments travel tens of thousands of miles on U.S. interstates, highways, and local thoroughfares across all 50 States. Materials that are transported include missiles, arms/weapons, ammunition, explosives, radioactive material, and classified items. Shipments are executed under the Transportation Protective Services (TPS) program which requires stringent safety and security standards for operators who are licensed to do business with the program.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) conducted a comprehensive review of the policies and procedures used by the Department of Defense in the handling of hazardous material shipments pursuant to section 363 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239). In its report to the committee, the GAO stated that the Safety Measurement System scores used by the Department to determine safety performance of its TPS carriers “should not be used to draw safety conclusions about a carrier’s safety condition. As a result, the Department may not be using the most reliable data from the Compliance, Safety, Accountability’s Safety Measurement System to determine which carriers should be eligible for the [TPS] program.”

As a result of this finding, and to ensure the safety and security of Department of Defense’s shipments of sensitive arms, ammunition, and explosives, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, to examine the data limitations of the Department of Transportation Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration’s Safety and Accountability program and report to the House Armed Services Committee by December 15, 2014, on what changes, if any, should be made to the process used by the Department of Defense to determine hazardous material carrier eligibility and evaluate performance of carriers within the TPS program. Additionally, the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, is directed to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by September 30, 2015, on the progress made to implement the changes.

#### F117 Engine Sustainment Strategy

The budget request contained \$778.0 million for F117 engine maintenance, repair, and overhaul (MRO) activities.

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has struggled to reign in F117 engine MRO costs. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force cannot sufficiently determine whether the Department is paying a fair and reasonable cost for F117 MRO because of limited performance and cost data available to the Department as a result of the F117 MRO contract structure and administration. As a result, the committee encouraged the Air Force to seek a competitive strategy for F117 MRO,

specifically competition for repair, overhaul, supply chain management, and systems engineering support activities. The Air Force determined that prospective vendors had the potential to use commercial data to derive F117 rates and factors, and that vendors illustrated avenues to procure parts from the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) of the F117 engine. Furthermore, the F117 engine is 91 percent similar in design to the PW2000 commercial engine, and the PW2000/F117 manuals are similar for overhaul and component repair.

In fall 2013, the Air Force attempted competition through issuance of a request for proposals but subsequently determined that proposals received were deemed not viable due to proposed costs. In performing a root-cause analysis, the Department determined that immediate competition was not possible because supply chain management competition was not feasible, vendors would need 3 to 5 years of F117 engine usage data, and engine OEMs have become increasingly more involved in after-market sales by offering life-cycle support programs.

The committee notes that the Air Force plans to consider an alternative MRO strategy that has the potential to reduce sustainment costs of the F117 engine, but the committee remains concerned that the Air Force may be limited in determining whether F117 sustainment costs are fair and reasonable as compared to commercial-derivative PW2000 engine MRO costs being borne in the private sector.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to continue pursuit of an F117 MRO sustainment strategy that will achieve measurable cost reduction and sufficient insight to OEM sustainment data and metrics in order to determine cost fairness and reasonableness of the F117 sustainment program execution. The committee also encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to re-evaluate the necessity for contracting with the prime system vendor for F117 MRO activities to determine whether process and cost efficiencies could be gained by contracting directly with the F117 OEM. The committee also includes a provision elsewhere in this act that would prohibit the F117 Milestone Decision Authority from approving entry into subsequent F117 sustainment contracts without the required MRO data that provide the Secretary of the Air Force sufficient insight to determine whether the Secretary is outlaying fair and reasonable costs to own and operate the F117 engine as compared to commercial-derivative PW2000 ownership MRO costs in the private sector.

#### Manufacturing Infrastructure Investment

The committee is aware of the unique challenges and varied relationships associated with the broad range of customers who have for decades supported the continued combat vehicle production capability at the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center (JSMC). As a government-owned, contractor-operated facility, JSMC represents a unique, long-term fiscal challenge for the U.S. Army for the continued maintenance and periodic upgrade of the facility, which has a deferred maintenance and repair projects list totaling over \$40.0 million. Production Base Support funding over the past several years has been insufficient to support minimum JSMC mainte-



nance requirements, including correcting critical safety and environmental deficiencies.

The Department of the Army must ensure the facility is properly resourced to efficiently and effectively meet the Army's tank and other combat vehicle production-related requirements, Foreign Military Sales (FMS), and Direct Commercial Sales for the foreseeable future. The committee understands the difficulty in determining how the Department should share the operational support costs associated with the JSMC across the broad range of current and future customers. For example, future FMS programs could generate more than \$10.0 million in facilities usage fees. The committee believes reinvestment of these funds could help remediate facilities maintenance deficiencies and subsequently benefit all current and future JSMC customers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 9, 2015, on the Army's analysis, plans, and/or recommendations, to include potential legislative proposals, on how the operational costs associated with the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center could be equitably applied so that the facility can remain viable and relevant.

#### Public-Private Partnerships at Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence

The committee recognizes the mutual benefits to both the organic and commercial industrial base of partnering activities especially in a resource-constrained environment. The committee also believes that full visibility into the scope and scale of partnerships is critical for proper oversight of industrial base sustainment. As a result, the committee is concerned about the lack of visibility into the Department of Defense's public-private partnership activities authorized by section 2474 of title 10, United States Code. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to deliver to the congressional defense committees by January 5, 2015, a report on all partnerships entered into pursuant to section 2474 of title 10, United States Code, in fiscal year 2014 and for the preceding three fiscal years. The report at a minimum should include the location of work performed under the partnership, the commercial and organic entities comprising the partnership, the length of the partnership, and a description of the work performed by the partnership.

#### Report on the Department of Defense's Transportation of Hazardous Materials

The Department of Defense transports more than 1.5 million hazardous material (HAZMAT) shipments each year. These shipments can be high-risk as well as highly sensitive and, if improperly handled, labeled, or packaged could result in the loss of life, property damage, and harm to national security interests. A complex framework of statutes and regulations governs the Department's handling, labeling, and packaging of hazardous material shipments. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently reported on challenges the Department has experienced in imple-

menting these regulations, which can adversely affect the safe, timely, and cost-effective transportation of hazardous materials. For example, in some cases Department of Defense installations did not provide carriers transporting sensitive arms, ammunition and explosives hazardous materials with timely access to secure hold areas or assist them in locating the nearest alternate means to secure those shipments, leaving these items in the public domain longer than necessary. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department to develop a process to identify and implement the necessary corrective actions to ensure that its installations provide secure hold as required. Additionally, GAO found a substantial number of hazardous material shipments were not documented and packaged in accordance with regulations and other guidance, which resulted in delays. The committee is concerned about costs (and potential operational impacts) that may be incurred by the Department as a result of these delays or whether any materials were unnecessarily shipped through the more expensive Transportation Protective Services program because they were improperly identified as sensitive items.

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 by December 1, 2014, on the Department of Defense's transportation of hazardous materials. That report should also be provided to the Comptroller General of the United States at that time. Specifically, the report should include, but is not limited to, a discussion of:

(1) The root causes of improper documentation and packaging of HAZMAT throughout the Department of Defense transportation system;

(2) The extent to which Transportation Protective Services are being used to transport HAZMAT shipments that could safely and securely be transported using less costly means;

(3) Any needed corrective actions and an action plan with associated milestones to implement those corrective actions.

After the Secretary provides the report to Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States should conduct a review of the report and provide a preliminary briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 15, 2015, with a final report or reports to follow within 120 days.

#### Report on the Eligibility and Performance of Carriers Who Transport Security-Sensitive Materials for the Department of Defense

The Department of Defense every year facilitates nearly 70,000 separate shipments of security sensitive material. Trucks carrying these shipments travel millions of miles on U.S. interstates, highways, and local thoroughfares across all 50 States. Examples of materials that are transported include missiles, arms/weapons, ammunition, explosives, radioactive material, and classified items. These shipments are executed under the Transportation Protective Services (TPS) program which requires stringent safety and security standards for operators who are approved to do business with the program. However, a comprehensive study of the necessary

safety standards, technology, and public liability of carriers in the TPS program has not been conducted.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 15, 2014. That report should include, but is not limited to, the following:

(1) An assessment of whether there is sufficient data in the Department of Transportation Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's Compliance, Safety, and Accountability program to evaluate carrier safety performance and what additional data may be necessary;

(2) A determination of what additional standards should apply to the process used by the Department of Defense to decide Transportation Protective Services carrier eligibility and evaluate performance of the TPS program;

(3) An assessment of whether proven safety technologies recommended by the National Transportation Safety Board (e.g., roll stability control systems, forward collision warning systems, electronic logging devices) should be mandated for trucks transporting TPS shipments in order to reduce the risk of a catastrophic accident or damage to materials;

(4) An assessment of whether minimum public liability and property damage insurance should be increased for TPS carriers; and

(5) An assessment of whether TPS carriers need to staff 24 hour call centers to monitor operations and assist in emergencies.

#### Submarine Propeller Repair and Overhaul

The committee understands the Navy continues to request partial funding to support submarine propeller repair and overhaul (SPRO) in the Overseas Contingency Operations account, rather than planning for full funding based on true historical and current year SPRO expenditures within the Navy's annual defense budget. Additionally, the committee remains concerned with the Navy's ongoing proposed "repair only" approach to SPRO. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to re-evaluate this plan and report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by December 15, 2014, on an approach, to include both fiscal year 2015 and Future Years Defense Program funding, that addresses the ongoing mix of both propeller repair and overhaul needs.

#### Sustainment of Deployed Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its rapid and successful deployment of an Army Air and Missile Defense Task Force (AMDTF) and Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile defense battery to Guam last spring in response to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's aggressive posture. The committee notes that Army Chief of Staff, General Raymond Odierno, in testimony before the committee, stated that the Army is working on plans to sustain a long-term presence of a THAAD battery and an AMDTF on Guam to provide necessary protection of military manpower, assets, and civilians. In order to

better understand the requirements to sustain an AMDTF and THAAD battery on Guam, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to report to the committee by January 31, 2015, on the following requirements related to THAAD sustainment:

- (1) An accounting of force structure needed, including potential Army National Guard or Army Reserve force structure;
- (2) Potential military construction needed for force protection and other sustainment issues;
- (3) Estimated military personnel and operation and maintenance costs; and
- (4) Any legal, statutory, or authority challenges associated with sustaining an AMDTF and THAAD battery on Guam.

#### READINESS ISSUES

##### Adequacy of Airlift and Refueling Capabilities in the Western Pacific

Recognizing the strategic importance of the Department of Defense's efforts to rebalance forces to the Asia-Pacific region, the committee continues to question the adequacy of airlift and refueling capabilities in that region. U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) must accomplish a variety of missions and requirements in a geographic area of responsibility that spans almost 9,000 miles from Hawaii in the Pacific Ocean to the Republic of Maldives in the Indian Ocean. Airlift and refueling capabilities play a critical role in supporting and sustaining forward-deployed forces in the Asia-Pacific region.

The committee is concerned about the ability of the U.S. Air Force to provide sustained airlift to support ground forces and equipment in the region to meet current and emerging requirements. Particularly, the committee is concerned about the cost of the current rotational tanker presence in the western Pacific. Given current budget constraints and the risk in the readiness accounts, the committee is concerned that rotational presence may not be the most fiscally prudent means of meeting airlift and refueling requirements, especially in light of the potential for sustained sequestration. The committee, therefore, directs the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, in consultation with the Commander, Pacific Air Forces, to brief the committee by March 30, 2015, on airlift and tanker capabilities in the Pacific Command area of responsibility. At a minimum, the briefing should include:

- (1) The cost of current rotational tanker presence in the western Pacific;
- (2) The cost of permanently stationing tankers in the western Pacific to meet current operational requirements; and
- (3) Plans for future beddown of permanent and rotational airlift and tanker assets in the western Pacific to meet Pacific Command operational requirements.

##### Advanced Situational Awareness Training Assessment

The committee is aware that the Army continues to successfully incorporate training modules to detect changes in human behavior

through Advanced Situational Awareness Training (ASAT). The committee recognizes the benefits of such training and the enhancement to mission effectiveness, decisive advantage, enhanced use of existing optical equipment, and reduction of civilian casualties that it can help provide. The committee believes the benefits of situational awareness training are significant enough to warrant a long-term assessment of ASAT training requirements and a plan for possible future institutionalization.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct an assessment of ASAT training and brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the results not later than October 1, 2014. This assessment and briefing should specifically include current ASAT training requirements, the cost and time required to institutionalize an ASAT training program across the Army, and quantifiable training benefits achieved by ASAT training to date.

#### Army Aviation Range Safety Improvements

The committee is concerned that low-altitude radar coverage deficiencies at Army aviation training ranges are creating undue risk. These aviation safety hazards contributed to a mid-air collision in December 2011, resulting in the loss of all crew members. The committee commends the Army for working to mitigate this risk with the installation of wide-area multilateration systems. Multilateration systems provide improved situational awareness in all weather conditions, are highly scalable, more affordable than traditional radars, have been proven in commercial aviation, and provide accurate tracking and data capture for training operations and after-action reports. Multilateration systems are capable of precision surveillance and identification of all transponder-equipped aircraft at all altitudes.

The committee encourages the Army to continue fielding wide-area multilateration systems on its training ranges to provide aviators with realistic operational scenarios and to enhance safety for aviators and civilians who live in proximity to military training areas.

#### Army Aviation Training

The committee notes the continued demand for Army aviation capabilities on the battlefield and the importance of providing real-world training to Army aviators throughout the program of instruction at the Army Aviation Center of Excellence. The committee recognizes the training, cost, and performance benefits of instructing Army aviators on aircraft that operate more similarly to the Army's current fleet of dual-engine, glass cockpit, four-blade combat helicopters.

#### Commercially Augmented Tactical Airborne Training

The committee is aware of the historical utilization of contracted fighter aircraft to enhance and augment training. The roles of these aircraft range from replicating adversaries with high-end electronic warfare capabilities, to developing air battle manager skills, to conducting joint terminal attack controller training. Using commercially provided assets to augment airborne tactical training

can prolong the service life of U.S. military aircraft and reduce the number of training support missions flown by military aviators.

The committee is also aware that additional contracted tactical training capacity exists and that there may be potential for additional savings or cost avoidance through the increased utilization of that capacity. Given the increased need to maximize efficiencies in training in order to preserve readiness and assets, the committee encourages the military departments to utilize, to the maximum extent practical, commercially provided tactical airborne training augmentation.

#### Common Range Integrated Instrumentation System

The committee is concerned by the proliferation of more advanced threats to U.S. Armed Forces and the lack of more advanced instrumentation to support aviation combat training. These increasingly complex weapons threats require equally complex next-generation capabilities that can provide realistic training while at the same time reducing cost of current “live-fly” exercises. The Common Range Integrated Instrumentation System has demonstrated critical attributes including: an integrated multi-level security that will enable seamless communications between legacy and next-generation aircraft as well as between U.S. and coalition forces; flexible architectures that enable live, virtual constructive training capability; and a network architecture that is deployable, both ashore and at sea. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to make maximum reuse of mature, scalable, and secure technologies developed for the test range community when considering their applicability and affordability for military training ranges.

#### Comptroller General Report on Readiness Metrics

For decades the Department of Defense has used “C-ratings,” which measure unit resources and training against doctrinal wartime missions, to measure the readiness of its forces. However, to support the recent missions in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, units have repeatedly been reconfigured and task-organized or called upon to execute missions that differed from their core doctrinal mission statements. To better portray readiness in this new environment, the Department has added “assigned mission” and “capability” ratings to its traditional C-ratings. The military departments and combatant commands also began reporting readiness assessment levels (RA-levels) to portray their strategic readiness. While the combination of traditional and newer readiness metrics have allowed the Department to portray its readiness for a much wider range of missions than in the past, the metrics do not fully account for the time component of readiness. Traditional C-ratings and assigned mission ratings tend to emphasize readiness at a particular point in time (the day the rating is completed). Capability and RA-ratings have an implicit time component because they measure readiness against timelines that are laid out in operations and contingency plans. However, the committee has observed that none of the metrics clearly answer the question of when forces will be ready. Over the past decade, when

the committee has asked that question, the ubiquitous response has been that most units will be ready “just in time.”

With the prolonged growth of non-discretionary spending placing continued fiscal pressure on the defense budget, the “just-in-time” answer does little to help decisionmakers minimize risk while preparing for a future that, in the words of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is “dangerous and uncertain.” Because units from different military departments can often provide similar, if not identical, capabilities, the committee believes the Department’s leadership and the Congress need to understand differences in both the speed and cost at which the military departments can provide ready forces to meet combatant commander requirements so they can prioritize resources and minimize risk.

To help inform the committee’s oversight and its consideration of the President’s budget request, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department of Defense’s readiness. The review should include, but not be limited to:

(1) The current readiness of the military departments and combatant commands, as reported in their December 2013 readiness reports;

(2) A description of the key factors that are affecting the readiness of the military departments and the combatant commands, as well as a description of the steps being taken to address or mitigate the impact of those factors;

(3) An analysis of the extent to which “time” is or has been incorporated as a quantitative or qualitative component of current and past readiness metrics; and

(4) A description of any efforts the military departments, the combatant commands, the Joint Staff, or the Office of the Secretary of Defense have made to modify their readiness metrics or add any additional metrics to better address the question of when units or commands will be ready.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a preliminary briefing on these four elements to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2015, with a report or reports to follow.

#### OTHER MATTERS

##### Arctic Center of Excellence

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy released its Arctic Roadmap for 2014–2030, which provides near-term, mid-term, and far-term direction to enhance the Navy’s ability to operate in the Arctic region. The committee notes the roadmap includes an implementation plan that provides a timeline and identifies organizations to lead specific actions recommended by the roadmap. One of these actions includes identifying requirements in fiscal year 2015 to establish an Arctic Center of Excellence, as well as developing an Arctic engagement plan focusing on partnerships with international, interagency and private sector stakeholders that enhance security. The committee believes that the establishment of such a center would support the Navy’s focus areas identified in the roadmap. In developing the requirements for such a center, the

committee encourages the Department to consider, among other things, how such a center could support Arctic-related training, operations, maritime domain awareness, scientific research, and technology development. When considering potential locations the Department should consider candidates that can effectively bring together elements from the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, academia, and other public and private stakeholders who can contribute to advancing U.S. interests in the Arctic.

#### Army Combat Shirt Fielding Strategy

The committee notes the Army Combat Shirt (ACS) is a field-tested and Army-authorized combat shirt approved for combat operations. The ACS is worn, in most cases, as the base layer for the Army's interceptor body armor system, and provides soldiers with a highly breathable, moisture wicking clothing option with a flame resistance capability.

The committee commends the Army's efforts to develop and field high performance flame resistant clothing to deploying soldiers through the rapid fielding initiative. The committee also notes that the ACS remains coded for wartime use only. The committee believes the same high performance and flame resistant protection capabilities provided by the ACS in combat operations could also be applied for domestic training and field exercises in the United States.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2014, on steps being taken to evaluate the ACS and other flame resistant combat uniforms items to describe (a) the near-term policy for authorizing use in appropriate field exercises and training scenarios at unit commander's discretion; and (b) the advisability and feasibility of implementing a long-term fielding plan for incorporating the ACS and other flame resistant combat uniforms as organizational equipment in appropriate units and in sizes and designs specific to female soldiers.

#### Briefing on Invasive Species Management

The committee notes that in the fall of 2013, the coconut rhinoceros beetle, an invasive species to the Hawaiian Islands and Guam, was discovered on the island of Oahu and has been found on Guam since 2007. While it is unknown how the species came to Hawaii or Guam, the committee is aware that a coconut rhinoceros beetle population was identified on Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, which is in close proximity to Honolulu International Airport. Since discovering the existence of this invasive species on Hawaii, the committee notes that the Department of Agriculture has been leading the effort, jointly with the Department of Defense and appropriate State agencies, to eliminate breeding sites, and monitor and control the spread of the coconut rhinoceros beetle on the island of Oahu.

In addition to the more immediate response, the committee notes that the Department of Defense is already addressing invasive spe-



cies through other mechanisms. Specifically, the Department of the Navy is supporting efforts to develop the Micronesian Biosecurity Plan, jointly with the Department of Agriculture, and the governments of the State of Hawaii, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. In preparing the plan, the partners evaluated invasive species risks to marine, terrestrial, and freshwater ecosystems, to include the coconut rhinoceros beetle. Additionally, for invasive species management, the committee notes that Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam and Joint Region Marianas maintain an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan which includes measures to prevent the proliferation of invasive species.

The committee encourages the Department of the Navy to continue its work with the Department of Agriculture, as well as State and local entities, to monitor and contain any further spread of the coconut rhinoceros beetle within Hawaii and Guam. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the committee not later than September 1, 2014, regarding the status of the coconut rhinoceros beetle on Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam and Joint Region Marianas and steps the Department of the Navy has taken, working with partners, to control, mitigate, or eradicate the species or its habitat.

#### Cold-Weather Protective Clothing

The committee is concerned that the use of end-of-year funding for the acquisition of cold-weather clothing, glove systems, and equipment for training, and for cold-weather combat negatively affect military readiness and the defense industrial base. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than September 30, 2014, a report describing the Department's efforts to provide the Active and Reserve Components with the cold-weather clothing, glove systems, and equipment required for training and deployments. The committee directs the Secretary to include in the report an update on the funding needed to meet Active and Reserve Component requirements for cold-weather clothing, glove systems, and equipment in fiscal years 2015 and 2016. The report should also include an acquisition strategy and spending plan outlining the projected schedule for the obligation of funds to acquire the necessary equipment.

#### Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense's Arctic Capabilities

In its 2012 report on Arctic capabilities, the Government Accountability Office noted that while the Department of Defense has undertaken some efforts to assess the capabilities needed to meet national security objectives in the Arctic, it is unclear whether the Department will be in a position to provide needed capabilities in a timely and efficient manner. Pursuant to the recommendations in that GAO report that the Department of Defense develop a risk-based investment strategy and collaborate with other interagency stakeholders to identify longer term needs, the Department pub-

lished an Arctic Strategy in November 2013. In that strategy, the Department identified a number of investments that will need to be made over time while noting the risk that investments in Arctic capabilities may not compete successfully against other priorities. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide to the congressional defense committees a review addressing:

(1) The process used by the Department of Defense to identify and develop the capabilities required for the Arctic mission to include identifying the supporting force structure, personnel, training, equipment, and infrastructure;

(2) The extent to which the Department has identified any capability gaps; and developed mitigation plans and timelines to address those gaps;

(3) How the Department of Defense is collaborating with other agencies such as the Coast Guard to identify and address longer-term needs in the Arctic; and

(4) Any additional information the Comptroller General deems appropriate in the context of that review.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a preliminary briefing to the House Armed Services Committee on the review by February 6, 2015 with a report to follow within 90 days.

#### Comptroller General Review of Process for the Disposition of Excess Defense Articles

The Department of Defense is a large provider of surplus personal property and equipment that goes to local governments, fire and police departments, Veterans Service Organizations, hospitals, and many other local entities. The transfer of surplus personal property and equipment to other Federal agencies and local and State governments by the Department provides a significant savings of American taxpayer dollars. As budgetary resources continue to shrink, it is imperative that American tax dollars are well spent and managed and re-utilization within the Department of Defense is maximized. Furthermore, it is important that any surplus personal property and equipment that is being sold through the Department of Defense surplus property sales program is done in accordance with laws relating to the disposition of excess and surplus property. As surplus personal property and equipment become more valuable, the Department of Defense and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) should have procedures and protocols to ensure that fair market value for surplus personal property and equipment is being received. If the Department is not receiving fair market value for surplus personal property and equipment being sold, this could be a serious financial loss to the American taxpayer.

To ensure that the taxpayer is getting the greatest financial benefit out of surplus equipment originally purchased with tax dollars, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review and report to the congressional defense committees on the Department of Defense's and the Defense Logistics Agency's excess and surplus personal property programs, including their programs that provide excess or surplus personal property and equipment to other Federal agencies and to local and State governments and on their programs that sell surplus personal property and

equipment. The review should include, but not be limited to, an examination of:

(1) The methods DLA uses to provide visibility of available excess property and equipment to interested agencies and provide access for physical inspection of the property and equipment;

(2) Instances in which Department of Defense property and equipment that have been declared excess, and that are desirable for use by other Federal agencies and by State or local governments, are transferred to a commercial vendor for sale;

(3) The process DLA uses to code property and equipment for disposition, particularly instances in which property and equipment that have been coded for return to military units are transferred to a commercial vendor for sale; and

(4) The costs that DLA incurs by destroying appropriately coded property and equipment that otherwise could be demilitarized and made available to interested Federal agencies or State and local governments.

(5) Instances where the Department did not receive fair market value for excess or surplus personal property and equipment transferred to a commercial vendor for sale.

The Comptroller General should provide a preliminary briefing to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2015, with a final report or reports to follow.

#### Office of Net Assessment

The budget request contained \$8.9 million within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the Office of Net Assessment (ONA).

The committee notes that the Department of Defense continues to decrement the proposed funding for the office. The committee is concerned that this decrement, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense's plan to realign the office under the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, may limit the ability and flexibility of ONA to conduct long-range comparative assessments. The office has a long history of providing alternative analyses and strategies that challenge the "group think" that can often pervade the Department of Defense. The committee believes that the growing array of complex security challenges facing the United States, as highlighted in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review, coupled with a constrained budget environment, will only create greater demand for the unconventional thinking and solutions that the Office is capable of providing.

One such challenge is in the area of space deterrence, and elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the office to conduct a study of potential alternate defense and deterrent strategies in response to the existing and projected counterspace capabilities of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation.

The committee therefore recommends \$18.9 million, an increase of \$10.0 million, for fiscal year 2015 for the Office of Net Assessment. This recommended authorization is reflected in a new funding line for the Office of Net Assessment within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, as shown in section 4301 of this Act.

Also, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would codify the Office within chapter 4 of title 10, United States Code, and establish a dedicated program element for budgeting purposes. The committee believes the office must remain an independent organization within the Department reporting directly to the Secretary. However, the committee also recognizes that improvements can be made within the Department to ensure the office's assessments better inform and influence its overall strategy and policy. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than September 5, 2014, a plan for how the Department can better leverage the Office as well as a description of the activities, deliverables, and allocation of funds planned for the Office of Net Assessment for fiscal year 2015.

#### Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers

The budget request contained \$3.6 million for the Concept Development, Study and Planning for Future Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers (RSCC) within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide.

The committee notes that this request is unwarranted and ahead of need given the statutory limitation on the establishment of an RSCC or similar entity by U.S. Special Operations Command within a regional geographic combatant commander's (GCC) area of responsibility, in accordance with section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66). The committee also notes that section 1244 of Public Law 113-66 required that the Secretary of Defense submit a report to certain congressional committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of Public Law 113-66, outlining RSCC requirements and anticipated legislative authorities that may be needed to support such requirements. The committee notes with concern that this report has yet to be delivered. The committee furthermore believes that any RSCC-like initiatives or requirements should be put forth by regional GCCs to ensure such initiatives are linked comprehensively to all regional plans, requirements, and activities. The committee therefore denies the requested amount of \$3.6 million for the Concept Development, Study and Planning for Future Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers and redirects this funding to more direct operational readiness requirements within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for the Flying Hours Program for U.S. Special Operations Command. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to provide the report as mandated in Public Law 113-66.

#### Report on Emerging Technologies for Flame Resistant Uniforms

The military services currently have validated requirements for flame-resistant uniforms for personnel in specific military occupational specialties and for personnel deploying to hostile environments. The committee believes the current flame-resistant requirements are appropriate and not in need of modification. However, the committee is concerned that the military services are not adequately exploring emerging flame-resistant capabilities and tech-

nology that may allow the services to expand protection to additional service members at a reduced cost.

The committee notes that the high material costs associated with flame-resistant uniforms and accessories have historically limited the distribution of such uniforms to military units that are preparing to deploy, are currently deployed, and to those serving in certain military occupational specialties. The committee understands that service members in such units require flame-resistant uniforms because of the high risk of burn injury posed by the contemporary operational environment. While the committee understands that these service members have an increased risk of sustaining a burn injury, the committee believes that other service members in training and domestic operations are also at-risk of sustaining burn-related injuries. The committee is concerned that flame-resistant uniforms are not available to these service members due to the cost-prohibitive nature of the current uniforms.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on emerging flame-resistant technologies and evaluate whether these technologies can provide cost-effective protection to a wider range of service members. The secretary shall report the findings of the assessment to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

#### Training, Travel, and Conference Restrictions

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its efforts to reduce unnecessary expenses. However, the committee remains concerned that the Department will exclude strategic locations in its efforts to curtail training, travel, and conference costs. The committee encourages the Department to take appropriate action to reduce costs and recommends the Department not exclude specific geographical areas for training, travel, and conferences, including those critical to our national security strategy or those aligned with the Department's strategic guidance.

#### U.S. Special Operations Command National Capital Region Office

The budget request contained \$5.0 million for the U.S. Special Operations Command National Capital Region (USSOCOM-NCR) office within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide.

The committee notes that this funding would have provided for an additional USSOCOM Washington, DC-based coordination office. The committee understands, however, that based on further analysis, USSOCOM has discontinued efforts to develop and implement its concept for the USSOCOM-NCR office, and that the Secretary of Defense has endorsed this decision. The committee further understands that USSOCOM will continue to maintain its USSOCOM Washington office at the Pentagon, and that it will sustain its current support to the interagency and planning process.

Therefore, since the USSOCOM-NCR requirement is no longer valid, the committee denies the requested \$5.0 million for the office and redirects this funding to more direct operational readiness requirements within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Flying Hours Program for U.S. Special Operations Command.

United States Special Operations Command Preservation of the  
Force and Families Program

The budget request included \$67.0 million within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, to support the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) Preservation of the Force and Families (POTFF) program. Of this amount, \$48.3 million supports the Human Performance Program (HPP) within POTFF. The budget request also included \$14.8 million within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for USSOCOM Behavioral Health and Warrior Care Management Program through the Defense Health Program. The committee recognizes the tremendous sacrifices made by the men and women within the Special Operations Forces (SOF) and their families after more than 12 years of war. The committee has always made the care of all service members and their families its highest priority, including members of SOF. The committee notes with concern, however, that suicide rates for SOF have continued to increase since calendar year 2010, and that for the past 2 years, suicide rates within USSOCOM have surpassed those of the military services.

The committee understands that most suicide prevention programs within USSOCOM have focused on training and awareness, and that USSOCOM is preparing to expand a pilot peer-to-peer training program. The committee also understands and is supportive of the many service-provided suicide prevention programs that USSOCOM has utilized at the component level. While action taken by USSOCOM has been positive, the committee is concerned that targeted suicide prevention programs within the command remain nascent and slow-moving given the troubling suicide statistics across the forces. The committee notes that USSOCOM only recently signed and promulgated a force-wide Suicide Prevention Policy Memorandum dated March 31, 2014, and that, according to USSOCOM, "suicide prevention efforts have been minimal and met as unfunded requirements."

The committee is also concerned that, given these increased rates of suicides across the force, the POTFF program lacks a distinct focus on suicide prevention programs and places too much costly emphasis on the Human Performance Program geared towards improving physical readiness with costly military construction and multi-year service contracts for physical therapists, strength and conditioning specialists, athletic trainers, and sports dieticians. The committee notes that these activities, while related holistically to the well-being and mental health of SOF, will likely do little to immediately address the high number of suicides currently impacting the force. Furthermore, the present POTFF focus on human performance and physical readiness places an over-reliance on contracts that are unsustainable and cost-prohibitive across the Future Years Defense Program, diverting resources otherwise required to immediately address suicides across the force. The committee notes that of the \$67.0 million requested for POTFF, only \$7.2 million was to support the Psychological Performance Program to promote, maintain, and restore the psychological and behavioral health of SOF.

Therefore, of the \$67.0 million within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, to support the USSOCOM Preservation of the Force and Families program, the committee recommends \$25.0 million to support Human Performance Program, a reduction of \$23.3 million, and \$38.1 million to support USSOCOM Behavioral Health and Warrior Care Management Program, an increase of \$23.3 million. In addition, the committee also recommends the full amount of \$7.2 million for the Psychological Performance Program within POTFF. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require a comprehensive review and assessment on prevention of suicides among members of U.S. Special Operations Forces.

#### United States Special Operations Command Proposed Sponsorship of U.S. Naval Ship Sumner

The committee is aware that the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) recently requested transfer of sponsorship of the United States Naval Ship (USNS) Sumner (T-AGS 61) from the Military Sealift Command to USSOCOM to support near-term maritime requirements for United States Southern Command. The committee is also aware that USSOCOM has initiated a new-start procurement using current fiscal year 2014 funds to begin modifications to USNS Sumner estimated at \$8.9 million. The budget request for fiscal year 2015 included \$20.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, to further modify and operate USNS Sumner within the United States Southern Command area of operations.

The committee is concerned that the proposed transfer of sponsorship of USNS Sumner to USSOCOM and proposed command and control relationships are without precedent, and that projected costs for the current fiscal year and across the Future Years Defense Program will far exceed current estimates. Further, the committee has concerns that the requirement is being funded only by USSOCOM Major Force Program-11 (MFP-11) funds which are limited by section 167 of title 10, United States Code, to provide only the incremental funding and acquisition of special operations-peculiar material, supplies, and services. Since the committee understands that this platform will be used to also support the geographic combatant commander theater campaign plans such as counter-narcotics, humanitarian assistance, and security force assistance, the committee believes that MFP-11 funding is an inappropriate source for these costly modifications and operations, and that MFP-11 is being used to supplant activities that should be provided for by the services and the geographic combatant commander.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2014, on the proposed transfer of the USNS Sumner from Military Sealift Command to USSOCOM. The briefing at a minimum should outline:

- (1) The validated requirement as defined by the geographic combatant commander;
- (2) Anticipated costs across the Future Years Defense Program and funding sources;

(3) Reason for the use of USNS Sumner, to include a business case analysis discussing efficiencies and cost savings; and

(4) Any other matters the Secretary deems appropriate.

Furthermore, given these concerns, the committee denies the requested amount of \$20.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, to further modify and operate USNS Sumner and redirects this funding to more direct operational readiness requirements within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Flying Hours Program for USSOCOM.

#### Waste Disposal Technologies in Contingency Operations

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations prohibiting the disposal of covered waste in open-air burn pits during contingency operations, except when no alternative disposal method is feasible. The committee further notes that the Report to Congress on the Use of Open-Air Burn Pits by the United States Armed Forces, submitted on May 12, 2010, pursuant to Public Law 111–84, stated that “The introduction of incinerators, plus other thermal (to include waste-to-energy) and non-thermal waste disposal options, are intended to eventually displace the use of burn pits.” The report concluded, “DoD must continue to explore viable technical solutions for waste reduction and waste disposal in all categories—solid, medical, and hazardous—and then make such solutions available through easily acquired commercial or DoD provided equipment.” To that end, the committee is aware that the final burn pit that was being operated in Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in compliance with Department of Defense and U.S. Central Command policies, as required by Public Law 111–84, was closed in April 2014. Remaining U.S. locations within Afghanistan utilize a combination of landfills, incinerators, and removal of waste by local nationals.

The committee is also aware that the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) has observed problems associated with incinerators that have been installed in Afghanistan. Such problems include poor construction, planning and design, and coordination between contracts for constructing the incinerators and for operating and maintaining them. The committee understands that the Department of Defense is assessing commercial incinerator and other waste-disposal technologies to determine the feasibility for use at bases of varying size, maturity, and duration. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to provide a briefing for the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 2, 2015, on the lessons learned related to waste-disposal methods in contingency operations and provide an update on the Department’s assessment of waste-disposal technologies, to include those that would provide an efficient, reliable and deployable capability that adheres to electrical and construction standards that ensure life, safety, and health of U.S. personnel.



## 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—Elimination of Fiscal Year Limitation on Prohibition of Payment of Fines and Penalties from the Environmental Restoration Account, Defense

This section would eliminate a sunset date for the requirement for the Department of Defense to obtain congressional authorization before paying fines and penalties under the requirement set forth in section 2703 of title 10, United States Code. The current requirement for congressional authorization does not apply to funds authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Restoration Account, Defense after fiscal year 2010. This section would strike any such date limitation.

## Section 312—Biannual Certification by Commanders of the Combatant Commands Relating to the Prohibition on the Disposal of Waste in Open-Air Burn Pits

This section would require the combatant commanders to submit a biannual certification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that covered waste under the jurisdiction of the commander has not been disposed of in violation of the regulations set forth in section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). This section also prescribes additional details required in instances of noncompliance.

## Section 313—Exclusions from Definition of “Chemical Substance” Under Toxic Substances Control Act and Report on Lead Ammunition

This section would modify section 2602(2)(B) of title 15, United States Code, to add to the exclusions any component of any article including shot, bullets and other projectiles, propellants when manufactured for or used in such an article, and primers. This section would also require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than September 30, 2015, that would detail the costs for the procurement of small arms alternative lead ammunition and the qualification of non-lead alternatives, and include an assessment of which non-lead variants of ammunition exist.

Section 314—Exemption of Department of Defense from  
Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement

This section would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) to exempt the Department of Defense from the requirements related to contracts for alternative or synthetic fuel in that section.

Section 315—Congressional Notice of Bulk Purchase of Alternative  
Fuels for Operational Use

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees 60 days before the bulk purchase of alternative fuels intended for operational use.

Section 316—Limitation on Procurement of Biofuels

This section would limit the Department of Defense’s ability to purchase or produce biofuels until the earlier of either the date on which the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) is no longer in effect, or the date on which the cost of biofuel is equal to the cost of conventional fuels. This section would provide an exception for biofuel test and certification and research and development.

Section 317—Limitation on Plan, Design, Refurbishing, or  
Construction of Biofuels Refineries

This section would require the Department of Defense to obtain a congressional authorization before entering into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery.

SUBTITLE C—LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT

Section 321—Additional Requirement for Strategic Policy on  
Prepositioning of Materiel and Equipment

This section would amend the strategic policy on prepositioned materiel and equipment required by section 2229(a) of title 10, United States Code, to ensure newly established crisis response elements are considered when developing goals, assessing challenges, and synchronizing requirements.

Section 322—Comptroller General Reports on Department of De-  
fense Prepositioning Strategic Policy and Plan for Prepositioned  
Stocks

This section would modify the reporting requirement in section 321 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to run through 2017, 3 years following the initial report due in 2014, for a total of four reports over 4 years.

Section 323—Pilot Program on Provision of Logistic Support for the  
Conveyance of Excess Defense Articles to Allied Forces

This section would create a 2-year pilot program allowing the Secretary of Defense to provide logistics support for the conveyance

of excess defense articles to allied forces participating in bilateral or multilateral training activities with the Armed Forces of the United States. This authority would be subject to funding limitations and would expire on September 30, 2016. The Secretary of Defense would be required to provide a report on the use of the authority to certain congressional committees at the end of any calendar year during which the Secretary carried out the pilot program.

#### SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

##### Section 331—Repeal of Annual Report on Department of Defense Operation and Financial Support for Military Museums

This section would repeal an annual report by the Secretary of Defense on Department of Defense operations and financial support for military museums required by section 489 of title 10, United States Code.

##### Section 332—Report on Enduring Requirements and Activities Currently Funded Through Amounts Authorized to Be Appropriated for Overseas Contingency Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees concurrent with the President's budget for fiscal year 2016, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, a one-time assessment of enduring mission requirements, equipping, training, sustainment, and other operation and maintenance-related activities of each military department, combat support agency, and the Department of Defense currently funded through the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget. The provision also requires associated funding information and a 3-year migration plan to move enduring requirements funding into the base budget.

The committee is concerned about the large portion of enduring activities, training, sustainment, and other military requirements being funded through amounts authorized to be appropriated for OCO. The committee believes the Department of Defense is accepting high levels of risk in continuing to fund non-contingency related activities through the OCO budget and has not fully articulated the scope of enduring OCO-funded activities or a clear path forward in migrating enduring requirement resources to the base budget.

##### Section 333—Army Assessment of the Regionally Aligned Force

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a strategic assessment of the regionally aligned force to the congressional defense committees concurrent with the submission of the President's budget for fiscal year 2016 pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

The committee supports the U.S. Army's regionally aligned force (RAF) concept, but has concerns about the institutionalization of pre-deployment training, incorporation of lessons learned, and the adequate coordination of activities between contractors, Special Operations Forces, Army RAF units, and joint exercise partners. The

committee is also concerned about the complexity of utilizing multiple funding authorities to support RAF activities and impacts associated with the long-term commitment of RAF forces to meet security cooperation requirements. The committee believes better coordination and long-term planning are needed to ensure RAF units maintain high levels of core mission readiness while supporting geographic combatant commander requirements.

The committee notes that while elsewhere in this report, the committee also directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the RAF concept, more specifically its employment in the U.S. Africa Command area of responsibility, the committee expects the assessment required by this section to be a separate and distinct forward-looking, internal assessment of the RAF concept, yet inform the Comptroller General's work.

#### Section 334—Report on Impacts of Funding Reductions on Military Readiness

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to report to the congressional defense committees the readiness and cost impacts of the reductions in operation and maintenance funding required in section 4301 of this Act.

#### SUBTITLE E—LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY

#### Section 341—Limitation on Authority to Enter into a Contract for the Sustainment, Maintenance, Repair, or Overhaul of the F117 Engine

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from entering into a subsequent contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, and overhaul of the F117 engine until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of the Air Force has structured the contract in such a way that provides the Secretary required insight into all aspects of F117 component and subcomponent historical usage, cost, service-life, and supply chain management data sufficient to determine that the Secretary is paying a fair and reasonable price for F117 sustainment as compared to the PW2000 commercial-derivative sustainment price in the private sector. This section would also allow the Secretary to waive this limitation if the Secretary determines such waiver is in the interests of national security.

#### SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 351—Clarification of Authority Relating to Provision of Installation-Support Services Through Intergovernmental Support Agreements

This section would transfer and redesignate section 2336 of title 10, United States Code, to chapter 159 of such title. This section would also define an intergovernmental support agreement and provide other technical changes.

Section 352—Sense of Congress on Access to Training Ranges  
within United States Pacific Command Area of Responsibility

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding access to training ranges within U.S. Pacific Command's area of responsibility.

Section 353—Management of Conventional Ammunition Inventory

This section would designate an authoritative database on conventional ammunition and broaden the existing military service annual reporting requirements on conventional ammunition.

## TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

### OVERVIEW

The Defense Strategic Guidance calls for a leaner, more adaptable force. The Department of Defense has determined it cannot support a standing force for large-scale prolonged stability operations but instead will maintain one that can quickly deter, defeat, and, if needed, rebuild capacity for unforeseen requirements. This means a smaller Active Duty force, with a Reserve Component capable of continuing to operate as an operational reserve to maintain strategic depth, which is reflected in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request. The budget included further reductions in the Active Component end strength in the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, while preserving the Navy at its current level. The committee notes the services plan for more drastic reductions in end strength and force structure in fiscal year 2016 absent a change to the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA).

The Reserve Components will make minor reductions in fiscal year 2015; but just as the Active Component, the Reserves will be required to take further reductions over the 5-year fiscal defense plan, which also could be significantly steeper absent repeal of sequestration. As the Active Components reduce end strength, the committee encourages the services to ensure the proper force structure and resourcing is provided to the Reserve Components in order to preserve an operational reserve. The committee also recommends that as missions such as cyber security, space operations, and unmanned aerial systems continue grow, the services incorporate the Reserve Components into these force structure requirements to capitalize on the expertise of the Reserve Component members.

The committee understands the situation the Army and Marine Corps face in this current budget environment, but remains concerned with the planned force reductions for the Army and Marine Corps, and with the Navy's continued challenges manning the fleet while combat and contingency commitments continue. This continued stress on the force, coupled with potential further reductions as a result of the BCA's discretionary caps, may have serious implications on the capacity and capability of the All-Volunteer Force and the ability for the services to meet the National Defense Strategy.

## 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, 2015:

| Service         | FY 2014<br>Authorized | FY 2015   |                                  | Change from        |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                 |                       | Request   | Committee<br>Recom-<br>mendation | FY 2015<br>Request | FY 2014<br>Authorized |
| Army .....      | 520,000               | 490,000   | 490,000                          | 0                  | -30,000               |
| Navy .....      | 323,600               | 323,600   | 323,600                          | 0                  | 0                     |
| USMC .....      | 190,200               | 184,100   | 184,100                          | 0                  | -6,100                |
| Air Force ..... | 327,600               | 310,900   | 311,220                          | 320                | -16,380               |
| DOD Total ..... | 1,361,400             | 1,308,600 | 1,308,600                        | 0                  | -53,100               |

## Section 402—Revisions 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, 2015. The committee recommends 490,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Army, 323,600 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Navy, 184,100 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 310,900 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, 2015:

| Service                    | FY 2014<br>Authorized | FY 2015 |                                  | Change from        |                       |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                            |                       | Request | Committee<br>Recom-<br>mendation | FY 2015<br>Request | FY 2014<br>Authorized |
| Army National Guard .....  | 354,200               | 350,200 | 350,200                          | 0                  | -4,000                |
| Army Reserve .....         | 205,000               | 202,000 | 202,000                          | 0                  | -3,000                |
| Navy Reserve .....         | 59,100                | 57,300  | 57,300                           | 0                  | -1,800                |
| Marine Corps Reserve ..... | 39,600                | 39,200  | 39,200                           | 0                  | -400                  |
| Air National Guard .....   | 105,400               | 105,000 | 105,000                          | 0                  | -400                  |
| Air Force Reserve .....    | 70,400                | 67,100  | 67,100                           | 0                  | -3,300                |
| DOD Total .....            | 833,700               | 820,800 | 820,800                          | 0                  | 12,900                |

| Service                   | FY 2014<br>Authorized | FY 2015 |                                  | Change from        |                       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                           |                       | Request | Committee<br>Recom-<br>mendation | FY 2015<br>Request | FY 2014<br>Authorized |
| Coast Guard Reserve ..... | 9,000                 | 7,000   | 7,000                            | 0                  | -2,000                |

#### 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, 2015:

| Service                    | FY 2014<br>Authorized | FY 2015 |                                  | Change from        |                       |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                            |                       | Request | Committee<br>Recom-<br>mendation | FY 2015<br>Request | FY 2014<br>Authorized |
| Army National Guard .....  | 32,060                | 31,385  | 31,385                           | 0                  | -675                  |
| Army Reserve .....         | 16,261                | 16,261  | 16,261                           | 0                  | 00                    |
| Navy Reserve .....         | 10,159                | 9,973   | 9,973                            | 0                  | -186                  |
| Marine Corps Reserve ..... | 2,261                 | 2,261   | 2,261                            | 0                  | 00                    |
| Air National Guard .....   | 14,734                | 14,704  | 14,704                           | 0                  | -30                   |
| Air Force Reserve .....    | 2,911                 | 2,830   | 2,830                            | 0                  | -81                   |
| DOD Total .....            | 78,386                | 77,414  | 77,414                           | 0                  | -972                  |

#### 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, 2015:

| Service                   | FY 2014<br>Authorized | FY 2015 |                                  | Change from        |                       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                           |                       | Request | Committee<br>Recom-<br>mendation | FY 2015<br>Request | FY 2014<br>Authorized |
| Army National Guard ..... | 27,210                | 27,210  | 27,210                           | 0                  | 0                     |
| Army Reserve .....        | 8,395                 | 7,895   | 7,895                            | 0                  | -500                  |
| Air National Guard .....  | 21,875                | 21,792  | 21,792                           | 0                  | -83                   |
| Air Force Reserve .....   | 10,429                | 9,789   | 9,789                            | 0                  | -640                  |
| DOD Total .....           | 67,909                | 66,686  | 66,686                           | 0                  | -1,223                |

#### Section 414—Fiscal Year 2015 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, 2015:

| Service                   | FY 2014<br>Authorized | FY 2015      |                                  | Change from        |                       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                           |                       | Request      | Committee<br>Recom-<br>mendation | FY 2015<br>Request | FY 2014<br>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                     |
| <b>DOD Total .....</b>    | <b>2,635</b>          | <b>2,635</b> | <b>2,635</b>                     | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>              |

**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 2015 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by section 401 or section 412 of this Act unless the duration on Active Duty exceeds the limitations in section 115(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

| Service                    | FY 2014<br>Authorized | FY 2015       |                                  | Change from        |                       |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                            |                       | Request       | Committee<br>Recom-<br>mendation | FY 2015<br>Request | FY 2014<br>Authorized |
| Army National Guard .....  | 17,000                | 17,000        | 17,000                           | 0                  | 0                     |
| Army Reserve .....         | 13,000                | 13,000        | 13,000                           | 0                  | 0                     |
| Navy 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                     |
| <b>DOD Total .....</b>     | <b>69,200</b>         | <b>69,200</b> | <b>69,200</b>                    | <b>0</b>           | <b>0</b>              |

**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 continues to be concerned with the Department of Defense’s efforts to smartly manage the force. Therefore, the committee would provide authority to remove the limitation on the number of officers recommended for discharge in a given fiscal year



in comparison to the number of officers discharged the preceding fiscal year and provides the military Secretaries the authority to establish specific objectives to best select warrant officers for early retirement. Additionally, the committee remains concerned during this drawdown that the services are able to retain the best qualified service members and extends the authority to conduct career flexibility programs for service members until 2019.

In support of military members and their families, the committee would provide assistance to local educational agencies that are impacted by the enrollment of dependent children of military members and Department of Defense civilian employees.

In the area of sexual assault prevention and response, the committee would direct several changes to refine the fundamental revisions made in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66). The committee would require that appropriateness of command climate be included in performance appraisals of commanding officers. The committee would further require the Judicial Proceedings Panel established under section 576 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to review and assess the use of mental health records by the defense during preliminary hearings and court-martial proceedings under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice and in civilian legal proceedings.

In the area of suicide prevention, the committee would require the Department to formulate a standardized policy governing collection, reporting, and assessing of suicide data for Active Duty and Reserve Components members and their dependents. The Department has made great strides in the area of suicide prevention, and improvement of suicide data management will serve as a strong foundation for this ongoing endeavor. However, the committee is concerned that while it appears suicides among members of the general forces have declined, the rate of suicides by members of the Special Operations Forces has increased. Therefore, the committee would direct a review and assessment of the suicide prevention efforts for members of the Special Operations Forces and their dependents.

#### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

##### Analysis for Change in Basic Allowance for Housing

The committee is concerned that the Administration's proposal to modify the basic allowance for housing to increase the out of pocket costs for service members and their families up to five percent out of pocket, as well as eliminate the stipend for renter's insurance in the calculation for housing allowance may have unintended consequences that have not been fully explored. The Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission is currently reviewing compensation programs, including the basic allowance for housing, and its report is due on February 1, 2015. The committee recommends that the Department of Defense share with the Commission, the analysis, if any, that was conducted on the impact of increasing the basic allowance for housing will have on member retention, readiness and morale of the force. The Department should also share any analysis that was conducted on the impact

to the housing privatization program, including any impact to recapitalization accounts, debt service, operation, maintenance and repair requirements and long-term operation of privatized projects. The committee looks forward to the results of the Commission, including any analysis on the impact of changes to the basic allowance for housing for service members.

#### Arlington National Cemetery Advisory Committee

The committee applauds the efforts the Army has taken to correct deficiencies in the oversight, management, and operations of Arlington National Cemetery. The Army's efforts to ensure the final resting place for our Nation's veterans and their families represent and demonstrate the highest ideals of honor and commitment which is to be commended. The establishment of the Arlington National Cemetery Advisory Committee provides an independent viewpoint to ensure that interests of veterans and surviving family members are taken into account. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue efforts to ensure that the advisory committee maintains a diverse representation of all constituencies and the Armed Forces and that the membership is filled to the fullest extent possible.

#### Briefing on Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the status of the implementation of the sexual assault provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81); the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239); the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66); and the initiatives announced in a memorandum by the Secretary of Defense on August 14, 2013. The briefing should include the extent to which the services have implemented policies, procedures, training, and education as required by Department of Defense policies, programs, and regulations. The briefing should be conducted not later than March 1, 2015.

#### Comptroller General Review of Army National Guard Recruiting Practices

The committee is concerned with the management and oversight of Army National Guard recruiting practices. The committee notes a series of issues over the past 5 to 8 years with recruiter and enlistment bonus irregularities, and the ongoing criminal investigation of the Guard Recruiter Assistance Program (GRAP). The committee is concerned that regulations and policies set forth by the Secretary of the Army and the National Guard Bureau are not being adhered to consistently across all of the States and territories.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Army and Army National Guard recruiting regulations, policies, and procedures to determine if the Army and Army National Guard have processes in place to ensure that these regulations and policies are being adhered to by recruit-

ers in the States and territories. The review shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) An assessment of how the Army and Army National Guard ensure that eligibility criteria for enlistment are enforced in a selected number of States and the impact this may have on the recruiting mission;

(2) An assessment of the number of persons who enlist, complete basic and advanced individual training, and remain in the Army National Guard for their initial term of service;

(3) An assessment of the extent to which persons who have contracted with a specified enlistment bonus, but were not authorized to receive a bonus by policy or regulation;

(4) An assessment of the average length of time between when a person enlists in the Army National Guard and the person completes the initial entry training required to be deployable;

(5) An assessment of the contracting vehicles being used by the Army National Guard to support recruiters and how the Army National Guard ensures such contracting vehicles comply with Department of Defense, Army policies and regulations; and,

(6) Recommendations for the leadership of the Army and the National Guard Bureau to improve and enforce compliance of regulations and policies with respect to recruiting.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to report the results of the assessment to the congressional defense committees by June 1, 2015.

#### Comptroller General Review of Army Reserve and Army National Guard Non-Availability for Mobilization

The committee is concerned with the high percentage of soldiers in the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard that are not available for mobilization. The Army Reserves has approximately 25 percent of its force non-available for mobilization, with the majority due to medical non-availability. The Army National Guard has almost 30 percent of its force non-available for mobilization, with the two largest categories being medically non-available and those who have not completed entry level training. As the active Army reduces its end strength to potentially 420,000 soldiers, the readiness and availability of the Reserve Component to maintain its operational focus becomes even more critical. While the Reserve Components have made significant contributions to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom over the last 13 years, only about half of their medical non-available population has ever deployed. The committee is concerned with the efforts of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard to manage the personnel readiness of their force.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard non-available population to:

(1) Determine the extent to which programs, policies, and regulations are being followed;

(2) Assess the management of such forces to minimize the impact to unit and individual deployments;

(3) Evaluate the process by which the Reserves and Guard are able to determine the extent and length of the non-availability of

those who have a medical profile and when such individuals should be assessed for a medical board determination;

(4) Assess whether the current process to assign individuals to units who have not completed their entry level training is the best course of action to man the Army National Guard; and

(5) Determine whether there are any systematic issues that result in a significant non-available population.

The Comptroller General is required to submit a report containing the results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than June 1, 2015. The committee requests the Comptroller General also provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the initial findings of the review by April 1, 2015.

#### Comptroller General Review Regarding Department of Defense and Military Departments Professionalism and Ethics Programs

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for focusing on military ethics, character, and leadership within the Department of Defense. Recently, the Secretary established a senior adviser for military professionalism for the Department who will report directly to the Secretary on issues related to military ethics, character, and leadership. Considering the high-profile lapses involving senior leaders, the committee remains concerned about how this new position will be executed and the roles, responsibilities, and effectiveness of the military services' ethics programs. The committee, therefore, directs the Comptroller General of the United States to initiate a comprehensive review of the Department of Defense and military departments' programs on professionalism, ethics, and integrity in the armed services for officers and enlisted service members. The Comptroller General should submit a report of the Comptroller's findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by not later than August 31, 2015. Additionally, the committee requests the Comptroller brief the committees on preliminary observations by April 1, 2015. As part of the review, the Comptroller General should include an evaluation of military service assessment tools and report on the extent to which those tools capture and assess professionalism, ethics, and integrity issues.

#### Continuum of Service and Reserve Component Duty Statuses

The committee notes the effort the military services have initiated to create greater flexibility for movement between the Active and Reserve Components, commonly referred to as continuum of service. The services have determined that this personnel initiative is key to allowing greater flexibility in the force. However, the committee notes that the current number of duty statuses for the Reserve Components is a hindrance to this initiative. The Commission on the National Guard and Reserve and the Commission on the Structure of the Air Force both recognized this as a barrier to fully implementing a continuum of service and recommended the Department of Defense reduce the number of duty statuses from 35 to approximately 6. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense

to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than January 1, 2015, a proposal that would reduce the duty status of the Reserve Components to no more than eight pay statutes to assist in creating greater flexibility for the Reserve Components to be more interoperable with the Active Components.

#### Department of Defense Hair and Grooming Standards

The Secretary of Defense shall not enforce and shall evaluate the changes to hair standards and grooming policies for female service members, as those contained in paragraph 3-2 of Army Regulation 670-1, issued on March 31, 2014, and report to the congressional defense committees the results of the evaluation. The evaluation shall include the opinions of those who may have religious accommodation requirements and minorities serving in the Armed Forces.

#### Diversity of the Armed Forces

The committee continues to support efforts by the services to ensure diversity among the force. The committee remains concerned that the efforts by the services to ensure that our Nation's military is reflective of American society are being reduced due to the current budget environment. The committee understands the challenges that the services are facing, but urges the services to maintain, and where possible, increase their advertising within minority communities, to support their commitment to ensuring a strong diverse force. Recruitment advertising within minority communities is an important avenue toward building interest and understanding in serving our Nation in uniform. The committee urges the services and the Department of Defense to maintain a commitment to diversity recruiting and retention.

#### Medal of Honor Process

The committee is encouraged that the Secretary of Defense has directed a comprehensive review of military decorations and awards. After 13 years of combat, it is imperative that we ensure service members have been properly recognized for their sacrifices and actions given the changed combat environment. The committee urges the Secretary to pay particular attention to the Medal of Honor process to ensure that individuals nominated for this award have not been hindered by delayed submissions or lack of timely action. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense as part of the comprehensive military decoration and awards review, to review the nomination process, the valor requirements, and the amount of time taken from submission of a nomination to approval by the Secretary of Defense to enhance the medal awards process. The review should also specifically review the Medal of Honor process to ensure that the nomination process, valor requirements, and timeliness of the process do not unfairly penalize service members. The Secretary of Defense should submit the results of the review, along with the specific focus on the Medal of Honor process, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2015.

### Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System Firefighting Mission

The committee recognizes the important capability of the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System (MAFFS) to assist the National Forest Service and State and local agencies fight forest fires. The committee believes that the National Guard should continue in its role as first responders to civil authorities, since the Guard is trained and ready to respond to natural disasters and emergencies regardless of State lines. The committee has become aware that, as a result of members who were killed while on a mission, the Department of Defense is reviewing a policy change dictating which authorities the Air National Guard should be activated under while in support of these missions. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, 60 days prior to any change in policy, a review and assessment of the factors used to make a determination of the appropriate duty status for members of the Air National Guard under either title 10 or title 32; the benefits the member may be afforded under title 10 or title 32 status; the average response time under title 10 or title 32 status; any degradation of the readiness of the MAFFS as a result of different duty statuses; and any other issues that were considered to make a determination on the status under which MAFFS is used to respond to a natural disaster or emergency. In addition, any proposed policy change shall not take effect until after the end of the 30-day calendar period beginning on the date on which the Secretary provides notice of the proposed policy change to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

### Recognizing Military Chaplains

The committee recognizes the historical and present-day significance of the chaplaincies of the military departments. Since General George Washington and the First Continental Congress created the Chaplain Corps on July 29, 1775, military chaplains have offered spiritual leadership to service members.

Since the inception of the Chaplain Corps in 1775, over 25,000 chaplains have served as religious and spiritual leaders for 25 million soldiers and their families in every war in which America has engaged. Four hundred chaplains have paid the ultimate sacrifice and given their lives in service to this country; 7 chaplains received the Medal of Honor; 27 received the Distinguished Service Cross; and many others received Purple Hearts, Silver Stars, Bronze Stars for Valor, and Combat Action Badges.

The committee acknowledges that military chaplains exist “to advise and assist commanders in the discharge of their responsibilities to provide for the free exercise of religion in the context of military service as guaranteed by the Constitution, to assist commanders in managing Religious Affairs, and to serve as the principal advisors to commanders for all issues regarding the impact of religion on military operations.”

The committee commends the chaplaincies of the military departments and urges the Department of Defense to support chaplains

in their efforts to serve and minister to our men and women in uniform.

#### Report on Need for Uniform Code of Military Justice Punitive Article

The committee notes the requirement in section 1741 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) that requires the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the recommendations of the Secretary regarding the need to amend chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, to create an additional article to address violations of the policy regarding prohibited and inappropriate relationships between a service member who exercises authority or control over a prospective member of the Armed Forces undergoing entry-level processing or training. The deadline for the report is June 2014. The committee expects the Secretary to provide the report by the required due date.

#### Report on the Sufficiency of Department of Defense Chaplain Guidance in Response to the Independent Review Related to Fort Hood

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015, on the results of a review to determine if current Department of Defense guidance regarding an individual, ecclesiastical endorsing agent, or religious organization's conviction or indictment of a terrorism-related offense or other offense threatening national security and their participation in the chaplaincy is sufficient to meet the recommendations of the Department of Defense Independent Review Related to Fort Hood.

#### Support to Youth and Charitable Organizations

The committee recognizes the importance of youth and charitable organizations that provide opportunities for the young men and women of America and the partnerships fostered with the Department of Defense and the military services. These relationships provide important training opportunities for the services, especially the Reserves and the National Guard. Section 508 of title 32, United States Code, establishes eligible organizations, and provides the Secretary of Defense the ability to designate other youth and charitable organizations. The committee encourages the Secretary to consider designating any Student Cadet Corps, when requested, as an organization eligible for assistance from the National Guard.

#### Transition Assistance Program

The committee applauds the Department of Defense's revamped Transition Assistance Program (TAP) to provide assistance to career ready military members transitioning to a new career or further education following military separation. The new Transition—Goals, Plans, Success (Transition—GPS) is an enhanced program established to assist members with their transition as the military

draws down. Transition—GPS gives the Department the flexibility and authorities required to execute its role in providing information, counseling, tools, and training for service members to transition from the military. While the committee stands by the good work the Department has done through Transition—GPS, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continuously improve and build the program. The committee supports the conclusions reached by the March 2014 Government Accountability Office report, *Transitioning Veterans: Improved Oversight Needed to Enhance Implementation of Transition Assistance Program* (GAO-14-144), and is specifically concerned with any lack of ability for individual unit commanders to participate in TAP and continued weakness in outcome measures, making it difficult to attribute results to TAP. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to comply with the recommendations for executive action listed in the GAO report.

#### U.S. Air Force Academy Reductions

The committee recognizes the critical role of the U.S. Air Force Academy (USAFA) in educating and cultivating the next generation of leaders for the U.S. Air Force. The committee is aware that the Air Force Academy Superintendent, due to budget reductions, is intending to eliminate 10 academic majors and multiple permanent staff positions, to include 40 Academy Military Trainers (AMTs). This will result in a reduction of Academy Military Trainers to 1 per squadron of approximately 100 cadets. AMTs provide critical services to cadets, including counseling, mentorship, and professional training essential to the development of Air Force leaders. Additionally, AMTs foster a foundation of trust within the cadet squadrons which is critical to developing and inculcating the ethics and moral values required for service in the military, as well as ensuring the well-being of the cadets attending the Academy. The committee finds this reduction troubling as the average age of a cadet is younger than the average Air Force enlistee. The committee is concerned that a reduction of AMTs unnecessarily jeopardizes the culture in the cadet squadrons by reducing resources for a cadet's professional development and personal well-being, which may lead to an increase in misconduct and sexual assaults. Prior to any reduction in staff at the Air Force Academy, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than January 1, 2015, an assessment justifying the need to cut permanent military staff in the cadet squadrons. The assessment should include the factors the Secretary used to make a determination for personnel cuts, how the Air Force Academy will ensure the professional development and personal well-being of cadets if these cuts are enacted, and any other determinations that were considered in the reduction of programs and degrees offered by the Air Force Academy.

#### U.S. Special Operations Command Education Initiatives

The committee recognizes the vital role of education in developing the next generation of leaders and subject matter experts



within the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). The committee notes the unique role of the Joint Special Operations University (JSOU) in developing Special Operations Forces (SOF) specific strategic and operational leadership within USSOCOM. The committee is aware of an expansion effort by the JSOU to include accreditation for bachelor and master's degree programs. The committee also notes the increase in advanced civilian education initiatives USSOCOM has taken over the past 2 years by increasing attendance of officers at the Naval Post Graduate School, creating a special master's degree program through Kansas State University for officers attending the Command and General Staff College and sending officers to Johns Hopkins University to obtain a Master of Arts in Legislative Affairs. The committee understands the dynamic situations in which SOF operate at the tactical, operation, and strategic level and recognizes that there are requirements for higher education to increase opportunities for success.

However, the committee is concerned with the validation of the requirement for JSOU to offer degrees, as well as the increased education requirements for officers that cannot be accomplished through the parent service. There are numerous degree-granting programs Department-wide, as well as partnership opportunities with civilian institutions which may meet mission requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense in coordination with the service secretaries to provide the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2015, an assessment of the validity of the course and degree requirements at JSOU, including USSOCOM's master's degree requirements for officers. The assessment of JSOU should include an analysis of current and proposed JSOU programs, including which programs can be accomplished at service schools or civilian institutions, and justification for JSOU to receive degree-granting authority. The assessment of USSOCOM's master's degree requirements should include a review of the positions coded as required to hold a master's degree, the number of officers who are required to attend fully funded master's degree programs on an annual basis to meet the position requirements, and the historical promotion rates and command selection rates for SOF officers who hold master's degrees from fully funded programs and serve in these master's degree coded positions. The assessment should also include the costs associated with JSOU receiving degree-granting authority across the Future Years Defense Program.

#### Unmanned Aerial System Transition of Personnel

The committee is aware that the Federal Aviation Administration has selected six Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) research and test sites to assess the integration of UAS in the Nation's airspace. The committee notes that military trained UAS pilots and maintenance personnel have accumulated extensive experience operating UASs in a range of environments. With the emergence of UAS technology in the civilian sector, the UAS industry will need a highly trained workforce of pilots, mechanics, and other support personnel. The committee recognizes that the services are being forced to reduce their force structure, and UAS personnel may need to transition from the military to civilian communities. The Depart-

ment of Defense has undertaken efforts to address the transition of service members in a number of career fields, such as nursing and information technology. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to assess the transition pathway for UAS personnel from military service to civilian employment as part of the Department's ongoing transition pilot program.

#### Use of Reserve Officers Training Corps Scholarships to Increase Cyber Security Expertise

The committee notes the efforts the Department of Defense has taken to increase cyber security capability and expertise. The committee believes it is important to ensure the Department and military services are capitalizing on the cyber education capabilities in institutions of higher education to train the current cyber force, as well as produce future military cyber leaders. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the military services to utilize the Reserve Officers Training Corps scholarship program to partner with the National Security Agency and Department of Homeland Security Centers of Academic Excellence program and institutions of higher education, for cyber security to ensure the Department of Defense can access the requisite number of qualified officers into the cyber security field.

### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

#### SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

##### Section 501—Authority to Limit Consideration for Early Retirement by Selective Retirement Boards to Particular Warrant Officer Year Groups and Specialties

This section would provide the Secretaries of the military departments the authority to establish selection objectives for warrant officer specialties for Selective Retirement Boards (SRBs) convened pursuant to section 581 of title 10, United States Code. This authority is necessary to enable the services to retain the very best warrant officers in each warrant officer specialty and not exacerbate the shortage of warrant officers in under-strength and low-density warrant officer specialties, as forces are drawn down during fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

##### Section 502—Relief from Limits on the Percentage of Officers Who May Be Recommended for Discharge during a Fiscal Year Using Enhanced Authority for Selective Early Discharges

This section would amend section 638a of title 10, United States Code, to give relief from limits on the percentage of officers who may be recommended for discharge during a fiscal year using enhanced authority for selective early discharges. This section would remove the limitation on the number of officers recommended for discharge in a given fiscal year in comparison to the number of officers discharged the preceding fiscal year. Currently, the number of regular officers recommended for discharge cannot exceed 70 percent of the number of officers discharged from Active Duty the preceding fiscal year.

Section 503—Repeal of Requirement for Submission to Congress of Annual Reports on Joint Officer Management and Promotion Policy Objectives for Joint Officers

This section would repeal section 667 and section 662(b) of title 10, United States Code, removing the requirement to submit an annual report to Congress concerning the Department of Defense Joint Officer Management Program.

Section 504—Options for Phase II of Joint Professional Military Education

This section would amend section 2154(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a senior service level course of at least 10 months in duration designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense to award Joint Professional Military Education Level II credit.

Section 505—Limitation on Number of Enlisted Aides Authorized for Officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps

This section would amend section 981 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the current limitation on the number of enlisted aides authorized to support general and flag officers. The maximum number of enlisted aides would be modified to be the lesser of 300 or the number of enlisted aides calculated based on two times the number of generals or admirals and the number lieutenant generals or vice admirals on Active Duty the preceding fiscal year. Further, this section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to report annually to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the total number of enlisted aides assigned and authorized as aides for general and flag officers.

Section 506—Required Consideration of Certain Elements of Command Climate in Performance Appraisals of Commanding Officers

This section would require a Secretary of a military department to include information regarding command climate with regard to allegations of sexual assault and the response to the victim of sexual assault by other members of the command on the performance appraisal of a commanding officer.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Retention on the Reserve Active-Status List Following Nonselection for Promotion of Certain Health Professions Officers and First Lieutenants and Lieutenants (Junior Grade) Pursuing Baccalaureate Degrees

This section would amend section 14701 of title 10, United States Code, to permit certain first lieutenants of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, who have twice failed for selection for promotion to the next higher grade to be considered for continuation on the reserve active-status list. Further, the proposal would require the Secretaries of the mili-

tary departments to retain health care professionals who have twice failed for promotion to the next higher grade, but who have not completed any service commitment incurred as a result of their participation in a health professions stipend program under section 16201 of title 10, United States Code, known in the Army as the Specialized Training Assistance Program. These two changes will allow the services to selectively continue officers qualified in critically short specialties required to provide medical support to the combatant commands.

**Section 512—Chief of the National Guard Bureau Role in Assignment of Directors and Deputy Directors of the Army and Air National Guards**

This section would amend section 10506(a) of title 10, United States Code, to include the Chief of the National Guard Bureau in the selection and nomination process for the Director and Deputy Director of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard.

**Section 513—National Guard Civil and Defense Support Activities and Related Matters**

This section would amend chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, by adding a new section to authorize the use of the National Guard to provide assistance to support firefighting operations, missions, or activities, including aerial firefighting employment of the Modular Airborne Firefighting System.

**SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES**

**Section 521—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel Decisions Relating to Correction of Military Records**

This section would establish procedures for judicial review for any final decision regarding records correction made under sections 1034(g) or (h) and section 1552 or 1554a of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the service member to exhaust administrative relief procedures before seeking judicial review for correction of military records or decisions granted by the boards for the correction of military records. Additionally, this section would require that service members be notified of their right to judicial review and of the statutory time limits associated with judicial review of correction board decisions.

**Section 522—Additional Required Elements of Transition Assistance Program**

This section would amend section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring any member who plans to use educational assistance entitlements under title 38 to receive instruction on an overview of those entitlements, courses in post-secondary education appropriate for the member and compatible with the member's goals, and how to finance the member's education. Implementation of this section would occur not later than April 1, 2016.

Section 523—Extension of Authority to Conduct Career Flexibility Programs

This section would extend the authority of the Secretary of a military department, until December 31, 2019, to carry out pilot programs under which officers and enlisted members of the Regular Component, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned, may be inactivated from Active Duty in order to meet personal or professional needs and returned to Active Duty at the end of the period of inactivation.

Section 524—Provision of Information to Members of the Armed Forces on Privacy Rights Relating to Receipt of Mental Health Services

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to provide information regarding the privacy rights of a service member who is seeking and receiving mental health services. The Secretary would be required to provide this information to service members during initial and basic training, and to other members of the Armed Forces as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 525—Protection of the Religious Freedom of Military Chaplains to Close a Prayer Outside of a Religious Service According to the Traditions, Expressions, and Religious Exercises of the Endorsing Faith Group

This section would authorize a chaplain, if called upon to lead a prayer outside of a religious service, to close the prayer according to the traditions, expressions, and religious exercises of the endorsing faith group.

Section 526—Department of Defense Senior Advisor on Professionalism

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to communicate with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the mission, goals, and metrics for the Senior Advisor on Professionalism. This section would further require the Senior Advisor on Professionalism to conduct reviews of the current programs on professionalism of the Department of Defense and the military departments. Additionally, this section would require the Senior Advisor on Professionalism to submit recommendations to strengthen professional programs in the Department of Defense to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Section 527—Removal of Artificial Barriers to the Service of Women in the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to direct the Secretary of each military service to validate the gender-neutral occupational standards used by the Armed Forces. Each Secretary would be required to work with an independent research entity to validate the standards. Further, this section would require each Secretary of a military department to ensure that properly de-

signed and fitted combat equipment is available and distributed to female members of the Armed Forces. This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of services' Outreach and Recruitment Efforts gauged toward women representation in the officer corps to include current initiatives used by the Armed Forces to increase accessions of women into the officer corps, new recruiting efforts to increase accessions of women into military service academies and Reserve Officer Training Corps, and resources and funding required to increase military service academy accessions by women and report the findings to Congress by April 1, 2015.

SUBTITLE D—MILITARY JUSTICE, INCLUDING SEXUAL ASSAULT AND  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Section 531—Improved Department of Defense Information Reporting and Collection of Domestic Violence Incidents Involving Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, to develop a comprehensive management plan to address deficiencies in the reporting of incidents of domestic violence involving members of the Armed Forces.

Section 532—Additional Duty for Judicial Proceedings Panel Regarding Use of Mental Health Records by Defense during Preliminary Hearing and Court-Martial Proceedings

This section would require the Judicial Proceedings Panel established under section 576 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to review and assess the use of mental health records by the defense during preliminary hearings and court-martial proceedings under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice. The panel would also be required to review the use of mental health records in civilian legal proceedings.

Section 533—Applicability of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response and Related Military Justice Enhancements to Military Service Academies

This section would require the Secretary of the military department concerned to ensure the provisions of title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) apply to the United States Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, and the Coast Guard Academy.

Section 534—Consultation with Victims of Sexual Assault Regarding Victims' Preference for Prosecution of Offense by Court-Martial or Civilian Court

This section would require the Secretary concerned to establish a procedure to ensure a victim of an alleged sexual-related offense is consulted regarding the victim's preference for prosecution authority by court-martial or a civilian court with jurisdiction over the offense.

Section 535—Enforcement of Crime Victims' Rights Related to Protections Afforded by Certain Military Rules of Evidence

This section would authorize a victim of an offense under Section 806b of title 10, United States Code, to petition the Court of Criminal Appeals for a writ of mandamus to require the court-martial to comply with the Military Rule of Evidence 513 and 412, if the victim believes that a court-martial ruling violates the victim's rights under such Rule.

Section 536—Minimum Confinement Period Required for Conviction of Certain Sex-Related Offenses Committed by Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require at a minimum, dismissal or dishonorable discharge and confinement for 2 years for sex-related offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Section 537—Modification of Military Rules of Evidence Relating to Admissibility of General Military Character Toward Probability of Innocence

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to modify the Military Rules of Evidence to make clear that the general military character of an accused is not admissible for the purpose of showing the probability of innocence except when the trait of the military character of an accused is relevant to an element of an offense for which the accused has been charged and may only be used for specified military-specific offenses.

Section 538—Confidential Review of Characterization of Terms of Discharge of Members of the Armed Forces Who Are Victims of Sexual Offenses

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to establish a confidential process for victims of a sex-related offense to appeal, through boards for correction of military records, the characterization of discharge or separation of the individual from the Armed Forces.

Section 539—Consistent Application of Rules of Privilege Afforded Under the Military Rules of Evidence

This section would eliminate the constitutionally required exception to the psychotherapist-patient privilege which is afforded to the patient of a psychotherapist to refuse to disclose, and to prevent any other person from disclosing, a confidential communication made between the patient and psychotherapist.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY FAMILY READINESS

Section 545—Earlier Determination of Dependent Status with Respect to Transitional Compensation for Dependents of Members Separated for Dependent Abuse

This section would provide for an earlier determination of dependent child status under section 1059(d)(4) of title 10, United States Code. Dependency would be determined as of the date the

separation action is initiated, when a member is administratively separated for a dependent abuse offense. Under current law, an individual's status as a dependent child is determined as of the date the member is actually separated.

**Section 546—Improved Consistency in Data Collection and Reporting in Armed Forces Suicide Prevention Efforts**

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy for a standard method of collecting, reporting, and assessing suicide data involving members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, including Reserve Components. The Secretary would be required, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit the policy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

**Section 547—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces**

This section would amend title II of the Service Members Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 521) to require a court that issued a temporary custody order based solely on the deployment or anticipated deployment of a service member to reinstate the custody order that was in effect immediately preceding the temporary order, unless the court finds reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child. This section would also prohibit a court from using deployment or the possibility of deployment as the sole factor when determining the best interest of a child.

**SUBTITLE F—EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES**

**Section 551—Authorized Duration of Foreign and Cultural Exchange Activities at Military Service Academies**

This section would amend sections 4345a, 6957b, and 9345a of title 10, United States Code, to allow attendance of foreign exchange personnel to the military service academies from 2 to 4 weeks.

**Section 552—Pilot Program to Assist Members of the Armed Forces in Obtaining Post-Service Employment**

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services to eligible members of the Armed Forces to assist members in obtaining post-service employment and reduce the amount of unemployment compensation being paid by the Department of Defense. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report not later than January 15, 2019, to the appropriate congressional committees describing the results of the program and whether the programs achieved the results of assisting members in obtaining post-service employment, the cost per member, and reduced the amount of unemployment compensation for ex-service members.



## SUBTITLE G—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION

## Section 561—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would authorize \$25.0 million for the continuation of the Department of Defense assistance to local educational agencies that are impacted by the enrollment of dependent children of military members and Department of Defense civilian employees.

## Section 562—Authority to Employ Non-United States Citizens as Teachers in Department of Defense Overseas Dependents' School System

This section would allow the Department of Defense to hire a local national who teaches a host nation language course in the Department of Defense Overseas School System, if a citizen of the United States is not available.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should demonstrate the efforts undertaken to first find a United States citizen to teach the native language before hiring a non-United States citizen.

## Section 563—Expansion of Functions of the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education to Include Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools

This section would expand the functions of the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education to include the domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools of the Department of Defense within the continental United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

## Section 564—Support for Efforts to Improve Academic Achievement and Transition of Military Dependent Students

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide grant assistance to non-profit organizations that provide services to improve the academic achievement of military dependent students, including those non-profit organizations whose programs focus on increasing the civic responsibility of military dependent students and their understanding of the Federal Government through direct exposure to the Government.

## Section 565—Amendments to the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012

This section would amend section 563(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), to extend, by 2 years, the effective date of the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012. In addition, this section would amend Public Law 112-239 by including a method to calculate the taxable value of eligible Federal property that is within the boundaries of two or more local educational agencies.

## SUBTITLE H—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

## Section 571—Medals for Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense Who Were Killed or Wounded in an Attack Inspired or Motivated by a Foreign Terrorist Organization

This section would amend the Purple Heart award to include members killed or wounded in attacks inspired or motivated by foreign terrorist organizations since September 11, 2001. Additionally, this section would require a review of the November 5, 2009, attack at Ford Hood, Texas, to determine as to whether the death or wounding of any civilian employee of the Department of Defense or civilian contractor meets the eligibility criteria for the award of the Secretary of Defense Medal for the Defense of Freedom.

## Section 572—Retroactive Award of Army Combat Action Badge

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Army Combat Action Badge to a person who, while a member of the Army, participated in combat during which the person personally engaged, or was personally engaged by, the enemy at any time during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on September 18, 2001.

## Section 573—Report on Navy Review, Findings, and Actions Pertaining to Medal of Honor Nomination of Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on the Navy review, findings, and actions pertaining to the Medal of Honor nomination of Sergeant Rafael Peralta to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

## SUBTITLE I—MISCELLANEOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

## Section 581—Secretary of Defense Review and Report on Prevention of Suicide Among Members of United States Special Operations Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to conduct a review of Department of Defense efforts regarding suicide prevention among members of the Special Operations Forces and their dependents. The review would include the feasibility of the application of current Department of Defense suicide prevention policy guidelines and prevention programs to Special Operations Forces, current Armed Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command strategies to reduce suicides among members of the Special Operations Forces and their dependents, the standards for responding to attempted or completed suicides, including guidance and training to assist commanders in addressing incidents of suicide, among other elements. The Secretary would be required to submit the report to the Committees on Armed Services

of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**Section 582—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Review of Separation of Members of the Armed Forces Who Made Unrestricted Reports of Sexual Assault**

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct a review to identify all members of the Armed Forces who, since January 1, 2002, were separated from the Armed Forces after making an unrestricted report of sexual assault. The review would seek to determine the circumstances of and the grounds for the separation and whether the separation was in retaliation or influenced by the unrestricted report. The Inspector General would then submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives concerning the results of the review within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

**Section 583—Comptroller General Report Regarding Management of Personnel Records of Members of the National Guard**

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report regarding the management of personnel records of members of the National Guard. The Comptroller General should consider the appropriate Federal role and responsibility in the management of these records, the extent to which the States have digitized the records, and the extent of State and Federal agreements for sharing and management of the records. The report shall be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than April 1, 2015.

**Section 584—Study on Gender Integration in Defense Operation Planning and Execution**

This section would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a study concerning the integration of gender into the planning and execution of foreign operations of the Armed Forces at all levels and to submit the study to the congressional defense committees not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**Section 585—Deadline for Submission of Report Containing Results of Review of Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity Role in Sexual Harassment Cases**

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit the report required by section 1735 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to the Committees on Armed Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives by June 1, 2015.

## SUBTITLE J—OTHER MATTERS

## Section 591—Inspection of Outpatient Residential Facilities Occupied by Recovering Service Members

This section would modify the current reporting requirement from an annual basis to at least once every 2 years.

## Section 592—Working Group on Integrated Disability Evaluation System

This section establishes a Working Group to carry out a 3-year pilot program to evaluate and reform the Integrated Disability Evaluation System of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs. The purpose of the pilot would be to increase process efficiencies, create a standardized form set, eliminate redundancies, improve existing process timelines of the Integrated Disability Evaluation System, increase service member satisfaction, and establish an information bridge between the E-benefits program and the MYIDES dashboard.

## Section 593—Sense of Congress Regarding Fulfilling Promise to Leave No Member of the Armed Forces Unaccounted in Afghanistan

This section would express the sense of Congress that the United States has a responsibility to continue to search for missing or captured members of the Armed Forces while transitioning from combat operations in Afghanistan.

## TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

## OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that robust and flexible compensation programs are central to maintaining a high-quality, all-volunteer, combat-ready force. Accordingly, the committee supports a 1.8 percent military pay raise for fiscal year 2015, in accordance with current law, in order for military pay raises to keep pace with the pay increases in the private sector, as measured by the Employment Cost Index.

The committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to utilize the services of an independent organization experienced in grocery retail analysis to assess the proposed changes to the defense commissary system. The committee is concerned about the efficacy of proposals to change the current pricing and business models for the operation of commissaries in order to accommodate proposed reductions to the commissary budget. The committee requires more information from the Department of Defense prior to making any changes to the underlying structure of the commissary, particularly given that prior studies commissioned by the Department of Defense have concluded that pricing adjustments and changes to stock assortments as proposed by the Department of Defense would not yield the savings or efficiencies to the system. Therefore, the committee recommends restoring \$100

million in appropriated funds for the commissary to maintain current operations for fiscal year 2015.

Additionally, the committee is concerned with the raft of compensation and benefit changes proposed in the President's budget and the effects of the totality of such proposals on service members and their families, particularly junior enlisted personnel. The committee recognizes that the fiscal environment has changed and the Department continues to face greater pressure under sequestration-level budget caps, which are still in effect for fiscal year 2016 and beyond. The committee, nonetheless, believes that a more prudent approach to address compensation and retirement proposals would be to await the recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to better understand the total impact proposed changes will have on efforts to maintain the high-quality, All-Volunteer Force. The Commission, established by Congress in response to a Department of Defense request, is required to provide a comprehensive approach to modernize and achieve fiscal sustainability of the compensation and retirement systems for the Uniformed Services by February 1, 2015. In the meantime, to sustain the current All-Volunteer Force, the committee continues to support authorities for a wide array of bonuses, special and incentive pays, and other compensation benefits for an additional year.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

#### Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances

This section would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rates of basic allowance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

#### Section 602—No Fiscal Year 2015 Increase in Basic Pay for General and Flag Officers

This section would freeze the basic pay rate for commissioned officers in the pay grades of O-7 through O-10 during calendar year 2015.

### 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, in-

come replacement payments for Reserve Component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for Active Duty service, and the authority to reimburse travel expenses for inactive duty training outside of normal commuting distance until December 31, 2015.

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, 2015.

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, 2015.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health professions incentive pay and bonus authorities, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, contracting bonus for Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets and midshipmen, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units until December 31, 2015.

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 incentive pay for precommissioning program members pursuing foreign language proficiency, 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, 2015.

## SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION

## Section 621—Authority to Enter into Contracts for the Provision of Relocation Services

The section would allow the Secretary of Defense to authorize a base commander to enter into a contract with an appropriate organization to provide relocation services to members of the Armed Forces.

## SUBTITLE D—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

## Section 631—Authority of Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities to Enter into Contracts with Other Federal Agencies and Instrumentalities to Provide and Obtain Certain Goods and Services

This section would amend section 2492 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Department of Defense authority to provide or obtain food services beneficial to the efficient management and operation of the dining facilities on military installations offering food services to service members.

The committee is providing the authority to the Department of Defense to authorize the Air Force's current "Food Transformation Initiative." However, the committee is concerned that the Air Force had initiated this program contrary to the limitations under section 2492 of title 10. The committee agrees with the Comptroller General's decision that the legal interpretation of section 2942 by the Air Force and the subsequent decision by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to support such an interpretation was wrong; and that the program did not meet either the spirit or the letter of the law. The committee cautions the services and the Secretary of Defense from initiating any additional programs that could be construed as an effort to pass appropriated funds through a non-appropriated fund instrumentality. In addition, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to restrain the services from additional creative legal interpretations of section 2942 of title 10. The committee reiterates that the intent of the change to section 2942 is to allow the continuation of the food transformation program, and should not be interpreted to allow further innovative legal interpretations of the provision.

## Section 632—Review of Management, Food, and Pricing Options for Defense Commissary System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review, utilizing the services of an independent organization experienced in grocery retail analysis, of the defense commissary system. The results of the review shall be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by February 1, 2015.

Section 633—Restriction on Implementing Any Department of Defense Policy to Limit, Restrict, or Ban the Sale of Certain Items on Military Installations

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments from implementing any new policy that limits, restricts or bans the sale of any legal consumer product category sold in exchanges or commissaries as of January 1, 2014.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 641—Anonymous Survey of Members of the Armed Forces Regarding Their Preferences for Military Pay and Benefits

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out an anonymous survey of random members of the Armed Forces regarding pay and benefits, including the value that members place on forms of compensation, relative to one another, including basic pay, allowances for housing, bonuses and special pay, healthcare benefits, and retirement pay.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee is resolute in ensuring that the Military Health System remains a top priority for the Department of Defense during the post-conflict shift to readiness training and force reduction. The committee recognizes Department efforts in preventative medicine, clinical and translational research, public health initiatives, and pioneering the health care team model. It is imperative that these critical areas continue progressing with the same level of commitment in this changing landscape in order to sustain the medical readiness of our service members. The committee encourages the Department to maintain this commitment to solving the complex physical and psychological implications of wartime service for the foreseeable future.

The committee remains focused on making certain that the Department cost-saving measures are centered on achieving the most efficient Military Health System possible before significant cost-sharing burdens are placed on TRICARE beneficiaries. The current Department proposal to fundamentally alter the structure of TRICARE and increase associated fees is concerning in light of concurrently proposed reductions in compensation. The committee notes the Department efforts toward reorganization of the Military Health System, but remains unconvinced that current implementation efforts will result in the projected cost savings. To that end, the committee includes requests for a report to further clarify Defense Health Agency implementation plans and a review of Defense Health Agency implementation progress by the Comptroller General of the United States. The committee is also concerned that the Department's plan to reduce or realign Military Treatment Facilities will further shift the health care burden to the purchased care sector and ultimately increase costs.



The committee seeks to ensure continued access to care and adoption of best practices during the Military Health System reorganization. The committee requests reviews on TRICARE reimbursement to sole community hospitals, graduate medical education billets, and the reduction of TRICARE Prime service areas. Moreover, the committee directs the execution of a pilot program focused on the improvement of patient medication use and outcomes through use of commercial best practices.

The committee is encouraged by the current downtrend in the suicide rate of the Armed Forces and commends the Department's diligence in addressing this tragic issue. However, although the overall trend is downward, there are certain communities of service members who remain at high risk. The committee strongly encourages the Department to continue training, research, and therapeutics to address psychological health and resilience.

#### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

##### AIR FORCE CRITICAL CARE TRAINING

The committee recognizes the efforts by the Air Force's Critical Care Transport Teams (CCATT) to provide vital care during the transport of members of the armed services who are critically injured. The committee encourages the Department to continue supporting the Air Force Centers for the Sustainment of Trauma and Readiness Skills (C-STARS), the training platforms for the CCATT. The C-STARS provide a unique and realistic environment for training Air Force personnel who treat critically injured members of the armed services. The committee supports the groundbreaking research and specialized training conducted at C-STARS, which has improved the survivability rate of critically wounded service members. The committee encourages the Department to continue investing in this crucial capability.

##### Canine Therapy for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Brain Injury

The committee recognizes the Department of Defense for their efforts to research and document the use of canine therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury. The committee understands that while still experimental, canine therapy has shown to be effective in treating the psychological symptoms of these conditions. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue researching and providing canine therapy for psychological as well as other physical conditions affecting the members of the Armed Forces.

##### Collaboration on Trauma Research

Last year, the committee recognized that advancements in trauma care are the results of research conducted across the public-private spectrum by Federal, academic, and private institutions, and encouraged the Department of Defense to work with other Federal agencies and the private sector to establish a trauma clinical research repository to share and maximize critical trauma research data. The committee recognizes the significant advances that the

services and the Department have made in trauma research and treatment on the battlefield that would be of great benefit to the civilian sector. The committee believes that such transition necessitates a whole-of-government approach that requires leadership beyond the Department of Defense. However, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to work with other Federal, State, and local governments, as well as academic and private institutions to advance trauma research and treatment which has a direct impact on readiness of the force.

#### Deployment Health for Women

The committee recognizes the unique work that the Army's Women's Health Task Force (WHTF) is doing to address the specific gender health needs of women in the military. The task force assessed and made recommendations on six areas of concern for women in a deployed environment. These include women's health education, barriers to seeking care, uniform and personal protective gear design, psychosocial effects of deployment, effects of deployment on children and families, and sexual harassment and assault response and prevention. Women's deployment issues are not unique to this force, which is why the committee required a Government Accountability Office (GAO) review of women-specific health services and treatment for female members of the Armed Forces in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81).

The committee believes that the information, expertise and experience of the WHTF, as well as the assessment by the GAO, should be used as the basis to ensure that the specific gender health needs of women in all types of deployed environments are being met. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment on the specific gender health needs of women in a deployed environment to ensure standardization of education and training in women's hygiene and gynecological management to enhance readiness for female members; ensure that women's health issues are included in leadership training and educational programs; provide Clinical Practice Guidelines to establish a standardized level of care in a deployed environment; and ensure that all services have the ability to provide a minimum level of education and training to address the specific gender health needs of women in a deployed environment.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the results of the assessment and implementation of policies or programs necessary to meet the specific gender health needs of women in various deployed environments to the congressional defense committees by April 31, 2015. The assessment should also address the research gaps identified by the Women's Health Research Interest Group, and what efforts have been undertaken to develop a repository of peer-reviewed research articles related to health issues for female service member, particularly those in a deployed environment.

### Early Autism Diagnosis and Assistance for Families

The committee recognizes that with early intervention a child diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder may make significant progress, potentially increasing language and social skills as well as mitigating the development of problematic behaviors. The committee encourages the Department to continue to assist military families with autistic children to ensure the availability of the full and expanding range of early evidence-based risk assessment and diagnostics, early intervention and treatment approaches.

### Healthy Base Initiative

The committee recognizes the efforts by the Department of Defense to improve the physical and mental health of members of the Armed Forces through the Healthy Base Initiative. This program promotes the health and wellness of service members, families, and civilians through education on how to improve nutritional choices, increase physical activity, reduce obesity, and stop smoking. The committee encourages the Department to incorporate the latest in scientific research on topics such as the benefit of antioxidant-rich foods and the detrimental impact of smokeless tobacco products, into education strategies for the service members and medical personnel. The committee further encourages the Department to consider a review of continuing medical education training for content related to these public health initiatives. The committee supports these efforts to promote and develop healthy lifestyle choices that will positively affect the health and readiness of the Armed Forces and their families.

### Infectious Disease Surveillance Testing

The committee recognizes the necessity of surveillance testing for certain infectious diseases, such as Human Immunodeficiency Virus, to maintain the readiness of the Armed Forces. The committee understands that the medical community continues to advance innovative methods of detection for such diseases. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continuously review its infectious disease screening methodology in comparison with current medical practice guidelines to provide the most current advances in testing to ensure the readiness of military service members.

### Integrated Scheduling System

The committee is aware that the Department of Veterans Affairs conducted a competition for medical appointment scheduling systems in 2013 that required entrants to demonstrate their systems' ability to achieve over 200 requirements and metrics with a focus on integration with the Veterans Health Information Systems and Technology Architecture Electronic Health Record system. The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs simultaneously provide medical care to a small population that overlaps both health care systems. Furthermore, the committee notes that the Department of Defense Healthcare Management System Modernization (DHMSM) program office is

currently working on an effort to replace its legacy health information system with a commercial solution that is modern and interoperable with the Department of Veterans Affairs. As the DHMSM program office develops its requirements for a final solicitation, the committee expects the program office to keep the committee informed on the requirements for the new system, to include the feasibility of having a requirement for an integrated scheduling system that is interoperable with the Department of Veterans Affairs.

#### Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Healthcare in Colorado Springs

The committee is aware that the Defense Health Agency has identified Colorado Springs, Colorado as the fastest growing Enhanced Multi-Service Market (EMSM) for healthcare in the country. As such, demand for healthcare may exceed the current capacity of Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs facilities in the region. Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs-civilian partnerships that can serve both active duty service members, their families, and veterans have the potential to be an effective, cost-saving approach to enhancing access to and the quality of healthcare services provided by the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, and the private sector. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to analyze the potential benefits of a partnership in the Colorado Springs area in order to better address the growing need for healthcare services. This analysis should consider the challenges that arise from the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense having different planning and budget timelines, authorizations and approval processes, personnel staffing authorities and requirements, pharmaceutical policies, clinical scheduling policies and procedures, management structure and performance evaluations, and provide solutions to address these challenge to best leverage the capabilities of the two Departments as well as the civilian community. The analysis should consider both the benefits and challenges seen in previous efforts to consolidate Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs' facilities, as well as current joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs' healthcare projects. The Secretary of Defense should report the results of the analysis to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### Joint Medical Kits

The committee recognizes the work of the service medical commands and personnel to improve combat casualty care and reduce combat mortality over the last decade, which has significantly reduced casualties in combat. The committee applauds the Defense Health Agency and its Defense Medical Materiel Program Office (DMMPO) for ongoing internal efforts and collaboration with industry to bolster combat casualty care, especially through enhancements in tactical medicine. The committee is particularly encouraged to learn of DMMPO's pursuit of a Joint First Aid Kit, and

supports the prompt fielding of a Joint First Aid Kit. The committee also supports efforts to assess the requirements for a Joint Combat Lifesaver Kit and Joint Vehicle Medical Kits. Joint kits would allow for commonality across services to promote safety and efficacy during joint operations.

#### Military and Academic Research Partnership

The committee recognizes that after over a decade of sustained combat, there have been many strides made toward providing service members the most current clinical medical treatment. However, the committee believes that it is important for both the military services and academia to collaborate toward a common goal of continuing to provide our service members the best medical treatment available. The use of data driven research by military and academic partnerships will foster innovative ways to study and monitor medical and health issues impacting readiness.

The committee believes that along with a whole-of-government approach, it is critical to include academia in the effort to improve the readiness of our service members. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue working with Federal, State, local, non-profit, and academic institutions to expand the network of support needed to promote advances in clinical medicine to improve the readiness of our Armed Forces.

#### Military Contributions to Breast Cancer Research

The committee supports the Department of Defense efforts in improving the prevention and treatment of breast cancer through research and clinical care. Section 737 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) directed the Department to conduct a study on the incidence of breast cancer among members of the Armed Forces serving on Active Duty. The resulting report is to include data important to translating this research into clinical practice. The committee urges the Department to provide the results of this study in an expeditious manner so they may be used, in conjunction with other federally funded sources of research-based recommendations, to guide future Department of Defense health policy in the prevention and treatment of breast cancer.

#### Military Health Care Team Model

The committee recognizes that the Armed Forces utilize a health care model that represents the full spectrum of health care professionals. The committee notes that this health care model includes physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists which maximizes taxpayer dollars, especially now in an austere fiscal environment. This health care team model has been critical to the success of military medicine in the deployed setting, resulting in an unprecedented survival rate of service members in combat. In addition, the committee believes that the training these medical professionals receive creates rewarding employment opportunities that provide for a seamless transition from military service to the private sector when these service members transition back to civilian life. The committee continues to support the efforts of

military medicine to improve quality of care and gain greater efficiencies in the system.

#### Military Innovations in Suicide Research

The committee commends the hard work of the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army STARRS). This study adds to a growing body of research that seeks to decrease suicide by improving the understanding of suicide risk factors as well as protective factors. The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense stands as a leader in the fight against suicide which affects not only service members and families, but an increasing number of the Nation's youth. The tragic rate of military suicide has highlighted the complex and often poorly understood psychological factors that lead to suicidal behavior. The Army STARRS research to date is contributing to the understanding of the importance of resilience in enhancing skills such as problem-solving, impulse control, and proper coping mechanisms. The committee commends the Army for taking a proactive stance on addressing suicide among service members and their families, and looks forward to future Army STARRS research outcomes to help inform the Department of Defense in developing targeted strategies to build resilience in the members of the Armed Forces and improve the understanding of psychological health.

#### Report on Implementation Plans for the Defense Health Agency

The Department of Defense has provided the committee with three submissions on its plans for implementation of the Defense Health Agency (DHA), which became operational on October 1, 2013. As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) noted in its review of the first two DHA implementation plans, the Department's submissions did not include critical information concerning the DHA's staffing requirements, cost estimates, and performance measures. In its response to the GAO's report, the Department stated that it would address many of these issues in its third submission to Congress. However, as the GAO noted in subsequent testimony, the Department's third submission did not fully incorporate this information. In addition, the Department's third submission did not include sufficient information concerning its education and training shared service, including a full explanation of its purpose and goals. As a full and complete implementation plan for the DHA is necessary to help ensure the Department achieves the goals of its reform of the Military Health System (MHS), the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by January 31, 2015, containing the following information:

- (1) Performance measures for each objective and shared service that are clear, quantifiable, objective, and include a baseline assessment of current performance, and if such information has not yet been developed, a timeline for developing and submitting such measures in the future;
- (2) An explanation of the potential sources of cost savings from the implementation of its shared services projects, including esti-

mates of cost savings for each product line within the respective shared services;

(3) A baseline assessment of the current number of military, civilian, and contractor personnel currently working within the MHS headquarters and an estimate for DHA at full operating capability, including estimates of changes in contractor full-time equivalents; and

(4) An explanation of the purpose and goals of the medical education and training shared service with regard to its role in improving the cost efficiency of delivering training, including the challenges it will address, the practices it will put in place to address these challenges, and the resulting cost savings.

#### Review of Defense Health Agency Progress

After years of studies, reviews, and assessments of the governance structure of the Military Health System (MHS), the Department of Defense established the Defense Health Agency (DHA) on October 1, 2013. The DHA assumed responsibility for, among other things, enterprise-wide common tasks handled by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force medical departments, known as shared services, as well as their common business and clinical processes. The changes to the design of the system along with enhanced accountability, will, according to the Department, enable continuous performance improvement and reduce the projected cost growth of the Defense Health Program. While the Department has reported significant progress in the establishment of this new agency, as well as efficiencies achieved, it remains unclear what specific improvements have been accomplished and if the Department remains on track to attain its savings and performance goals. Therefore, as this new agency reaches a year in existence, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the progress that the Department has made in achieving its goals within this year. More specifically, the review should include at a minimum a review of the Department's progress in (1) achieving cost savings, (2) developing performance measures, and (3) determining accurate staffing levels. The Comptroller General should issue a final report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by September 30, 2015, and brief preliminary results to the committees by April 1, 2015.

#### Review of TRICARE Reimbursement Rules for Sole Community Hospitals

The committee recognizes the vital role of sole community hospitals (SCH) in providing high-quality health care for service members stationed at rural military installations. The committee is aware of recent TRICARE reimbursement policy changes for SCHs and would like to understand the impact of the change on access to care for service members and their families. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review TRICARE's change in reimbursement rules for sole community hospitals. The review should include at a minimum:

(1) The extent to which TRICARE's change in reimbursement rules for SCH affects access to these facilities by service members and their families;

(2) The extent that TRICARE's change in reimbursement rules for SCH compares to the Medicare change in reimbursement rules for SCHs; and

(3) The extent to which the Defense Health Agency is monitoring the effects of TRICARE reimbursement rules changes on SCH and the subsequent access to care for service members and dependents.

The Comptroller General should submit the results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2015.

#### Sleep Health

The committee recognizes that sleep disruption is a contributing risk factor to the onset and severity of major mental health problems such as depression, bipolar disorder, substance abuse, posttraumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, and suicide.

The committee commends the Department for its initial steps to leverage investments by the National Institutes of Health in the development of the Pain Assessment Tool and Outcomes Registry for its use throughout the military health system. The committee recommends the continued implementation of the Sleep, Activity, and Nutrition program which works to ensure a strong and resilient military community. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the prevalence of sleep and circadian disturbances among active military personnel and its relationship between mental health, traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, chronic pain and fatigue, substance abuse, suicide, depression, cognitive function, and military performance and readiness.

#### Surgical Critical Care Institute

The committee is aware of the important translational research conducted by the Surgical Critical Care Initiative. The Initiative, a partnership of Federal, academic, and non-governmental organizations, strives to improve the care of wounded warriors through the investigation and mitigation of the short- and long-term physiologic effects of catastrophic injuries. As a result of the unprecedented survival rate of combat troops with complex and extreme life-threatening injuries, the Initiative has applied the lessons learned from the care of these injuries to develop biomarkers and decision-making algorithms that can be applied to combat-wounded and other critically ill surgical patients. The committee applauds the efforts of the Department of Defense toward continuing to advance the care of critical injuries which will improve lifesaving measures on future battlefields and translate to civilian trauma treatment.

#### US Family Health Plans

The committee is aware of the important role of the US Family Health Plans in providing quality health care, which consistently exceeds customer satisfaction expectations, to military beneficiaries. The committee notes that the Department of Defense



strives to provide quality health care to its beneficiary population, which has grown significantly over the last decade. Given the budget challenges the Department is facing, it is important that all segments of the military health system make every effort to ensure that they are providing the most cost-effective quality services available. The committee recognizes the contributions provided by the US Family Health Plans to the health of service members and their families, particularly retirees. Therefore, the committee encourages the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to address the role of the US Family Health Plan during deliberations regarding the future military health benefit.

### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

#### SUBTITLE A—TRICARE AND OTHER HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

##### Section 701—Mental Health Assessments for Members of the Armed Forces

This section would amend section 1074m of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide person-to-person mental health screenings once during each 180-day period in which a member is deployed.

##### Section 702—Clarification of Provision of Food to Former Members and Dependents Not Receiving Inpatient Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would amend section 1078b of title 10, United States Code, to allow former members and their dependents to receive food and beverages at no cost for those who are receiving certain outpatient care in military medical treatment facilities.

#### SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

##### Section 711—Cooperative Health Care Agreements Between the Military Departments and Non-Military Health Care Entities

This section would permit the Secretaries of the military departments to establish cooperative health care agreements between military installations and local and regional non-military health care entities.

##### Section 712—Surveys on Continued Viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra

This section would change the frequency of the reports of the reviews submitted to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the processes, procedures, and analysis used by the Department of Defense to determine the adequacy of the number of health care providers who accept TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra.

##### Section 713—Limitation on Transfer or Elimination of Graduate Medical Education Billets

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from transferring or eliminating a graduate medical education billet from a

military medical treatment facility unless the Secretary conducts a review of at least 2 years of the implementation of the reform of the administration of the Military Health System, examines recruiting and retention of medical professionals with regard to the Department's graduate medical education programs, determines the assignment of such billets, and certifies to the congressional defense committees that any proposed transfer of a billet meets the needs of the military departments and patients.

#### Section 714—Review of Military Health System Modernization Study

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the military medical treatment facility modernization study directed by the Resource Management Decision of the Department of Defense MP-D-01. The report would include the study data used by the Secretary and the results of the study with regard to recommendations to restructure or realign military medical treatment facilities. Further, this section would require the Comptroller General of the United States, not later than 180 days after the Secretary submits the report required, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the report submitted by the Secretary of Defense, to include an assessment of the study methodology and data used by the Secretary. The Secretary would be prohibited from realigning or restructuring a military medical treatment facility until 120 days following the date the Comptroller General is required to submit the report.

### SUBTITLE C—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 721—Extension of Authority for Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund

This section would extend the authority for the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund until September 30, 2016.

#### Section 722—Designation and Responsibilities of Senior Medical Advisor for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would designate the Deputy Director of the Defense Health Agency to be the senior medical advisor for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to reflect a change in the oversight organizational structure subsequent to the establishment of the Defense Health Agency. It also requires the homes to be in compliance with national recognized health care standards.

#### Section 723—Research Regarding Alzheimer's Disease

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct research on Alzheimer's disease.

#### Section 724—Acquisition Strategy for Health Care Professional Staffing Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement an acquisition strategy for contracting health care professional services within military medical treatment facilities. The Secretary would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than April 1, 2015, on the status of implementation of the strategy.

#### Section 725—Pilot Program on Medication Therapy Management Under TRICARE Program

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program for at least 2 years at not less than three locations to evaluate the feasibility and desirability of including medication therapy management as part of the TRICARE program. This program would be focused on improving patient medication use and outcomes using best commercial practices in medication therapy management and would quantify effectiveness by measuring patient medication use and outcomes as well as health care costs. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit a report of the results of the pilot program to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 months after the program commences.

#### Section 726—Report on Reduction of Prime Service Areas

This section would amend section 732 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as amended by section 701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the reduction of the availability of TRICARE Prime. The required report would include details regarding the impact to beneficiaries of the reduction of TRICARE Prime availability, including any increase in cost to beneficiaries and the estimated cost savings to the Department of Defense.

#### Section 727—Comptroller General Report on Transition of Care for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Traumatic Brain Injury

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the transition of care for post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, to include changes to pharmaceutical treatment plans and the benefits and challenges of combining the formularies across the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs. The Comptroller General would be required to submit a report on the assessment to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate by April 1, 2015.

#### Section 728—Briefing on Hospitals in Arrears in Payments to Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to brief the congres-

sional defense committees on the process used by the Defense Health Agency to collect payment from hospitals outside the Department of Defense. The briefing would include a list of each hospital that is more than 90 days in arrears in payment to the Secretary.

## TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

### OVERVIEW

As part of the committee's long-term institutional reform effort, the committee is examining opportunities to improve the Department of Defense acquisition system. Despite the significant improvements made in the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) and other recent acquisition reform legislation, the committee believes further improvements must be made to the Department's business practices, particularly at a time when defense resources for developing and acquiring weapon systems, products, and services are increasingly constrained. In this broad oversight and legislative effort, the committee aims to identify and drive out disincentives that increase cost and schedule of major programs and delay delivery of capabilities to the warfighter. The committee believes that any lasting reforms related to defense acquisitions will not be successful without a solid partnership between both the House of Representatives and Senate committees of jurisdiction, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, each of the military departments, and the defense industrial base. The committee looks forward to working with all stakeholders on this comprehensive effort.

In addition, the committee notes that an annual inventory of Department of Defense contracts for services is mandated by section 2330a(c) of title 10, United States Code (initially codified by section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181)). Although an inventory is being provided, the committee continues to be disappointed that the Department of Defense has not fully implemented the requirement and is failing to analyze the data or otherwise use the mandate for collection of data to inform decision-making. The committee remains convinced that, if properly conducted, the inventory would be an important tool to provide transparency in Government contracting and would also be a beneficial tool for decision-makers in planning, programming, and budgeting for the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue to not only improve data collection related to services contracting, but to also conduct analysis of that data to identify wasteful or excessive spending, duplication of efforts, opportunities to implement efficiencies, and areas of risk in the defense industrial base. Furthermore, to complement the committee's effort to improve the processes by which the Department of Defense acquires weapon systems, the committee, elsewhere in this title, includes a provision that would direct the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake a body of work to identify further opportunities to improve the Department's processes to acquire contracted services.

In addition, elsewhere in this report the committee includes a provision that would support the intent of the Marine Corps to streamline procurement of, and its fielding strategy for, the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (ACV) increment 1.1, and believes this program could potentially serve as an example for future major defense acquisition program reform. However, the committee notes this streamlined approach to ACV increment 1.1 is contingent on mature technology and validated, stabilized requirements. The committee will continue to closely monitor this program under the auspices of the committee's ongoing comprehensive reform effort.

Furthermore, as part of the ongoing effort to review the processes that often keep the Department of Defense from operating efficiently, and unintentionally create barriers to meaningful small business participation in the defense industrial base, the committee has worked closely with the House Committee on Small Business and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a result of this bipartisan cooperation, the committee includes provisions in this title that would remove duplicative processes, erase meaningless distinctions between competing programs, leverage procurement best practices, and better use the programs already in place.

#### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

##### Acquisitions Involving Reverse Auctions

The committee notes that there may be substantial benefits to contracting for goods and services through reverse auction procedures. However, the committee is concerned that Department of Defense personnel, particularly those that are not formally designated within the acquisition workforce, may lack sufficient training and experience to fully realize these benefits. Without adequate training on the benefits and risks of utilizing reverse auction procedures as a purchasing method, acquisition personnel might miss opportunities to stipulate best-value determinations, encourage small business participation, or raise other non-price considerations.

Two studies by the Army Corps of Engineers have posited that reverse auctions for construction services do not provide savings to the Government and that they increase risk associated with such projects. While the Corps has discontinued the use of reverse auctions in this area, other agencies continue to use reverse auctions for construction services. A third study by the Government Accountability Office (GAO-14-408) found that there was inadequate competition in nearly 40 percent of governmental acquisitions conducted using reverse auctions. The report recommended that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget take steps to amend the Federal Acquisition Regulations regarding agencies' use of reverse auctions and to issue government-wide guidance for maximizing competition and savings when using reverse auctions.

The committee is also concerned that reverse auction procedures and lowest price technically acceptable procurement methodologies which are aimed solely at making a purchase at the lowest price, may not be the best way to procure personal protective equipment and organizational clothing and individual equipment, such as body armor components, combat helmets, protective eyewear, fire resist-

ant and cold weather clothing and footwear. Using price as the deciding factor in the procurement of such items may lead to products of an inferior quality for the warfighter, and have long-term deleterious effects on the industrial base and the willingness of private sector firms to develop products and services for the Department. The committee believes that there are contracting circumstances where best value should be considered a higher criteria than lowest price.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to review the training and education provided to Department of Defense personnel regarding the use of reverse auction procurement methodologies, and to revise such training and education, as may be necessary, to ensure that Department personnel understand the benefits, risks, and appropriate applications of reverse auction procedures and lowest price and technically acceptable. The Under Secretary should report to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 2, 2015, on the findings of this review.

#### Briefing on Impact of Foreign Military Sales and Direct Commercial Sales on Industrial Base Sustainment

The committee is aware that Department of Defense officials have suggested foreign military sales (FMS) and direct commercial sales (DCS) as a means for the private defense industrial base to sustain operations in light of Budget Control Act (BCA) of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) mandated reductions in procurement spending. The committee is concerned that long lead time and current world events make FMS and DCS unreliable or financially infeasible for many vendors, restricting a significant path towards sustainability and adding an unacceptable level of risk to critical sectors of the industrial base. The committee is further concerned that a perception of available FMS and DCS opportunities may impact service planning to sustain high risk sectors of the industrial base.

Therefore, the committee directs, within 180 days, the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees on the levels of FMS and DCS factored into sustainment plans for the private defense industrial base for major acquisition programs. The briefing should include an analysis of whether these levels of FMS and DCS are anticipated to be met over the remaining years of the BCA budget caps; any sectors or major acquisition programs with limited access to FMS and DCS; and reason for limited access.

#### Briefing on the Impact of the Budget Control Act on High Risk Sectors of the Defense Industrial Base

The committee is aware that reductions under the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–67) will reduce procurement spending over the next several years, leaving some sectors of the national technical and industrial base with a limited number of viable suppliers. The committee is concerned that the scheduled end of some major acquisition programs, combined with enacted defense funding reductions could result in continued financial losses to several high-risk sectors, which could force consolidations, decisions to forego defense contracts, and facility closures.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to specifically examine the impacts of such budget reductions as part of the Department's sector-by-sector, tier-by-tier review of the defense industrial base and to ensure that the periodic assessments of the national technical and industrial base, required by section 2505 of title 10, United States Code, include consideration of these reductions. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, providing an analysis of sectors and tiers of the private industrial base found to be at highest risk and how the risk assessment has changed since enactment of the Budget Control Act of 2011 and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013; an assessment of which additional sectors and tiers that might be considered high risk as a result of those Acts; and steps necessary to protect those high risk sectors and tiers.

#### Comptroller General Assessment of Department of Defense Processes for the Acquisition of Services

To complement the committee's effort to improve the processes by which the Department of Defense acquires weapon systems, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake a body of work to identify further opportunities to improve the Department's processes to acquire contracted services.

Over the last decade, Congress has provided new tools and capabilities intended to improve the Department's processes and oversight of services acquisitions. These include requiring the establishment of a management structure and review process for high-dollar services; designation of senior managers responsible for services contract approval and oversight within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the military departments; and the mandating of an annual inventory of contracted services to assist in workforce planning and budgeting.

The committee notes that the Department has undertaken several actions to improve its approach to acquiring services, most recently in the Department's Better Buying Power initiatives. Nevertheless, in a series of reports issued over the past year, the Comptroller General found that the Department still did not know the current status of services acquisitions in terms of the volume or type of services being acquired, lacked reliable data on the projected spending for services, had not fully embraced total workforce management approaches, and had not fully leveraged its buying power through strategic sourcing. With services acquisition accounting for more than half of the Department's contracting efforts, the committee believes that a holistic assessment of the myriad processes that play a role in acquiring services is needed if the Department is to fundamentally improve its efficiency and effectiveness.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to continue monitoring the Department's efforts in this area and to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the processes and procedures of the Department of Defense for the acquisition of services to identify opportunities to improve these processes and procedures. An initial report on the assessment should be provided to the congress-

sional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016, with follow-up efforts subsequently briefed to the committees as phases of the assessment are completed. At a minimum, the assessment should examine:

- (1) The requirements generation, budgeting, and contracting processes associated with the acquisition of services;
- (2) How such processes interface with the Department's strategic human capital planning processes;
- (3) The Department's efforts to identify and, as appropriate, enhance the skills and capabilities needed by the workforce to acquire and oversee contracted services;
- (4) The extent to which the Department is acquiring contracted services using strategic sourcing; and
- (5) The extent to which the Department's annual budget request and future budget projections for contracted services are based on current, accurate, and reliable data.

#### Comptroller General Review of Compliance with Limitations on Contract Services Spending

The committee notes that a Government Accountability Office review found that the Department of Defense failed to adhere to the enacted limitations on contracted services in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), exceeding the limitations by more than \$1.0 billion in fiscal year 2012. Moreover, guidance for adherence to the extension of the limitations for fiscal year 2014 has yet to be issued. The committee is concerned that the Department does not have adequate policies, procedures, and controls in place to enforce limitations on the annual amounts expended on contracted services.

The committee is also concerned that not all contracted services are being subjected to the spending limitations because of the exclusion of contracted services involving Economy Act transfers between and within Department of Defense components. Also, because of the disparity between the levels of contracted services captured in the Inventory of Contracts for Services, required under section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, and what the Department budgets for contracted services, the committee concludes that the Department does not deliberately plan for most contracted services. At the same time the Department exceeded its spending limitations on contracted services, the Department furloughed a majority of its civilian workforce and, in the case of many Department of Defense components, under-executed civilian spending.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to report to the congressional defense committees on the Department's compliance with section 808 of Public Law 112-81, as amended by section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) for each of the fiscal years the limitation has been in effect. The Comptroller General should submit an initial report by October 30, 2014, that covers fiscal years 2012-13. The final report should be submitted by September 30, 2015, and address the Department's compliance during fiscal year 2014. The final report should include an assessment of the efforts by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Department's financial management and acquisition communities



to implement effective control mechanisms for contracted services spending. Additionally, the Comptroller General's review should assess steps taken by defense components in executing the reductions to contractor performance of inherently governmental functions, closely associated with inherently governmental functions, and staff augmentation workload in accordance with the provisions of section 808 of Public Law 112-81.

#### Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Trusted Foundry and Supply Chain Risk Management Programs

The committee recognizes that trusted components, both hardware and software, are vital to ensure the security and integrity of defense systems. To that end, the Department of Defense established a Trusted Foundry program to ensure a dedicated supply of trusted microelectronics for highly sensitive defense applications, as well as a trusted supplier program to provide less advanced microelectronics that still require a high degree of trust. The committee also notes that section 254 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) required the Department to develop a Trusted Defense Systems Strategy to ensure that those capabilities were aligned with the policy framework needed to enforce the use of those capabilities.

After 10 years of this capability and policy framework, the committee believes that it is important to review the Trusted Foundry program, the Trusted Suppliers certification program, and other supply chain risk management to determine their effectiveness and understand if updates or changes are necessary. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review and submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than February 1, 2015, on the Department's program related to trusted foundry, trusted suppliers, and other supply chain risk management activities to ensure that the program strategy, contracting vehicles, and execution are fully supported by clear policy guidance from the Department, that such guidance is being followed, and to make any recommendations for needed improvement.

#### Comptroller General Review of Rulemaking Practices of the Department of Defense

The committee is aware that the interim rulemaking process of the Department of Defense allows for the expedited promulgations of rules in certain cases, and that numerous factors lead the Department of Defense to issue interim rules in lieu of proposed rules. The committee notes that interim rules may be issued for a variety of reasons when cause can be shown that a standard public notice-and-comment period would be impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest. Such causes include responses to emergencies, expedient measures to avert threats to public health or safety, and the need to make minor technical or insubstantial changes to regulations. However, the committee is also aware that overreliance on the interim rulemaking process may limit industry participation because that process may not afford opportunities to

consider industry comments before, or even after, the final rule takes effect.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the Department's rulemaking practices for promulgating acquisition regulations, and specifically the issuance of interim rules rather than the issuance of proposed rules. The evaluation should include:

(1) A brief description of current rulemaking procedures, including relevant provisions for notice-and-comment;

(2) An assessment of the frequency with which the interim rulemaking process is used by the Department of Defense to promulgate acquisition regulations;

(3) Descriptions of the most prevalent good cause justifications given by the Department for using rulemaking options other than the proposed rulemaking process; and

(4) Any recommendations the Comptroller General may have for improving constructive communications between the Department and industry during the rulemaking process.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2015, on the results of this evaluation.

#### Export Controls and the Small Arms Industrial Base

As part of the ongoing Export Control Reform Initiative, the committee supports expeditious progress toward amending the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) to revise Category I of the U.S. Munitions List (USML) to describe more precisely the firearms and related articles warranting control on the USML. Category I of the USML currently covers firearms (other than non-combat shotguns with barrel length of 18 inches or longer) with a caliber up to .50 inches, combat shotguns, close assault weapons systems, and related parts, components, and accessories. The committee understands that draft regulations to revise this Category were developed more than 2 years ago but have not been further advanced through the Federal rule-making process. The committee also notes that under the Export Control Reform Initiative, only firearms that are inherently military and otherwise warrant control on the USML, such as those that possess parameters or characteristics that provide a critical military or intelligence advantage to the United States, should continue to be subject to ITAR. Those items that do not warrant USML control would shift to the more flexible licensing authorities of the Department of Commerce under this reform initiative. The committee is concerned that current export controls on firearms may be adversely affecting U.S. businesses, including suppliers of the Department of Defense, by giving foreign companies a competitive advantage over U.S. firms. Therefore, the committee supports review by the committee of jurisdiction of the current \$1.0 million congressional notification threshold for exports of USML-controlled firearms.

### Independent Assessment of Department of Defense Cloud Computing Acquisition and Brokerage Policies

The committee is aware that there are significant cloud computing resources in the commercial sector that have resulted in reduced data center infrastructure and support personnel, leading to cost savings and efficiency for users of these services. The committee acknowledged that reality, as evidenced by the language in section 2867 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) that called for a strategy for transitioning to cloud computing, including the utilization of cloud computing services generally available within the private sector.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense could benefit from that trend, but is concerned that the guidance for leveraging commercial cloud services is being developed too slowly. The committee believes that an outside review of the Department's guidance and planning for cloud computing capabilities, including both in-house and private sector, would be valuable. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an independent assessment of the Department's policies and guidance for cloud computing capabilities and provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by September 30, 2015. This assessment should include the following:

- (1) Whether industry and government best practices are embodied in Department of Defense policies and guidance;
- (2) Whether cloud brokerage procedures are clearly articulated, commonly understood by service providers, and unbiased with respect to the use of in-house government-provided cloud services;
- (3) Whether security protocols for commercial cloud products and services are clearly articulated;
- (4) Whether guidance exists for integration of commercial cloud capabilities into the architectural plans for the Joint Information Environment; and
- (5) Whether the ongoing commercial cloud pilots are being evaluated for cost, performance, and security against standardized, consistent, and objective measures of effectiveness that are adequately aligned with current guidance.

### Industrial Base Risks Associated with Negotiated Standards of Production

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense depends on multiple unique materials for the manufacture and operation of equipment. Without such materials, high-performance hulls and airframes, advanced targeting and sensor equipment, electronic and computing devices, and many other important pieces of warfighter equipment cannot be produced. The committee notes that many of these materials, such as beryllium, have unique characteristics and require specialized processing facilities. The committee is concerned that certain regulations adopted by other countries are problematic and should not be adopted by the United States. Specifically, the committee is concerned that negotiated standards of production for some of these materials could lead to a loss of capacity in the U.S. defense industrial base. Therefore, the

committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to monitor all proposed regulatory changes, to identify those that could potentially interrupt the supply of materials critical to national security, and to notify the United States Trade Representative of any concern in a timely manner.

#### Operational Contract Support

The committee notes that many of the contracting failures noted by the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, the Department of Defense Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office, and others, were due to weaknesses in planning, execution, and oversight of Operational Contract Support (OCS) activities. A March 2011 Defense Science Board Task Force report, titled "Improvements to Services Contracting," specifically highlighted OCS as a "special case" that needs immediate and focused attention given the important role of contractors in supporting military operations.

The committee applauds efforts by the Joint Staff, the geographic combatant commanders, and the military departments to improve planning, execution, and oversight of OCS activities. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense conducted a joint OCS exercise in January 2014 designed to prepare uniformed and civilian OCS professionals to deploy and support any contingency, humanitarian, or operational mission. Not only did the exercise provide individual and collective training related to OCS activities, but it also served as a platform to evaluate and to refine proposed revisions to Joint Publication 4-10, which establishes Department of Defense doctrine for planning, conducting, and assessing OCS integration and contractor management functions in support of joint operations. The committee also applauds the Department's inclusion of the Federal Emergency Management Agency in the exercise as a way to promote efforts to improve interagency coordination and cooperation in future contingency operations.

While the committee is pleased with the Department's efforts to improve OCS planning, execution, and oversight, and supports its efforts to conduct annual joint exercises related to OCS, the committee is concerned that such exercises have yet to be formally included in the Department's budget submission. Instead of expressly including funding for OCS exercises in the budget, it appears that the Department resources these exercises with funding from the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (DAWDF). The committee recognizes that the DAWDF was created to ensure "the acquisition workforce has the capacity, in both personnel and skills, needed to properly perform its mission, provide appropriate oversight of contractor performance, and ensure that the Department receives the best value for the expenditure of public resources." However, the committee is concerned that the use of DAWDF funds to support these exercises will perpetuate the notion that OCS is a contracting issue and could discourage the participation of personnel, outside of the contracting community, who are essential to performing OCS planning and management functions.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to ensure that future

OCS education, training, and exercises are sufficiently resourced in a manner that integrates OCS awareness, education, and training into the professional development of the entire civilian and military workforce. To further integrate military, civilian, and contractor personnel into an effective total force, the committee also encourages the Department to include contract support scenarios into select operational exercises.

#### Rare Earth Elements Supply Chain Review

The committee remains concerned about the Department of Defense's ability to mitigate the risks associated with its dependence on foreign-sourced rare earth elements. A February 2014 Department of Defense report titled "Diversification of Supply and Reclamation Activities Related to Rare Earth Elements," received by the committee pursuant to the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, stated that the Department's mitigation strategy for foreign-sourced rare earth elements used in Department of Defense weapon systems includes "diversification of supply, pursuit of substitutes, and reclamation of waste." However, a separate February 2014 report from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition on the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF), also required by H. Rept. 113-102, discussed the lack of feasibility of implementing such a mitigation strategy for the JSF.

The committee is aware that the development of many modern systems, including the JSF and the AN/TPS-80 Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar, rely on rare earth magnets, and it has come to the committee's attention that there are cases where these magnets are being supplied by foreign companies. The committee finds the Department's use of national security waivers to enable continued reliance on these foreign-origin magnets, to specifically include samarium-cobalt magnets, troubling, and it notes such concern elsewhere in this report. The committee is concerned that in relying on foreign companies for supply of these magnets, the Department may unknowingly impart knowledge of design parameters, performance requirements, and test procedures for parts or components in advanced U.S. military equipment. The committee is also concerned that the recent discovery of Chinese-origin rare earth magnets in the JSF supply chain occurred only as a result of compliance requirements related to the prohibition on foreign sourcing of other elements such as titanium, steel, and zirconium.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency to conduct an examination of the sourcing of rare earth elements in Acquisition Category (ACAT) I programs not later than February 1, 2015. In doing so, the Director should determine whether an ACAT I program contains rare earth elements that are necessary to the functionality of that program. If so, the Director should determine the country of origin of the elements. If the Director has reason to believe that rare earth elements in an ACAT I program were manufactured by a foreign entity, then the Director should immediately inform the program manager in writing, and provide a report of the findings to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2015. The report may be provided in classified form.

### Regional Commercialization Activities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense continues to be challenged in commercializing and transitioning technology developed through federally funded research and development. The Department has a number of tools at its disposal to support these activities, such as the Commercialization Readiness Program, the Manufacturing Technology Program, and the Mentor-Protege program, but few are focused on tapping into the regional innovation centers across the Nation.

The committee understands that the Office of Naval Research has funded some initiatives that support the regional technology commercialization ecosystem. For example, the Pacific International Center for High Technology Research provides some administrative support and subject matter expertise for small and emerging businesses in diverse fields such as agriculture, renewable energy, and health information systems. Also, the Hawaii Technology Development Venture is a project supporting Hawaii-based technology businesses, as well as current and future Department of Navy and Department of Defense programs.

In addition, the committee notes that section 252 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) allowed the Secretary of Defense to use the research and engineering network of the Department of Defense to support the regional advanced technology clusters established by the Secretary of Commerce to encourage the development of technologies for national security and homeland defense challenges. The committee sees such activities as useful means to leverage State and local technology investments, and encourages the Department to find similar mechanisms for supporting the Nation's industrial base for emerging technologies.

### Use of National Security Waiver to Specialty Metals Clause

The committee is aware of recent cases where the Secretary of Defense has waived the legal requirement to buy specialty metals from American sources, pursuant to the national security waiver clause in subsection (k) of section 2533b, title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that the national security waiver should be used only to provide flexibility to the Department of Defense when there is imminent threat of harm to U.S. service members or national security interests, not in lieu of the other exceptions provided in the clause. The committee is concerned that recent use of the waiver has not been aligned with this intent, therefore the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees, not later than December 1, 2014, on the Department's use of the national security waiver clause in section 2533b of title 10, United States Code. The report should include:

- (1) Documentation of all national security waivers issued by the Department since 2008;
- (2) The procedures used by the Department to determine whether a national security waiver should be issued;

(3) The procedures used by the Department to determine whether a supply deficiency is best addressed through the national security waiver or through the availability exception;

(4) The procedures used by the Department to monitor contractor compliance;

(5) The procedures used by the Department to determine whether noncompliance by contractors and subcontractors is “knowing or willful” (10 U.S.C. 2533b(k)(3)); and

(6) The procedures used by the Department to determine whether further action by the Department is necessary to prevent the recurrence of the supply chain issue that led to noncompliance and the subsequent issuance of a national security waiver.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

#### Section 801—Extension to United States Transportation Command of Authorities Relating to Prohibition on Contracting with the Enemy

This section would amend section 831(i)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to add United States Transportation Command to the list of covered combatant commands.

#### Section 802—Extension of Contract Authority for Advanced Component Development or Prototype Units

This section would extend existing statutory authority under subsection (b)(4) of section 819 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) until September 30, 2019. This authority provides the Department of Defense a “bridge” between the science and technology portion of a contract awarded under the Federal Acquisition Regulation’s Broad Agency Announcement authority, and the award of a contract under a new acquisition for advanced component development or production.

#### Section 803—Amendment Relating to Authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects

This section would amend section 845(a)(1) of Public Law 103–160 (10 U.S.C. 2371 note) to broaden the definition for the types of efforts for which other transactions authority might be used by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

#### Section 804—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services

This section would extend for 1 year the cap on the aggregate annual amount spent on contracts for services through fiscal year 2015.

## SUBTITLE B—INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

## Section 811—Three-Year Extension of and Amendments to Test Program for Negotiation of Comprehensive Small Business Subcontracting Plans

This section would modify and extend the test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans authorized by section 402 of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-574) and last amended by section 866 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81).

The committee notes that the test program was authorized to allow contracting activities in the military departments and the defense agencies to undertake one or more demonstration projects to determine whether the negotiation and administration of comprehensive subcontracting plans would reduce administrative burdens on contracts while enhancing opportunities for small business concerns. However, after nearly 24 years since the original authorization of the program, the test program has yet to provide evidence that it meets the original stated goal of the program in the committee report (H. Rept. 101-331) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991: “to be more advantageous to both the government and to small and small disadvantaged businesses,” and “to expand available participation in a broader range of subcontracting opportunities, especially in the technical area.”

Therefore, this section would include additional requirements to ensure that the test program collects the data necessary to assess its effectiveness and to standardize its requirements with other subcontracting programs:

(1) The test program would be expanded to apply to all of the small business subcontracting goals, as the committee believes that the program was not intended to ignore additional subcontracting programs of the Federal Government;

(2) The threshold for participation in the program would be raised from \$5.0 million to \$100.0 million because the test program was intended to apply to contractors with a substantial presence in defense acquisition, and all current participants exceed this threshold;

(3) Companies participating in the test program would be required to report data by North American Industrial Classification System codes, by major defense acquisition program, by military department, and by service contract exceeding \$100.0 million; and

(4) The requirements for data on the costs avoided as a result of the program would be expanded.

As with other subcontracting programs required by the Small Business Act, this section would stipulate that a failure of a participant to make a good-faith effort to comply with the program will be used as a factor in past performance evaluations.

Lastly, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, not later than September 20,



2015, with an assessment of the program in order to inform any future decision to reauthorize the program.

#### Section 812—Improving Opportunities for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses

This section would amend section 657 of title 15, United States Code, by consolidating the verification and appeals processes for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Small Business Administration (SBA), and by moving the processes and resources of the SDVOSB verification programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs to the SBA. This section would also unify the definitions of SDVOSB in section 632 of title 15, United States Code, and section 8127(l) of title 38, United States Code, and would amend section 8127(f) of title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a memorandum of agreement with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration specifying the manner in which the Secretary shall notify the Administrator as to an individual's status as a veteran or a veteran with a service-connected disability. These changes should allow more efficient and transparent verification of small businesses requesting SDVOSB status.

#### Section 813—Plan for Improving Data on Bundled and Consolidated Contracts

This section would amend section 644 of title 15, United States Code, by requiring the Small Business Administration to work with other agencies to create and implement a data quality improvement plan to promote greater accuracy, transparency, and accountability in the reporting of contract bundling and consolidation. The committee recognizes that properly labeling a contract as bundled or consolidated is important to small business competition, as the process of contract labeling triggers a series of reviews and mitigation steps that promote opportunities for small business. Therefore, this section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to initiate a study, not later than October 1, 2018, to examine the effectiveness of the required data quality improvement plan and report the findings of the study to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate not later than 12 months after initiation of the study.

#### Section 814—Authority to Provide Education to Small Businesses on Certain Requirements of Arms Export Control Act

This section would amend section 21(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(1)) by including a requirement that applicants receiving grants pursuant to that section shall also assist small businesses by providing, where appropriate, education on the requirements applicable to small businesses under the regulations issued pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act (chapter 39 of title 22, United States Code) and on compliance with those requirements. This section would also amend section 2418 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding the Procurement Technical As-

sistance Program to assist small business concerns with education related to export controls.

#### Section 815—Prohibition on Reverse Auctions for Covered Contracts

This section would express a sense of Congress that reverse auctions, when used appropriately, may improve the Federal Government's procurement of commercially available goods and services by increasing competition, reducing prices, and improving opportunities for small businesses. However, the committee is concerned that, if not used appropriately, reverse auctions can harm small businesses, reduce competition, and render higher purchase prices.

The committee remains concerned that the use of reverse auctions to procure services, such as design and construction services, or goods such as items of personal protective equipment and specific organizational clothing and equipment, may not serve the interests of the warfighter or the taxpayer. Therefore, this section would also amend the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631) to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for procurement of certain goods and services if the contract is awarded using a Small Business Act procurement authority. It would also limit the use of reverse auctions in cases where only one offer was received or where offerors do not have the ability to submit revised bids throughout the course of the auction. The section further clarifies that the desire to use a reverse auction does not obviate Federal agencies from the obligation to use a Small Business Act procurement authority.

#### Section 816—SBA Surety Bond Guarantee

This section would amend section 411(c)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-699) by raising the guarantee rate on the Small Business Administration's preferred security bond program from 70 percent to 90 percent. This should enable greater competition for government contracts by small business construction contractors, thereby reducing prices for the taxpayer. Data provided by the Small Business Administration to the House Committee on Small Business indicates that this change can be made at no cost to the taxpayer.

### SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 821—Certification of Effectiveness for Air Force Information Technology Contracting

This section would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a review of the Air Force Network-Centric Solutions II (NETCENTS II) contract and provide a certification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the NETCENTS II contract is effective in delivering information technology capabilities for the joint force.

#### Section 822—Airlift Service

This section would amend chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section that would require transportation of passenger or property by Civil Reserve Air Fleet-eligible aircraft

obtained by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department through a contract for airlift service to be provided only by a covered air carrier.

**Section 823—Compliance with Requirements for Senior Department of Defense Officials Seeking Employment with Defense Contractors**

This section would amend section 847 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to require the Secretary of Defense to designate an official of the Department of Defense to ensure compliance with the requirements of that section and would require that, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, such official shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Department’s efforts to ensure compliance with the requirements of section 847.

**Section 824—Procurement of Personal Protective Equipment**

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to use best value tradeoff source selection methods to the maximum extent practicable when procuring an item of personal protective equipment or critical safety items. Personal protective equipment items include, but are not limited to, body armor components, combat helmets, combat protective eyewear, environmental and fire resistant clothing, footwear, organizational clothing and individual equipment, and other items as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

**Section 825—Prohibition on Funds for Contracts Violating Executive Order No. 11246**

This section would prohibit funding authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to be used to enter into any contract with any entity if such contract would violate Executive Order No. 11246 (relating to non-retaliation for disclosure of compensation information), as amended by the announcement of the President on April 8, 2014.

**Section 826—Requirement for Policies and Standard Checklist in Procurement of Services**

This section would amend section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to implement a standard checklist to be used for new contract approval for services or exercising an option under an existing contract for services. The checklist shall be modeled on the policies and checklist relating to services contract approval form (dated August 2012) established and in use by the Department of the Army. Finally, this section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the standard checklist for each of fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

## TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Headquarters Reductions

The committee is aware that in July 2013, the Secretary of Defense directed a 20 percent reduction in the major headquarters budgets of the Department of Defense, and announced plans to implement a series of management efficiencies and overhead reductions within the Department. In December 2013, the Secretary then announced several organizational changes and personnel reductions within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), and stated that, “every dollar that we save by reducing the size of our headquarters and back-office operations is a dollar that can be invested in warfighting capabilities and readiness.” However, the committee notes that announcements on organizational changes and personnel reductions across the Department’s other major headquarters organizations have not yet been made.

The committee has observed extensive growth in the Department’s major headquarters over the past decade. In a 2013 review, the Comptroller General of the United States reported that the size of the headquarters staff of the geographic combatant commands, excluding U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), had grown by 50 percent over the past decade. In an ongoing review for the committee, the Comptroller General has found even larger growth at CENTCOM, noting its support to military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan over the past decade, as well as the functional combatant commands, the service secretariats and service staffs, the Joint Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The Comptroller General further observed a lack of discipline in setting and validating requirements for individual headquarters, and a lack of visibility into the total resources allocated across organizations for similar functions and missions. The growth in bureaucracy at the Department is also being examined by the Defense Business Board in the context of its review of best business practices in human capital management.

While the committee welcomes the Department’s efforts to implement management efficiencies and overhead reductions, it is concerned that the Department may seek to implement such changes and across-the-board personnel reductions without the benefit of a comprehensive assessment of mission and functional requirements, critical capability and skillset requirements, and cost drivers. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to combine combatant command back-office functions in order to achieve greater efficiencies.

The committee appreciates the Comptroller General’s reviews and believes that further assessment of the data collected by the Comptroller General may better inform the Department, as it continues efforts to generate cost savings through organizational changes and personnel reductions, and the committee as it con-

tinues to oversee such efforts. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to perform an in-depth review in order to identify:

- (1) Any trends in personnel and other resources being devoted to selected functional areas within and across related organizations;
- (2) To what extent the Department of Defense and the military services have taken steps to eliminate or consolidate overlapping, fragmented, or duplicative functions;
- (3) Whether efforts to date constitute a systematic and comprehensive approach; and
- (4) Any additional steps the Department could take to realize additional savings.

The organizations that should be considered in this cross-cutting review should include, but not be limited to, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the service secretariats and staff, the geographic and functional combatant commands and their service component commands, and the defense agencies and field activities. The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit one or more reports, as deemed appropriate by the Comptroller General and agreed to with the committee, by April 30, 2015, to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

#### Comptroller General Review of Operational Test and Evaluation Processes and Activities

The committee remains concerned over the regularity at which an increase in time and funding is required to develop and field new weapon systems. To help inform the committee's understanding of how operational test and evaluation processes and activities may unnecessarily increase schedule and cost of major defense acquisition programs, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the operational test and evaluation processes and activities of the Department of Defense and to inform the congressional defense committees of the results of that review not later than March 15, 2015. The review should, at a minimum, examine:

- (1) The processes the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) uses to select programs for oversight and the number and types of programs covered since October 1, 2009;
- (2) The nature and extent of oversight DOT&E conducted or is conducting on these programs;
- (3) The extent to which the requirements of subsection 2339(b) of title 10, United States Code, are applied in such a manner that imposes additional operational requirements on programs overseen by DOT&E or necessitates testing of operational requirements not previously validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council or a military service;
- (4) The benefits of DOT&E oversight on these programs, to include enhancements of program performance, reliability, and capability;
- (5) Cost or schedule delays in the operational test phases of these programs and the resulting cost and schedule delays incurred by these programs as a result of oversight processes and activities of DOT&E; and

(6) The specific DOT&E criteria, for example, measures of effectiveness and analysis, and process to measure effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of programs.

#### Department of Defense Unmanned Systems Office

The committee believes that an independent organization within the Department of Defense to develop and coordinate the unmanned air, land, and sea capabilities of the United States may provide greater unity of effort, better meet military requirements, minimize duplication, and maximize the allocation of limited resources for unmanned systems within the Department.

Such an independent organization would aim to improve policy and oversight of unmanned systems across the Department; coordinate acquisition and research, development, technology, and engineering efforts for unmanned systems; make investment and budget recommendations for unmanned systems; and make recommendations on integrating unmanned systems with existing operational concepts and determining new concepts.

The director of such office would serve as the principal advisor to both the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense on matters relating to unmanned systems and as the Department's principal liaison to other Federal agencies, the defense industry, and centers of research on such matters.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense to brief the House Armed Services Committee not later than August 1, 2014, on the advisability of establishing such an independent organization.

#### Global Response Force

The committee believes the Global Response Force (GRF), currently maintained within the Army's 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, is essential to the nation's ability to swiftly respond to crises and unforeseen events, and to rapidly project military power in support of U.S. national interests. As the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified to the committee on April 3, 2014, a robust and agile GRF capability is needed to "move more quickly, because events unfold more quickly in this world than they ever have before and we have [to] be able to get there fast."

However, the committee notes that the GRF is dependent on assets and support provided by the joint force, and thus its mission effectiveness and capacity are limited when such assets and support are not equally prioritized by other services or elements of the Department of Defense. The committee encourages the Department to look more holistically at the GRF to identify requirements, assess gaps in capabilities and seams across the services, and allocate sufficient resources. It also encourages the Department to place greater emphasis on joint planning, operations, and training to ensure an effective, integrated GRF capability is maintained in accordance with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Joint Force 2020 construct.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

## Section 901—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would re-designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

## Section 902—Additional Responsibility for Director of Operational Test and Evaluation

This section would amend section 139 of title 10, United States Code, by including a new subsection that would require the Director of Operational Test Evaluation to consider the potential for increases in program cost estimates or delays in schedule estimates in the implementation of policies, procedures, and activities related to operational test and evaluation, and to take appropriate action to ensure that the conduct of operational test and evaluation activities do not unnecessarily impede program schedules or increase program costs.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the operational test and evaluation processes and activities of the Department of Defense and to report the results of that review to the congressional defense committees not later than March 15, 2015.

## Section 903—Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment

This section would establish the position of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment. The position would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. The committee recognizes that the responsibilities of this organization already exist within the Department of Defense, reporting to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The creation of this Assistant Secretary of Defense position shall ensure no net growth in personnel or resources for the organization, and shall not be exempt from any directed headquarters reductions.

## Section 904—Requirement for Congressional Briefing before Divesting of Defense Finance and Accounting Service Functions

This section would prohibit the transfer of financial management functions out of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) until the Secretary of Defense provides a briefing to the congressional defense committees on a transfer plan and certifies the transfer would reduce costs, increase efficiencies, maintain the timeline for auditability of financial statements, and maintain the roles and missions of DFAS.

#### Section 905—Combatant Command Efficiency Plan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to combine the back office functions of two or more combatant commands and to submit a report on the plan to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would define the term “back office functions” as those including, but not limited to, the administrative and support functions of a headquarters of a combatant command. This section would also limit fiscal year 2015 funds for the headquarters of the Joint Chiefs of Staff until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Of Staff, provides the briefing on combatant command headquarters personnel and resource requirements that was directed in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

The committee believes a focus by the Department of Defense on consolidating or eliminating organizations and personnel that perform similar functions and missions, such as administrative and support functions, can contribute to cost savings and efficiencies within the Department.

#### Section 906—Requirement for Plan to Reduce Geographic Combatant Commands to Four by Fiscal Year 2020

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a non-binding plan to reduce the number of geographic combatant commands to no more than four by the end of fiscal year 2020 and submit a report to Congress within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the plan, the feasibility and risks of the plan, and any recommendations to implement the plan the Secretary considers appropriate.

#### Section 907—Office of Net Assessment

This section would establish the Office of Net Assessment (ONA) as a new section in chapter 4 of title 10, United States Code, that includes a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to establish a separate, dedicated program element for ONA in the annual budget materials submitted to Congress. This section would also include a statement of policy that the office be maintained as an independent organization within the Department of Defense responsible for developing and coordinating net assessments of the military capabilities and potential of the United States in comparison with the military capabilities and potential of other countries or groups of countries, so as to identify emerging or future threats or opportunities for the United States.

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense plans to realign ONA under the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. While the committee supports the Secretary’s objective to have ONA’s long-range comparative assessments inform and influence the Department’s overall strategy and policy, it remains concerned that such a realignment may ultimately impact the freedom and flexibility of the office to examine long-range challenges and non-policy specific matters that may not always be in sync with the priorities and responsibilities of the Under Secretary of Defense for



Policy. Furthermore, the committee remains unconvinced that such a realignment would produce any meaningful cost savings or efficiencies that the Secretary hopes to achieve.

This section would therefore preserve the independence of the office, ensure that the head of the office reports directly to the Secretary of Defense, and create greater visibility into its budget. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends an increase in funds for the office.

#### Section 908—Amendments Relating to Organization and Management of the Office of the Secretary of Defense

This section would incorporate a proposal from the Department of Defense to make several amendments to title 10, United States Code, relating to the organization and management of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

#### Section 909—Periodic Review of Department of Defense Management Headquarters

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan and submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to implement a periodic review and analysis of the Department of Defense personnel requirements for management headquarters and submit the required plan to the congressional defense committees. The section would also modify the status report requirements in section 904(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

### SUBTITLE B—TOTAL FORCE MANAGEMENT

#### Section 911—Modifications to Biennial Strategic Workforce Plan Relating to Senior Management, Functional, and Technical Workforce of the Department of Defense

This section would amend section 115b of title 10, United States Code, to modify the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to prepare a biennial Strategic Workforce Plan so as to cover “the senior management workforce” of the Department of Defense rather than the “senior management, functional, and technical workforce (including scientists and engineers).”

#### Section 912—Repeal of Extension of Comptroller General Report on Inventory

This section would amend section 803(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as amended by section 951(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), by striking “2013, 2014, and 2015” and inserting “and 2013”. The effect of this amendment would be to repeal the requirement for the Comptroller General of the United States to report on efforts by the Department of Defense to compile and review the Department’s inventory of contract services within 270 days after such inventory has been submitted to Congress. While the Comptroller General’s work in this area has been beneficial, the committee notes that there are

other existing mandates for reviews and reporting requirements regarding how the Department's inventory of contract services is used to inform workforce and budget decisions.

Section 913—Assignment of Certain New Requirements Based on Determinations of Cost-Efficiency

This section would require that when assigning a new Department of Defense work requirement to military or civilian personnel, or to a contractor, the assignment shall be made based on a determination of which workforce can perform the work in the most cost-efficient manner except in cases where the new requirement is inherently governmental, closely associated with inherently governmental functions, critical, or required by law to be performed by military personnel or civilian personnel.

Section 914—Prohibition on Conversion of Functions Performed by Civilian or Contractor Personnel to Performance by Military Personnel

This section would clarify when military personnel can be used to perform functions that are currently being performed by civilian or contractor personnel and would codify relevant Department of Defense instruction and policy.

Section 915—Notification of Compliance With Section Relating to Procurement of Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure compliance with existing law regarding appropriate manpower performance and provide written notification of compliance to the congressional defense committees. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of such a notification and report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the provision of such a notification.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 921—Extension of Authority to Waive Reimbursement of Costs of Activities for Nongovernmental Personnel at Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies

This section would amend section 941(b)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (10 U.S.C. 184) by extending for 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive the reimbursement of costs for certain nongovernmental personnel at the Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies.

Section 923—Authority to Require Employees of the Department of Defense and Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to Occupy Quarters on a Rental Basis While Performing Official Travel

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense to direct the use of adequate Government quarters, or the use of Government-

leased quarters or lodging arranged through a Government program, by civilian employees and Uniformed Service members, while performing official travel. Section 5911(e) of title 5, United States Code, currently states that an agency head may not require an employee or member of a Uniformed Service to occupy quarters on a rental basis unless the agency head determines that necessary service cannot be rendered or that Government property cannot adequately be protected otherwise. This change to title 5 is intended to provide travel cost savings and other benefits to the Department of Defense, without significantly reducing the quality and security of lodging for civilian employees and service members performing official travel.

Section 924—Single Standard Mileage Reimbursement Rate for Privately Owned Automobiles of Government Employees and Members of the Uniformed Services

This section would establish a rate that provides adequate compensation for employees who perform temporary duty travel. It would apply to all Federal Government employees and members of the Uniformed Services traveling on behalf of the Federal Government in a privately owned automobile.

## TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

##### Afghanistan Counternarcotics Strategy Post-2014

The committee recognizes the United States presence and mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan after December 31, 2014, has yet to be announced. The committee notes that the production of poppy and the resultant drug trade continue to increase and pose a threat to the security and stability of Afghanistan. In recent years, Afghanistan has produced approximately 90 percent of the world's poppy crop, and the level of profit from these crops continues to rise. These profits directly fund the terrorist activities of Al Qaeda and other dangerous groups that threaten both Afghanistan and the United States. The October 2013 Department of Defense Post-2014 Counternarcotics Strategy for Afghanistan and the Region states that, "Post-2014, it is imperative that the Department continue to work with inter-agency and international partners to disrupt the flow of illicit drug money to terrorists and insurgents, and reduce the corrosive and corruptive impact of illicit drug money on regional stability."

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to include the combating illicit narcotics and illicit trafficking mission in its post-2014 Afghanistan presence and mission requirements. The committee believes the Department's mission to combat narcotics in Afghanistan is an enduring mission that must be continued with our international partners to sustain security and stability in Afghanistan.

### National Guard Counterdrug Programs

The committee acknowledges the significant role the National Guard plays in combating illicit narcotics within the homeland. The demand for narcotics in the United States continues to fund transnational criminal organizations globally. The drug trade breeds instability on the Nation's border and throughout the country. Through a variety of programs to include education, training, and analysis, the National Guard provides necessary support to countering drugs and their threat to national security.

In a fiscally constrained environment, prioritizing limited resources is essential. Therefore, the committee encourages the National Guard to prioritize its counterdrug programs to maximize the use of limited funds. The committee is aware that the National Guard uses a threat-based resource model to determine the highest at-risk States and regions of the United States for which to focus resources. The committee believes the National Guard should leverage this model to prioritize its counterdrug programs and resources. The committee also encourages the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to continue evaluating how to best use limited counterdrug resources to more effectively combat illicit narcotics within the homeland.

### U.S. Southern Command Asset Resourcing

The committee continues to be discouraged by asset resourcing in U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM). In particular, the committee is concerned that a shortfall in maritime, aerial, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets in the region hampers SOUTHCOM's ability to combat the illicit networking of drugs, weapons, humans, and money, and affects security and stability along the southern border of the United States.

While the Office of National Drug Control Policy's whole-of-government goal is to remove 40 percent of narcotics transiting to the United States through SOUTHCOM's area of responsibility (AOR) by fiscal year 2015, the committee notes that this goal is unlikely to be met, in large part because resources allocated to the region to address this goal are continuing to diminish. In testimony before the committee in February 2014, the commander of SOUTHCOM expressed his concern about U.S. asset shortfalls in the region to meet the command's assigned missions derived from this whole-of-government goal, among others. Specifically, the commander testified that SOUTHCOM requires a 16.0 ship presence to support the command's assigned missions. In contrast, the commander estimates that, in fiscal year 2015, SOUTHCOM will maintain a sporadic 3.0 ship presence. Similarly, the commander of SOUTHCOM, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services in March 2014, estimated that in fiscal year 2015, the command will satisfy only 5 percent of its ISR requirements associated with combating transnational organized crime.

The committee recognizes that the cost of combating illicit drug and other networks is exponentially lower, and the associated violence levels minimal, outside the United States as compared to inside the Nation. Therefore, in order to more effectively interdict narcotics and combat other illicit networks and transnational

criminal organizations in the region, the Department of Defense must prioritize the detection and monitoring mission in SOUTHCOM.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2015, on the Department's updated strategy to combat illicit drug networks, other illicit networks, and transnational criminal organizations, in the SOUTHCOM AOR. The strategy should include an identification of requirements, assessment of capability gaps and shortfalls, assessment of assets and resources necessary to address the gaps and shortfalls, and plan for allocating those assets and resources. Lastly, the strategy should include an assessment of and cost estimate for alternative platforms, including maritime and aerial platforms, that could also satisfy the command's detection and monitoring requirements.

#### OTHER MATTERS

##### Army Force Structure

The committee believes the Army's current requirement to further reduce planned end strength and force structure by fiscal year 2019 is a direct consequence of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25). The committee notes the Army's current plan would reduce the Active Component end strength from a wartime high of 570,000 soldiers to 450,000 soldiers with a potential further reduction to 420,000 soldiers absent repeal of sequestration-level budget caps in fiscal year 2016.

As a result, the committee understands the Army is also reducing active brigade combat teams from 45 to 32 and divesting almost 700 aircraft, as well as eliminating 3 combat aviation brigades. The Army's plan would also reduce Army National Guard end strength from 358,000 soldiers to 335,000 soldiers with a potential further reduction to 315,000 soldiers absent repeal of sequestration-level budget caps. The committee understands the Army National Guard would be required to divest its AH-64 Apache attack helicopters, effectively transferring these assets to the Active Component, as well as divest its OH-58 Kiowa Warriors Scout Reconnaissance helicopters. However, the committee understands the Army National Guard would receive 111 UH-60 Black Hawk L and M model utility helicopters from the Active Component to improve the Guard's capabilities to perform title 32 crisis response and defense support to civil authority missions. Therefore, the committee expects that those units that transfer AH-64 Apache attack helicopters to the active Army will receive priority for modernized Black Hawks which should be at a minimum in the UH-60 Black Hawk L model utility helicopter configuration.

In testimony before the committee, the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff of the Army officially stated their concerns regarding the potential inability of the U.S. Army to meet the requirements of the current National Military Strategy and execute operational plans absent a repeal of sequestration-level budget caps in fiscal year 2016. The committee remains concerned by this testimony and believes that in order to mitigate the increased strategic

risk generated by the Budget Control Act of 2011, the Army is being forced to reduce end strength to preserve near-term readiness through the Future Years Defense Program. The committee is concerned with the planned reductions and realignments the Army has proposed, specifically the greater reductions in Active Component end strength and brigade combat teams, as well as the proposed aviation realignment of combat aviation aircraft. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require a Comptroller General of the United States review of the methods the Army and the Department of Defense Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation used to determine the future force structure of the Army, to include the appropriate mix between Active, Guard, and Reserve Component forces. The committee also recommends increases in funding for procurement and operation and maintenance accounts to accelerate the conversions of UH-60A to UH-60L Black Hawk helicopters, and also recommends additional funding to procure six additional UH-60M Black Hawk helicopters to address Army National Guard modernization shortfalls. Finally, the committee recommends additional funding for operation and maintenance readiness accounts to increase overall training opportunities and increase depot-level maintenance in the Army National Guard.

#### Assessment of Counterfeit Detection Efforts

The committee recognizes the challenges posed to the Department of Defense in identifying and mitigating the presence of counterfeit parts in its supply chain. Section 818 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) was an important step in establishing policy, guidance, and compliance reporting to move the Department forward in addressing the detection and mitigation of counterfeit parts, including microelectronics. The committee believes that it is important to take stock of the actions that have been taken to date and to evaluate their effectiveness.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2014, assessing the approaches currently taken to mitigate counterfeit parts in the supply system. The briefing should include the following:

- (1) A cost benefit assessment of current compliance and technology measures for mitigating counterfeit parts, including microelectronics, in the supply chain, and requirements for deoxyribonucleic acid authentication marking. This assessment should include costs associated with program implementation and the scope of components that are being addressed by these measures;

- (2) An assessment of the costs and benefits of expanding these measures to additional classes of technology, which have been deemed at high risk for counterfeiting;

- (3) An analysis of the quantity of alerts and problem advisories reporting counterfeit electronic parts in the Government Industry Data Exchange Program since January 2011 that were a result of the use of the measures described in item (1) above; and

(4) A description and analysis of the Department of Defense's efforts to collaborate and coordinate with the defense industrial base on the development of standards associated with the prevention, detection, and responses to the threat of counterfeit electronic parts in the military supply system.

#### Cargo Unmanned Aerial Systems

The committee is aware of ongoing efforts to develop and demonstrate cargo unmanned aerial systems to support logistics, sustainment, and re-supply missions in intra-theater operations where the use of high-value manned aircraft or ground convoys to resupply troops is uneconomical, dangerous or accomplished with difficulty. The committee is also aware that since December 2011, the Department of Defense has been conducting a Military User Assessment (MUA) of unmanned cargo helicopters for supply missions in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and that this MUA was the result of a merit based competitive selection. However, the committee is concerned that a Department of Defense program of record and associated funding has not been established to transition this advanced demonstration program into a fielded program of record. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to implement a program of record for this unmanned cargo helicopter system as part of the fiscal year 2016 budget submission. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2014, on its plans to potentially create cargo unmanned aerial systems programs of record.

#### Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense Antiterrorism and Force Protection Efforts

The committee recognizes that there have been an increasing number of insider attacks on U.S. military bases in recent years. In November of 2009, 13 people were killed and 43 others wounded when a soldier opened fire at Fort Hood, Texas. The committee notes that following this shooting at Fort Hood, the Secretary of Defense established the Department of Defense Independent Review Related to Fort Hood. The review board presented its findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense in January 2010. In completing its review, the review board limited the depth of its study in certain areas, including force protection roles and responsibilities and threat assessment programs, based on the Secretary of Defense's stated intent to have the military departments conduct in-depth follow-on reviews. However, the committee is concerned that more incidents have occurred since this incident, including a shooting at the Washington Navy Yard in September of 2013, as well as a second shooting at Fort Hood in April of 2014.

The committee recognizes that insider attacks, such as these, pose a different challenge to Department of Defense's traditional antiterrorism and force protection efforts that address external threats. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive review of the inside-the-wire, antiterrorism and force protection efforts of the Department of Defense, and submit a report to the House Committee

on Armed Services by March 30, 2015. The review should address the following areas:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Defense has implemented the recommendations identified in the Department's Independent Review Related to Fort Hood;

(2) The status of the follow-on studies to be completed by the military departments and to what extent have any recommendations from these studies been implemented;

(3) Additional actions taken by individual installations, and the extent to which these efforts have been shared with other installations; and

(4) The extent to which the Department's current antiterrorism and force protection policies, guidance, and standards address insider threats.

#### Coordination of Efforts to Track and Counter Weapons of Mass Destruction

The committee remains concerned about the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to the safety and security of the United States. Efforts to track and counter WMDs exist within a significant number of Federal agencies. The committee recognizes that counter-WMD missions outside of U.S. borders reside within the purview of the Department of Defense. However within U.S. borders, these missions fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee notes that as outlined in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review, the combating WMD strategy of the Department of Defense is to eliminate WMD threats prior to entering the United States; however, the committee recognizes that this may not always be possible. The committee is concerned about the eventuality wherein a WMD device crosses these jurisdictional boundaries, in particular, in regards to the coordination efforts between the Department of Defense and local, state, and Federal authorities. The committee believes that in the case of such an occurrence, the cooperation between the Department of Defense and other Government agencies should be absolute in order to guarantee the elimination of WMD threats. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2014, on the coordination efforts between the Department of Defense, the intelligence community, and local, state, and Federal authorities for tracking and combating weapons of mass destruction entering the United States. The briefing should include details on the authority structures in place within the Department of Defense to facilitate the coordination efforts, as well as examples of how these structures would operate in a realistic threat scenario.

#### Cross-Service Wargaming Capability

The committee recognizes that the information and insights gained from wargaming are uniquely valuable for investigating processes, organizing ideas, exploring issues, explaining implications and identifying questions. Historically, wargames have been



instrumental in driving doctrinal and technological change, such as those conducted by the Naval War College during the interwar period leading up to World War II, which contributed to advances in amphibious warfare and utilization of carrier aviation. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should continue to invest in a robust cross-service advanced wargaming capacity to inform Department strategy and doctrine in a fiscally constrained environment.

#### Department of Defense Humanitarian Mine Action and Conventional Munitions Assistance Program

The committee notes that the budget request contained \$5.8 million for the Department of Defense Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) program within operation and maintenance, Defense-wide. Elsewhere in this Act, a related section would modify the reporting requirements and definitions contained in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, regarding humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance. The goal of the HMA program is to reduce the adverse effects of land mines and other explosive remnants of war (ERW) on noncombatants while advancing geographic combatant commander theater campaign plans and national security objectives. The committee is aware that the Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) office within the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), which has worked in conjunction with the HMA program, has been discontinued and will no longer be available to assist the Department of Defense with the removal of conventional weapons, and physical security and stockpile management of at-risk abandoned stockpiles of dangerous explosive ordnance, small arms and light weapons, and man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS). The committee notes the excellent work that DTRA's SALW office has done throughout the years in support of geographic combatant commander requirements. The committee understands that some of the technical support previously provided by DTRA's SALW office may be provided by the Department of Defense Humanitarian Demining Training Center (HDTC) and may be in addition to amounts available under section 407 of title 10, United States Code, for such expenses. While the committee is supportive of this role for the HDTC, the committee remains concerned about a potential gap in providing technical assistance for the elimination of abandoned or at-risk stockpiles of conventional weapons, including MANPADS, which pose a grave threat to United States national security interests, particularly through Africa and the Middle East.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense Humanitarian Mine Action program to engage with international partners and allies when practical, including allies from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to ensure a coordinated and holistic approach to achieve geographic combatant commander security needs. As such, the committee recommends \$10.8 million, an increase of \$5.0 million, to ensure sufficient resources to address these concerns, for conventional weapons assistance including MANPADS.

### Department of Defense Installation Security

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense conducted internal and independent reviews of the security programs, policies, and procedures regarding security at military installations following the tragic shooting at the Washington Navy Yard. The committee notes that while these reviews include findings and recommendations related to the physical access control process, physical security infrastructure capabilities, and force protection, the Secretary of Defense's memorandum dated March 18, 2014, only approved the implementation of four recommendations, specifically to "implement continued evaluation," "establish a DOD [Department of Defense] Insider Threat Management Analysis Center," "centralize authority, accountability, and programmatic integration under a single Principal Staff Assistant," and "resource and expedite deployment of the Identity Management Enterprise Services Architecture."

While the committee believes these are important steps to improve the security of military installations, the committee is concerned that not enough emphasis has been placed on improving the programs, policies, procedures, and infrastructure supporting the physical security of installations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2014, that addresses the following:

- (1) An update on the Defense Installation Access Controls Joint Capability Technology Demonstration, and whether an opportunity exists to leverage commercially available tools into its architecture;
- (2) The frequency of installation anti-terrorism plans and local vulnerability assessments, and the process for mitigating or accepting identified risks;
- (3) Trends or identified shortfalls in equipment, personnel, training, or infrastructure that directly support the physical security of military facilities and installations and have been validated by Joint Staff Integrated Vulnerability Assessments;
- (4) Any changes that may be necessary to the physical security and anti-terrorism/force protection policies and procedures for vehicles and personnel entering military installations and facilities; and
- (5) Any authority gaps that may require legislation to strengthen the physical security of military installations and facilities.

### Economic Warfare Policy

The committee continues to be concerned by the possibility of adversaries utilizing economic warfare as a means to undermine U.S. military advantages. As noted in the committee report (H. Rept 112-78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, "[t]he committee is concerned that our adversaries understand this dependency, and are developing means to attack our military strength by attacking our economy."

In making those observations, the committee noted the findings of a 2009 report from the Irregular Warfare Support Program titled "Economic Warfare: Risks and Responses," which offered some plausible scenarios about how economic warfare might be used against the United States. That report also made a number of rec-

ommendations which have yet to be given serious attention by the Department of Defense or the national security establishment, including:

(1) Recognize that protecting the American economy and industrial capability is a top defense priority that should be properly funded and supported;

(2) Thoroughly research the hypothesis of economic warfare described from an economic defense perspective; and

(3) Create a specialized threat finance unit to develop and implement appropriate countermeasures to emerging economic warfare threats.

Since that report was released, the committee has become increasingly aware of the potentialities that cyber-enabled technologies add to these economic and financial threats. For example, the large-scale theft of intellectual property in sectors of strategic importance to the United States poses a direct challenge to U.S. technological superiority, but also a long-term economic pressure as we are forced to develop countermeasures against our own stolen defense technologies and potentially lose market advantage in some non-military technology sectors. The presence of large swaths of the financial sector without an adequate monitoring framework that could be exploited by terrorist or nation-state, such as dark trading pools, credit default swaps, sovereign wealth funds, naked short selling, or algorithmic trading, may be a significant blind spot for the United States.

Given the pervasive nature of these threats, and the apparent lack of clear policy guidance or organization to address these issues, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by August 1, 2015, on the Department's assessment of these activities. The report should include:

(1) Articulation of what sorts of activities amount to economic warfare upon the United States;

(2) Clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the Department of Defense in providing indications and warning of, or protection against, acts of economic warfare;

(3) The current status of authorities and command structure related to economic warfare; and

(4) Recommendations for improving the Department's capabilities, authorities, or command structure, as well as improving its coordination and support for interagency partners in dealing with economic warfare threats.

#### Force Structure Assessment

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy conducted a Force Structure Assessment in 2012 that determined the proposed composition of Navy surface and subsurface vessels. This latest Force Structure Assessment determined that an overall Navy fleet of 306 ships would be necessary to support the overall defense strategy. Since the release of the 2012 Force Structure Assessment, the Secretary of Defense released the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review which determined, in part, the requirement for 11 aircraft carriers and 92 large surface combatants. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to update the most recent Force

Structure Assessment and to submit it to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015.

#### Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account

The General Accounting Office (now the Government Accountability Office, or GAO) noted in a 1986 report (NSIAD-86-173) that the purpose of the Foreign Currency Fluctuation, Defense (FCF,D) account is to provide a mechanism for stabilizing the portion of operation and maintenance (O&M) and Military Personnel funding used for purchasing foreign goods and services. The FCF,D provides funds to O&M when foreign exchange rates are unfavorable (when losses occur) and receives funds from O&M when the rates are favorable (when gains occur). This ensures, as GAO stated, that “any given O&M appropriation for the purchase of foreign goods and services will purchase the budgeted amount of goods and services, regardless of the gains and losses of the dollar caused by currency fluctuations.” Based on the rationale for the genesis of the FCF,D account, the committee believes that when foreign currency rates are determined by the Department of Defense, the current balance of funds in the FCF,D account should be considered.

When the FCF,D account has a balance close to or at the cap of \$970.0 million, the committee believes the budgeted rates should be adjusted to generate losses within the account, thereby drawing down the FCF,D account balance. This would reduce the O&M budget requirement for foreign goods and services, allowing excess funds to be allocated to other readiness programs without changing the budget topline. However, as the FCF,D account realizes a net gain, these gains remain in O&M and are used for purposes not originally requested in the annual budget submission to Congress. Without visibility on these transactions through a reprogramming request, the committee cannot determine whether funds remaining in the FCF,D account are being used to reduce current readiness shortfalls. The committee notes that based on current foreign currency rates for fiscal year 2014, GAO estimates that the O&M accounts will realize a net gain of \$154.7 million through the FCF,D, and the Military Personnel accounts will realize a net gain of \$197.3 million.

The committee understands the difference between foreign currency and unobligated balances. Unobligated balances from O&M and Military Personnel appropriations that have expired for less than 2 years can be moved into the account to re-establish the FCF,D balance. The committee notes that from November 2012 to November 2013, unobligated balances for fiscal year 2012 O&M funding increased by more than \$860.0 million. These funds, if left unobligated, should be transferred to the FCF,D account, and future foreign currency rates adjusted to reduce the balance and increase funding to readiness.

The committee recommends the Department of Defense take into consideration the current balance within the FCF,D account when determining foreign currency levels in upcoming budget submissions. Accordingly, the committee recommends both a reduction in the O&M budget for fiscal year 2015 as shown in section 4301 of this Act and a reduction in the Military Personnel budget for fiscal year 2015 as shown in section 4401 of this Act, and realigns those

funds to support higher priority defense requirements throughout the Department.

#### Information Management Systems for Response Forces

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction–Civil Support Teams (WMD–CST) currently field a system called the CST Information Management System, to provide a common operating picture, promote information-sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation, and support the CST mission of assisting and advising first responders and facilitating communications with other Federal resources. The committee is also aware that in the National Guard Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Response Enterprise, there are also other capabilities such as the Unified Command Suite and the Joint Incident Command Suite. Because each of these tools support different echelons of command with different but related capabilities, it is vital that there be a comprehensive strategy for how to rationalize the current suite of tools, and move forward with a common, interoperable, enterprise information management solution.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2015, on a comprehensive strategy for developing and fielding an information management architecture for the Department’s CBRN Response Enterprise. This strategy should define the information architecture needs for the CBRN Response Enterprise as well as its plans to achieve enterprise-wide data interoperability for all operating elements within the Response Enterprise.

#### Inspector General’s Report on Over-Classification of National Security Information

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2015, on the status and implementation of the recommendations found in the Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General’s report, “DOD Evaluation of Over-Classification of National Security Information” (DODIG–2013–142). The Secretary’s report should include specific actions taken to implement the recommendations contained in the report and timeframes for implementing the remaining recommendations.

#### Internet Governance

The committee is aware of a recent proposal by the Department of Commerce to start the process of transferring the remaining Department of Commerce-managed Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions to the global multi-stakeholder community. The committee is also aware that such a transition is supported by the Administration, many in industry, and the international community.

The committee urges caution in such discussions to understand the full ramifications of any transition of responsibility, since the United States has played an important role in overseeing the stability of the Internet. As noted in recent testimony before the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, “Any pledge, commitment, or oath made by the current ICANN [Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers] leadership is not binding unless there is some accountability mechanism in place to back up that promise. Until now, the United States has served that role. If the U.S. Government is no longer providing that stability, an alternative mechanism is needed to ensure that ICANN is held accountable to the public interest.” Additionally, as this testimony points out, “U.S. oversight has served as a deterrent to stakeholders, including certain foreign countries, who might otherwise choose to interfere with ICANN’s operations or manipulate the Domain Name Servers for political purposes. For example, a country may want to censor a top-level domain name or have ICANN impose certain restrictions on domain name registries or registrars.”

Because of the Department of Defense’s equities in a secure and transparent Internet governance system, the committee believes it is important to ensure that any new Internet governance construct includes protections for the legacy .mil domains and maintains the associated Internet protocol numbers. Furthermore, the committee believes that any negotiations that occur should include verifiable measures for maintaining a separation between the policymaking and technical operation of root-zone management functions and that such protections should be a red line in interagency discussions and U.S. Government positions.

#### Inventory of Counter Threat Finance Programs and Capabilities

The committee recognizes that illicit financial networks are critical enablers to destabilizing networks and transnational criminal organizations, including terrorist, narco-traffickers, human smugglers, proliferators and actors seeking to avoid sanctions. The Department of Defense invested heavily in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to create counter threat finance capabilities to detect and combat such illicit activity. With the draw-down in Afghanistan and the pivot to Asia, the committee is concerned that the Department might begin to divest itself of such counter threat finance capabilities in favor of traditional military capabilities. However, the committee believes such capabilities will continue to be of value to combat threats to our national security, including state actors avoiding sanctions or maintain black market economic activities. The committee also believes such capabilities can be useful in supporting surveillance and indications and warning for national economic threats, such as attempts to perpetrate economic warfare or sabotage. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by February 15, 2015, on an inventory and sustainment plan for Department of Defense counter-threat finance programs and capabilities.

#### Military Auxiliary Radio System

The committee continues to support the Military Auxiliary Radio System (MARS), a Department of Defense-sponsored auxiliary organization of volunteer amateur radio operators who provide con-

tingency communications support to the Department of Defense and U.S. Government operations. In addition to providing an important back-up to conventional communications that is potentially vulnerable to disruption or degradation, MARS can play a vital role in helping to ensure continuity of Government and continuity of operations in the event of a natural or man-made disaster. Given these advantages of MARS, the committee is concerned by the Department's lack of action in fully utilizing this capability. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112-479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee encouraged the Department to clarify and maintain policy oversight of MARS within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and to update Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 4650.02 entitled "Mars Auxiliary Radio System (MARS)" with respect to the disestablishment of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration. The committee notes, however, that these actions have not yet occurred.

The committee is aware of efforts to revise and update DODI 4650.02, which establishes policy, procedures, and responsibilities for MARS. However, the revision is not yet complete. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that any rewrite of the DODI 4650.02 effectively integrates MARS into the Department of Defense's emergency communications plan; consolidates MARS operations through appointment of an individual MARS manager to ensure standardization of operating policies and procedures among the three MARS branches within the Army, Air Force, and Navy-Marine Corps; and directs the service secretaries and geographic combatant commanders to integrate MARS more fully into their operational planning and activities. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by August 30, 2014, on the status of the revision of DODI 4650.02.

#### Nuclear Monitoring and Verification Technologies

The committee notes the Defense Science Board (DSB) released a report in January 2014 titled, "Assessment of Nuclear Monitoring and Verification Technologies." The Board took a comprehensive approach to evaluating the current U.S. Government framework for monitoring nuclear proliferation. It provided recommendations to improve existing tools and capabilities, and identified new approaches to traditional monitoring means. The committee notes the report's conclusion that "monitoring for proliferation should be a top national security objective, but one for which the nation is not yet organized or fully equipped to address."

The DSB report included recommendations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the National Security Council. The report identified the need for a common picture of the growing nuclear proliferation threat. The DSB report recommended addressing the threat through coordinated funding and authorities; improving the U.S. Government tools to monitor, detect and assess the problem; and improving the national testing capability by allowing U.S. Govern-

ment agencies to experiment and adopt best practices and technologies.

The committee recognizes the importance and benefits of implementing the DSB report recommendations, including but not limited to addressing the lack of coordinated funding and authorities across all the agencies. The committee believes the integration and alignment of funding, authorities, and efforts is key to improving monitoring and detection capabilities within a comprehensive national framework. The committee is encouraged that the Administration has begun to address the DSB recommendations and understands that the Administration is conducting an assessment of progress made thus far and remaining gaps to inform the fiscal year 2016 budget request. The committee expects both the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration to keep the committee informed of each agency's respective progress in the aforementioned areas to ensure that sufficient focus and investments are made to improve monitoring and verification tools, capabilities, and approaches to address future proliferation threats.

#### Personnel Protection Equipment Budget Justification Material

Section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) directed the Secretary of Defense to submit with the annual budget request, a consolidated budget display that describes and justifies all programs and activities in the appropriations accounts for operation and maintenance as well as research, development, test, and evaluation that are associated with the development and procurement of personnel protective equipment. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of Defense has failed to comply with this requirement.

The committee remains concerned that after 12 years of war and billions of dollars spent to develop, produce, and field the best available individual personnel protection equipment, such as body armor and helmets, the Department of Defense should not lose momentum in its search for better protection at lower weight and lower cost for individual soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors. The committee continues to believe that one of the important lessons of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom is that research, development, and acquisition (RDA) of improved ballistic protection for military personnel must anticipate, not react, to likely threats. In this regard, the committee remains determined to have sufficient visibility to allow for comprehensive oversight of the Department's RDA efforts as reflected in the annual budget request accompanied by spending estimates projected over the subsequent 5-year time frame or Future Years Defense Program.

#### Phased Modernization of Certain Navy Ships

In March 2014, the Navy proposed to reduce its operational force structure of *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers and amphibious dock landing ships (LSD). The Navy plans to take 14 ships out of their normal deployment rotations and place them in long-term phased modernization and maintenance to extend the expected service life of the ships. According to the Navy, this plan will allow it to retain



the 11 cruisers and 3 amphibious ships through the 2030s and into the 2040s.

The committee is concerned about the Navy's plan to reduce its battle force structure by 14 ships, especially in light of shortfalls in the force structure necessary to meet the requirements of the National Military Strategy. Additionally, the committee notes that while the Navy places Military Sealift Command ships in reduced operating status, or ROS, on a regular basis, surface combatant and amphibious ships are more complex and their crews need more training before they can be certified as being ready for deployment and major combat operations. Further, the Navy states it has not reactivated any surface combatant ships from long-term protective storage since the 1980s.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, on the extent to which the Navy has identified:

- (1) The potential costs and cost savings associated with the Navy's phased modernization plan for the 11 cruisers and 3 LSDs;
- (2) The operational benefits and risks associated with this long-term plan; and
- (3) The costs, savings, benefits, and risks of any alternate plans that were considered before putting forth the Navy's current plan.

#### Recognizing the Importance of Professional Military Education Concerning Nuclear Deterrence Operations and Policy

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee stated its views on the importance of nuclear deterrence education in the U.S. armed services. The committee referenced the 2008 Schlesinger report on Nuclear Weapons Management, specifically, the phase-two report findings that included several recommendations, including the following recommendation concerning professional military education of military officers:

“The Secretary of Defense should direct a comprehensive review of the curricula of all academies, service schools, and senior-level professional military education institutions and provide recommendations for strengthening the understanding of deterrence theory, strategy and policy on the part of military leaders through revised or new courses, research, and analysis. . . .”

In January 2014, the Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum aimed at addressing multiple personnel failures in both training and doctrine that jeopardized the nuclear deterrence mission, including widespread cheating on tests and other gross negligence on the part of nuclear officers. The committee is encouraged by the Secretary's announcement of several proactive measures to begin addressing personnel failures within the nuclear enterprise and looks forward to receiving the Secretary's recommendations following an independent review.

In light of the Schlesinger report from 2008, which highlights shortcomings of nuclear deterrence education in the armed services, as well as the Secretary's memo from January 2014, which acknowledges operational and training deficiencies among our nuclear officers, the committee recognizes the urgent need for corrective actions. Absent a complete sea-change within the armed serv-

ices on the importance of nuclear deterrence, embarrassing performance mistakes will continue to occur. Therefore, the committee believes the Secretary should take appropriate steps to refocus the military member education to ensure it is adequately covering, across-the-board, the essentials of nuclear deterrence policy and operations (including such concepts as strategic stability and escalation control), including at the National Defense University, the military senior service colleges, and the CAPSTONE General and Flag Officer Course.

#### Reconstitution of Air Force Weapons Storage Areas

The committee notes that the Air Force has completed the report “Reconstituting Air Force Weapons Storage Areas” as requested in the committee report (S. Rept. 113–44) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. In its report, the Air Force acknowledged that it currently does not have a funded project to reconstitute a second Weapons Storage Area (WSA) for Air-Launched Cruise Missiles (ALCMs). Additionally, the report states that the Air Force’s WSA modernization plan, the WSA Recapitalization Corporate Initiative, is in the preliminary stages, and indicates that it should be finalized in time to be programmed in fiscal year 2016.

The committee is disappointed that the report did not include an analysis of the requirements and costs of reconstituting a second nuclear WSA capability for ALCMs and the potential benefits or savings of shortening the recapitalization timeframe as requested in S. Rept. 113–44. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to include the following information in the finalized plan for the WSA Recapitalization Corporate Initiative:

- (1) A business-case analysis of the requirements and costs for reconstituting a second WSA for ALCMs;
- (2) An analysis of potential cost-savings and benefits achieved through a shortened recapitalization timeframe;
- (3) An analysis of potential cost-saving and benefits of advances in physical and security surveillance technologies; and
- (4) A validation of requirements.

#### Report on National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force Recommendations

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) established the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force to evaluate the Total Force force structure of the Active, Guard, and Reserve Components of the Department of the Air Force.

The committee is grateful for the time, effort, dedication, and expertise of all the commissioners and their staff that was applied to the development of the commission’s report, despite the burdensome and arcane interpretation and application of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463) to the commission’s deliberations. The committee thanks the commissioners and staff for their many years of distinguished service in key leadership positions of the national security apparatus.

The commission was charged with reviewing six distinct areas of the Air Force Total Force: (1) current and anticipated requirements of combatant commanders; (2) personnel and mission balance between all components of the Total Force; (3) capacity and capability of the Total Force for addressing Homeland Defense and Disaster Assistance requirements; (4) regular Air Force ability to provide capability and capacity to the Reserve Components; (5) operational tempo of Total Force components; and (6) the affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness of the Total Force enterprise to meet national security requirements.

The commission derived 42 distinct recommendations for the President, Congress, and the Department of Defense to consider. The committee notes that during House-Senate conference deliberations on Public Law 112–239, it was acknowledged that the Commission's report would not likely inform the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2015 because of Department of Defense budget process timelines, the date for submission of the commission's report, and late enactment of Public Law 112–239, which established the commission. The conferees expected the report to be used to inform the Department's fiscal year 2016 budget submission to the Congress in calendar year 2015.

Air Force leadership testimony this year and recent discussions and briefings with Air Force officials indicate that Department of Defense officials are evaluating the commission's 42 recommendations to determine whether or not they could be viably institutionalized into the Air Force's Total Force enterprise. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 2, 2015, that includes the following:

- (1) Assesses all 42 recommendations of the commission's report;
- (2) Establishes an official regular Air Force, Air Force Reserve, and National Guard Bureau position on each recommendation;
- (3) Articulates which of the 42 recommendations are incorporated into the President's fiscal year 2016 budget request and fiscal year 2016 Future Years Defense Program for the Department of Defense;
- (4) Describes the method, measures of effectiveness, and metrics established for evaluating each recommendation incorporated into the budget request;
- (5) Articulates the interim or final disposition of each recommendation, and associated rationale, that is not integrated into the fiscal year 2016 budget request;
- (6) Includes dissenting views or opinions of any Air Force Total Force component leadership associated with the evaluation and disposition of any recommendation of the Commission's report; and
- (7) Any additional information that the Secretary of the Air Force or the Chief of the National Guard Bureau desire to include in the report.

#### Review of Military Standard to Protect Systems Against Electromagnetic Pulse

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense maintains a military standard for protection of ground-based systems

and facilities performing critical and time-urgent command, control, communications, computer, and intelligence missions from high-altitude electromagnetic pulse (HEMP). This military standard, known as MIL-STD 800-125-1 and -2, details the performance, acceptance test, and verification test requirements for identified systems, as well as HEMP-unique acceptance and verification test techniques.

The committee is concerned that in the nearly 16 years since this standard was last updated, technology may have progressed in ways that have out-paced the ability of the standard to ensure protection of designated systems. For example, on the offensive side, the capability exists now to buy commercial-off-the-shelf, non-nuclear electromagnetic pulse (EMP) generators to provide EMP effects without the need for nuclear devices. On the defensive side, the higher reliance on commercial information technology hardware, and the interconnection of such systems, results in a more complex interaction between specific systems that must be characterized to understand the propagation of EMP effects.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of MIL-STD 800-125-1 and -2 to determine if the standards are in need of updating based on the current and future projected threats, and whether the Department needs to revise the frequency for revisiting testing against these standards to ensure changes or updates to systems and facilities have not opened up new vulnerabilities. Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by June 1, 2015, on the results of this review.

#### Security Risks Related to Foreign Investment in the United States

The committee is concerned that gaps may exist within the current legislative and regulatory authorities for assessing the potential security impact of certain real property transactions involving the Federal Government and foreign-controlled entities within the United States. As a result of some recent transactions, entities controlled by foreign interests have acquired access to onshore and offshore properties within proximity of Department of Defense facilities, ranges, and sensitive operating areas.

The committee is concerned that such access and the proximities of associated properties could combine to negatively affect military readiness and national security. The committee notes that other government agencies are not required to coordinate with the Department of Defense to assess the potential effects of selling or leasing Federal property to foreign-controlled entities seeking to operate in the vicinity of military operating areas or installations. The committee also notes that the current processes that examine foreign investment in the United States do not cover all categories of transactions or projects having the potential to adversely affect Department of Defense capabilities and technologies, to include the possible exposure of tactics, techniques, and procedures. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with other relevant Federal departments and agencies as appropriate, to conduct an assessment of the current statutory and regulatory framework governing real property transactions involving

the Federal Government and foreign-controlled entities within the United States as they relate to military readiness and national security. The review should address:

(1) The processes by which the Department of Defense and the military services assess national security risks posed by foreign investments in Federal properties or facilities within proximity of Department of Defense operating areas or installations;

(2) Actions that may be taken by the Department of Defense to mitigate such risks;

(3) The manner in which the Department of Defense coordinates efforts with other Federal agencies to monitor proposed real property transactions involving the Federal Government and foreign-controlled entities within the United States; and

(4) Procedures by which the Secretary of Defense could communicate concerns to other Federal departments and agencies regarding a proposed real property transaction with a foreign-controlled entity due to proximity to Department of Defense facilities, ranges, or operating areas.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than January 5, 2015, on the findings of the review and on any recommendations that the Secretary may have for improving the current statutory and regulatory framework for monitoring real property transactions involving the Federal Government and foreign-controlled entities within the United States for possible national security implications. Within 90 days after the date of submission, the Comptroller General of the United States should conduct a sufficiency review of the report submitted by the Secretary and report the results of that review to the congressional defense committees.

#### Spectrum Operations Centers

The committee is aware that U.S. Strategic Command operates the Joint Electronic Warfare Center (JEWEC) at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. An important aspect of the JEWEC is its role in connecting electronic warfare (EW) resources to the warfighter, and the committee believes that the JEWEC provides critical operational EW support to the combatant commands, including combat operations support, opposing force EW during operational training exercises, Joint and North Atlantic Treaty Organization EW reprogramming, joint capabilities technology demonstration support and modeling analysis and simulation.

The committee believes that the capabilities of the JEWEC could be enhanced by having connections with sister organizations within each of the military services to act as spectrum coordination centers that would coordinate service-specific resources and needs into the planning and operations of the individual service training, exercises, and operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2015, that describes the use case for such spectrum operations centers, as well as a business-case analysis for designating or developing organizations to act in such a role. The briefing should examine the relative costs and benefits of leveraging existing organizations, as well as how such an organiza-

tion could support full-scope electromagnetic operations, including EW, spectrum management, and cyberspace operations.

#### Standing Joint Force Headquarters for Elimination

The committee is aware that as a result of direction received in the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review, U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) established the Standing Joint Force Headquarters for Elimination (SJFHQ-E) in 2012 with the purpose of planning, training for, and executing command and control functions during weapons of mass destruction (WMD) elimination missions. However, the committee believes that the planning and training mission of the SJFHQ-E appears to have significant overlap with the STRATCOM Center for Combating WMD (SCC-WMD), which performs a similar function for the larger mission space of combating WMD. The committee is also aware that prior to the formation of the SJFHQ-E, the command and control functions for elimination missions were performed through the establishment of a Joint Task Force for Elimination (JTF-E), which was only established if and when it was deemed necessary based on the scope of the elimination mission. In addition, the committee notes that in its formation, the SJFHQ-E assumed the tasks, missions, and operations of the Joint Elimination Coordination Element (JECE) which previously functioned as the core of any JTF-E upon its formation.

The committee believes that combating and eliminating WMD is of the utmost importance for national security. However, the committee also believes that in the current austere fiscal climate, the additional cost and bureaucracy associated with a standing headquarters must provide necessary, differentiable capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2014, on the added benefit of the SJFHQ-E. The briefing should discuss unique value added by the formation of a standing headquarters, and compare the current capabilities and associated costs of the SJFHQ-E with those capabilities that existed previously among the SCC-WMD and the existing JECE.

#### Transfer of Coast Guard HC-130H Aircraft to the Air Force for U.S. Forest Service Equipment Modifications

Section 1098 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) addressed the transfer of Department of Defense and U.S. Coast Guard aircraft to other U.S. Government departments for wildfire suppression and other purposes.

The committee notes that discussions among the Department of the Air Force, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of the Army, and the U.S. Forest Service have been extremely collaborative and productive as they relate to the complexity of transferring aircraft to and between each of the organizations. The committee was informed through briefings with officials from these agencies that there was ambiguity associated with the word “transfer” in section 1098(a) related to the exchange of aircraft between the U.S. Coast Guard and the Air Force. According to the General Counsel of the Air Force, the word “transfer” in section 1098(a) would require the U.S. Coast Guard to convey title, engineering services, and technical authority

of the HC-130H to the Air Force, which the committee understands is a cumbersome and paperwork-intensive process to perform for the short period of time that the Air Force would possess the aircraft for modifications and depot-level maintenance prescribed in section 1098(a). Furthermore, it was explained to the committee that the Air Force performs depot-level maintenance and modifications of HC-130H aircraft on behalf of the Coast Guard without having to convey title, engineering services, and technical authority officially to the Air Force. Lastly, and most concerning to the committee, is that if the U.S. Coast Guard had to officially convey title, engineering services, and technical authority to the Air Force using the strict interpretation of the word “transfer,” these actions would significantly delay the Air Force from performing the required depot-level maintenance and firefighting modifications required by section 1098(a), and thus delay providing much needed firefighting capacity improvements to the U.S. Forest Service. The committee did not intend the articulated interpretation of the word “transfer” to impede implementation of section 1098(a) for exchange of aircraft between the U.S. Coast Guard and the Air Force.

Therefore, the committee supports the current execution plan of the Air Force, U.S. Coast Guard, and U.S. Forest Service as briefed to the committee in February 2014 for modifying and providing firefighting capable HC-130H aircraft to the U.S. Forest Service in the most expeditious manner. The committee also expects the Air Force and U.S. Coast Guard to interpret the word “transfer” in section 1098(a) broadly as to mean not conveying title, engineering services, and technical authority of HC-130H aircraft from the U.S. Coast Guard to the Air Force in execution and compliance with section 1098(a).

#### U.S. Transportation Command Report on Operational and Tactical Control of All Department of Defense Executive Airlift Aircraft

The committee notes that the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command (CUSTC) is the distribution process owner for the Department of Defense. However, CUSTC is responsible for the operational tasking, scheduling, and tactical control of only Department of the Air Force executive airlift and special airlift mission (EA/SAM) aircraft. The committee notes that Department of the Navy and the Department of the Army EA/SAM aircraft are excluded from CUSTC’s control, and are not apportioned or allocated to meet CUSTC EA/SAM airlift requirements or airlift requirements of any other organization other than the service that owns and operates the EA/SAM aircraft. The committee believes this is an inefficient concept of operations in meeting EA/SAM airlift requirements of the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 2, 2015, that assesses the feasibility, capability, viability, effectiveness, and efficiency of the CUSTC assuming the role and responsibility of operational tasking, scheduling, and tactical control of all Department of Defense EA/SAM aircraft to meet EA/SAM airlift requirements of the Department of Defense.

## 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 2015 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—Repeal of Limitation on Inspector General Audits of Certain Financial Statements

This section would strike subsection (d) of section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) to permit an increase in the number of auditors available to provide independent reviews of audit practices throughout the Department of Defense, thus helping the Department streamline its efforts to ensure proper financial management. To comply with the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan to be audit ready by 2017, the Department of Defense requires a sufficient number of auditors within the Office of the Inspector General to provide independent audit reviews throughout the Department.

## Section 1003—Authority to Transfer Funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to Sustain Nuclear Weapons Modernization and Naval Reactors

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to transfer up to \$150.0 million to the nuclear weapons and naval reactor programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) if the amount authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the weapons activities of the NNSA is less than \$8.7 billion (the amount specified for fiscal year 2015 in the report required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84)).

## Section 1004—Management of Defense Information Technology Systems

This section would amend section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to expand certification requirements, investment review processing and enterprise architecture requirements from defense business systems to all defense information technology systems.

## SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

## Section 1011—Extension of Authority to Support Unified Counterdrug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend, by 1 year, support to the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia originally authorized by section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), and most recently amended by section 1011



of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

**Section 1012—Three-Year Extension of Authority of Department of Defense to Provide Additional Support for Counterdrug Activities of Other Governmental Agencies**

This section would extend, by 3 years, the authority of the Department of Defense to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of other governmental agencies originally authorized by section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510), and most recently amended by section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

**Section 1013—Submittal of Biannual Reports on Use of Funds in the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide Account on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate**

The section would amend section 1009(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to add the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate as recipients of a biannual report on the use of funds in the drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide account.

**Section 1014—National Guard Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities**

This section would amend section 112 of title 32, United States Code, adding the operations and activities provided by the National Guard Counter-drug Training Centers within the United States for Federal, State, and local law enforcement to the items for which the Secretary of Defense may provide funds to the governor of a state who submits to the Secretary a state drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan.

**Section 1015—Sense of Congress on Mexico and Central America**

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should continue to support programs that combat illicit networking in the United Mexican States and Central America.

**SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS**

**Section 1021—Definition of Combatant and Support Vessel for Purposes of the Annual Plan and Certification Relating to Budgeting for Construction of Naval Vessels**

This section would define the term “combatant and support vessel” that is used to support Department of the Navy’s 30-year shipbuilding plan.

#### Section 1022—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund

This section would create a National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund to manage the obligation and expenditures for the advanced procurement or construction of nuclear-powered strategic ballistic missile submarines.

#### Section 1023—Elimination of Requirement that a Qualified Aviator or Naval Flight Officer Be in Command of an Inactivated Nuclear-Powered Aircraft Carrier Before Decommissioning

This section would authorize an exception to section 5942(a) of title 10, United States Code, and allow a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier to be commanded by a non-aviation officer during an inactivation period that leads to the permanent decommissioning and disposal of such an aircraft carrier.

#### Section 1024—Limitation on Expenditure of Funds until Commencement of Planning of Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. George Washington

This section would limit the expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2015 until the Secretary of Defense obligates funds to commence the planning and long lead time material procurement associated with the refueling and complex overhaul of the USS *George Washington* (CVN-73).

#### Section 1025—Sense of Congress Recognizing the Anniversary of the Sinking of the U.S.S. Thresher

This section would express the sense of Congress in recognition of the anniversary of the sinking of the USS *Thresher*.

#### Section 1026—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the retirement, inactivation, or storage of *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers and *Whidbey Island*-class amphibious ships. This section would also require the modernization of two *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers to begin in fiscal year 2015.

### SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

#### Section 1031—Extension of Authority to Make Rewards for Combating Terrorism

This section would extend the authority through fiscal year 2015 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 conducted outside the United States against international terrorism or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation.

Section 1032—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States to House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds available to the Department of Defense during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2015, to modify or construct any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any detainee transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

Section 1033—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2015, to transfer or release detainees at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions.

SUBTITLE E—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1041—Modification of Department of Defense Authority for Humanitarian Demining Assistance and Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance Programs

This section would modify the reporting requirements and definitions contained in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, regarding humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance. Elsewhere in this report, the committee expresses concern that the Department of Defense Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) program has insufficient resources for HMA and conventional munitions assistance programs.

Section 1042—Authority to Accept Voluntary Services of Law Students and Persons Studying to be Paralegals

This section would amend section 1588 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to institute unpaid internship and externship programs for law students.

Section 1043—Expansion of Authority for Secretary of Defense to Use the Department of Defense Reimbursement Rate for Transportation Services Provided to Certain Non-Department of Defense Entities

This section would amend section 2642 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to use the Department of Defense reimbursement rate for transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense entities. That authority allows the Department to provide transportation services

covered by that section at the same rate that the transportation element in Department of Defense charges Department of Defense units for similar services.

Section 1044—Repeal of Authority Relating to Use of Military Installations by Civil Reserve Air Fleet Contractors

This section would repeal section 9513 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the use of military installations by commercial air carriers doing business with the Department of Defense. Under this program, the Secretary of the Air Force was authorized for Air Force installations, or in coordination with the Secretary of the other military services for other than Air Force military installations, to enter into contracts with air carriers authorizing the use of designated installations as a weather alternative, as a technical stop not involving the enplaning or deplaning of passengers or cargo, or, in the case of an installation within the United States, for other commercial purposes but was never utilized.

Section 1045—Certification and Limitation on Availability of Funds for Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program

This section would prohibit U.S. Special Operations Command from obligating any funds available for fiscal year 2015 for the Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program until the Secretary of Defense provides a certification to the congressional defense committees that validates program requirements.

Section 1046—Submittal of Procedures and Reports Relating to Sensitive Military Operations

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for fiscal year 2015 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict until the congressional defense committees receive the procedures required by section 130f(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, and the report required by section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

Sections 1041 and 1043 of Public Law 113–66 are critical to the congressional defense committees’ oversight of targeted lethal and capture operations conducted by the armed forces. The committee is troubled that the Department has missed the statutory deadlines for submitting these materials.

Section 1047—Limitation on Use of Russian-Flagged Airlift Aircraft to Support the Airlift Movement Requirements of the United States Transportation Command

This section would allow the use of Russian-flagged airlift aircraft to support airlift movement requirements of U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) only after the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command certifies to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, for each manifested cargo mission, that utilizing Russian-flagged airlift air-

craft is the only means available to TRANSCOM to execute that particular manifested cargo delivery mission.

**Section 1048—Prohibition on Reduction of Force Structure at Lajes Air Force Base until Completion of Assessments by Secretary of Defense and General Accounting Office**

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from reducing force structure at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, Portugal, until the following occur: the Secretary of Defense concludes a European Infrastructure Consolidation Assessment and briefs the congressional defense committees as to the results; and the Comptroller General of the United States reviews such assessment and conducts an independent assessment of possible operational capabilities of Lajes Air Force Base.

**Section 1049—Limitation on Removal of C-130 Aircraft**

This section would restrict the ability of the Secretary of the Air Force to remove a C-130 aircraft from a unit of the regular or reserve components of the Air Force that is tasked with the modular airborne fire fighting system mission, or from a unit that is formally associated with a unit that is tasked with such mission, until the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force certifies to the congressional defense committees that such mission will not be negatively affected by the removal of such aircraft.

**Section 1050—Conditions on Army National Guard and Active Army Force Structure Changes Pending Comptroller General Report**

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Army, during fiscal year 2015, from reducing the end strength for active duty personnel of the Army below 490,000; reducing the end strength for Selected Reserve personnel of the Army National Guard below 350,000; or transferring AH-64 attack helicopters from the Army National Guard to the regular Army.

This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to assess and validate the methods the Army and the Department of Defense Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation used to determine the future force structure of the Army, to include the appropriate mix between Active, Guard, and Reserve Component forces and submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2015.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee describes its larger concerns regarding the Army's end strength and force structure reductions. As a result of these concerns, the committee also recommends increases in funding for procurement and operation and maintenance accounts to accelerate the conversions of UH-60A to UH-60L Black Hawk helicopters, and additional funding to procure six additional UH-60M Black Hawk helicopters to address Army National Guard modernization shortfalls. Finally, the committee recommends additional funding for operation and maintenance readiness accounts to increase overall training opportunities and increase depot-level maintenance in the Army National Guard.

## SUBTITLE F—STUDIES AND REPORTS

## Section 1061—Protection of Defense Mission-Critical Infrastructure from Electromagnetic Pulse and High-Powered Microwave Systems

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a certification to the congressional defense committees that defense mission-critical infrastructure requiring electromagnetic pulse protection that receives power supply from commercial or other non-military sources, is protected from the adverse effects of man-made or naturally occurring electromagnetic pulse and high-powered microwave weapons.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is dependent on commercial power to supply most of its needs and understands that such commercial power could be susceptible to disruption or degradation from electromagnetic pulse or high-powered microwave events. The committee believes that much of the Department's defense mission-critical infrastructure includes planning and mitigation measures against such threats, but remains concerned that some critical capabilities may not have been included in previous reviews. The committee intends to determine if there is reason for further concern, but recognizes that remediation activities will have to be resourced by other organizations outside of the Department of Defense.

## Section 1062—Response of the Department of Defense to Compromises of Classified Information

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on actions taken by the Secretary regarding significant compromises of classified information. The report shall include a description of any changes to Department of Defense policies or guidance relating to significant compromises of classified information, an overview of mitigation efforts, a description of the resources dedicated to efforts relating to such compromises, a description of the Secretary's plan to continue evaluating and mitigating any damages, and a general description and estimate of the cost associated with mitigating such compromises. This section would also require updates to the initial report on a semiannual basis during calendar years 2015–18.

## Section 1063—Report and Briefing to Congress on Procurement and Inspection of Armored Commercial Passenger-Carrying Vehicles to Transport Civilian Employees of Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report and detailed briefing on the Department of Defense's policies and procedures for procuring and inspecting armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles for transporting civilian employees of the Department.

Section 1064—Study on Joint Analytic Capability of the  
Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to commission an independent assessment of the joint analytic capabilities of the Department of Defense to support strategy, plans, and force development, and their link to resource decisions. This section would further require the independent entity selected for the conduct of the assessment to provide a report on the assessment to the Secretary not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and require the Secretary to transmit the report to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the Secretary's receipt of the report.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1071—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

Section 1072—Sale or Donation of Excess Personal Property for  
Border Security Activities

This section would amend section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, "Excess personal property: sale or donation for law enforcement activities" to include border security activities and consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security when a transfer relates to the Department of Homeland Security.

The committee believes border security activities of the Department of Homeland Security should be considered alongside counterdrug and counterterrorism activities when determining the sale or donation of excess personal property for law enforcement activities.

Section 1073—Revision to Statute of Limitations for Aviation  
Insurance Claims

This section would amend section 44309 of title 49, United States Code, by clarifying that the claimant for civil actions must present a claim to the Secretary of Transportation and have it denied before instituting a civil action against the United States. Additionally, this section would clarify that an insurance claim must be made within two years of the loss, or for an insurance claim made by a person with whom the insured has no privity of contract, the earlier of either 60 days after final judgment by a court or 6 years after the date of the loss.

Section 1074—Pilot Program for the Human Terrain System

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a pilot program to utilize Human Terrain System assets in the U.S. Pacific Command area of responsibility to support Phase 0 shaping operations and to support the theater security cooperation plans of the geographic combatant commander.

#### Section 1075—Unmanned Aircraft Systems and National Airspace

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to enter into a memorandum of understanding with a non-Department of Defense entity that is engaged in the test range program authorized under section 332(c) of the Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–95). Such entity would be allowed access to non-regulatory special use airspace if such access is used by the entity as part of such test range program and does not interfere with the activities of the Secretary or otherwise interrupt or delay missions or training of the Department of Defense.

#### Section 1076—Sense of Congress on the Life and Achievements of Dr. James R. Schlesinger

The section would express the sense of Congress on the life and achievements of Dr. James R. Schlesinger, who served the country as the Director, Central Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Energy.

#### Section 1077—Reform of Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would amend section 118 of title 10, United States Code, to reform the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) by modifying the review and reporting elements, modifying the role of the National Defense Panel (NDP), and requiring a new Quadrennial National Security Threats and Trends Report (QNSTTR).

This section would replace the QDR with a Defense Strategy Review (DSR), which would be required on a 4-year cycle. As expressed elsewhere in this report, the committee believes that the strategy review undertaken by the Department of Defense has, over time, strayed further from the intent of Congress, and the 2014 QDR, in particular, missed an opportunity to reshape the longer-term direction of the Nation's forces, their missions and capabilities, and needed resources.

Therefore, the modified review and reporting elements contained in this section are intended to better address the fundamental components of a strategy over the near-, mid-, and far-term time horizons, and would include:

- (1) The assumed U.S. national security interests and strategic environment;
- (2) The prioritized missions of the Armed Forces;
- (3) The force structure, capabilities, presence, readiness, personnel composition and skillsets, organizational structures, and resources that are needed to fulfill the missions;
- (4) An assessment of gaps, shortfalls, and risks;
- (5) The assumed roles and capabilities provided by other U.S. Government agencies and by allies and partners; and
- (6) A sensitivity analysis to understand the relationships and specific tradeoffs between missions, risks, and resources.

This section would also require two reviews of the strategic environment that would precede the DSR and thus inform it. The first review, the QNSTTR, would be required of the Department of Defense and consist of the Department's assessment of U.S. national security interests and threats and trends that could affect those in-



terests in the near-, mid-, and far-term. The second review would be required of the NDP, which would be established prior to the DSR, and consist of an independent assessment of the strategic environment and require the NDP to provide recommendations on the strategic issues that should be examined in the DSR.

The NDP would further be required to assess the report on the DSR upon its completion, thus largely maintaining the duties it is currently prescribed in section 118 of title 10, United States Code.

#### Section 1078—Resubmission of 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to resubmit a report on the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) 2014 that was submitted, as required by section 118(d) of title 10, United States Code, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than October 1, 2014.

In the resubmitted report, the Secretary would be required to include: an articulation of a defense program for the next 20 years; an identification of 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, and any additional resources required to achieve such a level of risk; and 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. This section would limit authorized fiscal year 2015 funds for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy until the report is resubmitted to Congress.

While the committee appreciates the work that went into the 2014 QDR, it remains concerned that these reviews have grown less compliant with the law and strayed further from the intent of Congress. The committee believes the QDR should provide a mechanism for setting the priorities of the Department of Defense, shaping the force, guiding capabilities and resources, and adjusting the organization to respond to changes in the strategic environment. In addition, it should assist Congress in better understanding the relationships and tradeoffs between missions, risks, and resources, particularly in light of geopolitical changes and domestic developments in the last few years.

The committee believes the 2014 QDR missed a major opportunity to bring together key national security stakeholders and strategic thinkers in the Department to reshape the longer-term direction of the Nation's forces, their missions and capabilities, and needed resources. Instead, inconsistent with the QDR review and report requirements in sections 118(a) and (b) of title 10, United States Code, the 2014 QDR focused largely on the planned force structure associated with the 5 year Future Years Defense Program, and it contained a strategy that assumes increased risk to the force, without specifying the resources required to execute the strategy at a low-to-moderate level of risk.

The committee believes that much of the information to be included in the re-submitted report was produced over the course of the review and could be provided to the committee in a reasonable amount of time.

Section 1079—Sense of Congress Regarding Counter-Improvised Explosive Devices

This section would express the sense of the Congress on the need to remain dedicated to retaining knowledge, technological expertise, as well as the lessons learned from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom regarding counter-improvised explosive device tactics, techniques, and procedures.

Section 1080—Enhancing Presence and Capabilities and Readiness Posture of United States Military in Europe

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act a plan that identifies the capabilities and capacities required by the U.S. Armed Forces to counter or mitigate conventional, unconventional, or subversive activities of the Russian Federation and to meet operational plan requirements for a North Atlantic Treaty Organization Article 5 response. This section would also require the Secretary to identify any readiness deficiencies of U.S. Armed Forces in the area of responsibility of U.S. European Command and recommend actions, resources, and timelines to correct any deficiencies.

Section 1081—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by the Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to determine and disclose the transportation costs incurred by the Department of Defense for certain congressional trips outside the United States.

## TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Furlough of Employees Compensated Through Working Capital Funds

Working capital fund (WCF) employees are financed through sales revenue rather than direct appropriations. These unique civilian Federal employees work on the basis of no-year money, and the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense, when including WCF employees in the fiscal year 2013 furloughs of Department of Defense civilians, failed to offer sufficient justification of savings or an adequate legal argument to override statutes prohibiting management of these employees on any basis other than funded workload. Based on testimony of the military services and information gathered from facilities throughout the country, it is clear to the committee that the readiness consequences of furloughing working capital fund employees were grave. Furloughs at the Nation's organic industrial facilities cost the government money by raising overhead costs or causing transfer of work to more expensive venues, disrupted the supply chain, affected mission-critical work, and delayed the return of key weapon systems to the warfighter for training and operations. Further, these furloughs

wreaked havoc on the private lives and morale of tens of thousands of Federal employees and created long-term consequences for the Department when electricians, engineers, and highly skilled depot artisans, among others, resigned, citing financial hardship.

The committee finds this ineffective approach to managing overall shortfalls in the operation and maintenance account unacceptable because of the short- and long-term consequences. Working capital funds are required to “break even,” and the loss in productivity, workforce availability, and capability from unnecessary furloughs endangers the viability of the funds and increases the cost to the Department, customers, and the taxpayer by increasing overhead and rates. The committee believes that in the event of any type of furlough of civilian employees, WCF employees should be managed consistent with guidance issued for operations of the Department during a lapse in appropriations.

#### Overtime Pay for Department of the Navy Employees Performing Maintenance on the Nuclear Aircraft Carrier Forward Deployed in Japan

The committee notes that it has not received the report required by section 1105 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) regarding overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees who are maintaining the Navy’s forward deployed nuclear aircraft carrier in Japan. The committee is aware that the Secretary of the Navy, due to extenuating circumstances associated with the closure of Building 197 at the Washington Navy Yard, did not deliver the required report on use and cost of the authorized overtime pay, and recommendations regarding extension of the authority, to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) until mid-March of this year, more than 5 months late. Late delivery by the Navy precluded OPM from achieving its subsequent reporting deadline of March 31, 2014. While agreeing in substance with extending overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees who are maintaining the Navy’s forward deployed nuclear aircraft carrier in Japan, the committee is reluctant to do so without benefit of the report from OPM. The committee urges the Director of OPM to facilitate completion of the report as soon as possible to ensure timely and appropriate compensation for these civilian employees who are critical to the readiness of U.S. naval forces.

### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

#### Section 1101—One-Year Extension of Authority To Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas

This section would extend, for 1 year, the authority to waive the limitations on the amount of premium pay that may be paid to a Federal civilian employee who performs certain work in an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Central Command, an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Africa Command, in support of a military operation, or in response to an emergency declared by the President. The payment

Section 1102—One-Year Extension of Discretionary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone

This section would extend by 1 year the temporary discretionary authority to Federal agencies to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities comparable to those provided to members of the foreign service to an agency's civilian employees on official duty in a combat zone.

Section 1103—Revision to List of Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories

This section would amend the list of Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories in section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to include the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences and the Space and Missile Defense Command Technical Center.

Section 1104—Permanent Authority for Experimental Personnel Program for Scientific and Technical Personnel

This section would remove the sunset date and annual reporting requirement for section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261).

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has used this alternative personnel hiring authority to great effect since its inception. Furthermore, the committee believes that given the limited scope of this authority, the fact that there have been no reports of misuse or abuse in 15 years, and the fact that it does not authorize any new civilian billets for the Department of Defense, this authority should be made permanent. The committee believes that such unique hiring authorities will be important tools for the technical community in the Department to recruit, hire, and retain the Nation's top scientific and engineering talent.

Section 1105—Temporary Authorities for Certain Positions at Department of Defense Research and Engineering Facilities

This section would modify section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to provide direct hiring authority to the laboratory director of specified laboratories for undergraduate and certain graduate students enrolled in the scientific, technical, engineering, or mathematics programs at institutions of higher education on a temporary or term basis.

Section 1106—Judicial Review of Merit Systems Protection Board Decisions Relating to Whistleblowers

This section would extend by 3 years a pilot provision of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act (Public Law 101-12) to allow whistleblowers to appeal cases from the Merit Systems Protection Board to any circuit court of appeals with jurisdiction rather than being restricted to the Federal circuit.

## TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

### OVERVIEW

The committee's continued oversight of national security matters relating to foreign nations and the lessons learned from that oversight, as well as the demands of current events, has translated into four legislative focus areas in this title: continued military commitment to, and U.S. presence in, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; strengthening security force assistance, particularly to those nations that have chosen to partner with the United States to combat terrorism; bolstering U.S., allied, and partner capabilities to deter aggression; and addressing emerging and evolving threats in an increasingly uncertain global security environment.

First, the committee recognizes that the gains in Afghan security, governance, and society have come as a result of the immense sacrifices made by U.S. and coalition forces and the Afghan people. The committee continues to believe that the United States has a vital national security interest in Afghanistan, and that Al Qaeda and its affiliates must be denied safe havens in Afghanistan and elsewhere to launch attacks against the United States and its allies. The committee, therefore, supports the post-2014 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) mission known as Operation Resolute Support, and it urges the President to announce a residual U.S. presence in Afghanistan to demonstrate U.S. commitment, reassure the Afghan people, and encourage other NATO and coalition partners to commit to a post-2014 mission and presence in Afghanistan. The committee remains optimistic that a new Afghan president will sign the Bilateral Security Agreement between the United States and Afghanistan, which would serve as a framework for a post-2014 NATO-Afghanistan status of forces agreement.

As the United States transitions to Operation Resolute Support, the committee expects the Administration to communicate a clear understanding of the missions, authorities, plans, and resources necessary to support Operation Resolute Support. The committee has carefully reviewed the authorities for which it recommends extension such as the Commanders' Emergency Response Program and reimbursement of coalition nations for support provided to U.S. military operations. The committee would require a revised "Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan Under Operation Resolute Support" to inform its understanding of the post-2014 security and economic environment in Afghanistan, and a plan for sustaining the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) through fiscal year 2018. Additionally, the committee continues to leverage important oversight tools, such as the Department of Defense Inspector General, to ensure Department of Defense funds for Afghanistan are properly managed to protect against waste, fraud, and abuse. The committee also recognizes the service performed by many Afghans in support of U.S. military efforts, and it would authorize additional special immigrant visas for Afghans who were employed by or on behalf of the U.S. Government in Afghanistan.

Second, the committee continues to support Department efforts to carry out security force assistance and military-to-military inter-

actions throughout the world by providing authorities for interactions that support U.S. national security interests particularly with those nations that have chosen to partner with the United States to combat terrorism. The committee would extend the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF), and provide an authority that would allow for foreign liaison officers to be temporarily assigned to the headquarters of a combatant command, component command, or subordinate operational command.

The committee also would provide an authority to the Department of Defense relating to the acquisition of products and services produced in Djibouti in recognition of the Government of Djibouti's continued support of the U.S. base at Camp Lemonnier, which is critical to U.S. national security efforts in the region. However, the committee also believes that the U.S. Government must improve its whole-of-government engagement of strategic partners such as Djibouti.

Third, the committee would take several steps in this Act aimed at bolstering U.S., allied, and partner capabilities to deter aggression. The committee condemns the recent aggressive actions undertaken by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, which include its illegal occupation of Crimea, deployment of tens of thousands of Russian soldiers near the Ukrainian border, and its infiltration and destabilization of eastern Ukraine. The committee therefore would limit U.S.-Russia military contact and cooperation and limit the use of funds for Department of Defense and National Nuclear Security Administration activities with Russia. The NATO alliance remains a cornerstone of international security, and the committee would seek to further strengthen the alliance and reassure U.S. allies and partners in Europe through measures such as requiring a comprehensive strategic framework for security force assistance to European and Eurasian forces and providing additional funds for the Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace program.

The committee also remains concerned about the continued nuclear and missile developments in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as well as the military developments in the People's Republic of China, including its provocative maritime claims. The committee conducted an Asia-Pacific oversight series, focusing largely on the implications of the Administration's rebalance to Asia on U.S. defense policy, posture, capabilities, and investments. Many of the Asia-Pacific-related provisions contained in this Act reflect the findings and recommendations that emerged from the oversight series.

Fourth, the committee maintains strong oversight of Department of Defense efforts to address emerging and evolving threats to U.S. vital national security interests around the world. The committee applauds the successes of the United States military in its global pursuit of Al Qaeda. However, the committee remains concerned that Al Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates and associated forces are evolving and growing in certain geographic areas due to safe havens that have emerged in locations such as Libya, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the Republic of Iraq. The committee addresses these issues by extending the authority to support special operations to combat terrorism and by requiring the President to

provide a report on the national security planning guidance to deny safe havens to Al Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates. Also, the committee recognizes the additional requirements for U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) associated with “New Normal” and therefore would require a report on the force posture and structure required of AFRICOM to meet the “New Normal” requirements in its area of responsibility.

The committee supports Department of Defense efforts to prepare and posture itself for other threats. The committee believes that the United States’ should continue to maintain a robust forward presence in the region of the Arabian Gulf to support those allies and partners in order to deter the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee further believes that any comprehensive deal on Iran’s nuclear program should address past and present issues of concern with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and should require Iran to cease enrichment of uranium, address ballistic missile and conventional military systems, and stop support for international terrorism. Additionally, the committee believes that the United States should continue to put significant pressure on Iran’s network of organizations that conduct malign activities in the Arabian Gulf region, and around the globe, even while the United States engages in negotiations with Iran relating to its nuclear program.

Lastly, the committee remains deeply concerned about the implications of budget cuts and force reductions on the ability of the United States to meet the global demand for forces across the combatant commands. AFRICOM and U.S. Southern Command, in particular, lack key enabler capabilities such as intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets. Although U.S. Pacific Command has benefitted from the Administration’s rebalance to Asia, it is still anticipated to lack the full time presence of a carrier. These shortfalls not only hamper the combatant commanders’ ability to meet their requirements, but they also affect the United States’ ability to provide robust presence to deter potential adversaries and to reassure allies and partners and, ultimately, affect perceptions of U.S. commitment to these regions. While the committee has taken several steps in this Act to address these concerns, it recognizes that doing so will become increasingly difficult as funding becomes increasingly scarce.

#### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

##### Additional Reporting on the Transfer of International Traffic in Arms Regulations Controlled Missile Defense Technology to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space and Technology of the House of Representatives, not later than August 1, 2013, that responds to certain questions concerning

reports of the illegal transfer of Missile Defense Agency (MDA) developed technology.

The committee is troubled that the stated agencies have thus far been unable to respond to those questions. Therefore, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to investigate whether MDA technology was transferred to NASA other than by the Department's policies and procedures for the protection of classified and International Traffic in Arms (ITAR) controlled technology; whether classified technology was involved; whether it was retransferred beyond the control of the U.S. Government and, if so, whether any damage to the security of the United States resulted by that transfer; and who had access to that technology, including foreign nationals. The Inspector General is further directed to provide a preliminary report to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives not later than November 31, 2014. In the event a final report is not complete by November 31, 2014, the Inspector General should brief the initial findings to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives. The committee expects NASA to provide unfettered access to MDA technology and related documents, personnel, and any other matters requested by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense. The Inspector General should immediately report to the committees any non-compliance or impairment with this direction.

In the event the Inspector General finds that such transfer(s) did occur, the committee directs the Inspector General to review the Department's compliance with its transfer policy and procedures department-wide and to provide an interim report to the House Committee on Armed Services on its plan to undertake this review not later than November 1, 2015.

#### Aggression by the Russian Federation

The committee notes with concern the recent actions undertaken by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine. The committee believes that both the overt and covert actions taken by the Russian military and Government to seize and annex Crimea, destabilize eastern Ukraine, and threaten further military action against the Government of Ukraine, are clearly meant to coerce the Government and people of Ukraine into adopting policies and an orientation centered on Russia and away from Europe and the West.

The committee supports the military steps taken by the Administration to reassure North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies in Europe. The deployment of additional U.S. troops to the territory of the easternmost NATO members, steps taken to increase the air policing and airborne warning missions, and the deployment of additional ships to the Black Sea are all useful and necessary steps. The committee further notes with approval the non-lethal military aid the Administration has provided to Ukraine to date. However, in both areas, the committee believes that more can be done and will likely be required in the future.



The committee is concerned that Russia's actions in Ukraine, coming only a few years after similar, albeit less sophisticated, actions were taken against Georgia, represent the Russian Government's policy for dealing with neighboring states that do not follow its preferred orientation. Combined with announced increases in Russian defense spending, such a policy would be very concerning for Russia's neighbors, including former Soviet states that are now members of NATO.

The committee encourages the Administration to consider additional steps that could be taken to reassure allies and dissuade Russia from further actions designed to coerce its neighbors. The committee notes that cooperation between Russia and the United States has benefited both countries in the past and that Russian economic growth in the last two decades came largely as a result of Russia's economic relationship with Europe.

The committee also believes the Administration should consider further sanctions that, coupled with an effective information strategy, make clear to Russia's people that prosperity and peace are the result of cooperation with neighboring countries rather than threatening those neighbors. The committee further encourages the Commander of U.S. European Command (EUCOM) to consider additional exercises with European and NATO allies to increase readiness and military preparedness. Finally, the committee believes that the EUCOM Commander and the full Administration should continue to conduct engagement with and provide assistance to Ukraine. Such assistance could include, but not be limited to, additional non-lethal military assistance, cooperation on cyber defense, and strategic information sharing.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends two provisions in title 10, seven provisions in title 12, one provision in title 13, and two provisions in title 31 that are related to Russia, including expressing a sense of Congress on Russian aggression, requiring the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to enhance the presence, capabilities, and readiness posture of the U.S. military in Europe, and establishing limitations on fiscal year 2015 funds for cooperation and activities with the Russian Federation until Congress has received certain certifications. Elsewhere in this report, the committee also recommends \$34.4 million, an increase of \$10.0 million above the budget request, for the Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace.

#### Briefings on Arms Control Inspections and Potential Inconsistencies

Given ongoing concerns with the Russian Federation's compliance with its arms control obligations to the United States, the committee believes it is imperative that Congress stay well-apprised of the results of arms control inspections conducted by the United States in Russia. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) to provide, during fiscal year 2015 and the remainder of fiscal year 2014, semi-annual briefings to the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Sen-

ate Select Committee on Intelligence on U.S. arms control inspections in Russia and their results. The first such briefing should be provided by June 30, 2014, and subsequent briefings should be conducted semi-annually during fiscal year 2015.

The committee further directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee by July 31, 2014, on Department of Defense information regarding U.S. arms control agreements with Russia and any potential inconsistencies, circumventions, or violations regarding Russia's compliance with such agreements.

### Conflict in Syria

The committee remains concerned about the conflict in Syria, which has now entered its fourth year. President Bashar al-Assad has waged a ruthless campaign against the Syrian people to include: flagrant human rights violations; extrajudicial killings; use of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction against civilians, including children; and interference with the provision of medical aid and humanitarian assistance.

The human toll in this conflict continues to rise dramatically. To date, over 140,000 Syrians have been killed, including at least 10,000 children, according to United Nations' estimates. Additionally, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) estimates that 9.3 million Syrians are in need of humanitarian assistance, 6.5 million Syrians are internally displaced, and 2.4 million Syrian refugees are in neighboring countries.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Near East Affairs, in testimony before the committee on February 11, 2014, highlighted the growing regional instability in the vicinity of Syria, stemming from the ever-increasing violence due to the conflict in Syria and the refugee outflows that continue to spill over Syria's borders into the Republic of Turkey, the Lebanese Republic, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Republic of Iraq, and the State of Israel. The committee notes the impact of the Syrian conflict on Jordan, in particular, and will continue to consider ways in which it can support Jordan's ability to maintain border security and stability, as the committee did in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

The committee remains concerned about the effect of outside influences in Syria. The Islamic Republic of Iran has sent into Syria the Iranian Revolutionary Guard-Quds forces, Shia militias from Iraq, Hezbollah, and other advisers to maintain its client, the Assad regime, and in some cases, to actively fight the Syrian opposition on behalf of the Assad regime. The committee is further concerned by the growth of Al Qaeda-linked or Al Qaeda-inspired elements in the Syrian civil war, especially, although not exclusively, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and the Al Nusra Front. Both of these groups share ideologies with Al Qaeda and have attracted many foreign fighters, increasing the chances that radicalized adherents could return to the United States, Europe, or other countries and conduct attacks.

The committee supports the attempt to remove Assad's chemical weapons, but is disappointed by the continual delays and missed

deadlines by the Assad regime to transfer the precursor chemicals. Such delays and missed deadlines sow doubt that the destruction of Assad's chemical precursors and chemical weapons-making capability will be achieved, consistent with the deal that was reached. The committee notes that this deal does not address the biological weapons program that the Assad regime continues to maintain.

The committee believes the United States must act to protect the Nation's interests and those of U.S. allies and partners in the region, and should leverage all tools of national power to achieve such interests. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense and the U.S. Central Command continue to conduct prudent planning to support any Presidential policy decision to address the conflict in Syria or stability in the region. The committee encourages the Department of Defense, and the Administration more broadly, to continue to look at realistic options to support U.S. allies in the region and to help further regional stability. The committee also believes that the United States and U.S. allies in Europe and the Middle East must do more in a cooperative and coordinated manner to track and address the foreign fighter threat. Finally, the committee reserves judgment on any plan to train and equip select elements of the Syrian opposition until it understands the details of such plan or proposed authority, including how it fits into a broader strategy and policy. However, the committee does believe that such an effort merits prudent planning and consideration in order to understand how it would help bring about an end to the Syrian civil war, the civilian strife caused by the war, and the threat of international terrorism posed by some of the participants in that war.

#### Department of Defense Arctic Collaboration with International Partners

The committee notes that the Department of Defense plays a role in the U.S. National Strategy for the Arctic Region. The Department of Defense November 2013 Arctic Strategy states the Department's desired end-state for the Arctic is "a secure and stable region where U.S. national interests are safeguarded . . . and nations work cooperatively to address challenges." The strategy also states that "relationships with allies and partners are important enablers of cooperation in meeting security and defense commitments," and that these relationships "play an important role in conflict prevention, and if prevention and deterrence fail, in coordinating an international response to security and defense challenges." The committee recognizes the Department's Arctic strategy places a significant focus on collaboration with partners in the region, including the pursuit of increased multilateral collaboration with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies and partners, to leverage the most appropriate capabilities to meet the Department's desired end-state. The committee encourages the Department to continue fostering this collaboration with international partners, including NATO, and to keep the committee informed of its efforts.

Foreign Military Sales of U.S. Air and Missile Defense Systems  
and Interoperability With Friendly and Allied States

The committee believes that international cooperation in air and missile defense will continue to grow as the threat grows in sophistication and numbers, and as defense budgets for the U.S. and friendly and allied states continue to decline. Further, the committee believes that through interoperability, the United States and its allies can realize the benefits of force multiplication and economies of scale.

Conversely, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and related U.S. Government agencies are not appropriately postured to fully promote the benefits of interoperable air and missile defense capabilities between the United States and friendly and allied countries. The committee is aware that, in many cases, policies related to data sharing and protection of sensitive and classified information are unclear. The committee is aware of examples where undeveloped policies and incomplete processes related to coproduction have stymied foreign military sales of these capabilities. Likewise, the committee has seen examples in which foreign states better position their indigenous capabilities in tenders and competitions, when superior U.S. capabilities have been offered but lack the clear support of the U.S. Government, across the Federal Government.

The committee believes that the multiplicity of agencies involved in these matters (specifically the Department of Defense (including the Defense Security Cooperation Agency; the Defense Technology Security Administration; the Missile Defense Agency; the military services; the Tri-Service Committee; the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; and others), the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and others) does not provide the focus and efficiency required to fully take advantage of the opportunities available to the United States by the interest of friendly and allied states in U.S. air and missile defense technology.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to evaluate and provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2014, on the current structure for foreign military sales of air and missile defense technology to friendly and allied states, associated obstacles or barriers, and recommend steps to improve the structure to make it more nimble, responsive, and to better position U.S. military technology in foreign tenders and competitions.

The committee further directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the geographic combatant commanders and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to conduct an analysis and provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2015, on the potential, in specific examples and recommendations, for foreign military sales of U.S. air and missile defenses to friendly and allied states to enhance interoperability and data sharing to better share the operational burden of defending against regional missile threats.

Lastly, the committee directs the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 15, 2014, on the intent of the United

States, through the Department of Defense, to sell defense articles, equipment, and services related to U.S. air and missile defense technology under consideration and the potential for economies of scale.

#### Global Security Contingency Fund

The budget request contained \$30.0 million for the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF).

The GSCF was established as a joint authority for both the Department of Defense and the Department of State in section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). Section 1207(g) of Public Law 112–81 further required both departments to fund GSCF activities, by specifically requiring that the Secretary of State contribute not less than 20 percent of the total amount required for an activity, and the Secretary of Defense contribute not more than 80 percent.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2015 budget request contained the Department of Defense request for \$30.0 million for GSCF, but contained no funds requested by the Department of State. The committee remains concerned about the disproportionate contribution of the Department of Defense to the GSCF. The committee notes section 1207(f) of Public Law 112–81 provides transfer authority for the Department of Defense for up to \$200.0 million and encourages the Department of Defense to use the transfer authority in order to fund future proposed programs.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of \$30.0 million, for the GSCF. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would extend the GSCF for 1 year and broaden the types of authorized assistance to include small-scale construction, and informs the Department that it may consider not renewing the GSCF authority after it expires at the end of fiscal year 2016.

#### Missile Defense Cooperation With Japan

The committee continues to support the significant level of missile defense cooperation with the Government of Japan. Included in this cooperation is the co-development of the Standard Missile 3 block IIA missile interceptor. Japan is one of only a handful of countries with the requisite technical expertise and with whom the United States has the level of trust required to partner on the development of significant military technology such as a missile interceptor.

The committee is also profoundly appreciative of the continuing activity to deploy a second Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance-model 2 radar unit in Japan. When the radar is available later this year, it will make a significant difference to regional missile defense and the homeland missile defense of the United States. The committee is aware that these two deployments bind together the security of the United States and Japan, and do not come without additional risks to Japanese security. The committee believes this is a measure of the security alliance between the two nations.

The committee commends the announcement of the Secretary of Defense on April 6, 2014, to forward deploy to Japan an additional

two United States Navy Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense ships by 2017. The committee supports this decision, as well as Japan's decision to obtain two more Aegis ballistic missile defense ships for its own defense forces.

The committee believes this cooperation is the bedrock of regional security and will support additional missile defense cooperation in the years ahead.

#### Missile Defense Cooperation With the Republic of Korea

The committee is aware that the Republic of Korea has three naval cruisers equipped with Aegis tracking software possessing some ballistic missile defense sensor capability and plans to increase the number of equipped warships by three. The committee is also aware that South Korea has not currently obtained sea-based ballistic missile interceptors. The committee is aware of discussions between the U.S. and South Korea to facilitate the first exports of this technology in the near future and is supportive of these discussions.

The committee is also aware that South Korea is interested in obtaining the Standard Missile 6 interceptor, and that it is considering the Standard Missile 3 missile interceptor as well. The committee believes these could be valuable to South Korea's security and could further deepen bilateral defense cooperation between the two nations.

The committee is also aware that South Korea has announced plans to implement a Korean Air and Missile Defense system to counter regional threats. The committee believes regional security and bilateral ties would be strengthened if South Korea obtained U.S. technology for this system, which would enable fully interoperable capabilities in the event of a threat to either country. The committee would be concerned that other technology sold by other countries may not possess this highly desirable force multiplication for South Korea's security and nor would strengthen the 1953 Mutual Defense Treaty.

The committee continues to support South Korea's procurement of the Guided Enhanced Missile-Tactical interceptor and its evaluation of the PATRIOT Advanced Capability 3 (PAC-3) and the PAC-3 Missile Segment Enhancement interceptor.

#### Monitoring of Ongoing Construction Activities in Afghanistan

The committee is aware that there may be limitations in the ability of U.S. forces to access all parts of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to monitor ongoing Department of Defense construction activities after December 31, 2014. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, not later than December 15, 2014, on plans to monitor such activities after December 31, 2014.

#### National Guard State Partnership Program

The committee reiterates its support for the National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP), which has focused on improving long-term international stability through unique cooperative part-

nerships between 53 U.S. states and territories and 74 foreign partner countries. SPP activities support partner capacity building in a wide-range of areas including humanitarian assistance, emergency management, consequence management, emergency communications, disaster relief, counter-trafficking, and counter-proliferation.

The committee notes that section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), which authorized the SPP, required an annual report on SPP activities. In this annual report, the first of which is due by January 31, 2015, the National Guard is required to include a summary of expenditures to conduct SPP activities, including annual costs and a breakdown of such expenditures by geographic combatant command. The committee continues to encourage the National Guard to provide greater transparency and detail on the costs to plan, execute, and administer the SPP.

#### National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking

The committee is aware that the Administration has announced a National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking, which established guiding principles for U.S. efforts to stem illegal trade in wildlife, including strengthening domestic and global enforcement; reducing demand for illegally traded wildlife at home and abroad; and strengthening partnerships with international partners, local communities, non-governmental organizations, private industry, and others to combat illegal wildlife poaching and trade. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should support this national strategy to the extent that it is in the U.S. national defense interest.

#### Non-Lethal Weapons for Contingency Operations

The committee reaffirms its longstanding support for the accelerated development, fielding, and deployment of non-lethal technologies. Non-lethal systems are useful for both force application and force protection missions. The committee notes that their employment is consistent with U.S. military strategy and helps minimize damage to property and inadvertent civilian casualties in the kinds of operational contingencies, including irregular warfare and humanitarian crises, in which U.S. forces are likely to be engaged. Their use provides commanders with additional decision time and space before resorting to lethal force, helps mitigate the negative consequences of unintended non-combatant injuries and fatalities, and enhances the overall prospects of mission success.

The committee understands that, as a result of budget pressures, the Department of Defense is proposing significant cuts to the Department's Non-Lethal Weapons program over the next 5 years. This includes a roughly one-third reduction in fiscal year 2015 for overall Department of Defense non-lethal investments and more than a 40 percent reduction in the Future Years Defense Plan compared to the previous 5-year estimate. The committee is also concerned that significant cuts to service procurements are also planned, further exacerbating cuts to the joint program.

The committee believes that such reductions may have unintended or unforeseen impacts on contingency planning related to humanitarian relief, non-combatant evacuation operations, and peacekeeping. If current contingency plans are predicated on the availability of such non-lethal systems, the Department of Defense may be forced into relying solely on lethal force to deal with these emerging requirements. Accordingly, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2015, on the impact of funding reductions for non-lethal systems on current contingency operations planning supporting humanitarian relief, non-combatant evacuation operations, and peacekeeping. This briefing should examine current contingency planning to determine if the level of investment estimated across the Future Years Defense Program in the joint and service programs is sufficient to support those plans, and a possible course of action to mitigate any shortfall.

#### North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2014 Summit

The committee notes that the September 2014 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Summit in Wales, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, represents an important opportunity for the United States and alliance members to discuss the future of the alliance. Historically, NATO has served as the cornerstone of U.S. cooperation with European allies and partners. As U.S. security interests remain parallel with those of European partners, the committee believes the United States should continue to consider NATO as the security and defense foundation of the transatlantic relationship.

The committee believes that the Wales Summit presents an opportunity for the United States to reaffirm its commitment to the alliance in the midst of an environment of complex global challenges and threats, and that the United States must play a leadership role both in the alliance and at the Summit. The committee also notes the United Kingdom's key role in hosting and leading the Summit.

Additionally, the committee is aware that the Wales Summit agenda has not yet been determined, but believes key areas of discussion for the alliance could include: the evolving security situation between the Russian Federation and Ukraine, and the implications for NATO; the defense and security threats facing alliance members, including potential aggression by Russia towards NATO allies; maintaining key defense capabilities and capacities across the alliance; NATO's Operation Resolute Support mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan beyond December 2014; and maintaining interoperability and combat gains from the International Security Assistance Force mission in Afghanistan.

Lastly, the committee encourages continued engagement by the Department of Defense as the Summit approaches, as well as after the Summit.



North Atlantic Treaty Organization Center of Excellence on  
Deterrence

The committee is aware that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has successfully built a construct of centers of excellence in member states to strengthen the Alliance's posture by training and educating leaders from NATO member and partner states, develop important doctrines, improve interoperability, identify lessons learned, and test and validate important concepts for alliance security.

The committee is aware of over 18 of these centers (with three more in development) concentrating on subjects ranging from human intelligence to cooperative cyber defense. The committee is also aware that there is no center devoted to nuclear deterrence, including extended deterrence and assurance, or to reducing the risk of nuclear smuggling and nuclear terrorism.

The committee is aware of the robust nuclear weapons modernization program in a state neighboring the alliance, the on-going security crisis in Europe, including concerns about the use of nuclear weapons in escalation control in certain circumstances, invasion of states considered for Alliance membership, arms control violations that could affect the security of Alliance members, and the instances of nuclear smuggling and risk of fissile material theft or diversion in or near-Europe.

Moreover, the committee is aware that it is a central tenet of the May 2012 NATO Deterrence and Defense Posture Review that, "[n]uclear weapons are a core component of NATO's overall capabilities for deterrence and defense alongside conventional and missile defense forces . . . As long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the utility for NATO of a center of excellence focusing primarily on nuclear deterrence (including extended deterrence and ensuring compliance with arms control obligations), missile defense, and reducing the risk of nuclear smuggling and nuclear terrorism and submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than November 1, 2014. The study should include: a detailed examination of establishing a NATO Center of Excellence-Deterrence (COE-D), which would include a discussion of the notional concept with key allies and potential stakeholders (Allied Command Transformation, NATO Headquarters, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, U.S. Strategic Command, U.S. European Command); development of a notional vision and mission statement, goals and objectives, and organizational chart; propose a timeline for establishment, initial operating capability, final operating capability (accreditation), and provide proposed budget and staffing; development of a notional curriculum; recommendations for physical location and necessary infrastructure; the manner in which the center would meet NATO (Allied Command Transformation) accreditation requirements; and, additional recommendations as appropriate based on the outcome of the study. The committee believes, in discussion with Allies, the study should identify and encourage member states to offer to be the host nation

for the COE-D and equitably share the costs of establishing and operating such a center.

#### Oversight of United States-Russian Federation Missile Defense Cooperation Discussions

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and the Director, Missile Defense Agency to brief certain congressional committees on (1) missile defense discussions between the United States and the Russian Federation; (2) the use of missile defense declassification authority by Director, Missile Defense Agency; and (3) the declassification of certain missile defense information.

The committee directs that this information provided to the congressional committees pursuant to H. Rpt. 113-102 be updated by the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director, Missile Defense Agency and the Secretary of State, and be reported to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than August 1, 2014.

Additionally, at the March 25, 2014, House Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request for missile defense, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy stated, "[w]ith regard to talks with Russia on transparency and cooperation, Russia's intervention in Ukraine in violation of international law led to the suspension of our military-to-military dialogues, including [Department of Defense] civilians, and we have subsequently not continued to engage Russia on the topic of missile defense."

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to notify the House Committee on Armed Services not later than one week after the Department of Defense resumes any missile defense discussion with the Russian Federation.

#### Report on Countering Violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty

On March 5, 2014, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy testified before the Senate Committee on Armed Services that, "[w]e are concerned about Russian activity that appears to be inconsistent with the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. We've raised the issue with Russia. They provided an answer that was not satisfactory to us, and we will, we told them that the issue is not closed, and we will continue to raise this." The committee shares this concern regarding Russian behavior that is "inconsistent with" or in violation or circumvention of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty.

Additionally, the Commander, U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, stated on April 2, 2014, that, "A weapon capability that violates the INF, that is introduced into the greater European land mass is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with. . . I would not judge how the alliance will choose to

react, but I would say they will have to consider what to do about it. . .It can't go unanswered."

The committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. European Command, the Commander, U.S. Central Command, and the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than September 1, 2014, detailing the following:

(1) A list of any military capabilities (beyond those indicated by the September 2013 report by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Report on Conventional Prompt Global Strike Options if Exempt from the Restrictions of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics") the United States would develop or deploy to satisfy military requirements but for United States compliance with and adherence to the INF Treaty;

(2) The capability of the Aegis Ashore systems scheduled to be deployed to Romania and the Republic of Poland to detect Russian military systems that are inconsistent with or in circumvention of the INF treaty, and the appropriate types of interceptor missiles, including interceptor missiles other than the Standard Missile-3, that would be capable of defending allies and U.S. deployed forces from such Russian military systems that could be deployed at such Aegis Ashore sites, as well as a detailed explanation of any hardware and software changes required to those sites in order to provide a cruise-missile defense capability, and the costs of those changes;

(3) The defensive capability of the Aegis Ashore system, currently situated on the Pacific Missile Range Facility in Hawaii, if redeployed to one of the following locations: Japan, the Baltic Region of Europe, or the South Caucasus of Europe;

(4) Options to increase the long-term, long-duration deployment of U.S. Aegis destroyers and cruisers, configured with the Aegis ballistic missile defense system, in the North Sea, Black Sea, Baltic Sea, White Sea, and other locations that provide an enhanced defense of the United States, deployed forces, and allies within range of the aforementioned Russian military systems, and costs of those options;

(5) Options to provide for the forward-deployment, on a non-temporary basis, for U.S. Terminal High Altitude Area Defense or PATRIOT units at potential locations in Eastern Europe, the South Caucasus of Europe, or in allied states in East Asia, and the costs of those options;

(6) Options to increase the deployment of U.S. Dual Capable Aircraft in states within range of the aforementioned Russian military systems, and the costs of those options;

(7) Potential locations in Eastern Europe or the South Caucasus of Europe, or in allied states in East Asia, for U.S. Weapons Storage and Security System weapons vaults that would reduce response time and increase proximity to potential threats, and the costs of constructing the vaults at those sites; and

(8) The potential sensor coverage of potential threats to allies and U.S. deployed forces if the United States deployed the Ground-based Radar Prototype presently located on Kwajalein Atoll at optimal locations in the Baltic States, the South Caucasus, Eastern Europe, or in allied states in East Asia, as well as the potential sensor coverage of additional forward-deployed Army-Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance units at those locations, and the costs of deploying such sensors.

(9) Assessment of likely responses by the Russian Federation to such options, if implemented, and the interest of NATO states in hosting the capabilities described in (2)–(8) and an assessment of the Alliance’s likely position on the deployment of such options, as required.

The report shall be submitted unclassified form, with a classified portion marked annex as necessary.

#### Report on Financial Management Capacity of Afghan Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Interior

In November 2013, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) issued a report titled, “Comprehensive Risk Assessments of MOD and MOI Financial Management Capacity Could Improve Oversight of Over \$4 Billion in Direct Assistance Funding” (SIGAR–14–12–SP). The report evaluated whether Department of Defense funds provided to the Ministry of Defense (MOD) and the Ministry of Interior (MOI) of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan are properly managed and safeguarded to protect against fraud, waste, and abuse. The Department of Defense reported to SIGAR that, as of September 2013, it committed \$4.2 billion and disbursed nearly \$3.0 billion in direct assistance to the Afghan MOD and MOI for the sustainment of the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF), including procurement of food, goods, and services; funding salaries; and funding minor construction.

The committee believes that an assessment of the financial management capacity of the Afghan MOD and MOI will improve the protection of U.S. direct assistance to Afghanistan to fund and equip the ANSF and ensure the assistance is used as intended. The committee also believes that an assessment of any associated risks for U.S. funds will assist the Department of Defense in developing mitigation measures to address any such risks.

Therefore, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the financial management capacity and risks within the Afghan MOD and the MOI. The Inspector General should also assess the capacity and risks within the Afghan Ministry of Finance, to the extent the Inspector General determines that such an assessment is required to protect Department funds and would not duplicate efforts conducted by other agencies of the U.S. Government. Such assessment should:

(1) Identify core financial management functions within the Afghan MOD and MOI, including: financial management and accounting capacity; financial accountability and control environment; procurement and asset management capacity; contracting mechanisms and processes; and management of personnel systems;

(2) Identify major risks and mitigation strategies deemed necessary for ensuring that the MOD and MOI are able to manage U.S. direct assistance; and

(3) Assess how a post-2014 United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization residual military presence to train, advise, and assist the ANSF would help mitigate any risk in the financial management capacity of the Afghan MOD and MOI.

The committee further directs the Inspector General to provide a report on the results of the assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by December 31, 2014.

The committee is cognizant of the security situation in Afghanistan and of other challenges that may affect the Inspector General's ability to carry out such an assessment. The committee understands that the Inspector General would conduct the assessment in phases to accommodate these challenges. If the Inspector General cannot complete the assessment and deliver the required report by December 31, 2014, the Inspector General should notify the committees of the reasons the assessment cannot be completed by that date and include in such notification the date the Inspector General expects that the assessment will be completed and submitted.

#### Report on Foreign Ballistic Missile Defense Programs

The committee notes the long-term utility of the annual reports on military power of states including the People's Republic of China and the Islamic Republic of Iran. Drawing on these examples, as an initial step, the committee is interested in better understanding the consequences of the increasing reliance on missile defenses by states around the globe.

For example, the committee was informed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in his response to its direction in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 that: "Russia's objective with its ballistic missile defense (BMD) capabilities is to ensure defense of critical political and military targets in the Moscow area from a ballistic missile attack, either by the United States or any other nation with nuclear or conventional ballistic or cruise missile capabilities. China desires a BMD capability to protect its mainland and strategic forces. At present, China's existing long-range surface to air missile inventory offers a limited capability against short-range ballistic missiles. China is proceeding with research and development toward a missile defense umbrella consisting of intercept at exo-atmospheric altitudes (>80km), as well as intercepts of ballistic missiles and other aerospace vehicles within the upper atmosphere."

The committee is also aware that the Republic of India is undertaking tests of its anti-ballistic missile defense system as part of its efforts to develop and deploy a ballistic missile defense shield. The committee is further aware of extensive U.S. missile defense cooperation involving the State of Israel, the Republic of Korea, Japan, the United Arab Emirates, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Gulf Cooperation Council, and many others.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, in cooperation with the Director, Missile and Space Intelligence Center and the Director, National Air and Space Intelligence Center, to provide an unclassified report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than November 15, 2014, that includes the following:

(1) A detailed description of ballistic missile defense programs of each state that possesses such a program, including role and capability of outer space in their system architecture, either through indigenous development or procurement from another state;

(2) The missile defense employment policy of that country, including any views on the reason such state has its missile defense system and any limitations on its use as a defense system, as well as any technical or doctrinal indications that a state's ballistic missile defense programs are intended to defend that state from U.S. ballistic missiles;

(3) Intent to, and established programs to, modernize such systems and relative budget as compared to national defense budget; and (4) Indication that a state will abandon its ballistic missile defense program if the U.S. provides that state guarantees of any sort that U.S. ballistic missile defense programs are unrelated to that state's offensive forces.

#### Report on Operational Contract Support in U.S. Africa Command

While much attention has been paid to the use of contractors by the Department of Defense to support the large-scale operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee recognizes the Department uses contractors to support myriad efforts in other locations around the globe. Specifically, within U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM), the Department relies heavily on contractors to provide logistical, linguistic, intelligence, and transportation support to ongoing training, advising, and other assistance missions. While the challenges and deficiencies regarding the planning, management, and oversight of contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan have been well documented, and the Department has taken several steps to address these challenges, the committee notes that the challenges associated with contractor support for other types of operations in other regions could be substantially different. In addition to broader concerns regarding planning, management, and oversight of contracts of this nature, the committee is concerned about the extent to which the Department may face operational contract support challenges in AFRICOM.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to examine the processes AFRICOM uses to plan, manage, and oversee contractors that support its military operations conducted in Africa. Specifically, the review should include an assessment of the following:

(1) The extent to which AFRICOM uses contractors to support its programs and operations and the appropriateness of how AFRICOM uses contractors to support such programs and operations;

(2) The extent to which AFRICOM depends on the Department of State to provide operational contract support to its activities in Africa and the potential challenges associated with this support;

(3) The organizational structure in place at AFRICOM and its subordinate commands to manage operational contract support, including planning for the use of contractors and oversight of contractors during operations, as well as the systems and processes for tracking contractors throughout operations;

(4) The processes used to vet non-United States contractors and contractor employees; and

(5) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the Department of Defense's operational contract support in AFRICOM.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2015, on the above assessment, with a follow-on report delivered to those committees not later than April 15, 2015.

#### Report on the Proliferation Activities of Karl Lee and the Support of the Chinese Government

The committee is aware that the United States has repeatedly invoked sanctions on Karl Lee, a national of the People's Republic of China, for his proliferation to the Islamic Republic of Iran of components related to its illegal ballistic missile program in violation of United States statutes (for example, the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act) and numerous Executive orders.

The committee is also aware that despite a criminal indictment in the United States for these activities, and numerous and repeated invocations of United States sanctions against him, China has made little apparent effort to respond to Karl Lee's activities. The committee believes it would be a benefit to the bilateral relationship between the two nations if China took efforts to arrest Karl Lee to stop permanently his illegal proliferation.

The committee directs the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than August 31, 2014, providing the following: ongoing proliferation activities involving Karl Lee or his front companies, and relationships between Karl Lee and officials of the Chinese government, including bribes or protection payments to ensure that his activities go unchallenged by the government. The report should be in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary.

#### Report on U.S. Army Regionally Aligned Brigade in Africa

In 2013, U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) became the first geographic combatant command to receive a regionally aligned force (RAF). Under the regionally aligned force concept, the Army will align designated units to specific regions and deploy small groups of personnel from those units to conduct security force assistance activities, leaving the rest of the units at their home stations. These activities include exercises, training events, and other secu-

rity cooperation and security force assistance activities. The RAF units are expected to maintain readiness for their core mission even as they support the geographic combatant commander's needs. The Army has designated one brigade to serve as the regionally aligned force for AFRICOM.

The committee is concerned about potential overlaps in roles and responsibilities, and notes that there are other Department of Defense security force assistance activities underway in Africa, including Africa Contingency Operations Training and Assistance efforts and the National Guard's State Partnership Program. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that these additional mission requirements and the dispersion of the RAF may impact the ability of the force to maintain readiness for its core mission. Elsewhere in this report, the committee expresses support for the Army's RAF concept but also states various concerns. In addition, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit an assessment of the RAF to the congressional defense committees concurrent with the submission of the President's budget for fiscal year 2016.

As a complement to this assessment, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the employment of the RAF in Africa. The Comptroller General's evaluation should be informed by the required Army assessment and include the following:

(1) The extent to which AFRICOM has defined the intended roles, responsibilities, goals, objectives, and required capabilities for the use of the regionally aligned brigade to conduct security force assistance activities, to include evaluating the impact of conducted activities;

(2) The extent to which AFRICOM has identified and mitigated potential overlap between the requirements and capabilities of the regionally aligned brigade and other Department of Defense security force assistance activities within AFRICOM;

(3) The extent to which the regionally aligned brigade has been able to meet AFRICOM requirements to conduct security force assistance activities, to include the training and equipping of brigade personnel and associated costs to meet mission requirements;

(4) What impact, if any, the regionally aligned brigade's security force assistance activities and requirements in AFRICOM have had on its ability to maintain readiness, to include adhering to training schedules; and

(5) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the Army's regionally aligned brigade in Africa.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a preliminary briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2015, on the above evaluation, with a report to follow not later than April 15, 2015.

#### Report on U.S. Government Comprehensive Approach to Strengthen its Strategic Partnership with Djibouti

The committee believes that the strategic relationship between the U.S. Government and the Government of the Republic of



Djibouti remains one of the most important strategic relationships that the United States has in the region. In written testimony submitted to the committee on March 5, 2014, the Commander, U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) stated that the Department of Defense's presence at Camp Lemonnier in Djibouti, "provides a critical platform for our activities, as well as those of Central Command, Special Operations Command, and Transportation Command." The committee further notes the importance of the Department's presence in Djibouti in the classified annex to this report.

The committee appreciates the Government of Djibouti's continued support of this relationship and therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would provide an enhanced authority to the Secretary of Defense to acquire products and services produced in Djibouti in support of Department of Defense activities in AFRICOM.

However, the committee believes that a comprehensive, long-term, interagency approach is necessary to support the strategic relationship between the two countries, and to support ongoing Department of Defense efforts facilitated by that relationship. The committee is aware that the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development are engaged in Djibouti, but believes that these efforts could be better coordinated within the interagency and should be robust enough to support such a comprehensive approach.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than February 6, 2015, on the specific steps the U.S. Government is taking to strengthen its strategic relationship with Djibouti, including:

(1) A summary of the strategic goals for the relationship between the United States and the Government of Djibouti;

(2) An assessment of the current state of the relationship between the United States and the Government of Djibouti; and

(3) A detailed description of the steps being taken, and additional steps that could be taken, to support a long-term, strategic relationship between the United States and the Government of Djibouti.

#### Report on Updated Independent Cost Estimate of the European Phased Adaptive Approach

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense provided the October 2012 Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) for the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) on February 25, 2014. The committee is aware of both the total acquisition and lifecycle cost as well as the statement of the Under Secretary of Acquisition, Technology and Logistics that there have been numerous requirement content changes to the EPAA since it was completed, including mission requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to update his October 2012 ICE and sub-

mit it directly to the congressional defense committees not later than November 15, 2014.

#### Republic of China Radar Interoperability

The committee is aware that the Republic of China (Taiwan) possesses a large and highly capable Early Warning Radar. The committee believes that, based on its geographical location, this radar could be a benefit to United States and allied missile defense objectives.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 1, 2014, detailing his views on any benefits, and associated costs and security requirements, of integrating such radar with other United States missile defense and sensor systems to improve U.S. regional missile defense capabilities. The committee directs this report to be provided in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary.

Separately, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy may provide an additional report detailing his views on the benefits and costs of such cooperation.

#### Transfers of Excess Defense Articles

The committee appreciates the important diplomatic interests served by the transfer of Excess Defense Articles (EDA) to allied and partner nations. While a properly executed EDA program bolsters U.S. diplomatic aims, under section 2321j of title 22, United States Code, the EDA program must be executed in a way that does not harm the capability or capacity of the U.S. defense industrial base, which is particularly important during this time of fewer Federal investments in defense procurement and research and development.

The committee is concerned about the adverse impact of antiquated equipment transfers on partner nation capacity-building objectives as well as the harm done to the reputation of the U.S. industrial base from transferring non-functional or obsolete equipment. In order to ensure that the diplomatic aims of EDA are fully appreciated and efforts to enhance the sustainment of the U.S. defense industrial base with international sales are not undermined, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to engage the industrial base in providing refurbishment and sustainment of EDA equipment, to include supplies and parts, to the fullest extent possible.

#### United States Security Assistance to the Government of Egypt

The committee notes with concern the growing Al Qaeda presence and associated terrorist attacks in the Arab Republic of Egypt. Presently, at least six terrorist groups with links to Al Qaeda operate in Egypt, including the Ansar Bayt al-Maqdis and the al-Furqan Brigades. In recent months, terrorist attacks in Egypt claimed the lives of hundreds of Egyptians and over 350 soldiers and police officers. Within the past 6 months, there have been over 280 attacks in the Sinai Peninsula. On January 24, 2014, Al

Qaeda-linked terrorists conducted a series of coordinated attacks that killed 6 and injured over 100 people in Cairo.

Egypt is not only enduring the effects of terrorism from the Sinai Peninsula, it is also enduring the increasing flow of foreign fighters and military material from its western and southern borders with Libya and the Republic of the Sudan, respectively.

The committee understands that the Secretary of State, in accordance with section 7041 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–71), will certify to Congress that Egypt is taking steps to support a democratic transition and that the President has made the decision to deliver 10 Apache helicopters to support Egypt's counterterrorism operations in the Sinai Peninsula. Given the significant increase in terrorist activity, the close relationship that the Egyptian military has with the U.S. military, and the interim Government's support of the peace treaty with the State of Israel, the committee supports the President's decision to provide the Apache aircraft to the Government of Egypt. The committee further believes that the United States should provide necessary security assistance to the Government of Egypt, specifically focused on areas of mutual security interest.

The committee remains concerned that if the United States does not engage through security assistance with the Government of Egypt and the Egyptian military, then other countries, such as the Russian Federation, may fill this gap, which would work at cross-purposes with vital U.S. national security interests.

The committee continues to closely observe Egypt's transition towards a new democratic government structure and is encouraged by both the direction and progress that the interim Government has made in this realm. In January 2014, Egyptians participated in a referendum to approve a new constitution, which includes protections for individual freedoms, equal protection and rights for all Egyptians, government transparency and accountability, and improved civilian oversight of the Egyptian military. Additionally, the committee is encouraged that the presidential and parliamentary elections appear to be on track and likely to be completed by the summer of 2014, and urges the Government of Egypt to ensure that the elections are free, fair, and devoid of fraud. The committee is concerned by reports that there may have been human rights violations that have occurred in Egypt. The committee encourages the next President of Egypt to address the economic and political needs of the Egyptian people, including the protections for individual freedom and human rights reflected in the new Egyptian constitution.

#### United States Security Policy and Posture in the Middle East and North Africa

The committee recognizes that the Middle East is undergoing significant change, and remains concerned about the implications of those changes on security and stability in the region and on U.S. policy and posture in the region.

As the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs testified to the committee on February 11, 2014, "The Middle East today is undergoing historic changes. Across the region, we are seeing unprecedented political ferment and in some cases upheaval as

people demand change.” Major events such as the war in the Republic of Iraq, the Arab Awakening, and the ongoing conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic, have shaped, and are shaping, the Middle East in fundamental and irreversible ways. Over the next 6 months, key diplomatic and defense related events in the greater Middle East will further shape the region and the U.S. engagement therein. These include: the likely signing of the Bilateral Security Agreement between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; the President’s decision on a potential post-2014 U.S. residual presence in Afghanistan; the international effort to destroy the chemical precursors and chemical weapons production capability of the Assad regime; the continuing conflict in Syria; the negotiations between the State of Israel and the Palestinian National Authority; the negotiations to achieve a comprehensive nuclear deal with the Islamic Republic of Iran; and the parliamentary and presidential elections in the Arab Republic of Egypt. However, the committee remains unclear about how these diplomatic and military activities will shape a comprehensive U.S. policy for the Middle East and North Africa.

Officials from key allies and partners in the region, most prominently from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the State of Israel, and some Gulf States, have made public comments that suggest they are concerned that the United States is disengaging from the Middle East, or at least that U.S. interests appear to be diverging from these allies’ interests. These public expressions of concern appear to be spurred by the ongoing negotiations and interim nuclear deal with Iran, disagreements with the United States about how best to respond to the conflict in Syria, and the ongoing U.S. “rebalance to the Asia-Pacific” that may lead to greater U.S. disengagement from the Middle East.

The committee believes that the United States should be clear in its commitment to the Middle East and North Africa, and that the U.S. forward posture across these regions should demonstrably support U.S. stated policy goals and strategy, consistent with the “deep, enduring interest” and commitment expressed in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The committee also notes that the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs stated before the committee on February 11, 2014, that “the greater Middle East remains a region of vital strategic importance to the United States . . . The most tangible sign of U.S. commitment that we can make to the security of the region is the physical presence of the men and women in uniform as well as the presence of advanced military equipment.”

The committee believes that a commitment to the regular funding of U.S. strategic bases that support U.S. forces in the Middle East is the most visible way the United States can demonstrate its commitment to the region in the short term. The committee further believes that the United States’ forward posture and presence is not sufficient to meet the goals of the 2014 QDR unless they are also fiscally sustainable. The committee is aware that much of the critical U.S. military posture and basing in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) region, which is used to deter Iran and would be leveraged in the event there are any military operations to counter Iran in the GCC region, continues to be expeditionary in nature

and financed through Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding. The committee recognizes that OCO funding may be phased out in the coming years, and therefore remains concerned that the Department of Defense has not identified other sources of funding to support these strategic bases and presence. In addition, the committee notes that the United States does not have in place the Status of Forces Agreements, and associated defense agreements, with GCC countries to ensure that these locations are maintained for the defense of the Arabian Gulf and other U.S. national security interests. The committee has previously highlighted the need for a sustainable posture and relationship with the GCC countries, including language in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) that required the Secretary of Defense to provide the committee with a report addressing its concerns about U.S. plans, funding, and agreements in the region.

The committee expects continued engagement from the Department of Defense on U.S. policy and posture in the Middle East and North Africa, and on any changes stemming from budgetary constraints or policy shifts.

#### Updated Report on Russian Tactical Nuclear Weapons Developments

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency to “provide unclassified semi-annual reports, with a classified annex if necessary, detailing the status of the development and deployment by the Russian Federation of nuclear weapons and associated delivery systems not subject to strategic arms control treaties. Such reports shall include status of deployment, numbers of deployed systems, expected employment doctrine, and status of training in the employment of such systems by the military forces of the Russian Federation.”

The committee has received one such report and found it to be less responsive to its direction than it hoped. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2014, that includes the following:

- (1) The status of the development and deployment by the Russian Federation of nuclear weapons and associated delivery systems not subject to strategic arms control treaties;
- (2) The numbers of such deployed and non-deployed systems;
- (3) The expected employment doctrine; and
- (4) The status of training in the employment of such systems by Russian military forces.

#### Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace

The budget request contained \$24.4 million for the Warsaw Initiative Fund (WIF)/Partnership for Peace (PFP) program, representing a \$9.7 million decrease from the fiscal year 2014 budget request.

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense's Warsaw Initiative Fund program is one of the primary tools the Department uses to promote defense reform efforts and defense institution building with developing partners that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Partnership for Peace program. The committee believes that additional funds are necessary to enable U.S. European Command, through military exercises and defense reform efforts, to build the capacity of PFP militaries in order to promote regional stability and deter aggression by the Russian Federation.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$34.4 million, an increase of \$10.0 million, for the WIF/PFP program.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

#### Section 1201—One-Year Extension of Global Security Contingency Fund

This section would modify section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). This section would broaden the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF) authority to include small-scale construction, not to exceed \$750,000 on a per-project basis, as part of the authorized types of capacity building. The committee believes that small-scale construction, under \$750,000 per project, may be required for long-term sustainability of capacity building activities. However, the committee expects that any small-scale construction projects authorized under this section would be a supporting, logical component of a comprehensive GSCF program, and not a stand-alone project.

This section would also authorize a 1-year extension of the GSCF and state that amounts appropriated or transferred to the Fund before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 shall remain available for obligation and expenditure after September 30, 2015, only if activities under programs under section 1207(b) begin before September 30, 2015.

The committee remains concerned about the progress of the GSCF, as previously stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. The committee believes that if the Department of Defense and the Department of State cannot successfully establish full operational capability for the GSCF, including planning, executing, and assessing GSCF activities, then it may consider not renewing this authority in future years.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends no dedicated funding for GSCF; rather, the committee believes projects contemplated under GSCF should compete within other security assistance priorities for funds otherwise available to the Department as they have been.

Section 1202—Notice to Congress on Certain Assistance Under Authority to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction

This section would amend section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) by adding the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to the notification requirement.

Section 1203—Enhanced Authority for Provision of Support to Foreign Military Liaison Officers of Foreign Countries While Assigned to the Department of Defense

This section would amend section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide administrative and support services, to include certain training programs, for liaison officers of a foreign country, while such liaison officers are assigned temporarily to the headquarters of a combatant command, component command, or subordinate operational command of the United States. This section would further amend section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, to include a limitation on the authorized number of liaison officers and amount of unreimbursed support for travel, subsistence, and medical care expenses per fiscal year for any such liaison officer. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees an annual report on January 31 of each year from 2016–18 on the summary of expenses incurred by the United States for liaison officers of a developing country, and include the Department of Defense’s definition of a “developing country” as used for the purposes of this authority.

The committee recognizes the role of foreign liaison officers at the combatant commands and component commands to provide expertise to the commander and staff to better understand the respective region and plan for contingencies in the command’s area of responsibility. Although the committee recognizes foreign liaison officers are present at all commands, section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, provides specific authority to the Secretary of Defense to provide administrative and financial support to those liaison officers of a developing country involved in a current U.S. military operation. The committee believes the commands should continue to benefit from the unique contributions of the liaison officers beyond current military operations, such as Operation Enduring Freedom.

Section 1204—Annual Report on Human Rights Vetting and Verification Procedures of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to Congress an annual report on human rights vetting and verification procedures of the Department of Defense. This report shall be submitted at the same time as the budget of the President is submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

## SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

## Section 1211—Extension of Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan

This section would amend section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as most recently amended by section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), by extending for 1 year the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

## Section 1212—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would amend section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), by extending the authority for reimbursement of coalition nations for support provided to the United States for military operations through fiscal year 2015, and making certain technical amendments.

Additionally, this section would prohibit the reimbursement of support provided by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan until such time as the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that Pakistan is maintaining security and is not, through its actions or inaction at any level of government, limiting or otherwise restricting the movement of U.S. equipment and supplies along the Ground Lines of Communication through Pakistan, and that Pakistan is taking demonstrable steps to: (1) support counterterrorism operations against Al Qaeda, Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan, and other militant groups such as the Haqqani Network and the Quetta Shura Taliban; (2) disrupt the conduct of cross-border attacks against U.S., coalition, and Afghan security forces; (3) counter the threat of improvised explosive device networks; and (4) conduct cross-border coordination and communication with Afghan security forces and U.S. Armed Forces.

## Section 1213—Extension of Certain Authorities for Support of Foreign Forces Supporting or Participating with the United States Armed Forces

This section would amend section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and section 1202(e) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), as most recently amended by sections 1217(a) and 1217(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), respectively. Specifically, it would extend the authority to (1) provide supplies, services, transportation (including airlift and sealift), and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting United States military and stabilization operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; and (2) use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend military equipment to the military forces of a nation partici-



pating in combined operations with the United States in Afghanistan.

The committee recognizes that the United States may be involved in a combined operation with partner nations in Afghanistan as part of Operation Resolute Support, following the end of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization mission in Afghanistan on December 31, 2014. Should the President decide to commit the United States to a post-2014 presence and mission as part of Operation Resolute Support, such partner nations would require logistical support and the lending of military equipment from U.S. forces in Afghanistan to effectively execute the Operation Resolute Support mission.

#### Section 1214—Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan under Operation Resolute Support

This section would create a new “Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan.” It would include reporting requirements similar to those originally contained in section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), but updated to reflect the post-2014 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) effort in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan known as Operation Resolute Support.

In addition, this section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit such report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than April 1, 2015, and every 180 days thereafter, on the progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan under Operation Resolute Support.

Lastly, this section would extend the original “Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan” for 3 months and sunset it on December 31, 2014.

#### Section 1215—Requirement to Withhold Department of Defense Assistance to Afghanistan in Amount Equivalent to 150 Percent of All Taxes Assessed by Afghanistan to Extent Such Taxes Are Not Reimbursed by Afghanistan

This section would require the Department of Defense to withhold fiscal year 2015 funds appropriated for assistance to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in the amount equivalent to 150 percent of the total taxes assessed during fiscal year 2014 by Afghanistan on such assistance. This withhold would continue to the extent that the Secretary of Defense certifies that Afghanistan has not provided a reimbursement for those taxes to the Department, or relevant Department contractors and subcontractors. The Secretary of Defense may waive such requirement if it is necessary to achieve U.S. goals in Afghanistan.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, not later than March 1, 2015, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the

Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, on the total taxes assessed during fiscal year 2014 by the Government of Afghanistan on any Department of Defense assistance.

Lastly, this section would terminate once the Secretary of Defense notifies the appropriate committees that the United States and Afghanistan have signed a bilateral security agreement and that such agreement has entered into force.

The committee notes that such taxation by Afghanistan on Department of Defense assistance is a violation of the status of forces agreement (SOFA) between the United States and Afghanistan. The committee expects the Government of Afghanistan to adhere to this SOFA and not levy illegitimate taxes and penalties on Department of Defense contractors and subcontractors providing services in Afghanistan.

#### Section 1216—United States Plan for Sustaining the Afghanistan National Security Forces Through the End of Fiscal Year 2018

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, that contains a detailed plan for sustaining the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF) through the end of fiscal year 2018, consistent with plans that are being considered by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The objective of such plan is to ensure that the ANSF will be able to independently and effectively conduct operations and maintain security and stability in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

#### Section 1217—Sense of Congress on United States Military Commitment to Operation Resolute Support in Afghanistan

This section would express the sense of Congress on the United States military commitment to Operation Resolute Support in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to include: the importance of maintaining a U.S. residual presence in Afghanistan for Operation Resolute Support beginning on January 1, 2015; the importance of achieving a signed Bilateral Security Agreement, and a status of forces agreement to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) mission; and, continuing to financially support the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF) due to the vital interests that the United States continues to have in Afghanistan.

The committee applauds the gains achieved by the United States, NATO, and its coalition partners in Afghanistan, to include:

(1) The International Security and Assistance Force has trained and is building the ANSF, including doubling the ANSF in size between 2009–14, to its current end strength of approximately 352,000 personnel;

(2) The ANSF currently executes 95 percent of its conventional operations and 98 percent of its special operations missions across Afghanistan;

(3) The United States signed a Strategic Partnership Agreement with the Government of Afghanistan and has designated Afghanistan as a major non-NATO ally;

(4) Life expectancy in Afghanistan has increased from 37 years of age in 2000 to 56 years of age in 2014;

(5) 65 percent of the Afghan population has access to the Internet;

(6) There are four times more healthcare facilities in Afghanistan in 2014 than in 2003;

(7) More than 10,000,000 children are attending school, including 3,000,000 girls, in Afghanistan;

(8) There are more than 13,000 general education schools in Afghanistan; and

(9) Paved roads have increased from just 32 miles in 2002 to 7,500 miles in 2014.

The committee notes that the term Operation Resolute Support refers to the NATO mission in Afghanistan beginning on January 1, 2015.

#### Section 1218—Extension of Afghan Special Immigrant Program

This section would authorize a certain number of visas for principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant visa status in accordance with section 602(b)(3) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101). This section would also extend the period in which the principal alien must be employed by or on behalf of the U.S. Government in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to December 31, 2015. Additionally, this section would extend the period in which the principal alien must apply to the Chief of Mission in Afghanistan to September 30, 2015. The authorization in this section would terminate on September 30, 2016.

#### SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

##### Section 1221—Limitation on Military Contact and Cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation

This section would prohibit the use of funds for fiscal year 2015 for bilateral military-to-military contact or cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Russia is respecting the sovereignty of Ukrainian territory, no longer acting inconsistently with the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, in compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, and Russia has not sold or transferred the Club-K land attack cruise missile system to any foreign country or person during fiscal year 2014. This section would include a waiver for the Secretary of Defense, pending a notification, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the appropriate congressional committees that such contact or cooperation is in the national security interest of the United States and a period of 30 days has elapsed following the notification. Further, the certification regarding the sale or transfer of the Club-K cruise missile could be waived by the Secretary of Defense if the United States has imposed sanctions against the manufac-

turer of such system by reason of the sale or transfer, or, if the Secretary has developed and submitted to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to prevent the sale or other transfer of such system in the future.

The committee notes that at the time this report was filed, the Secretary of Defense has suspended military exercises, bilateral meetings, port visits, and planning conferences between the Armed Forces of the United States and Russia in response to ongoing Russian aggression towards Ukraine. The committee believes that U.S.-Russia military contact and cooperation must remain suspended so long as Russia continues its aggression towards Ukraine and continues to take actions inconsistent with its treaty obligations.

#### Section 1222—Limitation on Use of Funds With Respect to Certification of Certain Flights by the Russian Federation Under the Treaty on Open Skies

This section would impose a limitation on the use of funds to permit the certification of a proposal by the Russian Federation to change any sensor package for a flight by Russia under the Open Skies Treaty unless: (1) the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence jointly certify to the appropriate congressional committees that such proposal will not enhance the capability or potential of the Russian Federation to gather intelligence that poses an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States or is not designed to be collected under such treaty; and (2) the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Russia is no longer illegally occupying Ukrainian territory, the Russian Federation is no longer violating the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and is in compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. The President would be able to waive this section if he submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so. The section would also require a 90 day notice-and-wait prior to the approval of a Russian proposal.

The committee is committed to effective and complete compliance with the Treaty on Open Skies, provided such compliance is not allowed to become a threat to the national security of the United States.

The committees notes its request for a briefing on the ongoing implementation of the Treaty on Open Skies, and that this briefing was postponed at the request of the Administration. The committee looks forward to receiving this briefing and plans to continue close oversight of this issue.

#### Section 1223—Limitations on Providing Certain Missile Defense Information to the Russian Federation

This section would extend the sunset date on certain measures relating to the provision or prohibition on the provision of U.S. missile defense information to the Russian Federation. This section would also add a new prohibition on the transfer of velocity or burnout information to Russia. Additionally, this section would add

the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to the specified recipients of the notification required under this section.

Section 1224—Limitation on Availability of Funds to Transfer  
Missile Defense Information to the Russian Federation

This section would limit the use of funds in a fiscal year to transfer missile defense information to the Russian Federation unless the President has submitted a report to the congressional defense committees by October 31st of such fiscal year detailing discussions between the United States and Russia during the prior fiscal year.

Section 1225—Report on Non-Compliance by the Russian  
Federation of Its Obligations under the INF Treaty

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the material breach of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty by the Russian Federation, and would require the President to report not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, on efforts to have Russia return to being in compliance with the treaty, and the President's assessment as to whether it remains in the national security interest of the United States to remain a party to the treaty.

Section 1226—Sense of Congress Regarding Russian Aggression  
Toward Ukraine

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding Russian aggression towards Ukraine.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee notes with concern the recent actions undertaken by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine. The committee believes both the overt and covert actions taken by the Russian military and Government to seize and annex Crimea, destabilize eastern Ukraine, and threaten further military action against the Government of Ukraine, are clearly meant to coerce the Government and people of Ukraine into adopting policies and an orientation centered on Russia and away from Europe and the West.

Section 1227—Annual Report on Military and Security  
Developments Involving the Russian Federation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than June 1, 2015 and annually thereafter through 2021, to submit to the specified congressional committees a report on the current and future military power of the Russian Federation. The report would address the current and probable future course of military-technological development of Russian security and military strategy, and military organizations and operational concepts, for the 20-year period following the report. This section would also repeal section 10 of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-95).

## SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

## Section 1231—Strategy to Prioritize United States Interests in the United States Pacific Command Area of Responsibility and Implementation Plan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, to develop a strategy to prioritize United States interests in the U.S. Pacific Command's area of responsibility. This section would further require the President, acting through the National Security Council and in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to develop an implementation plan for the strategy, and to submit a report to Congress containing the strategy and implementation plans not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

## Section 1232—Modifications to Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China

This section would modify section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to include an additional reporting requirement on developments in the maritime law enforcement capabilities and organization of the People's Republic of China.

## Section 1233—Report on Goals and Objectives Guiding Military Engagement with Burma

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than December 1, 2014, a report on the goals and objectives guiding military-to-military engagement between the United States and the Union of Burma. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit an annual update to the required report to the aforementioned committees that would sunset after a 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee welcomes the commitment to reform made by the Government of Burma. However, the committee notes that the Government of Burma needs to progress in: protecting the individual freedoms and human rights of the Burmese people, including for all ethnic and religious minorities and internally displaced populations; establishing civilian control of the armed forces; severing military-to-military ties with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; implementing constitutional and electoral reforms; and implementing mechanisms for increased governmental transparency and accountability.

The committee recognizes the role that the U.S. military can play in improving the Burmese military's understanding of human rights, the rule of law, and civilian control of the military. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of State to communicate the relationship between U.S.-Burma mili-

tary-to-military engagement and reform efforts undertaken by the Government of Burma.

Section 1234—Report on Department of Defense Munitions  
Strategy for United States Pacific Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by April 1, 2015 to the congressional defense committees, on U.S. Pacific Command's 10-year munitions strategy, including munitions requirements, gaps and shortfalls, and investment plans.

Section 1235—Missile Defense Cooperation

This section would express the sense of Congress that increased missile defense cooperation among the United States, Japan and the Republic of Korea enhances the security of allies of the United States in northeast Asia, increases the defense of forward-based forces of the United States, and enhances the protection of the United States.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment to identify opportunities for increasing missile defense cooperation among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, and to evaluate options for short-range missile, rocket, and artillery defense capabilities, including several specific elements. The Secretary would be required to brief the congressional defense committees on such assessment not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1236—Maritime Capabilities of Taiwan and Its  
Contribution to Regional Peace and Stability

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report on the maritime capabilities of Taiwan and its contribution to regional peace and stability to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than April 1, 2016. This section would also express the sense of Congress on Taiwan.

Section 1237—Independent Assessment on Countering Anti-access  
and Area-denial Strategies and Capabilities in the Asia-Pacific  
Region

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with an independent entity to conduct an assessment of anti-access and area-denial strategies and capabilities that pose a threat to security in the Asia-Pacific region and strategies to mitigate such threats. This section would further require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2015, containing the assessment and strategies.

Section 1238—Sense of Congress Reaffirming Security  
Commitment to Japan

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the continued importance of the alliance between the United States and Japan for Asia-Pacific stability and prosperity.

Section 1239—Sense of Congress on Opportunities to Strengthen  
Relationship between the United States and the Republic of Korea

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the continued importance of the alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea for Asia-Pacific stability and prosperity.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1241—Extension of Authority for Support of Special  
Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would extend through 2017 the authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). Further discussion of this provision is contained in the classified annex to this report.

Section 1242—One-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-  
Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would extend by 1 year the authority for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities pursuant to subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Section 1243—Extension and Modification of Authority to Support  
Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in  
Iraq

This section would amend section 1215(f)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as most recently amended by section 1214 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), by extending the authority for the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I) through fiscal year 2015, to include clarifying that the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may authorize OSC-I to conduct training activities in support of Iraqi Ministry of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service (CTS) personnel at a base or facility of the Government of the Republic of Iraq to address capability gaps, integrate processes relating to intelligence, air sovereignty, combined arms, logistics and maintenance, and to manage and integrate defense-related institutions.



Section 1244—Modification of National Security Planning Guidance to Deny Safe Havens to Al-Qaeda and Its Violent Extremist Affiliates

This section would modify section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by requiring the President to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the required national security planning guidance, including any updates to such guidance, to deny safe havens to Al Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates not later than October 1, 2014. Additionally, this section would add an element to the required guidance that would describe the feasibility, resourcing, authorities required, and potential benefit of conducting multilateral training and equipping of military forces in relevant countries.

The committee remains concerned about the worldwide evolution and growth of Al Qaeda, its affiliates, and associated groups, as noted by non-U.S. Government experts at a February 2014 committee hearing. Al Qaeda has been able to evolve and grow largely due to safe havens in certain locations such as the Syrian Arab Republic, the Republic of Iraq, and Libya, to name a few.

While section 1032 of Public Law 112–81 required the President to issue national security planning guidance to deny safe havens to Al Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates, it did not require the submission of such guidance to the relevant congressional committees. However, the conference report (H. Rept. 112–329) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 requested that the conferees be briefed on the guidance issued by the President. The committee notes that such briefing was not provided.

Section 1245—Enhanced Authority to Acquire Goods and Services of Djibouti in Support of Department of Defense Activities in United States Africa Command Area of Responsibility

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense with an enhanced authority to acquire products and services produced in the Republic of Djibouti in support of Department of Defense activities in the U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) area of responsibility. The Secretary would be required to make a determination that: (1) the product or service is to be used only in support of Department activities in AFRICOM; (2) the limit on competition or preference for Djiboutian products or services is vital to the national security interest of the United States; (3) the Djiboutian product or service is of equivalent quality to that which would have been otherwise acquired; and (4) the limitation or preference will not adversely affect U.S. military or stability operations in AFRICOM or the U.S. industrial base. The authority provided in this section would terminate on September 30, 2018.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that such procurement of Djiboutian products or services is conducted in accordance with Department of Defense management structure requirements in section 2330(a) of title 10, United States

Code, and identified and reported under a single, joint Department of Defense-wide system for the management and accountability of contractors operating overseas. It would also require the Secretary to ensure that AFRICOM has sufficiently trained staff and resources to conduct oversight of such procurement activities in order to detect and deter fraud, waste, and abuse.

Additionally, this section would express the sense of Congress that U.S. forces should remain forward postured in Africa and the Middle East; that Djibouti is strategically located to support U.S. vital national security interests; that the United States should take definitive steps to maintain its basing access and agreements with the Government of Djibouti; that the United States should devise and implement a comprehensive approach to reinforce the strategic partnership with the Government of Djibouti; and that the Secretary of State, the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, and the Secretary of Defense should take concrete steps to advance and strengthen the relationship between the United States and the Government of Djibouti.

The committee believes that this is an exceptional situation and recommends this authority because it recognizes that the U.S. military basing in Djibouti provides unique strategic positioning and access to the region, which has and continues to support vital U.S. national security interests. Additional detail on the criticality of U.S. basing in Djibouti is contained in the classified annex to this report. The committee believes that the United States must take proactive steps to reinforce a long-term, strategic relationship with the Government of Djibouti in order to support such vital national security interests. Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to certain committees outlining the specific steps that the Department of State is taking to strengthen its strategic relationship with Djibouti.

#### Section 1246—Strategic Framework for United States Security Force Assistance and Cooperation in the European and Eurasian Regions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to develop a strategic framework for security force assistance and cooperation in Europe and Eurasia. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report on the strategic framework within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The committee believes that a comprehensive strategic framework for security force assistance is important for building and maintaining the partner capacity of European and Eurasian forces. The committee recognizes and values the interoperability and combat gains made by European and Eurasian allied and partner forces, earned as a result of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and it does not want to see

these gains lost after the ISAF mission ends in December 2014. The committee believes the strategic framework should focus on those nations for which the Department of Defense has leveraged its building partnership capacity authorities, to include the Global Train and Equip, Warsaw Initiative Fund, and Global Security Contingency Fund authorities.

**Section 1247—Requirement of Department of Defense to Continue Implementation of United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally and Participation in Interagency Working Group**

This section would express the sense of Congress that combating violence against women and girls worldwide is critical to promoting regional and global stability and achieving sustainable peace and security. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on efforts by the Department of Defense relating to its participation in the interagency working group to implement the U.S. Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally, and to continue implementing the strategy as appropriate.

**Section 1248—Department of Defense Situational Awareness of Economic and Financial Activity**

This section would set forth a number of findings and require the Secretary of Defense to take such steps as necessary to improve the situational awareness capabilities of the Department of Defense regarding legal and licit business transactions of adversaries and potential adversaries, and to improve the ability of the Department to translate such capabilities into certain activities of the Department.

**Section 1249—Treatment of the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan Under the Immigration and Nationality Act**

This section would authorize the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General of the United States, or the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to exclude the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP) and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) from the definition of a terrorist organization in section 212(a)(3)(B)(vi)(III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(vi)(III)) for the purpose of issuing a temporary visa to a member of the KDP or PUK.

Additionally, this section would prohibit judicial review by any court that has jurisdiction to review any determinations made in accordance with the authority in this section.

**Section 1250—Prohibition on the Integration of Certain Missile Defense Systems**

The section would continue the prohibition enacted in section 233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014

(Public Law 113–66) regarding the use of Department of Defense funds to integrate the missile defense systems of the People’s Republic of China into the missile defense systems of the United States.

SUBTITLE F—REPORTS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

Section 1261—Report on “New Normal” and General Mission Requirements of United States Africa Command

This section would express a sense of Congress on the force structure and force posture of AFRICOM within the context of “New Normal” and its general mission requirements.

Following the terrorist attack against U.S. facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, the U.S. Government established a “New Normal” set of requirements and associated resourcing worldwide. The committee is aware that with the current force posture and structure of the U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM), the United States is accepting a high level of risk in defending U.S. posts that have been determined to be “high risk, high threat” as part of the “New Normal” requirements. Moreover, the committee is concerned that AFRICOM does not have sufficient assigned military forces; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets; crisis response forces; and enablers to meet the “New Normal” requirements.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than January 15, 2015, on how the “New Normal” has changed AFRICOM’s force posture and force structure requirements. The committee expects the report to include inputs and views from the Commander, U.S. Africa Command.

Section 1262—Report on Contractors with the Department of Defense That Have Conducted Significant Transactions with Iranian Persons or the Government of Iran

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that contains:

- (1) A list of each contractor with the Department of Defense that has conducted a significant transaction with an Iranian individual or corporation;
- (2) A list of each contractor with the Department that has conducted significant transactions with an Iranian individual or corporation whose property has been blocked by the United States Government during the 5-year period prior to the submission of this report; and
- (3) The value of such significant transactions.

The period for the annual report required by this section would not exceed 3 years.

#### Section 1263—Reports on Nuclear Program of Iran

This section would require the President to submit a report to Congress, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the interim agreement related to the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear program, including a verification of whether Iran is complying with such agreement and an assessment of the overall state of Iran's nuclear program.

Additionally, this section would require the President to submit additional reports to Congress on the nuclear program of Iran. If the interim agreement related to Iran's nuclear program is renewed or if a comprehensive agreement is entered into, the President is required to submit to Congress a report on such interim agreement or comprehensive agreement with the Government of Iran. These additional reports would be submitted to Congress not later than 90 days after a renewal of the interim agreement or 90 days after entering into a comprehensive agreement with the Government of Iran.

#### Section 1264—Sense of Congress on United States Presence and Cooperation in the Arabian Gulf Region to Deter Iran

This section would express the sense of Congress on the U.S. forward presence and cooperation in the region of the Arabian Gulf in order to deter the Islamic Republic of Iran. Elements of this section would include statements that the United States should: maintain a robust forward presence and posture in the Arabian Gulf; seek ways to support the security posture of Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries and the State of Israel; move funding of key strategic bases in the Arabian Gulf region into the Department of Defense's base budget; and seek to complete status of forces and defense agreements with GCC countries to support the defense of the Arabian Gulf.

Furthermore, this section would state that any comprehensive agreement with Iran regarding its nuclear program should address past and present issues of concern of the United States, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the United Nations Security Council. Additionally, this section would express that any comprehensive agreement should be agreed to by the United States only if: (1) Iran ceases enrichment of uranium; (2) Iran has ceased the pursuit, acquisition, and development of its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, its ballistic missiles, and ballistic missile launch technology, including verifiable dismantlement; and (3) the Government of Iran has ceased providing support for acts of international terrorism.

Finally, the sense of Congress would state that the United States should continue to put pressure on Iran's network of organizations that conduct malign activities, and the U.S. Government should not enter into a contract with any person or entity that has violated U.S. sanctions laws with respect to contracting with the Government of Iran.

Section 1265—Sense of Congress on Modernization of Defense Capabilities of Poland

The provision would express the sense of Congress that the Polish defense modernization program is an important opportunity to strengthen the U.S.-Poland bilateral relationship.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained \$365.1 million for fiscal year 2015, representing an decrease of \$163.3 million from the amount requested and authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2014. The request included \$20.7 million for the Global Nuclear Security (GNS) Program, \$256.8 million for CBEP, and \$40.7 million for the Proliferation Prevention Program (PPP).

The committee continues to support the goals of the CTR program and believes that the program is important to United States national security. In past years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have sometimes limited progress of the CTR program. The committee notes, however, that the CTR program has made significant achievements, and that much work remains to be done as new threats emerge. The committee is also aware of the Department's efforts to identify and streamline CTR authorities.

Congress has addressed these concerns in recent national defense authorization acts by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the former Soviet Union; increasing CTR funding, including funding for new CTR initiatives; requiring reports by the National Academy of Sciences and the Secretary of Defense on the development of new CTR initiatives and metrics; requiring a report by the Secretary of Defense regarding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project in the Russian Federation at Schuch'ye; requiring increased reporting from the Secretary of Defense on CTR defense and military contacts; providing CTR programs with authority for urgent threat reduction activities; authorizing the CTR program to accept international contributions; and ensuring that the CTR program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee notes that the CTR Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP) now encompasses 70 percent of the CTR budget request. The committee reaffirms its view, stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 111-491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, and reaffirmed in the two most recent committee reports accompanying the House of Representatives-passed national defense authorization acts, 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 com-

mittee 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 continues to believe that concrete metrics remain important for measuring the impact and effectiveness of CBEP activities. Lastly, the committee welcomes efforts by the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and to keep it fully informed of efforts and developments in these areas.

The committee recommends \$365.1 million, the amount of the budget request, for the CTR program. The committee believes that no CTR funds for fiscal year 2015 should be authorized for activities with the Russian Federation based on ongoing Russian aggression towards Ukraine. Therefore, the committee recommends \$17.7 million for the GNS Program, a decrease of \$3.0 million; \$254.3 million for CBEP, a decrease of \$2.4 million; and \$46.1 million for PPP, an increase of \$5.4 million.

#### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

##### Cooperative Biological Engagement Program

The budget request contained \$365.1 million for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program, of which \$256.8 million was requested for the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP). The committee notes that the CBEP share of the total CTR program budget continues to increase. The budget request would allocate 70 percent of the fiscal year 2015 CTR funds to CBEP as compared to the 40 percent that was allocated in fiscal year 2011.

The committee questions the focus on infrastructure projects that the CBEP continues to fund, with approximately \$34.7 million of CBEP’s budget request allocated towards laboratory construction and renovation in the former Soviet Union republics. While the committee supports the CBEP mission to build the capabilities and capacities of key partners to rapidly detect, investigate, report, and secure dangerous biological pathogens, it is concerned about the CBEP’s focus on building and renovating laboratories. The committee is aware of the program’s plan to phase out funding for these infrastructure projects in the next few years as the projects are completed. However, the committee believes that, in the current fiscal environment, the Department should focus its CTR resources on more efficient and effective means to build partnership capacities to counter biological weapons of mass destruction. The committee will continue to oversee these projects to ensure the CBEP is properly positioned to meet evolving biological threats, both in the region and around the world.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

##### Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would define the programs and funds that are Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act, and specify

that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

#### Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program from within the overall \$365.1 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 2015. This section would also require notifications to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2015 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 Threat Reduction Activities with Russian Federation

This section would limit Cooperative Threat Reduction fiscal year 2015 funding to the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Russia is respecting the sovereignty of Ukrainian territory, no longer acting inconsistently with the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and in compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. This section would include a waiver for the Secretary of Defense, pending a notification, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the appropriate congressional committees that such contact or cooperation is in the national security interest of the United States and a period of 30 days has elapsed following the notification.

## TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Progress on Determining Sufficient Working Capital Fund Cash Balances

The committee has been concerned for a number of years that the determination of prices and rates for Defense Working Capital Fund activities is driven by an arbitrary, outdated goal of maintaining 7 to 10 days of cash to sustain business operations. This metric cannot respond to changes related to external pressures such as fluctuations in commodity markets that are outside of the Department of Defense's control.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a report examining a range of alternative cash balance parameters by which the revolving funds could be managed to sustain a single rate or price to the customer throughout the fiscal year. Having found this report to be insufficient, the committee directed a study in section 1402 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) requiring an independent review of



each working capital fund within the Department to ascertain the appropriate cash corpus required to maintain good financial management of each fund. This study was thorough and informative but did not provide for change within management of the working capital funds. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2013, the committee responded by recommending that the Department modify its Financial Management Regulations to adjust the range of the cash corpus required for fuel-related working capital funds to mitigate the continued fluctuation of rates charged to the customer during the fiscal year.

The committee commends the Department for initiating processes to determine the correct cash corpus thresholds for each working capital fund. Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation 7000.14–R, Volume 2B, Chapter 9, 090103, Cash Management Policy, is under revision to require each activity to determine and justify its cash requirements in terms of mission and management factors, such as collection and disbursement cycles. The Department anticipates that cash requirements will vary by activity and anticipated workload levels. The new cash target range will support a number of requirements including the following:

- (1) Near-term operational requirements (formerly 7 to 10 days);
- (2) Capital investment program disbursements;
- (3) Any positive accumulating operating result budgeted for return to customers;
- (4) An amount of cash equal to undisbursed direct appropriations (lags over a 4-year period);
- (5) A commodity/market adjustment for cost changes;
- (6) Cash required for undelivered orders that will be delivered after the budget year;
- (7) Multiple disbursement cycles between collection cycles (for example, extra payroll cycle); and
- (8) Mitigation of risk/cash loss when implementing a business process change.

The committee looks forward to future budget submissions with prices and rates set to maintain an adequate cash balance to absorb external pressures, thereby maintaining a steady, dependable rate for the customer throughout the fiscal year.

#### Secure Sources of Materials Critical to National Security

In section 1412 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), the Congress provided authority for the National Defense Stockpile Manager to acquire six materials critical to national security, two of which were compounds of rare earth elements: dysprosium metal and yttrium oxide. The committee notes that foreign suppliers, historically, accounted for the majority of global production of these materials and have implemented multiple controls on the production and export of dysprosium metal and yttrium oxide.

Based upon research by the Department of Defense, new investment in the rare earth supply chain may have increased the availability of these materials from domestic sources. As the Department prepares to procure quantities of these materials for the Defense National Stockpile, the committee is concerned that market

dynamics may result in these materials being provided by historically foreign suppliers rather than from secure domestic sources. The committee encourages the National Defense Stockpile Manager to maximize the utilization of sources that refine dysprosium metal and yttrium oxide in the United States.

#### Upgrading Beryllium within the National Defense Stockpile

The committee notes that the existing National Defense Stockpile (NDS) for beryllium, a strategic and critical defense material, is presently not in a form which is usable within the defense supply chain. Viable sources of beryllium are only found in the United States and the Russian Federation. The committee continues to believe that military readiness requires continued quick access to beryllium. The committee recognizes the concerted effort on the part of the Department of Defense and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), which administers the NDS, to upgrade the beryllium stockpile. In its latest Annual Materials Plan, the DLA stated its plan to upgrade more than 17 short tons of beryllium material. The committee urges the DLA to upgrade this material quickly, thereby ensuring that the beryllium held in the NDS is capable of quick insertion into the defense supply chain, potentially mitigating supply chain risk.

In addition, the committee directs the Administrator of the National Defense Stockpile to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 1, 2014, on the progress of and future plans for the upgrade program for beryllium.

### 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—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 1403—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 1404—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 1405—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—Revisions to Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize revisions on limitations in asset sales contained in section 3303(a)(7) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), as most recently amended by section 1412(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), to increase the Department of Defense’s stockpile commodity disposal authority by \$50.0 million, and extend this authority from 2016 to 2019.

This section would further 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 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to increase the Department of Defense’s stockpile commodity disposal authority by \$20.0 million, and extend this authority from 2016 to 2019.

## SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

## Section 1421—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

## Section 1422—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize \$63.4 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2015.

## 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.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained no funding for National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment account. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee notes that the base budget request contained \$3.3 billion for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment.

The specific amount of resources, including equipment, needed to adequately sustain the National Guard and Reserve Component's operational reserve status remains a concern because of the fiscal environment, especially given the dual mission responsibility of the National Guard and Reserve Components, particularly the National Guard. The committee recognizes the National Guard and Reserve Components continue to report significant equipment shortages in modernized equipment.

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 to include single channel ground and airborne radio systems, non-system training devices, logistics automation systems, remote weapon stations, chemical/biological protective shelters, internal and external fuel tanks for rotorcraft, and other critical dual-use procurement items for the National Guard and Reserve Components.

The committee recommends additional funding for a National Guard and Reserve Component equipment account within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. The committee recommends \$3.3 billion, the full amount of the base budget request, 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 addition to amounts otherwise authorized in

this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

#### Section 1502—Procurement

This section would authorize an additional \$6.2 billion for procurement programs.

#### Section 1503—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize an additional \$64.0 billion for operation and maintenance programs, and \$635.0 million for maintaining, operating, and upgrading A–10 aircraft.

#### Section 1504—Military Personnel

This section would authorize an additional \$7.1 billion for military personnel.

#### Section 1505—Other Appropriations

This section would authorize an additional \$1.5 billion for the Defense Health Program, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, and National Guard and Reserve Equipment.

### SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

#### Section 1511—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 1512—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, REPORTS, AND OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 1521—Continuation of Existing Limitations on the Use of Funds in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would continue the existing limitations on the use of funds in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund subject to the conditions of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), through fiscal year 2015.

#### Section 1522—Use of and Transfer of Funds from Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would authorize various transfer authorities, reporting requirements, and other associated activities for the Joint Im-

provided Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Fund, as managed by the Joint IED Defeat organization.

## TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

### OVERVIEW

The committee has determined it necessary to reorganize title XVI to combine missile defense, nuclear forces, space, cyberspace, and intelligence sections within one title. These new subtitles have been rearranged from positions from past national defense authorization acts to now reflect the current title XVI.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Additional Homeland Missile Defense Interceptor Site

The committee notes that section 239 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) provided for certain briefings on the development of an additional homeland defense interceptor site and section 4201 of that Act provided \$20.0 million for planning activities related to such site.

The committee is also aware that on February 26, 2014, the Commander, U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) testified that:

”[T]he third site, if you built it, would give us better weapons access, it’d give us increased inventory and increased battle space with regards to a threat coming from the direction of the Middle East. So those are just facts. And that’s what it would give to the combatant commander—and that’s me—the one that’s accountable for the defense of the homeland from the ICBM threats . . . [Iran has] not stopped aspirational goals towards ICBM technologies. They have successfully put a missile—space vehicle into orbit, and that demonstrates the types of technologies that you need to develop an ICBM . . . I think it was very prudent to direct us—or the Missile Defense Agency—to do a site selection.”

The committee acknowledges the assessment of the Commander of NORTHCOM and therefore directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency (MDA), in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, to provide the House Committee on Armed Services briefings not less than every 90 days through the end of fiscal year 2015, and starting not later than September 15, 2014, on the following:

- (1) Progress updating the cost estimates provided to the committee in March 2012 for the additional homeland missile defense site;
- (2) Progress updating the Facility Requirement Documents, such as those developed for the ground-based interceptor site at Ft. Greely, Alaska, and the planned site in the Republic of Poland, also known as the Third Site, and other planning and designing processes related to the construction of an additional homeland missile defense interceptor site; and
- (3) Any additional matters they deem useful.

Furthermore, the committee directs the Director, MDA, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. NORTHCOM, not later than

September 15, 2014, to provide the congressional defense committees a written and unclassified assessment of which of the potential sites for a homeland missile defense site under consideration offers the best site for the defense of the homeland from intercontinental ballistic missiles from Iran and whether such site is different than the site determined by the Commander in his 2007/2008 homeland missile defense study (the 2007–2008 U.S. NORTHCOM Ground-based Interceptor Study).

#### Air Force Cyber

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2015 budget request is generally characterized by reductions in most mission areas except cyber. This trend is true across all the military services, including the Air Force. However, the committee believes that for the Air Force, it is particularly difficult to understand the breadth and depth of investment and focus in cyber given the dispersion of cyber manpower across multiple program areas and operating environments.

The committee is concerned that disaggregating the cyber workforce across multiple expenditure centers and projects in such a manner not only makes understanding the entirety of the cyber investment more difficult, it generates greater risk for suboptimizing the cyber workforce, increased unintentional redundancy in tasking, and challenges in managing operational roles and responsibilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Director of the National Security Agency, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate by February 16, 2015, that captures the aggregate Air Force investment in cyber, laying out where the various elements of Air Force cyber are nested, and how those elements are integrated within the overall Air Force and Department of Defense cyber enterprises. The report should focus both on the current laydown of personnel as well as the envisioned end-state manning construct. It should also include a discussion on how the Air Force has constructed the various operational chains of command within the service and between the service elements and United States Cyber Command.

#### Air Force Distributed Common Ground/Surface System

The Air Force Distributed Common Ground/Surface System (DCGS-AF) is a family of existing and planned systems providing multi-intelligence tasking, processing, exploitation, and dissemination capabilities at the Joint Task Force level and below. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2015 request for DCGS-AF totaled \$782.4 million and included over 7,600 personnel. Resident in the Processing and Exploitation expenditure center, DCGS-AF has traditionally been viewed in that functional context.

The committee is concerned that through the course of supporting combat operations over the past 12 years, DCGS-AF has begun to evolve beyond the intelligence processing and exploitation

functions to include single-intelligence and even multi-intelligence source analysis. The committee believes this presents an important opportunity for the Air Force to clarify the operational role of the DCGS-AF enterprise, taking every measure to ensure full coordination between enterprise elements and complete deconfliction of functions, tasking, and mission responsibilities where possible.

The committee is specifically concerned that initiatives like the DCGS-AF Analysis and Reporting Team (DART) System risk stepping beyond the appropriate functional boundaries for the system, unduly broadening the mission, and distracting the operational focus. However, the committee believes that the future Analysis and Targeting Wing must take full advantage of technical advances accomplished within the DCGS-AF as part of Air Force efforts to clarify and cement appropriate mission assignments across the intelligence enterprise.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by June 1, 2015, that describes the future of DCGS analytic and processing, exploitation, and dissemination responsibilities. The report should describe which intelligence functions, such as processing, exploitation, and analysis, should reside at the service intelligence centers, the Joint Intelligence and Operations Centers, and at DCGS-AF nodes. The report should outline a proposed Plan of Action and Milestone to execute the transformation to the stated end state, including anticipated costs and manpower requirements across the enterprise and a plan for satisfying those requirements.

#### Assessment of Foreign Nuclear Weapons Programs

As the United States embarks on a decades-long effort to recapitalize the nuclear deterrent, the committee believes a comprehensive assessment of foreign nuclear weapons programs would help inform decisions on policies, programs, and resources.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Department of Energy's Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence and the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency to submit a joint report to the congressional defense committees, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence by January 31, 2015, on foreign nuclear weapons programs. Such report should include a comprehensive assessment and description of current and developmental capabilities in foreign countries regarding nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. The report should also discuss nuclear doctrine and employment strategy, nuclear explosive and subcritical testing, advanced nuclear weapon research programs, the number of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, and other matters as the Directors determine appropriate. Such report should be unclassified to the maximum extent consistent with the protection of classified information, but should also have classified annexes at the appropriate levels of classification.



### Biometrics for Identity and Access Management

The committee is aware that the Joint Information Environment is developing a reference architecture for identity and access management. Currently, for enterprise applications, this is done through the use of passwords and common access cards. As the Department of Defense moves to a future architecture for security and identity management, the committee believes that the Department should look at ways to integrate biometrics capability into that architecture for improved two-factor authentication.

Additionally, the committee believes that the Department should examine the possibility of implementing enterprise-scale biometric enrollment solutions in order to gain efficiencies and better secure sensitive data. As the Department has already transitioned from the collection of fingerprints on ink and paper cards to electronic fingerprints for the conduct of background checks, the committee believes that further improvements can be achieved by leveraging web-enabled submission technologies.

#### Briefing and Report on the Implementation of the Secretary of Defense's Plans for Cruise Missile Defense of the United States

The committee shares the concerns of the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, who testified on February 26, 2014, about the rising threat of cruise missile attack on the United States homeland and commends the Department of Defense for beginning to address this threat in an affordable manner. The Commander testified that:

“[W]e’ve been directed by the Secretary to ensure that we are also looking at how to provide effective defense against cruise missiles in a way that outpaces any threats, to include Russians . . . and that’s a three-phased approach that’s been approved by the Pentagon. And it starts with getting the national capital region right. And right now, we’re going through a test phase where two things have been added or are being added to the national capital region—the stateside affordable radar, in conjunction with a joint elevated net sensor, the JLENS balloons. And what they’re trying to accomplish is integrating that into an overall defensive plan that allows us to see, detect, track, warn and in the future hopefully engage cruise missiles that could pose a threat to the national capital region. Then the issue will be if the cruise missile threat continues to evolve, how do we then take and export that capability where we think we might need it to defend other strategically or critical infrastructure locations in the United States and Canada.”

The committee supported the Secretary of Defense’s plan in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). However, the committee is concerned that the Secretary’s plan is in danger of not being executed in only its second year of implementation. The committee is aware that the Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Organization had been responsible for implementation and funding for the initial capability in fiscal year 2014, but that responsibility is shifting to a military service in fiscal year 2015. The committee is aware that at least two of the key programs in the Secretary’s plan are not funded by

the responsible military service in the first year of its responsibility for doing so.

However, to more fully understand the impacts of the fiscal year 2015 budget request, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than June 30, 2014, explaining the impacts on the Secretary's cruise missile defense plan of the potential delays included in the fiscal year 2015 budget request and how the Chairman believes these potential delays can be avoided, including through re-programming actions if necessary.

The committee directs the Chairman, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, and such other persons or agencies he deems expedient, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report not later than February 1, 2015, that includes the following: an identification of the longer-term coordination challenges within the Department of Defense and the federal government concerning other government radar assets that could be useful to this mission and a plan to ensure their availability; an identification of any air space challenges that may be present at a more advantageous geographic location for defense of the national capital region and a plan to address them; views of, and recommendations from, the North American Air Domain Awareness Surveillance (NAADAS) Analysis of Alternatives (AoA); and a recommendation for the designation of a responsible Departmental authority to coordinate planning for the cruise missile defense mission and acquisition of related military capabilities.

#### Briefing on Funding Modernization of the Nuclear Deterrent

Given the long timeframes and costs associated with programs to modernize the nation's nuclear deterrent, the committee believes it is imperative that such efforts be based upon sound long-term planning. The nation is embarking upon a decades-long effort to modernize a nuclear deterrent that last saw major recapitalization in the 1980s. These current and future efforts include life extension of nuclear warheads, development and procurement of new delivery systems (ballistic missile submarines, nuclear-capable bombers, dual-capable tactical aircraft, cruise missiles, and ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles), modernization of nuclear command and control systems, and construction of new nuclear infrastructure.

In a 2013 report, the Congressional Budget Office estimated the cost of operating, sustaining, and modernizing the nuclear triad over the next decade at approximately \$355.0 billion. While the Department of Defense's estimate contained in the reports submitted pursuant to section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) is lower, the committee notes that this report did not include expected costs for the new bomber or replacement intercontinental ballistic missiles because of uncertainty in these programs' direction. The committee is pleased that the Department plans to include rough estimates for these costs in its next report, and encourages the Department to make

its assumptions clear to enable consistent comparisons between various cost estimates.

The committee is aware that many of the planned nuclear programs are expected to enter service in the 2030s, and is aware of significant production and funding challenges to successfully execute this important recapitalization effort. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than October 31, 2014, on the Department's process for planning, prioritizing, and estimating costs for sustaining and modernizing the nuclear triad beyond the current 10-year reporting requirement. This briefing should include relevant measures to ensure that these plans are executable and cost-effective, and discussion of the challenges associated with such very-long-term planning.

#### Briefing on Number of B61-12 Nuclear Gravity Bombs to Be Produced

The committee notes the value of providing a credible extended nuclear deterrent to U.S. allies. The committee recognizes that the ongoing B61 Life Extension Program (LEP) will produce B61-12 nuclear gravity bombs to contribute to both extended deterrence and the U.S. strategic deterrent. The committee believes the number of B61-12 bombs to be produced by the LEP must be appropriately sized to meet the requirements of extended and strategic deterrence, and should be informed by geopolitical developments in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere around the world.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, the Commander of U.S. European Command, the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, and the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide a briefing to the committee by January 15, 2015, on the analysis and requirements that have informed the determination of the number of B61-12 bombs to be produced by the LEP. This briefing should include analysis regarding the number required to provide a credible extended deterrent to U.S. allies around the world, the number required for forward-deployment and to be available for forward-deployment, the number required for the U.S. strategic deterrent, and a timeframe for when a final decision must be made regarding the total number of B61-12s to be produced by the LEP.

#### Briefing on Plutonium Strategy

The committee directs the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, in consultation with the Administrator for Nuclear Security, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by September 15, 2014, on the costs, benefits, risks, challenges, opportunities, requirements, and potential impacts on other programs associated with pursuing a plutonium strategy that achieves a pit production capacity of 50 to 80 plutonium pits per year in 2027 as compared to a strategy that achieves such capacity in 2031.

## Comptroller General Assessment of U.S. Cyber Command

The committee notes that according to the Secretary of Defense, cyberspace is the new terrain for warfare where adversaries seek to do harm to the Nation, the economy, and its citizens. Adversaries, such as nations, insiders, terrorists, criminal groups, hackers, and other individuals and organizations, use an array of cyber tactics that could threaten our nation's security. The unique nature of cyber-based attacks can vastly enhance their reach and impact. To address these threats, the Department of Defense established U.S. Cyber Command as a sub-unified command under U.S. Strategic Command.

In 2010 and 2011, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the Department's and U.S. Cyber Command's efforts could benefit from additional detail and clarity and that they had not fully defined long-term mission requirements and desired capabilities to guide the military services' efforts to recruit, train, and provide forces with appropriate skill sets. In 2014, GAO also reported on the Department's planning efforts to maintain continuity of operations in a degraded cyber environment.

U.S. Cyber Command achieved full operational capability in October 2010, and is currently responsible for planning, coordinating, integrating, synchronizing, and conducting activities to direct the operations and defense of specified Department of Defense information networks, and to prepare to conduct full spectrum military cyberspace operations, when directed, to enable actions in all domains and ensure U.S. and allied freedom of action in cyberspace while denying the same to our adversaries. As U.S. Cyber Command continues to develop and grow, it is essential that it does so as efficiently and effectively as possible. Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2015, on the organization, missions, and authorities of U.S. Cyber Command and its operational relationship with the geographic combatant commands. This report should include a review of the existing organizational structure of the U.S. Cyber Command, including the extent to which:

- (1) The Department has clearly defined U.S. Cyber Command's mission, responsibilities, and authorities;
- (2) U.S. Cyber Command's organization, personnel, and structure support cyberspace operations and leverage relationships with the combatant commands, military services, and defense while minimizing potential overlap or duplication of effort;
- (3) U.S. Cyber Command coordinates and supports the operations and activities of the geographic combatant commands, including identifying the offensive and defensive cyber rules of engagement for U.S. Cyber Command and geographic combatant commands and conducting assessments to identify needed cyber capabilities; and
- (4) Effective coordination mechanisms have been established between U.S. Cyber Command and other Federal agencies that have a role in cyberspace operations.

### Comptroller General Assessment on Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

Airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) systems provide critical insight to the warfighter across the spectrum of operations from combat to peacetime. Commanders of the combatant commands recognize the advantages that ISR provides, and therefore have significant demand and requirements for the use of these platforms in their areas of operation. The military departments must balance the warfighter requirements and overall investments to meet a broader defense strategy. Addressing the appropriate level of ISR capacity and capability appears to be a significant and recurring challenge for the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the processes by which the Department determines its airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance investments and balances capability and capacity in order to meet commanders of the combatant commands' critical ISR requirements. The Comptroller General should provide a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by February 1, 2015. The report should address the extent to which the Department of Defense has the necessary:

- (1) Risk and resource management structures in place to validate, prioritize, and address airborne ISR collection requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands;
- (2) Airborne ISR capabilities to meet current intelligence requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands;
- (3) Airborne ISR investment strategy, including the appropriate capability and capacity of platforms and sensors relative to current and anticipated intelligence requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands; and
- (4) Any related matters the Comptroller General finds appropriate.

### Comptroller General Evaluation on Department of Defense Efforts to Protect Information and Systems from Insider Threats

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has implemented a number of measures, both technical and administrative, to try to mitigate the threat from privileged insiders. That process began with the unauthorized disclosures from Bradley Manning, but clearly gaps continue to exist that have been exploited by Edward Snowden. The committee remains concerned that the Department's efforts have not been comprehensive enough or implemented swiftly enough to get ahead of the problem. The committee is also concerned that the Department does not have an adequate baseline or rigorous metrics to assess the effectiveness or performance of the measures that are in place.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2015, evaluating the Department's efforts at protecting against insider threats. This report should address the following issues:

- (1) To what extent has the Department assessed and mitigated for the threat, vulnerabilities, and consequences that insiders pose

to Department of Defense information and systems the Department uses?

(2) To what extent has the Department developed and implemented an insider threat detection and prevention program consistent with guidance and standards developed by the Insider Threat Task Force?

(3) To what extent have lessons learned from prior insider threat incidents been incorporated into the Department's insider threat detection and prevention program?

(4) Has the Department reached out to other Federal agencies, foreign governments, or the private sector to identify best practices and lessons learned with regard to insider threats; and to what extent have those best practices and lessons learned been incorporated into the Department's insider threat detection and prevention program?

(5) How well has the Department been performing on the assessments, both self-assessments and external assessments, called for in Executive Order 13587; and to what extent has the Department developed corrective action plans to address the findings in a timely manner?

(6) What additional areas need to be addressed, either by technical systems or additional policies?

#### Comptroller General Review of Nuclear Weapons Council

The role of the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC) established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (Public Law 99-661) has evolved with time and national needs. Today, the NWC's primary responsibilities focus on coordination and joint decisionmaking between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy with respect to U.S. nuclear weapon policies, programs, schedules, and budgets.

Over the past several years, the NWC has considered and approved a series of actions, programs, and plans for the future of the U.S. nuclear weapons program that have shortly thereafter been thwarted by Department of Energy resource constraints and differing priorities. This tension has been exacerbated by Department of Energy's increasing reliance on annual budget authority transfers from Department of Defense (totaling over \$1.0 billion each year) to accomplish its nuclear modernization mission. Recent defense authorization bills have sought to provide the NWC greater insight into Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration budget and budgeting process, but coordination and transparency problems remain apparent.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015, containing an assessment of the Nuclear Weapons Council's role, responsibilities, and effectiveness in coordinating Department of Defense and Department of Energy policies, programs, schedules, and budgets for developing, sustaining, and modernizing nuclear delivery systems, nuclear weapons, and their supporting infrastructure. The Comptroller General should assess: (1) the authorities and responsibilities of the NWC; (2) the decision-making processes and procedures of the NWC and its subordinate committees; and (3) the ability of the NWC to implement, oversee,

and ensure its decisions are successfully executed. The Comptroller General's report should include recommendations to the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, or matters for congressional consideration, as appropriate, to improve the effectiveness of the NWC.

#### Conventional Prompt Strike Capability Research, Development, and Acquisition

The committee is aware that in testimony before it on April 2, 2014, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command stated:

“Conventional Prompt Strike (CPS) capability offers the opportunity to rapidly engage high-value targets without resorting to nuclear options. CPS could provide precision and responsiveness in Anti-Access Area Denial environments while simultaneously minimizing unintended military, political, environmental, economic, or cultural consequences. I support continuing research and development of these important capabilities.”

The committee agrees. The committee recognizes the success of the Army's Advanced Hypersonic Weapon (AHW) test conducted on November 17, 2011, though it notes the failures of the Hypersonic Technology Vehicle tests. The committee is also aware of the planned flight test 2 of the AHW technology development system that will demonstrate operationally suitable ranges and performance as well as additional technologies needed to support continued development of this capability.

The committee is aware that following flight test 2, the Department of Defense plans to examine the feasibility of deploying a hypersonic prompt strike weapon on a submarine platform. The committee believes it is prudent to undertake these efforts but is concerned about the budget sufficiency to do so. The committee is also concerned that there is no clear development path of an Army system. The committee believes that a third flight test of the AHW system could provide useful information to inform decisions about such a development path.

The committee is also concerned that with the budget request for fiscal year 2015, and the Future Years Defense Program, there is not sufficient funding requested and planned for the transition of this technology to a military service for a full-scale development and acquisition program when the technology has reached appropriate maturity.

The committee notes that the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review stated that the Administration planned to deploy these capabilities, “while not negatively affecting the stability of our nuclear relationships with Russia or China.” The committee agrees with this policy. The committee also notes that it directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on any policy considerations concerning any potential ambiguity problems regarding the launch of a conventionally armed missile from submarine platforms and any potential verification measures that may be pursued in the Joint Explanatory Statement (Committee Print No.2) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. The committee has not yet received this directed report; it expects to receive a detailed understanding of how the Department plans to

evaluate and resolve these potential problems, including potential cooperative measures.

The committee is also concerned that there does not appear to be an Army development program in the Department's plans, notwithstanding the fact that the only success the United States has seen with these technologies is the Army's AHW demonstrator. The committee believes it is prudent to consider whether a third flight test of the AHW could contribute to the Department's understanding of the feasibility of an Army development path.

The committee therefore directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, jointly with the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2015, that includes the following: a detailed plan for the future of CPS, including an estimated timeline for completion of current research and development activities and associated projected cost; a determination about which additional strategic infrastructure technologies and enabling capabilities may be required to support CPS; opportunities for inter-service collaboration in development of common technology; opportunities and efforts to transition technologies developed under this program to current and future weapons systems; a date by which CPS programs will be transitioned to military services for full development and acquisition; an assessment of the utility of a third AHW flight test; an assessment of the key technologies that could be demonstrated through a third development test; and, an updated assessment of threat for which the military requirement for this capability was validated.

#### Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation Review of Missile Defense Agency Tests and Targets Efficiencies

The committee is aware that the budget request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program contains significant and meaningful efficiencies in the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) ballistic missile tests and targets programs. The committee commends the efforts of the Director, MDA to achieve these hundreds of millions of dollars in savings by the measures proposed and believes these funds can and should be reinvested into important modernization programs for the ballistic missile defense system.

To support the Director, MDA, the committee directs the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE), in coordination with the Director, MDA, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 31, 2014, detailing the views of the Director, CAPE on the likelihood that the proposed efficiencies in MDA's test and targets programs can be realized and the Director's views as to whether there are opportunities to achieve further efficiencies in fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program.

#### Defense Industrial Base Information Sharing for Cybersecurity

The committee notes that the Department of Defense maintains a program of information sharing with its defense industrial base (DIB) known as the DIB Information Assurance/Computer Security program. The committee is aware that this program has been suc-



cessfully sharing classified government threat information with its industrial base, and has been expanding its network of voluntary partners of the past few years. The committee believes that the Department continues to prioritize efforts to help secure the networks and information systems of DIB companies, and that continued attention by Department leadership is needed to ensure that defense industrial base companies are making the maximum possible effort toward protecting their systems. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Department to recognize and account for participation in relevant cybersecurity information-sharing structures to the greatest extent possible when making procurement decisions.

#### Defense Intelligence Priorities

As part of both the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community (IC), the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) is dually tasked with providing intelligence collection, analysis, and support specifically responsive to the Department of Defense as well as national requirements established through the National Intelligence Priorities Framework (NIPF). The committee believes that both roles are critical, but can be difficult to balance. The committee also understands that measuring satisfaction of NIPF requirements may be easier than measuring the satisfaction of Department-specific requirements. In part, the committee believes this is due to difficulties with identifying Department-specific requirements in a holistic manner.

Section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) requires the Secretary of Defense to establish a written policy governing the internal coordination and prioritization of intelligence priorities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments to improve identification of the intelligence needs of the Department of Defense. Given this new policy, the committee directs the Director, DIA, to provide an assessment to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by October 1, 2014, of the following:

- (1) A specific description of how the new policy is being implemented in terms of driving and focusing DIA intelligence efforts to support the Department;
- (2) How efforts to incorporate the new policy are being balanced with DIA's responsibilities pursuant to the NIPF;
- (3) The extent to which any other Department of Defense or IC policies or guidance impact DIA's implementation of the new policy; and
- (4) Any recommendations to further improve the Department's identification of its specific requirements and DIA's ability to respond to such requirements.

#### Directed Energy for Missile Defense

The committee is concerned with the fiscal year 2015 budget request for Missile Defense Agency (MDA) directed energy. The committee is also concerned that MDA has chosen to focus the limited funds included in the budget request for directed energy on two technologies, which may not in fact be the most promising tech-

nologies for multiple aspects of the missile defense mission. While the committee supports the MDA's focus on directed energy applications for the missile defense sensing mission, it does not believe it is appropriate to focus only on those applications.

The committee is aware of the progress being made by the U.S. Army and the U.S. Navy with testing, including field testing, of directed energy systems to destroy threats. The committee is also aware of cutting-edge work being done elsewhere in the Department of Defense. The committee notes that MDA pursued development of a megawatt class laser and had a successful test against a ballistic missile threat, though the program experienced technical challenges and delays. MDA has largely abandoned near-term development of its non-sensing directed energy efforts.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, in cooperation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and the Director, Missile Defense Agency, to provide a roadmap to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than January 15, 2015, covering the development and deployment of missile defense technologies dealing with the destruction of threat ballistic missiles.

#### E4-B and Assessments on Nuclear Command and Control

In a January 2014 report to Congress required by the committee's report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Air Force described the history and way ahead for sustainment of the E4-B fleet. The report described several abortive attempts to initiate a replacement program for the aging E4-B fleet, as well as the increasingly difficult and costly efforts to sustain and recapitalize E4-B systems. Plans for replacement of the E4-B have been delayed largely because of uncertainty in future concepts of operations (CONOPs) for nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) National Military Command System (NMCS) airborne fleets. The January 2014 report describes several efforts underway, and scheduled for completion by late-summer 2014, that are examining and defining NC3 requirements, architectures, and CONOPs. The committee believes these efforts must be completed expeditiously to inform critical decisions regarding the nation's NC3 system, including potential replacement of the E4-B system.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to submit to the congressional defense committees by November 15, 2014, the reports resulting from the ongoing capabilities-based assessment of the nuclear command and control system and the mission area analysis of the NC3 NMCS airborne fleet.

#### Encrypted Key Delivery

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is developing a system called the Key Management Infrastructure (KMI) which is designed to provide secure and interoperable cryptographic key generation, distribution, and management capabilities. When fully deployed, KMI will provide a means for the secure

ordering, generation, production, distribution, management, and auditing of cryptographic products, and will replace the legacy Electronic Key Management System.

The committee also understands that the National Security Agency, which is developing KMI, is utilizing its Commercial Communications Security Endorsement Program to look at commercial solutions that might supplement or be integrated into KMI. The committee encourages the Department to take advantage of existing solutions in the private sector in order to meet the encrypted key delivery requirements of the future. The committee believes that such solutions can be helpful in reducing the time, cost, and manpower used in key distribution and rekeying operations for current systems.

#### Fielding of Global Positioning System Military Code

The committee fully supports investments to the Global Positioning System (GPS) to maintain U.S. military preeminence in positioning, navigation, and timing. In particular, the Department of Defense is working to field the military code (M-code), which is a capability designed to provide improved resistance to existing and emerging threats, to include jamming.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee noted its concern that the current schedule for GPS III spacecraft, Next Generation Operational Control System, and the user equipment is not aligned. The committee believes that this is still a valid concern. The committee also notes the requirements stated in section 913 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) requiring the Department to purchase M-code capable user equipment during the fiscal years after fiscal year 2017.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2015, on the progress the Department is making in deploying an M-code capability. This assessment should include current and planned investments; whether key milestones are being met; the projected ability to meet the requirements in section 913 of Public Law 111–383; and an identification of the challenges that GPS faces and possible recommendations on how to make the program more successful in delivering M-code capabilities.

#### Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests for Trident II D5 Missiles

In the fiscal year 2015 budget request, the Navy has proposed, as a cost savings measure, a reduction in the number of Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests (FCET) for Trident II D5 missiles in fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016. While the committee supports the Navy's efforts to find efficiencies wherever possible, the committee cautions that such efficiencies must not come at the expense of critical operational testing needed to ensure the reliability of the nuclear deterrent. The committee expects this reduction in

testing to be temporary and encourages the Navy to return to a full FCET testing schedule in fiscal year 2017.

#### Geospatial Intelligence for Disadvantaged Users

The committee is aware of the stated National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) strategic goal to provide online, on-demand access to geospatial-intelligence knowledge. However, in contrast to online products, the committee notes the importance of NGA's continued support to combat forces operating in disconnected, intermittent, and limited bandwidth operational environments. While current programs are addressing this requirement, a strategic plan for this area has yet to be developed for software tools.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, in coordination with the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer, to jointly provide a briefing to House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2014, on a joint plan to address the relevant combat forces requirements for software tools to efficiently and cost-effectively access national geospatial-intelligence data in disconnected, intermittent, and/or limited bandwidth environments.

#### Global Positioning System Denied Environments

The committee notes that many military assets such as aircraft, missiles, ground vehicles, and dismounted troops rely on the Global Positioning System (GPS) for accurate position and time information. If GPS is unavailable, such as by malfunction or enemy jamming action, then alternative sources of navigation data must be available for mission completion. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to review potential technologies to improve the military's ability to address this challenge.

#### Global Positioning System Replenishment

The committee is aware of the Air Force's most recent plan to delay the procurement and launch of Global Positioning System (GPS) III constellation satellites. While the committee is aware that the Air Force may have made some technical changes to enable better power management of on-orbit satellites, this does not affect the overall constellation fragility as characterized by factors such as satellite age and technical state of internal redundancy or lack thereof. The committee is concerned with the revised Air Force plan and has not seen any detailed analysis to support the significant changes to the schedule.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by November 1, 2014, on the Global Positioning System satellite constellation and replenishment plan. The GPS plan should address the following:

- (1) Current satellite and launch vehicle acquisition schedule;
- (2) Cost advantages and disadvantages of maintaining a satellite and launch vehicle acquisition schedule as planned in the fiscal year 2014 President's budget, as compared to the current schedule;
- (3) Age, design life, and technical state of all on-orbit assets;

- (4) Calculated functional availability as identified with planned launches;
- (5) Risk assessment of not meeting the required functional availability;
- (6) Options to lower the risk assessment, to include faster replenishment of satellites;
- (7) National security impact if the necessary capability is not provided; and
- (8) Risks of further schedule delays to the planned satellite and launch schedule.

#### High Capacity Satellite Communications

The committee is aware of the growing satellite communications needs of the Department of Defense. According to the fiscal year 2013 report from the Defense Business Board (DBB) titled, "Taking Advantage of Opportunities for Commercial Satellite Communications Services," the DBB states, "as the demand for service increases in the future, the cost of communications satellite services purchased by Defense Information Systems Agency is projected to grow to \$3B–\$5B over the next 15 years."

The committee believes that the use of modern technologies, such as high capacity communications satellites, may provide cost-effective bandwidth options to meet the Department's growing communications requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 15, 2014, on the potential use of modern technologies, such as high capacity communications satellites, to address the Department's requirements, and whether existing satellite communications acquisition processes and authorities are conducive to acquiring such technologies.

#### Human Intelligence Training Joint Center of Excellence

The committee is aware of the Human Intelligence Training Joint Center of Excellence at Fort Huachuca. The committee supports this joint activity to help reduce costs, foster better inter-service relationships, and improve the quality of training across the services.

The committee recommends continued funding of this program to improve interoperability and increased efficiency across the Department of Defense.

#### Information Assurance Training and Certification

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its ongoing efforts related to providing certifications to personnel responsible for Information Assurance (IA) activities pursuant to Department of Defense Directive (DODD) 8570, which establishes the policy and assigns the responsibilities for Department IA training, certification, and workforce management. Furthermore, the committee is aware that the Department may be looking at making adjustments to this policy to update it with current considerations related to cyber training standards that are in development. The com-

mittee believes that as this policy evolves, it should leverage the successes of DODD 8570 as the foundation for any future policy.

As the Department evolves to address its future cyber and IA workforce training needs, the committee also understands the importance of testing to verify skills, which raises the effectiveness of information technology and cyber professionals and can help identify gaps in training. The committee therefore encourages the Department to make testing which leads to certifications available for trainees, as needed, in order to improve and continuously evaluate the cyber and IA workforce.

#### Inspector General Review of the Activities Supporting the Joint Information Environment

The committee has been monitoring progress on the Department of Defense's Joint Information Environment (JIE) for several years. The committee is aware that the Department does not consider JIE to be a program of record, but is a coordinating framework for other programs of record in the Department. The committee is concerned that without a strong architectural foundation, many acquisition decisions are being made by the military services and Department of Defense agencies without sufficient planning and rigor to ensure that there is transparency and competition in the process. The committee is aware of at least one instance in which the Air Force, despite a court ruling, failed to adhere to necessary contracting and Federal Acquisition Regulation requirements. The committee believes that the current process for contracting components of the JIE lends itself to an over-reliance on sole-source or brand-names contracts, or other decisions made for expediency over competition.

Therefore, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to review Department of Defense noncompetitive information technology contracts to determine whether they were properly justified as sole source, and to provide a briefing on the results of the review to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by March 1, 2015. The review should look at a sample of noncompetitive information technology contracts in fiscal years 2013–14, and review of these contracts should determine whether the Department is overly reliant on sole-source, brand-name or other contract types that bypass competition requirements.

#### Investments for Joint Information Environment Activities

As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee has been monitoring progress on the Department of Defense's Joint Information Environment (JIE) for several years. The committee is aware JIE is an ambitious initiative to consolidate its information infrastructure, but is considered a coordinating framework for other programs of record in the Department and not a program of record itself. However, the committee recognizes that many existing acquisition programs influence, or are influenced by, the architectural framework being developed by the Department of Defense, in close coordination with each of the military services and defense agencies.

The committee is concerned, however, that the Department cannot readily indicate which programs are affected by the standards and processes being developed for JIE. The committee believes that JIE cannot be effective if the Department does not understand the span of all programs falling under the rubric of JIE, which will effect resourcing, development, manpower, testing, and evaluation. Therefore, the committee directs the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2015, that identifies all of the major funded activities within each of the military services and defense agencies that currently contribute to JIE, as well as the funding across the Future Years Defense Program, and an integrated master schedule with major milestones for all of the indicated programs.

#### Kestrel Eye Joint Capability Technology Demonstration

The committee fully supports the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command program called Kestrel Eye. Kestrel Eye is a Joint Capability Technology Demonstration of a nanosatellite-class imagery satellite that is designed for tactical ground forces. The satellite will provide the warfighter, in the field, a capability to directly task and receive operational data from a space-based collection system. The imagery intelligence will support rapid situational awareness.

The committee is aware that this is a technology demonstration in development and has not launched into orbit yet. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to find a suitable space launch opportunity to enable the Army to complete a military utility assessment to evaluate the operational value of this capability.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, within 180 days of initial operating capability, on the military utility assessment of Kestrel Eye.

#### Long Range Discriminating Radar for Homeland Missile Defense

Section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), directed the Director, Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to deploy a long-range discriminating radar (LRDR) against long-range ballistic missile threats from the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and authorized \$30.0 million for that purpose.

In the budget request for fiscal year 2015, \$79.5 million was also requested for this purpose. As the MDA’s fiscal year 2015 budget overview states, “the new LRDR is a mid-course tracking radar that will provide persistent sensor coverage and improve discrimination capabilities against threats to the homeland from the Pacific theater. This new radar also will give the Sea-Based X-Band (SBX) radar more geographic deployment flexibility for contingency and test use.”

The committee recalls that section 235 of Public Law 113–66 also requires a plan be developed for such contingency deployment, including on the East Coast of the United States against the poten-

tial long-range ballistic missile threat from the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee looks forward to receiving this report in June 2014.

The committee supports the LRDR approach and intends to provide careful oversight over the technology and site selection processes for what the Future Years Defense Program indicates will be a nearly \$1.0 billion program.

The committee is aware that the National Academy of Sciences report, "Making Sense of Ballistic Missile Defense: An Assessment of Concepts and Systems for U.S. Boost-Phase Missile Defense in Comparison to Other Alternatives," recommended one potential sensor architecture. The committee also recalls that in a study conducted by the Director, Missile Defense Agency in response to the committee report (H. Rept. 112-479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, it was clear that employing current technology, like the ground-based radar-prototype, could be highly affordable and effective. The committee expects the Director to consider these and other options.

The committee is also concerned that this necessary, \$1 billion investment will be borne entirely by the Missile Defense Agency when, it is likely that the missile defense mission will consume very little of the LRDR's actual operational employment. The committee understands that missile defense will, by necessity, be the priority mission; however, it is expected that space situational awareness and other applications will likely be the primary operating mode.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Air Force Space Command and any other appropriate United States government agency, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees prior to setting the requirements for the LRDR, and not later than January 1, 2015, detailing how those requirements will be optimized to perform missions including missile defense sensor coverage, space situational awareness, and other missions of interest to the United States. The committee believes that there is also the opportunity for cost-sharing of the costs of such radar design and operation and expects the report coordinated by the Director among these agencies will include an assessment of that opportunity. The committee is aware that the U.S. Air Force is making significant investments in space situational awareness and believes there exists the opportunity in this nascent MDA acquisition effort to realize significant efficiencies for the American taxpayer.

The committee further directs the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than January 31, 2015, detailing the requirement for space situational awareness coverage and how the LRDR fits into that coverage requirement and may enable a change in current plans to take advantage of this added capability.

#### Metrics of Trust in Cybersecurity

The committee is aware of the challenges associated with communication between the U.S. Government and commercial industry in response to cybersecurity threats. The committee encourages the



Department of Defense to continue to research and develop metrics of trust in dynamic adversarial and cooperative networks including the military and commercial industry in order to promote timely and effective cybersecurity measures.

#### Military Intelligence Program and Defense Input to the National Intelligence Program

In addition to describing responsibilities with regard to the Military Intelligence Program, section 3038 of title 50, United States Code, describes the Secretary of Defense's responsibilities regarding the National Intelligence Program. Section 3038 requires the Secretary of Defense to "ensure that the budgets of the elements of the intelligence community within the Department of Defense are adequate to satisfy the overall intelligence needs of the Department of Defense, including the needs of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of the unified and specified commands and, wherever such elements are performing government-wide functions, the needs of other departments and agencies." Further, section 3038 requires the Secretary of Defense to "ensure that the elements of the intelligence community within the Department of Defense are responsive and timely with respect to satisfying the needs of operational military forces." The Secretary also has specific statutory authorities relating to individual elements of the intelligence community that are part of the Department of Defense.

Within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI) is largely responsible for fulfilling these statutory responsibilities on behalf of the Secretary and plays a critical role in ensuring that the intelligence needs of the warfighter are addressed. Specifically, the USDI has taken the lead role in establishing the new policy required by section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to govern the internal coordination and prioritization of intelligence priorities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments to improve identification of the intelligence needs of the Department of Defense.

Thus, the committee directs the USDI to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by October 1, 2014, that contains a detailed description of how the new policy regarding Department of Defense intelligence priorities has been integrated into resourcing deliberations and planning for the Military Intelligence Program, and how the new policy has been integrated into USDI's representation of the Department of Defense in resourcing deliberations and planning for the National Intelligence Program.

#### Missile Defense Applications for Electro-Magnetic Rail Gun Technology

The committee applauds the work of the Navy and the Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO) to develop an electro-magnetic rail gun that could be capable of use as a more affordable air and missile defense option. The committee is mindful that a significant body of

work and technology maturation remains to be completed before a thorough evaluation of this technology's suitability for air and missile defense is possible.

The committee is concerned that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has been largely relegated to a minor, supporting role in the evaluation of rail gun technology thus far. The committee is aware that MDA has been granted significant exemptions from Department of Defense acquisition processes precisely to empower the agency to provide for the rapid development and fielding of cutting edge technology to defend the United States, its allies, and deployed forces from threat ballistic missiles. This exemption for MDA was reaffirmed in the Ballistic Missile Defense Review of 2010. The committee notes the value of cutting-edge and nimble development and acquisition to satisfy air and missile defense requirements, as well as the operational requirements of the combatant commanders, and it hopes MDA is still capable of such development and acquisition efforts.

The committee is also aware of the assumption of technical authority over Integrated Air and Missile Defense by MDA; and the committee believes this is a powerful opportunity to synergize efforts across the Department of Defense.

The committee has been briefed by SCO and MDA on the path ahead for evaluating rail gun technology for the air and missile defense mission, and believes that rigorous testing is vital to that evaluation. The committee is concerned that the current test schedule creates the potential for progress to stall in fiscal year 2016 if SCO funding ends for this test program and MDA has not had sufficient test data to evaluate the technology for development as part of the ballistic missile defense system and inclusion in the budget request for fiscal year 2016.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Director, Strategic Capabilities Office, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than November 15, 2014, that details the following:

- (1) An agreed upon series of test events to determine the suitability of this technology for transfer to MDA for further development activity, including test exit criteria that should be met to warrant its transition;

- (2) Funding required in fiscal year 2016 and future years to undertake that test activity (beyond those funds already provided by SCO);

- (3) Opportunities to use existing MDA test events and assets to evaluate features of a rail gun system; and

- (4) Opportunities to leverage other military service development and test activities to ensure the most cost-effective commitment of SCO, MDA, and other Department of Defense resources.

#### Mobile User Objective System

The committee supports the Department of the Navy's Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) space program. The committee is aware that MUOS will provide a critical communication capability for the warfighter by enabling greater mobility, higher data rates, and improved operational availability. Of the eventual five satellite

constellation, there are currently two MUOS satellites on orbit which were launched in November 2012 and July 2013.

The committee is aware that MUOS has two payloads, one to continue the legacy narrowband communications capability and another with a modern adaptation of Wideband Code Division Multiple Access (WCDMA) cellular technology. The committee is concerned that the modern WCDMA payload, which represents the primary purpose of developing a MUOS system, is unavailable for use by the warfighter.

The committee is aware that the current Navy schedule projects the MUOS space and ground system to be operational in the first quarter of fiscal year 2015, but the user terminals will not be available until 21 months later. The committee is disappointed with this lack of synchronization in delivery of capability to the warfighter. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2014, on a plan to accelerate the fielding of the user terminals in support of the MUOS program.

#### Nuclear Detonation Detection System

The committee is aware of the joint Department of Defense and Department of Energy nuclear detonation (NUDET) detection system. The NUDET detection system is designed to detect, locate, and report on nuclear detonations in the Earth's atmosphere or near space in near real time. The program is designed to support treaty monitoring, integrated tactical warning and attack assessment, and nuclear force management. The committee is aware that the funding for this program is split between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy, which can cause challenges in program execution and coordination. The committee notes the importance of meeting NUDET detection system requirements as part of its plans for its space architecture, understanding the multitude of requirements that exist on the space architecture and the declining budget.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2015, on the NUDET detection system. The briefing should include identification of the requirements, a strategic plan to address those requirements, and the cost and schedule of the associated activities.

#### Operationally Responsive Space

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

The committee continues to support the ORS program to address urgent military operational requirements for space support and reconstitution. Additionally, the committee is aware of the Air Force's plan to develop ORS-5, a space situational awareness operational demonstrator to address rapidly evolving space threats. This satellite is being funded with prior year appropriations and does not

include funding for a launch vehicle. The committee is aware that this satellite is projected to be completed around fiscal year 2017.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$30.0 million, an increase of \$30.0 million, in PE 64857F to continue the Operationally Responsive Space program and to fund a competitively procured launch vehicle for the ORS-5 mission.

#### Plan for Improving Cyber Situational Awareness

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has embarked on an ambitious, multiyear effort to improve its cybersecurity posture. That process was begun in 2010 with the establishment of United States Cyber Command, with the responsibility as a sub-unified combatant command to plan, coordinate, integrate, synchronize, and conduct activities to direct the operations and defense of specified Department of Defense information networks. It has continued with the creation of a cyber mission force that will defend Department of Defense networks, conduct cyber operations missions to protect the homeland, and to support combatant commander requirements for cyber operations support. Even the single security architecture for the Joint Information Environment represents a change of approach that integrates security seamlessly into network operations.

The committee is concerned, though, that the focus of the Department of fielding and training a cyber workforce has far outpaced the ability of that workforce to have all of the tools necessary to operate effectively on the network. In particular, the committee is concerned that the tools supporting cyber situational awareness do not provide a comprehensive, fused common operational picture. The committee believes such tools are vital to empower a skilled, trained and experienced workforce to fight the network as effectively as any land, sea, or air component commander.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of United States Cyber Command, in coordination with the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, to provide a plan for improving cyber situational awareness tools to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015. This plan should include the following:

- (1) Development of a common, open cyber situational awareness architecture, including the capability to rapidly integrate new privacy and civil liberty protections into the architecture based on changes directed by the Secretary or the administration;

- (2) Identification of current tools for providing cyber situational awareness, as well as an assessment of gaps in current capabilities;

- (3) Assessment of new tools or processes that might be incorporated into a cyber situational awareness architecture, such as net flow data, host-based monitoring, anomaly detection, audit logs and agent-based algorithms, including identification of any potential issues related to current privacy and civil liberties protection policy;

- (4) Integration of current tools into the Joint Information Environment single security architecture; and

- (5) Assessment to testing resources, including funding and ranges, that may be necessary in the future to support developmental and operational testing.

### Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination

The committee recognizes that advances in the understanding and application of Object Based Production and Activity Based Intelligence (ABI) have exposed the imperative need for making every ounce of collected and processed intelligence readily accessible to the all-source analyst community in formats that are consistent, shareable, and searchable. The committee is concerned that the military services have been largely absent or excluded from those discussions and working groups. As the services have a significant personnel investment in intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance processing, exploitation, and dissemination (PED), it is of critical importance that they remain abreast of technical advances in shared intelligence and analytic processes. To obtain the maximum possible value from nascent ABI analytic methodologies, the committee believes that every PED process must deliver accurately tagged and accessible or shareable content.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to submit a report to the congressional defense and the congressional intelligence committees by May 1, 2015, on a proposed way ahead for transforming the existing Department of Defense PED enterprise. The report should look across all PED organizations in the enterprise and focus on today's single source products developed in largely single intelligence discipline environments. The report should include a plan of action and milestones (POA&M) laying out specific actions to be taken, by each intelligence discipline and each collector, to evolve or enhance today's PED processes and outputs to a condition that directly facilitates ABI analysis. In building the POA&M, the report should prioritize collection sources, identifying those that can be tackled simultaneously, and highlighting any obstacles that prevent the required PED maturation.

#### Provision of Finished Intelligence Products on the CAPITOL NETWORK

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to submit a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees not later than October 1, 2014, on the process and procedures for conveying finished intelligence products to the appropriate committees via the CAPITAL NETWORK (CAPNET). The report should specifically describe:

- (1) Any Department or Department agency-specific policies and procedures for identifying and approving finished intelligence products to be posted to CAPNET (specifically including the processes by which the products are reviewed or evaluated before posting), or for removing, supplementing or modifying such intelligence products;

- (2) Any policies and procedures that may exist to adjudicate potential disagreements about the posting or failure to post finished intelligence to CAPNET; and

- (3) Any changes to or deviations from existing practices, policies, or procedures for identifying and approving information to be posted to CAPNET since January 1, 2012.

Further, as this report is being prepared but before it is conveyed to the committees, the committee directs the Secretary to provide an interim briefing to the congressional defense and intelligence committees on these issues.

#### Remote Sensing Technology Education Programs

The committee is aware of the importance of remote sensing as a discipline to support defense intelligence missions. As the Department of Defense increasingly focuses on operating in non-permissive environments, and on traditional missions like non-proliferation and counter-proliferation, the committee sees remote sensing as a critical skill set for the defense intelligence establishment. Additionally, with the growth of new techniques and increasing sophistication of remote sensing tools, the committee believes it is important to foster a robust analytical workforce for this community that can flexibly adapt to new missions and new technologies. The committee encourages the Department to leverage its science, technology, engineering, and mathematics research and educational resources to find methods for establishing partnerships with qualified universities to increase the quality of remote sensing technical education in areas including sensor systems, phenomenology, analytical techniques, image processing, and collections strategies, to include a variety of current and future imaging modalities. The grants should also be aimed at increasing the number of remote sensing students at all university levels, including undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate.

#### Report and Plan for Minuteman III Sustainment

From 2001–09, the Air Force conducted a Propulsion Replacement Program to remanufacture solid rocket motors for the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile system. This high-production rate program extended the life of 601 solid rocket motors an additional 20–25 years. In 2017, ongoing surveillance efforts will enable the Air Force to determine the expected service life of these remanufactured rocket motors; the first of which will likely age out between 2020–25. Concurrently, existing Minuteman III guidance electronics are expected to age out in the mid-2020s.

The committee notes that the Air Force is expected to finish its analysis of alternatives (AOA) for the follow-on to the Minuteman III in July 2014. Regardless of the outcome of this analysis, the Air Force plans to sustain and operate the Minuteman III system through 2030. The committee believes a significant gap and misalignment exists between the Air Force's stated intention to sustain Minuteman III through 2030 and the programs required to do so. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2015, containing the Air Force's plan and programs to sustain the Minuteman III system through 2030 or beyond. Such report and plan should: (1) be informed by the pending AOA; (2) assess the feasibility, costs, and benefits of initiating a low-rate production program for solid rocket motors, including identification of preparatory actions should current rocket motors begin aging out in 2020; and (3) to the extent practicable, align guidance replace-

ment, propulsion replacement, and other efforts to minimize flight testing expenses.

#### Report on Aegis Ashore Missile Defense Test Complex

The committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than September 1, 2014, on the requirements and value of converting the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense Test Complex at the Pacific Missile Range Facility from a test and evaluation center to a permanent facility capable of continuous operations.

The report shall include the following:

- (1) A description of manpower requirements associated with staffing the facility for continuous operations.
- (2) A description of the safety mitigation strategies associated with permanent, continuous operations.
- (3) A description of operational impacts at the Pacific Missile Range Facility complex.
- (4) Anticipated operations and sustainment costs.
- (5) A description of operational benefits and impacts of conversion to a permanent facility.

For the report described, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall include a consideration of the following:

- (1) Technical feasibility.
- (2) Cost, cost effectiveness, and affordability.
- (3) Schedule considerations.
- (4) Capacity to respond to changes in future threat evolution.

#### Report on Balance in Nuclear Weapons Program

The committee continues to believe that the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) nuclear weapons program is in the process of transitioning from a focus, in the past two decades, on developing new tools and science-based understanding of nuclear weapons to a focus on applying such tools and understanding to modernize the stockpile. NNSA's projected program plan shows that the level of effort and funding required to support this modernization, including life extension programs and the infrastructure needed to support them, is considerable. The committee believes that while continual progress in advancing science-based understanding of the stockpile is needed to certify the stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing and respond to unforeseen challenges, the program plan may require further rebalancing towards engineering- and production-based efforts centered upon life extension programs and their supporting infrastructure.

To better understand the appropriate balance in this program, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2015, on the appropriate balance, over approximately the next decade, between efforts within the nuclear security enterprise to advance scientific understanding of nuclear weapons and efforts to deliver life extension programs and supporting infrastructure. In particular, this report should assess and make recommendations

regarding: (1) the appropriate balance in resources, funding, and personnel; (2) the required levels of funding and the requirements driving programs on science, life extensions, and infrastructure; (3) the certification challenges facing the nuclear weapons stockpile over the next decade and the scientific advances necessary to meet them; (4) the level of basic science research needed to attract, retain, and challenge world-class scientists for the nuclear security enterprise; and (5) such other matters as the Commander determines appropriate. The committee expects the Commander to leverage the expertise of the Commander's Strategic Advisory Group Stockpile Assessment Team in support of this effort. Subsequent to submission of the Commander's report, the committee expects to receive the Administrator for Nuclear Security's views on these matters and understand how the Administrator intends to follow the Commander's recommendations.

#### Report on International Agreements Concerning Outer Space Activities

The committee is aware that there are ongoing discussions related to international agreements concerning outer space activities. As noted in section 913 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), the committee wants to ensure that any agreements, nonbinding or otherwise, will not have any impact on the ability of the United States to conduct military or intelligence activities in outer space. Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by December 1, 2014, on any agreements currently in discussion or being considered, the potential for impact on any Department of Defense or intelligence activities in outer space, and the significance of such impacts. Such report shall be in unclassified form, with a classified portion marked annex if necessary.

The Secretary of State may submit additional views, and such additional views shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees, as well as the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. Such report shall be in unclassified form, with a classified portion-marked annex if necessary.

#### Report on Reliability, Modernization and Refurbishment of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense Segment

The committee recognizes the shift in the Administration's missile defense policy to a priority on homeland defense as evidenced by the March 2013 Secretary of Defense announcement, made in response to an escalating intercontinental ballistic missile threat, to increase the ground-based interceptor (GBI) fleet by nearly fifty percent by 2017. The committee supports this position; however, there is concern that the Administration has not made a commensurate shift in funding for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system to address long-standing issues that have manifested themselves in flight test failures, degraded reliability, escalating obsolescence, and erosion of margin of capability over the



threat. The committee notes that the GMD system is approximately 10 years old and was originally designed for a 20-year service life. The committee supports efforts to close the gap between what it believes is needed as necessary investment in the GMD system and the proposed funding levels contained in the budget request.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than November 1, 2014, that evaluates the necessary resources to maintain the GMD system in future years to achieve no less than standard industry practices for strategically important peer systems (such as Minuteman, Trident D5, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, and Aegis Standard Missile-3) for fleet upgrades, reliability confidence, obsolescence mitigation, and service-life assurance of capabilities against a threat that is growing in quantities and sophistication. The report should include, but not be limited to:

(1) Action plans, schedule, and by-year budget required to improve overall GBI fleet reliability and incorporate lessons learned from all ground and flight test failures into the existing fleet and in-process assets;

(2) Action plans, schedule, asset line-of-balance allocations, and by-year budget required to conduct a robust systems engineering approach for GBI ground testing to ensure confidence in system reliability, capability, and long-term sustainment. This should include robust GBI integration testing, Stockpile Reliability, Aging and Surveillance, Highly Accelerated Life Testing, and Highly Accelerated Stress Screening;

(3) Action plans, schedule, and by-year budget required to modernize and improve the GMD Ground System to ensure its sustainability for its operational life. Areas addressed should include technology refresh of obsolete components and technologies, modernized electronics architectures to eliminate single point failures and improve reliability, replacement of Ada software with a modern supportable and sustainable language, and fully incorporate the improved capabilities planned in the Enhanced Kill Vehicle Re-design and the Long Range Discrimination Radar; and

(4) By-year procurement budget requirements for various lot-buys for the additional 14 GBIs that the Secretary of Defense announced in March 2013, and include the associated long-lead procurement budget requirements and timeline to support, and impacts on the industrial base.

#### Report on Satellite Positioning Ground Monitoring Stations Near U.S. Overseas Military Installations

Not later than June 30, 2015, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), to provide to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, a report on global navigation satellite system ground monitoring stations operated directly or indirectly by the Russian Federation located near

any U.S. military installation overseas or located near allied military installation or any other installation deemed sensitive by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State or Director of National Intelligence. The report shall include the name and location of any such stations located in geographic proximity to any U.S. military or sensitive installation located outside continental United States; an assessment of the threat posed to such installations; the significance of such threat; and the plans to mitigate the impacts of covered stations. The report should also cover any planned future locations of such Russian Federation ground monitoring stations, to the extent that the Secretaries or the DNI are aware. The committee understands from public reports, that this will be a limited number of sites. The Secretary shall submit such report in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary.

#### Report on Strategic Submarine Command and Control in the People's Republic of China

In its report on "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2013," the Department of Defense highlighted the ballistic missile submarine program in the People's Republic of China, stating that China's Navy "places a high priority on the modernization of its submarine force. China continues the production of *JIN*-class nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines (SSBN). Three *JIN*-class SSBNs (Type 094) are currently operational, and up to five may enter service before China proceeds to its next generation SSBN (Type 096) over the next decade." In testimony before the committee on March 5, 2014, the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command stated that, "China's advance in submarine capabilities is significant. They possess a large and increasingly capable submarine force. China continues the production of ballistic missile submarines. The platform will carry a new missile with an estimated range of more than 4,000 nautical miles. This will give the [sic] China its first credible sea-based nuclear deterrent, probably before the end of 2014."

The committee is concerned that China's imminent deployment of an operational sea-based strategic deterrent is a major new step in China's nuclear weapon program. This step further increases the opacity of China's already opaque nuclear forces. Of particular concern, deployment of nuclear-armed SSBNs requires China to develop and implement new command, control, and communications paradigms to ensure positive control of the nuclear warheads by China's senior leaders. To better understand this new Chinese capability and its implications, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by November 1, 2014, on the strategic and regional implications of China's sea-based nuclear deterrent force; China's command, control, and communications system for such force; the implications for the U.S. and its allies of the emergence of a Chinese sea-based nuclear force; the contribution of China's sea-based deterrent to China's overall nuclear doctrine and employment strategy, including survivable second-strike capabilities; and, U.S. and partner nation mitigation or response plans.

#### Requirement for Plan for Use of Highly Accelerated Life Testing and Highly Accelerated Stress Screening

On March 4, 2014, the committee received a report from the Director, Missile Defense Agency in response to the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, concerning highly accelerated life testing and highly accelerated stress screening (HALT/HASS) testing of Ballistic Missile Defense Systems and Components. The committee believes this report was a useful review of the potential benefits and limitations of employing this rigorous review system in addition to current Missile Defense Agency (MDA) systems. The committee agrees with the Director's belief that HALT/HASS testing could be useful in certain future MDA efforts.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives in concurrence with the fiscal year 2016 budget submission a plan to employ HALT/HASS testing, as appropriate, in appropriate future MDA programs. The committee believes these efforts should be supervised in part by MDA and should be competitively awarded through full and open competition.

#### Responses to Foreign Hypersonic Weapons Threats

The committee is concerned that the People's Republic of China and other competitor nations pose an increasing challenge to the United States' technology edge in such emerging areas as hypersonic weapons. On January 9, China successfully conducted the first flight test of a hypersonic glide vehicle. The Russian Federation is also known to be pursuing research and development of hypersonic capabilities. In testimony before the committee on January 28, 2014, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, stated that, “[o]n hypersonics, this is a good example of an area of technology that is going to move forward whether we invest in it or not . . . China is doing work in this area.”

At the same time, the committee is unaware of any significant efforts to prepare defenses against hypersonic weapons. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2014, that evaluates emerging hypersonic threats to the United States, its allies, and its deployed forces, and explains how the Department of Defense intends to develop and deploy a defensive capability to counter this emerging threat.

#### Retirement of B83 Nuclear Gravity Bombs

The committee notes the Administration's stated goal of retiring B83 nuclear gravity bombs in the mid-2020s, after confidence in the safety, security, and reliability of the B61–12 nuclear gravity bomb is established. The committee also notes that, in June 2013 the President stated an intention, “to seek negotiated cuts with Russia,” favoring bilateral negotiations rather than unilateral cuts

to U.S. nuclear forces. On March 6, 2014, the Secretary of Defense testified before the committee that, “there would be no unilateral actions taken by this Administration on going below the current levels. Those would have to all be, as we have done in every administration, negotiated through treaties.” At the same hearing, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reinforced this position, saying, “any further reduction should be done only through negotiations, not unilaterally.”

The committee is concerned that the proposed retirement of the B83 would be a unilateral action by the United States, with no reciprocal reductions by the Russian Federation. Both Congress and the Administration have made clear that further reductions to the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile and associated delivery vehicles should only be made in concert with Russia pursuant to a treaty that is bilateral and verifiable. The committee expects the Administration to ensure this is the case prior to retirement of the B83, and that such a treaty ensures appropriate reciprocal reductions in the nuclear stockpile of Russia.

#### Revision to the Integrated Master Test Plan

The committee believes that the reliability and warfighter confidence in the Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment, also called the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) segment, could be enhanced through more frequent flight and intercept testing.

According to the “Plan to Increase the Rate of Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Flight Tests” submitted to the congressional defense committees in October 2013 in accordance with the requirements of section 231 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), an increase in test cadence to three test events every 2 years will “require an increase in test resources and personnel.” The committee believes such resources could increase warfighter confidence and the reliability of the nation’s operationally deployed homeland missile defense capability if this test cadence is feasible and efficient.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency (MDA), in coordination with the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees following the FTG–06b intercept test, if successful, on the benefits and risks of revising the Integrated Master Test Plan presently in force and future submissions of the plan, to achieve GMD tests at a frequency of not less than every nine months. The committee also directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to include in the budget request for fiscal year 2016 an illustration of the funding required, if appropriate, to meet this enhanced GMD test cadence.

#### Shortfalls in Headquarters Cyber Support Personnel

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has been making great strides in establishing a robust cyber mission capability, including increasing the number of cyber operations personnel, organizing and training them to a joint standard, and creating the tools and doctrine for their employment. However, the

committee is also aware that while these cyber mission teams are being adequately resourced, personnel reductions to headquarters elements for the military service cyber commands are becoming a serious cause of concern.

While the Department's goal of reducing bloat in headquarters is laudable, and an important step in increasing the tooth-to-tail ratio for military forces, this is having an unintended but detrimental effect for cyber forces. The committee notes that in some cases, military service cyber commands headquarters personnel are double- and sometime triple-hatted, leading to even greater inefficiencies and slower response to operational needs. These headquarters forces are important enablers for the cyber mission forces, providing planning, requirements, resourcing, and exercise support that is vital at this early stage of development. The committee encourages the Department to examine its cyber personnel needs more comprehensively in order to ensure that the military service cyber commands have sufficient support enablers to keep pace with the expansion of operational forces.

#### Space-Based Reconnaissance

The committee believes that the Operationally Responsive Space-1 (ORS-1) satellite has provided significant intelligence value to the U.S. Central Command and the Army's 513th Military Intelligence Brigade. When referring to this capability, the 513th stated "the ability to provide timely geospatial-intelligence (GEOINT) response to a real world mission during execution cannot be matched." U.S. Central Command provided similar feedback on the operational flexibility provided by this space reconnaissance asset to support urgent, short-notice requirements.

The committee is aware that ORS-1 is currently operating well beyond its design life, and there is no follow-on program planned. The committee would like to understand the requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands for use of space reconnaissance assets. Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a report to the congressional defense and the congressional intelligence committees by January 15, 2015, on the feedback from each of the commanders of the combatant commands on the utility of space-based reconnaissance capabilities to meet their priority intelligence requirements and their current ability to utilize and control space-based reconnaissance to meet those requirements.

#### Special Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Exploitation Program

The committee is aware that there are a number of threats and challenges in U.S. Southern Command. The Commander of U.S. Southern Command stated that 132 metric tons of cocaine was seized under the command's counter-narcotics mission in fiscal year 2013. This represents over \$2.5 billion drug revenue that would have supported transnational criminal organizations, cartel violence in Mexico, and the continued threat of regional destabilization.

The committee is aware of new sensor technologies that may be able to support the Commander of Southern Command's ability to

address these challenges. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to examine the current state of sensor technologies that could be used to modernize existing systems and improve detection, tracking, targeting, and engagement of these irregular threats as part of the Special Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Exploitation Program.

#### Standard Missile 3 Block IB

The committee is concerned by the reduction in funding for the Standard Missile 3 (SM-3) program in fiscal year 2015 and across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). After demonstrating success in five of five intercepts in 2013 and with a Full Rate Production decision planned for fall 2014, the Department now has reduced programmed quantities each year to fewer than were funded in fiscal year 2014 in Low Rate Initial Production. The committee believes such a reduction injects inefficiency into the production line and that inefficiency may unnecessarily increase the per unit cost of these interceptors.

At the same time, the committee is not aware of any diminishment in requirements by the combatant commanders for these interceptors. The committee supports the funding requested in the budget submission for Advanced Procurement to support long-lead time requirements for these missiles. The committee also supports the likely request in the fiscal year 2016 budget request for multi-year procurement authority for these missile interceptors. The committee believes that a successful negotiation between the Missile Defense Agency and its contractors could drive down the per unit cost of these interceptors and increase the available quantities to the warfighter.

The committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2014, on the sufficiency of current and programmed inventory of SM-3 missiles to meet combatant commander requirements, the number of Requests for Forces received from combatant commanders in 2012-13 for SM-3 interceptors, and the shortfall in interceptors in each year of the FYDP.

#### Targeting Enterprise

The committee recognizes the importance of geospatial intelligence (GEOINT) support to military operations. The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) defines GEOINT as the exploitation and analysis of imagery and geospatial information that describes, assesses and visually depicts physical features and geographically referenced activities on the Earth. An important aspect of GEOINT operations is the target material provided to support the common operational picture, mission planning, precision coordinate generation, and other analytical products. The committee believes that the targeting mission is of critical importance, and the current threat environment will create challenges and necessitate the need for further review of the methods to accomplish this mission.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Director, National

Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives by May 1, 2015, on the state of the targeting enterprise. The briefing should include: an assessment of the current GEOINT targeting capabilities; identification of targeteer training as well as the current and projected number of targeteers across the Defense Intelligence Enterprise, including NGA; and an analysis of opportunities for improvement within the defense intelligence community.

#### U.S. Transportation Command Joint Intelligence and Operations Center

The U.S. Transportation Command Joint Intelligence and Operations Center (JIOC-TRANS) recently executed a highly successful proof of concept associated with a new organizational construct titled the Transportation Intelligence Center (TIC). While the committee supports the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff delegation of authority to the TIC to allow full exercise of appropriate intelligence coordination activities as demonstrated in the proof of concept, the committee requires additional information regarding why it is necessary to engender a new organizational construct to achieve the desired end state, particularly when manned with the same personnel as the existing JIOC.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, to provide a report to the congressional defense and the congressional intelligence committees by February 16, 2015, detailing the authorities delegated to the TIC as part of the proof of concept and presenting an evaluation of any obstacles to delegating those same authorities directly to the Commander, JIOC-TRANS. The report should identify any opportunities to apply the same lessons and delegations across the other functional JIOCS (e.g. U.S. Strategic Command JIOC, U.S. Cyber Command JIOC, and U.S. Special Operations Command JIOC) to achieve improved operational intelligence efficiency and effectiveness. Finally, the report should explore the potential for such initiatives to allow more efficient utilization of JIOC or Intelligence Community manning.

#### University Affiliated Research Centers for the Missile Defense Agency

The committee believes the missile defense mission is crucial to the protection of the homeland as well as allies and deployed forces, especially as the enemy threat increases in size and complexity. Yet, both internal and external evaluations and assessments have indicated that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) needs to make significant technical advancements to create Ballistic Missile Defense System performance that is more reliable and affordable.

The committee is aware that many agencies, including defense agencies, have found that University Affiliated Research Centers (UARC) have been useful for their core research and development capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 1, 2014, on whether expanding use of UARCs is appropriate and useful to the Missile Defense Agency, and if so, in what specific mission or technological areas, the prospective costs of such cooperation (including the safeguarding of unclassified technical information and classified information), and a plan for relevant universities to undertake a pilot UARC partnership, including identification of requirements for qualification to participate, and the completion by MDA of a public survey of university capabilities before entering into any UARC agreement.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—SPACE ACTIVITIES

#### Section 1601—Department of Defense Space Security and Defense Program

This section would state the sense of Congress that critical U.S. space systems face a growing foreign threat, that both the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation are developing capabilities to disrupt the use of space by the United States during a conflict, and that a fully-developed, multi-faceted approach is needed to deter and defeat any adversary's acts of aggression in outer space.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that assesses the ability of the Department of Defense to deter and defeat any adversary's act of aggression in outer space.

In addition, this section would direct the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Net Assessment, to conduct a study and provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act of potential alternate defense and deterrent strategies in response to the existing and projected counterspace capabilities of China and Russia.

#### Section 1602—Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Notification

This section would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to provide certain congressional committees with notification of each change to the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) acquisition plan and schedule as compared to the plan and schedule included in the budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2015. The notification would include an identification of the change, a national security rationale for the change, the impact of the change on the EELV block buy contract, the impact of the change on the opportunities for competition for certified EELV launch providers, and the costs or savings of the change. The notification requirement would apply to fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017.



#### Section 1603—Satellite Communications Responsibilities of Executive Agent for Space

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to revise Department of Defense directives and guidance for the Department of Defense Executive Agent (EA) for Space, with respect to the development of space strategies, architectures and programs for satellite communications. This section would require the EA to conduct strategic planning to ensure these strategies align with Department requirements. In addition, it would require the EA to coordinate with the necessary offices within the Department of Defense in order to eliminate duplication of efforts, maximize the effectiveness of efforts, and to optimize acquisition effectiveness and efficiency for military and commercial satellite communications. Finally, this section would direct the EA to coordinate with the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council to develop a process to identify current and projected satellite communications requirements for the Department.

#### Section 1604—Liquid Rocket Engine Development Program

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should develop a next-generation liquid rocket engine that is made in the United States, meets the requirements of the national security space community, is developed by not later than 2019, is developed using full and open competition, and is available for purchase by all space launch providers of the United States.

This section would also direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a next-generation liquid rocket engine that enables the effective, efficient, and expedient transition from the use of non-allied space launch engines to a domestic alternative for national security space launches. Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, \$220.0 million would be available for the Secretary of Defense to develop a next-generation liquid rocket engine. The Secretary would be required to coordinate with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to the extent practicable, to ensure that the rocket engine developed meets objectives that are common to both the national security space community and the civil space program of the United States.

The Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, would be directed to deliver a report with a plan to carry out the development of the rocket engine, including an analysis of the benefits of using public-private partnerships, the estimated development costs, and identification of the requirements of the program to develop such rocket engine.

#### Section 1605—Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communication Services

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to develop and execute a pilot program to examine the feasibility of expanding the use of working capital funds to acquire commercial satellite communications services to meet Department of Defense requirements. This program would terminate on October 1, 2020. In addition, this section would limit the use of any funds authorized for the Depart-

ment's acquisition of commercial satellite communications services to not more than \$50.0 million per year for the pilot program execution, and only for fiscal years 2015–20. This section would also limit the authorities of the Secretary of Defense in the execution of the pilot program by prohibiting the use of the authorities granted in sections 2208(k) and 2210(b) of title 10, United States Code. Finally, this section would define goals for the execution of the pilot program, as well as reporting requirements for the program. This section does not constitute authority for multi-year procurement of commercial satellite services.

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED  
ACTIVITIES

Section 1611—Assessment and Limitation on Availability of Funds for Intelligence Activities and Programs of United States Special Operations Command and Special Operations Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, and the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, to submit an assessment to the appropriate congressional committees on the intelligence activities and programs of the U.S. Special Operations Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command. This section would also limit 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 of U.S. Special Operations Command Major Force Program-11 procurement, defense-wide, and research, development, testing, and evaluation, defense-wide, until such assessment is received. Further discussion of this provision is contained in the classified annex to this report.

Section 1612—Annual Briefing on the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Requirements of the Combatant Commands

This section would direct the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements, by specific intelligence capability type, of each of the combatant commands; for the year preceding the year in which the briefing is provided, the satisfaction rate of each of the combatant commands with the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements, by specific intelligence capability type, of such combatant command; and a risk analysis identifying the critical gaps and shortfalls in such requirements in relation to such satisfaction rate.

Additionally, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence would be required to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate on short-term, mid-term, and long-term strategies to address the critical intelligence, surveillance, and recon-

naissance requirements of the combatant commands. The briefings should address the role of government and commercial systems, and the methods to meeting the requirements of the combatant commands.

These briefings would be due with the budget submission each year, from fiscal year 2016–20.

#### Section 1613—One-Year Extension of Report on Imagery Intelligence and Geospatial Information Support Provided to Regional Organizations and Security Alliances

This section would extend the existing reporting requirement by 1 year, regarding sharing of imagery intelligence and geospatial information to regional organizations and security alliances.

#### Section 1614—Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities Executive Agent

This section would establish an executive agent for the Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities (TENCAP) program. The executive agent shall report directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, and shall be responsible for working with the combatant commands, military services, and intelligence community to develop methods to increase warfighter effectiveness through the exploitation of national capabilities and to promote cross-domain integration of such capabilities into military operations, training, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance activities.

This section would also require the TENCAP executive agent to provide an annual briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives for the fiscal years 2016–20 on the investments, activities, challenges, and opportunities in carrying out the TENCAP program.

#### Section 1615—Air Force Intelligence Organization

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Air Force National Air and Space Intelligence Center provides indispensable intelligence support, and should remain organizationally aligned to the Headquarters Air Staff with reporting through the Vice Chief of Staff. In addition, this section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees a strategic plan for the intelligence organization of the Air Force, which includes maintaining the National Air and Space Intelligence Center alignment to the Headquarters Air Staff.

#### Section 1616—Prohibition on National Intelligence Program Consolidation

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2015, to execute: the separation of the portion of the Depart-

ment of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program from the rest of the Department of Defense budget; the consolidation of the portion of the Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program within the Department of Defense budget; or the establishment of a new appropriations account or appropriations account structure for such funds.

#### SUBTITLE C—CYBERSPACE-RELATED MATTERS

##### Section 1621—Executive Agency for Cyber Test and Training Ranges

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an executive agent to coordinate and oversee the management of the various cyber test and training ranges being developed and deployed by the Department of Defense.

The committee is aware that a number of cyber ranges currently exist, but the Department's Test and Evaluation Strategic Plan has identified a number of capability gaps that need to be addressed in order to provide sufficient and adequate cyber test and training. Though there has been significant growth of cyber personnel to fulfill critical defensive and offensive missions for the Department, the capacity for training in a realistic environment has not kept pace. The committee is concerned that those challenges have not been addressed and that the Department is unable to come to resolution on how best to provide adequate management and support for such capabilities. The committee believes that designation of an executive agent for cyber test and training ranges will be an important step in managing the current range resources, as well as provide discipline to prevent rampant proliferation of duplicative capabilities.

#### SUBTITLE D—NUCLEAR FORCES

##### Section 1631—Preparation of Annual Budget Request Regarding Nuclear Weapons

This section would amend section 179 of title 10, United States Code, and add a new requirement regarding annual transfers to the Department of Energy of Department of Defense budget authority. Prior to making such transfers, the Secretary of Defense must establish a memorandum of agreement with the Secretary of Energy as to how the funds will be obligated and expended within the Weapons Activities budget of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The committee believes that these are Department of Defense funds and it must be assured as to how they will be used by the Department of Energy if the transfers are to continue.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual certification to the congressional defense committees that includes detailed assessments from the Nuclear Weapons Council, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command regarding the implementation by the NNSA of any agreements and decisions of the Council.

Section 1632—Independent Review of the Personnel Reliability Program of the Department of Defense and the Human Reliability Program of the Department of Energy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an independent review of the Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) of the Department of Defense and the Human Reliability Program (HRP) of the Department of Energy and submit the report of this independent review to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2015. Such review would be required to examine the costs and benefits of each program; examples of successes and failures for each program; the reporting and administrative requirements of each program; the authorities and responsibilities of commanders and managers in each program; guidance for when certain positions must be included in each program; recommendations for making the programs more effective, more efficient, and, to the extent appropriate, more consistent across the departments; and such other matters as the Secretaries determine appropriate.

Reviewing the results of investigations initiated by the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy in the wake of security and personal integrity failures in their respective nuclear enterprises, the committee believes that the programs administered by each department to ensure the reliability and fitness of personnel for nuclear-related duties must be modernized to be more effective and more efficient. The Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) of the Department of Defense and the Human Reliability Program (HRP) of the Department of Energy are key programs for mitigating threats from insiders and for identifying and mitigating problems with nuclear workers before it affects their duties. Concerns about PRP and HRP have been raised in several studies over the past decade, but until recently little action has been taken. The committee commends the Air Force for its current review of its PRP and encourages its effort to take carefully considered actions to improve the program. The committee believes the entire nuclear enterprise would benefit from a broad-based, independent review of PRP and HRP.

The committee believes sustained attention at the senior-most levels is necessary to overcome the leadership and integrity problems revealed within the Air Force and the Navy nuclear enterprise in the past year. The committee notes that various reviews and investigations are ongoing and will continue close oversight of the recommended reforms and their implementation.

Section 1633—Assessment of Nuclear Weapon Secondary Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to assess the annual nuclear weapon secondary production requirement needed to sustain a safe, secure, reliable, and effective nuclear deterrent. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit a report on this assessment to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enact-

ment of this Act. This report would be in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary, and would be required to include an explanation of the rationale and assumptions that led to the current 50-to-80 per year secondary production requirement, including the factors considered in determining such requirement, and an analysis of whether there are any changes to the 50-to-80 per year secondary production requirement, including the reasons for any such changes. The report would also be required to include a description of how the following is affected by or related to the secondary production requirement:

(1) The demands of stockpile modernization, including the schedule for life extension programs;

(2) The requirement for a responsive infrastructure, including the ability to hedge against technical failure and geopolitical risk; and

(3) The number of secondaries held in reserve or the inactive stockpile, and the likelihood such secondaries may be reused.

Finally, the report would be required to include a proposed timeframe for achieving the annual secondary production requirement.

#### Section 1634—Retention of Missile Silos

This section would express the sense of Congress that recent authorization and appropriations acts enacted by Congress and signed by the President have promulgated a national policy that it is in the national security interests of the United States to retain the maximum number of land-based strategic missile silos and their associated infrastructure to ensure that billions of dollars in prior taxpayer investments for such silos and infrastructure are not lost through precipitous actions which may be budget-driven, cyclical, and not in the long-term strategic interests of the United States.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to preserve each intercontinental ballistic missile silo that contains a deployed missile as of the date of the enactment of this Act in, at minimum, a warm status that enables such silo to remain a fully functioning element of the interconnected and redundant command and control system of the missile field and be made fully operational with a deployed missile. This requirement to preserve silos in a warm status would terminate on February 5, 2021.

#### Section 1635—Certification on Nuclear Force Structure

This section would require that, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, should jointly certify that the plan for implementation of the New START Treaty announced on April 8, 2014, will enable the United States to meet its obligations under such treaty in a manner that ensures the nuclear forces of the United States are capable, survivable, and balanced; and maintain strategic stability, deterrence and extended deterrence, and allied assurance.

## SUBTITLE E—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

## Section 1641—Theater Air and Missile Defense of Allies of the United States

This section would state the policy of the United States that available short-range air and missile defense systems and terminal missile defense systems of the United States with operational missiles be rotationally deployed to central and eastern European allies, pursuant to agreements with those allies, as appropriate.

This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense ensure the operational availability of the Aegis Ashore system site in Poland not later than December 31, 2016, pursuant to an agreement between the United States and the Government of Poland. Additionally, this section would require that, not later than December 31, 2014, the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to an agreement between the United States and the government of Poland, deploy a short-range air and missile defense capability or terminal missile defense capability, or both, and the personnel required to operate and maintain such a system. Further, the Secretary of Defense would be required to notify the appropriate congressional committees by not later than 60 days after the date on which a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization makes a request of the Secretary that they host such a system.

## Section 1642—Sense of Congress on Procurement and Deployment of Capability Enhancement II Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle

This section would state the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Defense should not procure an additional capability enhancement II exoatmospheric kill vehicle for deployment until after the date on which a successful intercept flight test of the capability enhancement II ground-based interceptor has occurred, unless such procurement is for test assets or to maintain a warm line for the industrial base.

## TITLE XVII—DEFENSE AUDIT ADVISORY PANEL ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDITABILITY

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## Section 1701—Findings and Purposes

This section would discuss the findings of Congress leading up to the establishment of an advisory panel on Department of Defense audit readiness. In addition, this section would discuss the purpose of the panel: to actively monitor the Department of Defense's audit readiness and audit work and to report on problems that need to be resolved with the intention to shed light on the best, most efficient path forward to meet the 2017 and 2019 deadlines relating to auditability.

#### Section 1702—Establishment of Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Audit Readiness

This section would establish the advisory panel on Department of Defense audit readiness, describe the process for the selection of members to the panel, identify the period of appointment, and describe meeting requirements of the panel.

#### Section 1703—Duties of the Advisory Panel

This section would define the duties of the advisory panel. The panel would identify, review, and evaluate the work of the Department of Defense regarding auditability. The panel would submit to congressional defense committees semi-annual reports on the findings and recommendations of the panel.

#### Section 1704—Powers of the Advisory Panel

The section would provide the authority for the advisory panel to hold hearings and receive information directly from the Department of Defense.

#### Section 1705—Advisory Panel Personnel Matters

This section would require members of the advisory panel to serve without compensation for such service. This section would also provide authority for travel expenses and staff to support the advisory panel.

#### Section 1706—Termination of the Advisory Panel

This section would terminate the advisory panel on April 30, 2019.

## **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 2015. As recommended by the committee, division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of \$6,532,970,000 for construction in support of the active forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2015.

### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested \$5,096,827,000 for military construction, \$270,085,000 for Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities, and \$1,190,535,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends authorization of \$5,276,927,000 for military construction, \$270,085,000 for BRAC activities, and \$1,190,535,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2015.



## Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite division B of this Act as the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.”

## Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVII of this Act shall expire on October 1, 2017, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later.

## Section 2003—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, and XXVII of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2014, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

## TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$539,427,000 for Army military construction and \$429,585,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends authorization of \$673,427,000 for military construction and \$429,585,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction of funding for a project contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. This reduction includes:

(1) \$13.0 million for a Command and Control Facility at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. The budget request included \$96.0 million to support the command and control requirements for U.S. Army Pacific headquarters. While the committee supports the requirement for this facility, the committee is concerned that the unit cost for this facility is high compared to a standard design even when accounting for Area Cost Factors. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$83.0 million, a reduction of \$13.0 million, for this project.

In addition, the committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Army but not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) \$86.0 million for an Advance Individual Training Barracks Complex, Phase 3, at Fort Lee, Virginia. The budget request did not include funding to support housing requirements for advanced individual training students. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$86.0 million, an increase of \$86.0 million, for this project.

(2) \$46.0 million for a Simulation Center at Fort Hood, Texas. The budget request did not include funding to support a command and control training using simulators. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$46.0 million, an increase of \$46.0 million, for this project.

(3) \$15.0 million for a Consolidated Shipping Center at Bluegrass Army Depot, Kentucky. The budget request did not include funding to support a consolidated, indoor shipping and receiving center for munitions, arms, and explosives. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$15.0 million, an increase of \$15.0 million, for this project.

(4) \$69.0 million for a High Value Detention Facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The budget request did not include funding to support this complex. The committee recommends \$69.0 million, an increase of \$69.0 million, for this project.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SECTION 2101—AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

This section would contain the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

#### Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2015.

### SECTION 2103—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

This section would authorize appropriations for Army military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

#### Section 2104—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

#### Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013

(division B of Public Law 112–239) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of previously authorized construction projects. This section was included in the President’s request or included as a specific request from the Secretary of the Army.

Section 2106—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year  
2011 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President’s request.

Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year  
2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President’s request.

## TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$1,018,772,000 for Navy military construction and \$370,441,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends authorization of \$998,772,000 for military construction and \$370,441,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Explanation of Funding Adjustment

The committee recommends reduction of funding for a project contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. This reduction includes:

(1) \$20.0 million for the Center for Cyber Security Studies Building at Annapolis, Maryland. The budget request included \$120.1 million to support the requirements for academic cyber security programs at the U.S. Naval Academy. The committee supports the authorization of 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 the Navy has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2015. As such, the committee recommends \$100.1 million, a reduction of \$20.0 million, 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 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

## Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2015.

## Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2015.

## Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize appropriations for Navy military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

## Section 2205—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction projects. This section was included in the President's request.

## Section 2206—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

## Section 2207—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2208—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year  
2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY  
CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$811,774,000 for Air Force military construction and \$327,747,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends authorization of \$811,774,000 for military construction and \$327,747,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Air Force Strategic Basing Process

The committee notes that the Air Force has plans to divest legacy aircraft from its Active Duty and Reserve Component force structure over the Future Years Defense Program. While divesting of legacy aircraft, the Air Force will also conduct strategic basing reviews to determine where to locate new units and missions, such as the F-35A and the KC-46A, in the coming years. The committee is supportive of the Air Force's strategic basing process and believes that it provides a thorough, consistent, and transparent process for basing decisions. When evaluating candidate bases for new units and missions, the committee believes that it is appropriate for the Air Force to consider infrastructure supporting aircraft to be divested from its force structure as being available to support new units and missions should the scheduled divestiture occur before the scheduled arrival of the new unit or mission.

Infrastructure Deficiencies of Dining Facilities

The committee is aware of serious infrastructure deficiencies of dining facilities at installations administered by the Air Force. The failure or unavailability of a dining facility would result in mission degradation, and greater risk exists at dining facilities constructed several decades ago or those originally intended to be temporary structures. Further, relative to the total cost of training operations and in the context of critical training missions, the committee believes that replacing severely deficient dining facilities is an appropriate, cost-effective method of preserving mission capabilities. The committee encourages the Air Force to take into consideration the necessity of reducing risk of mission stoppage by investing in the replacement of dining facilities that have infrastructure deficiencies which could cause health and safety issues.

## 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 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

## Section 2302—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 2303—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181) and authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

## Section 2304—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

## Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

## TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$2,061,890,000 for defense agency military construction and \$62,662,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends authorization of \$2,032,890,000 for military construction and \$62,662,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2015.

The budget request also contained \$38,715,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of \$38,715,000 for chemical demilitarization construction for fiscal year 2015.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) \$70.0 million for the Medical Center Replacement, Increment 4 at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany. The budget request included \$259.695 million to support the replacement of an aging medical center that provides medical services to beneficiaries throughout U.S. European Command, as well as contingency casualty evacuation support for military personnel deployed in various combatant command areas of responsibility. The committee supports the authorization of 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 2015. As such, the committee recommends \$189.695 million, a reduction of \$70.0 million, for this project.

(2) \$20.0 million for planning and design activities at various worldwide locations. The budget request included \$142.240 million to support the planning and design of projects in the construction program of various defense agencies. The committee supports authorizing appropriations for planning and design in an amount that supports military construction activities projected in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). For this request, the committee believes that the Department of Defense's budget request for planning and design exceeds the requirement necessary to support the construction program for the FYDP submitted for fiscal years 2015 through 2019. As such, the committee recommends \$122.24 million, a reduction of \$20.0 million, for planning and design.

(3) \$9.0 million for contingency construction at various worldwide locations. The budget request included \$9.0 million to support contingency construction requirements not previously authorized by law. The committee notes that the Department has not requested a military construction project using funds from this account since 2008. In addition, the committee notes that unobligated balances remain available in the military construction account and other authorities exist to construct projects that are in keeping with a national security interest. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of \$9.0 million, for this program.

In addition, the committee recommends an increase of funding for projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) \$70.0 million for the Hospital Replacement, Increment 6 at Fort Bliss, Texas. The budget request includes \$131.5 million to support the replacement of a hospital that provides inpatient and outpatient care to the beneficiary population at Fort Bliss. The committee supports the authorization of 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's request is below the amount required in fiscal year 2015 to support

the construction project's scope and schedule without putting the project at risk. As such, the committee recommends \$201.5 million, and increase of \$70.0 million, for this project.

(2) \$20.0 million for Missile Defense Agency Military Construction Planning and Design activities for a CONUS Interceptor Site for homeland missile defense. The committee recommends \$20.0 million, an increase of \$20.0 million, for this project.

#### Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility

The committee notes that in January 2014, approximately 27,000 gallons of fuel leaked from a tank in the Red Hill underground fuel storage facility. The underground storage facility was constructed in the early 1940s and contains 20 fuel tanks that are buried beneath 100 feet of volcanic rock.

The committee further notes that the budget request included \$52.9 million in investments to replace two fuel tanks and upgrade the fire suppression and ventilation system supporting the Red Hill underground fuel storage facility. The committee believes that the Red Hill facility will continue to play an important supporting role for the U.S. rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2014, on the long-term infrastructure improvements that may be necessary to support the continued safe and secure operation of the Red Hill underground fuel storage facility.

### 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 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

##### Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects at the amounts authorized for each project at a specific location valued at a cost greater than \$2.0 million. This section would also authorize the sum total of projects across various locations, each project of which is less than \$2.0 million. This section would also preclude the ability to set-aside operation and maintenance facilities restoration and modernization funds for the exclusive purpose of funding energy projects. It would require installation energy projects to compete in the normal process of determining installation requirements.



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—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2406—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2015 Projects Pending Submission of Required Reports

This section would restrict the obligation of funds to support human performance center initiatives at certain locations, until the Secretary of Defense submits a report on this program that was required in the Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as printed in the Congressional Record on December 12, 2013 (page H7956), and a report on the review of Department of Defense efforts regarding the prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents required elsewhere in this Act.

SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for chemical demilitarization construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2412—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2000 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 107-107), as amended, and authorize the Secretary of Defense to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

## TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$199,700,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends authorization of \$199,700,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2015.

### 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 \$426,549,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends authorization of \$521,649,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2015.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Army but not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) \$26.0 million for an Army Reserve Center at Arlington Heights, Illinois. The budget request did not include funding to support a reserve center for Army Reserve units. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$26.0 million, an increase of \$26.0 million, for this project.

(2) \$25.0 million for an Army Reserve Center, Phase II, at Riverside, California. The budget request did not include funding to support a reserve center for Army Reserve units. The committee notes

that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$25.0 million, an increase of \$25.0 million, for this project.

(3) \$19.0 million for Enlisted Barracks and Transit Training at the Yakima Training Center, Washington. The budget request did not include funding to support the requirements of the Washington Army National Guard's Regional Training Institute. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$19.0 million, an increase of \$19.0 million, for this project.

(4) \$10.8 million for a National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop at Dagsboro, Delaware. The budget request did not include funding to support vehicle maintenance shop requirements for the Delaware Army National Guard. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$10.8 million, an increase of \$10.8 million, for this project.

(5) \$9.3 million for an Army Reserve Center and Land at Starkville, Mississippi. The budget request did not include funding to support a reserve center and land acquisition for Army Reserve units. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$9.3 million, an increase of \$9.3 million, for this project.

(6) \$5.0 million for a National Guard Readiness Center Addition/Alternation at Alamogordo, New Mexico. The budget request did not include funding to support additions/alterations required to address facility shortages and inadequacies at a readiness center. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of critical unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends \$5.0 million, an increase of \$5.0 million, for this project.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

#### Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list

contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects**

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects**

This section would contain the list of authorized Air National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects**

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve**

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

**SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS**

**Section 2611—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects**

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section would also extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

**Section 2612—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project**

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013

(division B of Public Law 112–293) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President’s request.

Section 2613—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year  
2011 Project

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later. This section was included in the President’s request.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE  
ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$270,085,000 for activities related to Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities. The committee recommends authorization of \$270,085,000 for BRAC activities.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Base Closure and Realignment Disposal Assessment

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has requested authority to conduct another round of defense base closures and realignment (BRAC) in 2017. BRAC is often cited as a means of saving significant defense dollars in a time of declining budgets. The committee is concerned that efficiencies associated with the BRAC process are offset with the inability to quickly dispose of excess property and the potential lack of overall savings to the federal government. For example, there are numerous instances where the Department of Defense conveyed excess property to other Federal agencies and the overall Government may not have saved money.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, as to the overall effectiveness of the property disposal process. The report should specifically assess each prior BRAC round (1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005), by military department, and provide the following:

- (1) A listing, by acre, of property disposed to: other Federal agencies; state and local agencies; non-profit entities; and the private sector;
- (2) A list of remaining acreage to be disposed;
- (3) An assessment of land sale revenues realized from prior property disposal actions;
- (4) An assessment of environmental expenditures and caretaker services expended; and
- (5) An assessment of remaining environmental remediation costs to complete and associated caretaker services anticipated during the environmental remediation.

### Joint Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations

At the request of the committee, the Government Accountability Office has issued reports on the status of Department of Defense's joint basing initiative. However, the committee remains concerned that efforts to implement Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) 2005 recommendations that required the military services to merge or consolidate functions to become more joint were not effectively implemented, obviating certain cost saving opportunities. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, on the status of Department of Defense actions to implement its BRAC 2005 recommendations that meet these goals of reducing infrastructure and promoting "jointness." The report should address the following questions:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense identified benefits, cost savings, and/or cost avoidances resulting from implementing these recommendations?

(2) To what extent has the Department achieved enhancements to joint operations from establishment of joint centers of excellence or joint training activities or achieved other operational efficiencies from such consolidations?

(3) What challenges has the Department experienced in implementing these initiatives and to what extent has the Department of Defense resolved these challenges?

### Property Disposal Methods

The committee seeks a greater understanding of the Department of Defense's implementation of homeless assistance, pursuant to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), via property disposal actions that the Department of Defense completes through the Base Realignment and Closure Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, on the findings of a review of the effectiveness of implementation of the relevant statutory provisions by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Defense.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account

This section would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of Base Realignment and Closure activities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

## SUBTITLE B—PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL BRAC ROUND

Section 2711—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base  
Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round

This section would affirm congressional intent to reject the budget request to authorize another Base Realignment and Closure round in 2017.

## SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2721—Force-Structure Plans and Infrastructure Inventory  
and Assessment of Infrastructure Necessary To Support the  
Force Structure

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report as part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the President's budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 that details (1) a 20-year force structure plan, and (2) a comprehensive inventory of worldwide infrastructure. The report shall also compare these two items to determine categories of excess in the Department of Defense infrastructure. The Secretary of Defense shall also certify whether the need exists for the closure or realignment of additional military installations and whether the Secretary anticipates that each Base Closure and Realignment recommendation would result in annual net savings for each of the military departments within 6 years after the initiation of the additional round of closures and realignments.

This section would also require that within 60 days of submission of the Secretary of Defense report, the Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the accuracy and analytical sufficiency of the plan and inventory.

Section 2722—Modification of Property Disposal Procedures Under  
Base Realignment and Closure Process

This section would authorize the local government, in whose jurisdiction the military installation is wholly located, to be recognized as the local reuse authority for purposes of managing Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) reuse planning. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees as to excess BRAC property that has not been declared surplus by the Federal Government.

Section 2723—Final Settlement of Claims Regarding Caretaker  
Agreement for Former Defense Depot Ogden, Utah

This section would limit any further claim adjudication associated with a caretaker agreement between the City of Ogden, Utah, the Ogden Local Redevelopment Authority, and the Department of the Army. This limitation would be conditioned on a release of claims against the United States by the City of Ogden and the Ogden Local Redevelopment Authority.

## TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Army Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment

The committee notes that the Army has used a stationing strategy, called Army 2020, to analyze the various options available to the Secretary of the Army to implement a reduction in force structure. The Army 2020 process used key inputs including a Programmatic Environmental Assessment, a military value analysis, community listening sessions, and an analysis of other stationing factors. Additionally, military judgment, utilizing a variety of planning and steering committees was incorporated into the final decision to reduce specific Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs). As a result of the Army 2020 process, the Army inactivated 12 BCTs and reorganized the remaining BCTs by adding a third maneuver battalion to armor and infantry brigades located in the continental United States. On February 6, 2014, the Army announced plans to implement a Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA), to analyze the reduction of the Active Component below 490,000 soldiers. However, the Army is proceeding with the SPEA before fully implementing the results of Army 2020.

The committee believes it is appropriate for the Secretary of the Army to use the results of the Army 2020 analysis as the baseline input of the SPEA. Therefore, concurrent with the release of the draft SPEA, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2014, on the baseline for the SPEA and any deviation from the Army 2020 analysis. If the Secretary is compelled to deviate from the Army 2020 analysis, the Secretary should provide the committee an explanation of why such deviation is appropriate.

#### Cyber and Electromagnetic Open-Air Test Ranges

The committee believes that the Department of Defense needs to maintain robust test range capabilities to meet current and emerging cyber and electromagnetic requirements. The committee believes that maintaining the ability to support testing, evaluation, and simulation of cyber and electromagnetic capabilities and threats in an open-air environment with limited spectrum encroachment is important to U.S. national security interests. As such, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should continue to ensure that test ranges have modern facilities, instruments, equipment, as well as sufficient funds to support its mission. In addition, the Department should take appropriate actions to mitigate encroachment or other threats that may reduce the capacity or capability to conduct necessary testing missions to ensure a modern military.

#### Deployment of Secure Work Environments

The committee is aware of the increasing importance of protecting valuable intellectual property and sensitive information, es-



pecially during this current cyber environment. The committee notes that data loss prevention is critical for the long-term sustainment of most military operations, personnel protection, and troop movements, particularly when information needs to be discussed in locations outside of a fully protected Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF).

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to establish an agency-wide strategy to create secure work environments where unclassified but sensitive information can be shared utilizing technological advances in full spectrum Radio Frequency (RF) monitoring and commercial off the shelf solutions for film protected glass that protects from data loss and intrusion. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, that: (1) details a programmatic plan to provide additional protection from RF and Infrared (IR) for non-SCIF facilities that would be impacted by potential intrusions; and (2) an assessment of the Unified Facilities Guide specifications that are used to provide RF and IR protections.

#### Facilities Modernization Model

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's real property management process requires extensive oversight to maintain more than \$850.0 billion in infrastructure at an annual cost of nearly \$60.0 billion. As part of its overall effort to maintain facilities, the Department of Defense is required to modernize certain facilities to make sure that they meet current standards. To assist in this process, the Department of Defense developed its Facilities Modernization Model which predicts the average annual dollar amount required for the Department to modernize its inventory of facilities on an ongoing basis.

The Facilities Modernization Model parallels the Facilities Sustainment Model. In 2008, the Government Accountability Office reported that although the sustainment model provides a consistent and reasonable framework for preparing estimates of the Department of Defense's facility sustainment funding requirements, there were issues with some of the model's key inputs, affecting the reliability of the model's estimates. As the Modernization Model should always be used in conjunction with the Facilities Sustainment Model, the committee is concerned that similar issues may affect the reliability of the Facilities Modernization Model's estimates. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, on the Facilities Modernization Model to include the following:

(1) What are the main inputs into the Facilities Modernization Model and to what extent have the Department and the military services validated these inputs?

(2) To what extent are the services funding facility modernization at levels determined by the model; how are decisions made to deviate from the models' recommendations if needed; and what is the impact if modernization funding is not provided at the recommended levels?

### Family Housing at Camp Humphreys, Korea

The committee supports the Yongsan Relocation Plan agreed to by the United States and the Republic of Korea to relocate United States military forces from Seoul, Korea to Camp Humphreys in Pyeongtaek, Korea. The committee notes that while the majority of the relocation costs will be paid by the Republic of Korea, the Department of the Army is responsible for the acquisition of military family housing at Camp Humphreys that meets U.S. standards for acceptable size, condition, and quality of construction to support command sponsored families that will be stationed there.

The committee notes that the Commander, United States Forces, Korea has indicated a requirement for 40 percent of command-sponsored families to reside on Camp Humphreys based on operational needs to enhance readiness. He also testified that additional family housing at Camp Humphreys is required starting in 2016.

In 2008, the committee notes that the Department of the Army competitively solicited and agreed to terms with a private partner to construct and operate family housing units on Camp Humphreys. The goal of this project was to use private financing to construct military family housing on-post at Camp Humphreys. This acquisition method was preferred by the Department over a significant investment in military construction, which was unsupportable given the limited amounts available in military family housing construction accounts and other operational priorities in the Army.

The committee is mindful that the Army conducted a family housing forum in Korea in March 2014. This forum confirmed that without some combination of a higher Overseas Housing Allowance and occupancy guarantees little new construction of American style family housing units is likely to be built in the area around Camp Humphreys. The committee is concerned that housing in the Pyeongtaek, Korea area does not afford military members and their families adequate housing, meeting quality and force protection standards without significant out-of-pocket expenses. The committee believes that privatized housing may be a solution for the pending family housing shortage at Camp Humphreys.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to prepare a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, a detailed description of the factors and assessment used to determine the adequacy of an off-base housing unit in the Pyeongtaek area and an assessment of the progress and milestones for the acquisition of adequate housing for military members and their families.

### High Performance Facades for Department of Defense Installations

The committee is aware of a new blast protection technology that has been developed which utilizes high performance materials through a secondary facade structure to provide increased blast and ballistic protection to Department of Defense buildings, bases, and installations. The committee notes that such secondary facades could provide the Department increased flexibility and cost-savings in certain situations where relocation is being considered. The committee also notes that secondary facades could be more useful for

retrofitting and upgrading existing buildings, as well as being incorporated into the architectural designs of new buildings. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2014, on recent efforts to utilize and test high performance materials as a secondary facade structure and any modifications to the Unified Facility Guide Specifications that would be necessary to incorporate the assessment of this technology.

#### Innovative Building Materials and Design Techniques

The committee notes that in March 2013, the Department of Defense released Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 1-200-02, High Performance and Sustainable Building Requirements. UFC 1-200-02 defines the minimum requirements for planning, design and construction, renovation, repair, maintenance and operations, and equipment installation in new and existing facilities. In a policy memorandum issued in November 2013, military components were authorized to pursue greater energy and water efficiency if such initiatives are shown to reduce total ownership cost of the facility, or preserve or increase mission effectiveness in the face of projected resource scarcity.

The committee recognizes that innovative technologies have expanded the availability of materials with lower embodied energy for facilities that require tall walls and large open spaces with minimal intermediate supports. In addition, design techniques such as advanced framing contribute to lower material costs, increased energy efficiency, and reduced waste in facilities. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to incorporate the use of innovative materials and design techniques that support the requirements of UFC 1-200-02 and the goals of achieving greater efficiency and lower environmental impacts at a lower material cost.

#### Joint Land Use Study

The committee notes that military installations are often the economic engines that underpin and drive local economies. Direct expenditures of defense dollars in the form of payrolls and local procurement contracts generate in turn secondary expenditures that help support local economies. Military installations can also affect adjacent communities in several ways, some positive (as with the economic impacts) and some negative. Negative impacts may include noise, safety concerns, smoke, dust, and other effects from training and military operations. In some instances, the military attempts to moderate these negative effects through the Joint Land Use Program.

The committee is aware of certain noise and encroachment concerns around the U.S. Air Force Academy, Peterson Air Force Base and Fort Carson, Colorado. The committee believes that a Joint Land Use Study of the surrounding area would be effective to help offset these negative consequences. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide notice to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, of the Joint Land Used

Studies that the Secretary has programmed and a schedule for when the area supporting the U.S. Air Force Academy, Peterson Air Force Base and Fort Carson are expected to begin a Joint Land Use Study.

#### Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization

The committee notes that the infrastructure supporting Lincoln Laboratory's facilities at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, are in need of recapitalization in order to support its mission. The committee is aware that the Air Force, in coordination with Lincoln Laboratory, has developed an Enhanced Use Lease proposal using existing authorities under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, which has been approved by the Department of Defense and is under review by the Office of Management and Budget. The Enhanced Use Lease will allow Massachusetts Institute of Technology to carry out improvements and modernization of the Lincoln Laboratory complex at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, at no cost to the U.S. Government. The modernization effort will replace the aging compound semiconductor and microelectronics integration facilities and the engineering and prototyping facilities with two modern, energy efficient buildings. The committee supports the plans to keep Lincoln Laboratory on the cutting edge of technology and enable it to continue to confront the Nation's most complex technological challenges.

#### Performance-Based Standards for Building System Components

The Unified Facilities Guide Specifications (UFGS) provide guidance for the design and construction of facilities and the acquisition of building system components by the Department of Defense. The committee notes the limited resources available to the Department for the construction and maintenance of facilities. The committee further recognizes the consistent implementation of the Department's construction specifications is critical to acquiring high performing and life-cycle cost-effective assets. The committee is aware of recent instances of military construction projects in which deviations from the construction specifications occurred. The committee reminds the Department that the use of UFGS are mandatory and encourages the Secretary of Defense to ensure that those specifications are consistently applied in construction and renovation.

#### Public-Private Family Housing on Guam

The committee recognizes that the Department of the Navy recently released a draft supplemental Environmental Impact Statement regarding the development of a main cantonment area and firing range for U.S. Marines realigning from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. Further, the committee recognizes that the Distributed Laydown differs significantly from previous realignment plans, as it depends on a more heavily rotational force on Guam than a permanent headquarters presence. Under the renegotiated agreement with the Government of Japan to support the Distributed Laydown, the committee understands that the Government of Japan will no longer provide nearly \$3.0 billion in special purpose entity (SPE) funds. According to plans and briefings from the Department, a

SPE is essentially a public-private venture (PPV) for military family housing and certain utility improvements.

Despite the changes to the plans for the realignment of U.S. Marines, the committee recognizes that additional military forces are also realigning to Guam as part of the Asia-Pacific rebalance. In particular, the Navy announced the stationing of a fourth Los Angeles class fast-attack submarine in Guam, and the Air Force continues a Red Horse and Contingency Response Group beddown at Andersen Air Force Base. These additional forces, along with other potential military personnel increases, will challenge the current inventory of military family housing on Guam. The committee has been supportive of PPV endeavors in other U.S. locations and recognizes the potential long-term cost savings coupled with improvements to quality of life matters for service members and their families.

As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015, on the feasibility of utilizing public-private housing ventures on Guam and any factors that might inhibit establishment of such a public-private housing venture. The report should also assess the current backlog and projected backlog in the Future Years Defense Program as to shortfalls in family housing, by service, and the measures that the Secretary has programmed to address these shortfalls.

#### Real Property Management

The committee is concerned about the Department of Defense's management of real property resources. In an era of declining resources, the committee is concerned by decisions made by the Department of Defense to retain underutilized real property. The committee is supportive of real property authorities that provide the Secretary concerned the authority to outlease non-excess properties, but believes that there are instances where the Department has not fully utilized these authorities to manage its real property assets. For example, the committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force is responsible for Keesler Air Force Base and certain non-contiguous properties in the area. A former base housing area called Harrison Court was destroyed by Hurricane Katrina and the 40 acre parcel remains vacant 9 years since Hurricane Katrina. The committee notes that the Air Force continues to expend funds to maintain the vacant property while the local community expresses interest in developing the property for economic or public use purposes. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to assess the value of certain noncontiguous properties in the Keesler Air Force Base area and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, that determines whether there remains a continued requirement for the Air Force to maintain these properties, the feasibility of an enhanced use lease, or the Secretary's intent to initiate excess proceeding for these properties.

### Report on Circumvention of Military Construction Laws

The committee is aware of certain construction projects that were awarded without a specific authorization from Congress and in apparent contravention to section 2802 of title 10, United States Code. The committee is concerned by the contracting officer's and fiscal attorney's assessment to not seek a specific military construction authorization for these projects prior to award. The committee is further concerned that similar construction projects may have been undertaken within the past 5 years without a specific authorization by Congress. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, that assesses the entirety of all construction projects carried out in the last 5 years by the Secretary concerned without a specific authorization by Congress. This assessment should only review construction projects that exceed the minor military construction thresholds established by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code.

### Type I and Type III Retro-Reflective Glass Beads

As requested in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee notes that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics submitted the report, "Analysis of Type I and Type III Retro-Reflective Glass Beads" to the congressional defense committees on April 16, 2014. In its report, the Department of Defense stated that "Type III glass beads provide a modest increase in visibility compared with Type I beads but this benefit is short-lived and costly. Although the Department does not preclude the use of Type III beads, we find Type I glass beads to be a satisfactory and cost-effective solution for our airport pavement marking requirements." The committee also notes that another report entitled, "Airfield Marking Durability Study" was prepared on March 12, 2014, by Sightline, LC, that found "based on reflectivity data recorded at 13 airports across the United States, including military and commercial, Type III glass beads provide higher levels of retro-reflectivity initially and over time, resulting in lower maintenance costs." The committee notes that the Department of Defense was likely unable to consider the findings of the report by Sightline, LC when it was preparing its report to the congressional defense committees.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to assess the Sightline, LC report and information associated with Type III glass beads and determine whether this additional information was incorporated into its report, "Analysis of Type I and Type III Retro-Reflective Glass Beads" submitted on April 16, 2014. If the Sightline, LC report was not considered, the committee directs the Under Secretary to prepare an addendum to their previous report and submit it to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2014, and use the Sightline, LC report, and any other new information available, to assess the value associated with incorporating Type III beads into the Unified Facilities Guide Specifications.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

## Section 2801—Prevention of Circumvention of Military Construction Laws

This section would amend section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that certain military construction projects, land acquisitions, and defense-access roads projects must be specifically authorized in a Military Construction Authorization Act.

## Section 2802—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction

This section would modify section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, by increasing the threshold associated with operation and maintenance funding for construction purposes from \$750,000 to \$1.0 million. This section would also unify the threshold for application of unspecified minor construction from \$2.0 million to \$3.0 million. Finally, this section would authorize the Secretary concerned to make adjustments to the general authority to match area cost factors.

## Section 2803—Use of One-Step Turn-Key Contractor Selection Procedures for Additional Facility Projects

This section would modify section 2862 of title 10, United States Code, to expand the existing authority to use turn-key selection procedures for military construction projects to also include certain repair projects and facility construction associated with authorized security assistance activities.

## Section 2804—Extension of Limitation on Construction Projects in European Command Area of Responsibility

This section would extend the prohibition previously included in section 2809 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) on awarding a contract for any new military construction and family housing project, with certain exceptions, in the U.S. European Command area of responsibility until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the installations and specific military construction requirements authorized in this Act have been examined as part of the ongoing European Infrastructure Consolidation Assessment, have been determined to be of an enduring nature, and most effectively meet military requirements at the authorized location.

## SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Consultation Requirement in Connection with  
Department of Defense Major Land Acquisitions

This section would require consultation by the Secretary concerned with the chief executive officer of the state or territory as to the location of any proposed major land acquisition.

The committee notes that the Secretary concerned is already required to obtain a specific military construction authorization in accordance with section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, and comply with National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321) before any major land acquisition can be implemented.

Section 2812—Renewals, Extensions, and Succeeding Leases for  
Financial Institutions Operating on Military Installations

This section would authorize the Secretary concerned to enter into a sole source renewal, extension or succeeding lease for a financial institution operating on military installations.

## Section 2813—Arsenal Installation Reutilization Authority

This section would modify section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the authorities to lease real or personal property contained in such section to the commander of military manufacturing arsenals or, if part of a larger military installation, the installation commander for the purposes of leveraging private investment at military manufacturing arsenals through long-term facility use contracts, property management contracts, leases, or other such agreements. This section does not supersede authorities in section 4544 of title 10, United States Code, and is designed to give the commander of military manufacturing arsenals or, if part of a larger military installation, the installation commander, greater flexibility to utilize unused administrative and warehouse space at military installations.

## Section 2814—Deposit of Reimbursed Funds to Cover Administrative Expenses Relating to Certain Real Property Transactions

This section would amend section 2695 of title 10, United States Code, and would provide flexibility to ensure that reimbursements eventually received by the military departments are not expired at the time of reimbursement. This section would provide for the merger of the reimbursed funds with those in the current appropriation, fund, or account used by the military departments for payment of administrative transaction-related expenses. Finally, this section would authorize the military departments to use operation and maintenance appropriations to pay for administrative expenses needed to complete other real property transactions.

Section 2815—Special Easement Acquisition Authority, Pacific  
Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to use the authority provided by section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to acquire from willing sellers easements and other interests in



real property in the vicinity of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii.

Section 2816—National Security Considerations for Inclusion of Federal Property on National Register of Historic Places or Designation as National Historic Landmark under the National Historic Preservation Act

This section would prohibit the designation of Federal property as a National Historic Landmark or for nomination to the World Heritage List if the head of the agency managing the Federal property objects to such inclusion or designation for reasons of national security. This section would also authorize the expedited removal of Federal property listed on the National Register of Historic Places if the managing agency of that Federal property submits a request to the Secretary of Interior for such removal for reasons of national security.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATED TO ASIA-PACIFIC MILITARY REALIGNMENT

Section 2831—Repeal or Modification of Certain Restrictions on Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region

This section would amend section 2822 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and strike certain restrictions limiting the movement of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa, Japan to Guam.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2841—Land Conveyance, Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial, La Jolla, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, certain Department of the Navy property to the Mount Soledad Veterans Memorial Association in La Jolla, California, for public purposes.

Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Former Walter Reed Army Hospital, District of Columbia

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, certain Army facilities at the former Walter Reed Army Hospital to Children’s Hospital for medical research purposes.

Section 2843—Transfers of Administrative Jurisdiction, Camp Frank D. Merrill and Lake Lanier, Georgia

This section would require the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange lands located Camp Frank D. Merrill in Dahlonaga, Georgia, currently under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, for certain lands adjacent to Lake Lanier, Georgia, currently under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army.

Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam,  
Hawaii

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, approximately 1.2 acres of public land to the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation for public purposes.

Section 2845—Modification of Conditions on Land Conveyance,  
Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois

This section would extend years of operations associated with certain landfill operations at the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois from 23 years to 38 years.

Section 2846—Land Conveyance, Robert H. Dietz Army Reserve  
Center, Kingston, New York

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, the former Robert H. Dietz Army Reserve Center to the City of Kingston, New York, for public purposes.

Section 2847—Exercise of Reversionary Interest, Camp Gruber,  
Oklahoma

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to perform a business case analysis to assess the requirements associated with reacquiring the former Camp Gruber, Oklahoma. If the Secretary determines that a reversion of the former Camp Gruber is needed for national defense purposes, the Secretary shall exercise the reversionary rights and request the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife to reconvey Camp Gruber to the United States. The Secretary shall then convey, without consideration, the former Camp Gruber to the Oklahoma Military Department for military maneuver space.

Section 2848—Land Conveyance, Hanford Site, Washington

This section would require the Secretary of the Energy to convey two parcels of real property to the Community Reuse Organization of the Hanford Site for fair market value by December 31, 2014. The Secretary of the Energy may convey the property below fair market value if the Community Reuse Organization agrees to provide the net proceeds from the sale or lease of the real property during a seven year period to support economic redevelopment at the Hanford Site, Washington.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Memorial to the Victims of the Shooting Attack at  
the Washington Navy Yard

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a memorial at the Washington Navy Yard in the District of Columbia. The memorial will be dedicated to the victims of the shooting attack that occurred on September 16, 2013.

**Section 2862—Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies**

This section would name the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies at Honolulu, Hawaii, as the “Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies”, and would make other conforming changes.

**Section 2863—Redesignation of Pohakuloa Training Area in Hawaii as the Pohakuloa Training Center**

This section would change the designation of the Pohakuloa Training Area in Hawaii to the Pohakuloa Training Center.

**Section 2864—Designation of Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in Riverside, California**

This section would authorize a memorial to members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. The memorial is located at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, and would hereby be designated as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

**Section 2865—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio**

This section would modify the name of the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers Aviation Center, Dayton, Ohio, to the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers National Museum, Dayton, Ohio.

**Section 2866—Manhattan Project National Historical Park**

This section would authorize the Secretary of Interior to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park as a unit of the National Park System.

**TITLE XXIX—MILITARY LAND TRANSFERS AND WITHDRAWALS TO SUPPORT READINESS AND SECURITY**

**LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS**

**SUBTITLE A—NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON, NEVADA**

**Section 2901—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada**

This section would transfer certain public lands adjacent to Naval Air Station Fallon in Churchill County, Nevada, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Navy.

**Section 2902—Water Rights**

This section would ensure that the United States does not acquire additional water rights as a result of the transfer of administrative jurisdiction authorized by this subtitle.

## Section 2903—Withdrawal

This section would withdraw lands transferred by this subtitle from all forms of appropriation under public land laws so long as the land remains under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

SUBTITLE B—MARINE CORPS AIR GROUND COMBAT CENTER  
TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA

Section 2911—Redesignation of Johnson Valley Off-Highway  
Vehicle Recreation Area, California

This section would rename the Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area in California, as the Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area.

SUBTITLE C—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT WITHDRAWN  
MILITARY LANDS EFFICIENCY AND SAVINGS

Section 2921—Elimination of Termination Date for Public Land  
Withdrawals and Reservations Under Military Lands With-  
drawal Act of 1999

This section would extend the public lands withdrawn for military purposes listed in the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title 30 of Public Law 106–65) until the Secretary of the military department determines a military purpose does not exist, or the Secretary of Interior permanently transfers the administrative jurisdiction to the Secretary of the military department concerned.

SUBTITLE D—NAVAL AIR WEAPONS STATION CHINA LAKE,  
CALIFORNIA

Section 2931—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Land for  
Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California

This section would amend section 2979 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and permanently extend the withdrawal and reservation of public land for Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California. This section would also permanently withdraw public lands known as Cuddeback Land Area for use by the Secretary of the Navy.

SUBTITLE E—WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, NEW MEXICO

Section 2941—Additional Withdrawal and Reservation of Public  
Land to Support White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

This section would amend section 2951 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and extend the withdrawal and reservation of public land of White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, to include Federal lands located beneath the boundaries of the Special Use Airspace designated as R–5107C and R–5107H.

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

**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

**OVERVIEW**

The budget request for fiscal year 2015 contained \$17.7 billion for atomic energy defense activities. The committee recommends \$17.4 billion, a decrease of \$308.0 million to the budget request.

**ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

**NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**

**Overview**

The budget request contained \$11.7 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2011. The committee recommends \$11.8 billion, an increase of \$143.7 million to the budget request.

**Weapons Activities**

*B61–12 and W76–1 Life Extension Programs*

The budget request contained \$643.0 million for the B61 Life Extension Program (LEP) and \$259.2 million for the W76 LEP. The committee continues to believe that the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) primary focus must be its nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship program, and within that broader program the deliverables directly supporting Department of Defense requirements must be paramount. Successfully delivering LEPs efficiently and on schedule must be NNSA's central focus.

The committee notes the considerable progress of the B61 LEP in the past year. With development engineering well underway, the Director of Sandia National Laboratories testified before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on April 9, 2014, that the design of the B61–12 bomb is 75 percent complete and all major schedule and cost milestones established in the program baseline, as adjusted for receipt of appropriations, have been met. The committee is encouraged by the progress of this critical program and believes continued success will help NNSA rebuild lost trust with the Department of Defense and Congress. The committee recommends \$643.0 million for the B61 LEP, the amount of the budget request.

The committee also notes that NNSA completed only 74 percent of the W76–1 production build schedule in fiscal year 2013. The committee understands that a key cause of this was uncertainty in funding and delays at the Pantex site. The committee believes NNSA's plan to ramp up to the full, steady-state production rate for the W76 LEP in fiscal year 2015, and therefore meet the Navy's deliverable schedule, is at significant risk. Therefore, the committee recommends \$273.8 million for the W76 LEP, an increase of \$14.6 million from the budget request.

*Deferral of the W78/88-1 Life Extension Program*

The fiscal year 2015 budget request proposes to defer the W78/88-1 Warhead Life Extension Program (LEP) by at least 5 years. This program would create an “interoperable” warhead containing key components that could be used on both submarine-launched ballistic missiles and land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) believes the deferral of this program does not represent an abandonment of the Nuclear Weapons Council’s long-term “3+2” strategy for the nuclear weapons stockpile, but does create a more realistic out-year funding profile for NNSA’s Weapons Activities.

The committee does not object to the proposed deferral in principle, and is aware of the challenges to this program related to costs, certification, and the potential need for increased missile flight tests. However, the committee is concerned about the implications of this deferral for the nuclear weapons stockpile and the nuclear security enterprise. Deferral will reduce opportunities for sustaining critical design and development skills at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, create significant production gaps at Pantex (coupled with the proposed deferral of the long-range standoff weapon warhead), require a reevaluation of the overall strategy for hedging against the risk through the non-deployed and inactive stockpiles, and reduce the ability to leverage development efforts between LEPs. The committee expects the Nuclear Weapons Council to consider these impacts in the months ahead and expects robust mitigation actions to be formulated and carried out.

Furthermore, deferral places increased importance on surveillance efforts related to the existing W78 warhead. The budget request contained \$62.7 million for W78 Stockpile Systems. The committee recommends \$66.4 million for W78 Stockpile Systems, an increase of \$3.7 million, to support increased surveillance.

Finally, the committee notes that section 3118 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) remains in effect for the future and expects the comparative analysis required by that section to be submitted prior to the W78/88-1 LEP entering Phase 6.3 (development engineering).

*Deferred maintenance*

Within Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF), the budget request contained \$205.0 million for Maintenance and Repair of Facilities and \$209.3 million for Recapitalization. These funds are intended to slow the rate of growth in the backlog of deferred maintenance at facilities across the nuclear security enterprise.

Budget justification materials submitted by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) note that NNSA’s deferred maintenance backlog is over \$3.5 billion and growing. The materials highlight that, of NNSA’s approximately 3,800 facilities, almost 30 percent were built during the Manhattan Project era and over 50 percent are more than 40 years old.

The committee agrees with NNSA that infrastructure risk, if left unaddressed, becomes safety risk and mission risk. The committee fears that, given NNSA’s numerous high-priority programs and the termination of the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization

Program (FIRP) in 2013, insufficient attention and funding will be applied to the deferred maintenance problem going forward.

To support NNSA's efforts to continue mitigating infrastructure risks and buying down deferred maintenance, the committee recommends \$220.0 million for Maintenance and Repair of Facilities, an increase of \$15.0 million, and \$248.3 million for Recapitalization, an increase of \$39.0 million. Of the funding provided for Recapitalization, the committee expects the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide at least \$60.0 million to the Capabilities Based Investment program to focus recapitalization efforts on the highest priority mission needs.

*Implementation of Center for Security Technology, Analysis, Response, and Testing*

Section 3116 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) required the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish a Center for Security Technology, Analysis, Response, and Testing (CSTART). In the wake of the security breach at the Y-12 National Security Complex in July 2012, the CSTART was established to provide the Administrator, the Chief of Defense Nuclear Security, and the management and operating contractors of the nuclear security enterprise a wide-range of objective expertise on security technologies, systems, analysis, testing, and response forces.

To better understand the Administrator's plan for the CSTART, the committee directs the Administrator to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2014, on the Administrator's implementation plan for the CSTART. Such plan should be developed in consultation with the Department of Energy's Departmental Security Committee and should discuss the roles, missions, functions, responsibilities, and personnel assigned to the CSTART, as well as actions to be taken to implement the CSTART and timelines for such actions.

*Plan for Public-Private Partnerships*

The committee believes that recent experience at the Kansas City Plant, the Y-12 National Security Complex, and elsewhere around the nuclear security enterprise shows that public-private partnerships can be a useful tool in quickly and efficiently executing non-nuclear construction projects. However, the committee notes the October 2009 report by the Comptroller General of the United States on the Kansas City Plant concluded that National Nuclear Security Administration "officials acknowledge that while leasing a facility through the General Services Administration under a 20-year scenario is less costly than purchasing, it can be more costly over the longer term." The committee also notes the value of building new facilities through public-private partnerships, which can enable workers to quickly relocate from decaying, antiquated buildings to modern office and non-nuclear laboratory spaces while also enabling a reduction in deferred maintenance backlogs.

The committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit a plan to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2015, describing at least two public-private partnerships the Ad-

administrator will seek to enter into to build modern, non-nuclear facilities for the nuclear security enterprise. This plan should discuss the benefits, risks, costs and cost savings over the life of the facility, timelines, and effects on the deferred maintenance backlog associated with carrying out the projects as compared to a program plan that does not carry out the projects.

*Weapons Activities and budget prioritization*

The budget request contained \$8.3 billion for the Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). These programs support NNSA's central mission of ensuring and sustaining the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the U.S. nuclear weapon stockpile.

Within Weapons Activities, the committee continues to believe NNSA must emphasize programs and capabilities that directly support NNSA's deliverables to the Department of Defense. To ensure this emphasis, the committee recommends several adjustments to the budget request for Weapons Activities, as reflected in the accompanying tables. In particular, the committee recommends increases, discussed elsewhere in this title, for several life extension programs (LEP). Furthermore, the committee recommends \$17.0 million, an increase of \$7.6 million, to accelerate NNSA's cruise missile warhead life extension program.

The committee also recommends \$166.6 million for the W88 Alt 370, an increase of \$1.2 million to support the study of options for refresh of conventional high explosives required elsewhere in this title.

The committee recommends \$363.2 million for Production Support, an increase of \$12.3 million, to support sustainment and recapitalization of key production equipment and \$212.5 million for R&D Certification and Safety, an increase of \$11.0 million, to support technology maturation for LEPs and limited life component development. The committee also recommends \$172.9 million for Plutonium Sustainment, an increase of \$28.3 million, to support efforts to deliver a responsive plutonium infrastructure as required elsewhere in this title.

The committee recommends \$54.4 million for Enhanced Surety, an increase of \$2.4 million, to support continued development of safety, security, and use-control technologies and \$41.4 million for Enhanced Surveillance, an increase of \$3.6 million, to accelerate development of tools and methods for predicting aging effects.

The committee recommends \$182.4 million for Nuclear Counterterrorism Incident Response, an increase of \$9.0 million, to better support Department of Defense needs for NNSA's nuclear expertise in support of this critical national security mission.

Overall, the committee recommends \$8.5 billion for Weapons Activities, an increase of \$147.7 million to the budget request.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

*Adopting the Gold Standard for section 123 agreements*

The committee continues to support agreements made in accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Public Law 83-703), which include "the Gold Standard" commitment, as



exemplified by the nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and the United Arab Emirates. The Gold Standard represents a binding legal restriction on uranium enrichment and reprocessing as a condition for concluding nuclear cooperation agreements, and it remains an important component of effective nuclear nonproliferation leadership for reducing longer-term nuclear proliferation risks. However, the committee is concerned that the Administration no longer prioritizes the inclusion of this standard as a condition for nuclear cooperation agreements and has shifted to an ad hoc approach.

The committee remains concerned that the Administration does not require the Gold Standard in all new and renegotiated 123 agreements. The committee believes this weakens U.S. nonproliferation leadership and leverage to limit the potential spread of the knowledge, technology, and material required to enrich uranium and reprocess plutonium. The committee notes that enriched uranium and reprocessed spent nuclear fuel can be used to produce significant stockpiles of fissile material for both peaceful and military purposes. The resulting increase of fissile material could be used by a state to make nuclear weapons or become vulnerable to diversion or theft by terrorists, increasing risks to international and regional security. To preclude such scenarios and the potential increase in the number of latent nuclear weapons states, the committee believes the Gold Standard represents an important legally binding commitment by a foreign country to forgo uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, and is an important indicator of such country's commitment to nuclear nonproliferation.

*Explanation of Funding Adjustments for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation*

The budget request contained \$1.6 billion for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN). Of this amount, \$333.5 million was requested for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI), \$360.8 million for Nonproliferation Research and Development (R&D), \$141.4 million for Nonproliferation and International Security (NIS), \$305.5 million for International Material Protection and Cooperation (IMPC), and \$311.1 million for Fissile Materials Disposition (FMD).

The committee recommends \$413.5 million for GTRI, an increase of \$80.0 million, to accelerate the clean-out and security upgrades in countries other than Russia to minimize the risk of theft of diversion of vulnerable fissile material. The committee recommends \$430.8 million for Nonproliferation R&D, an increase of \$70.0 million, and \$177.8 million for NIS, an increase of \$36.4 million, to support additional verification work, including research and development of next-generation verification and remote sensing technology, and the development of a national verification roadmap as recommended in the January 2014 Defense Science Board report on Assessment of Nuclear Monitoring and Verification Technologies.

The committee believes that no DNN funds for fiscal year 2015 should be authorized for activities with the Russian Federation based on ongoing Russian aggression towards Ukraine. Therefore, the committee recommends \$129.1 million for IMPC, a decrease of \$176.4 million. The decrease of \$176.4 million for IMPC includes a

reduction of \$83.4 million for programs with Russia and a reduction of \$93.0 million for Second Line of Defense (SLD). Also within IMPC, the committee recommends \$21.5 million for SLD for mobile detection systems. The committee questions the value of fixed detection units at major border crossings and ports in deterring and intercepting nuclear weapons-usable material, and believes SLD funds could be better allocated towards mobile detection capabilities to reduce the risk of nuclear terrorism.

Therefore, the committee recommends a total of \$1.6 billion for DNN. Of this amount, the committee recommends \$413.5 million for GTRI, \$430.8 million for Nonproliferation R&D, \$177.8 million for NIS, \$129.1 million for IMPC, and \$311.1 million for FMD.

#### *Nuclear Security Summit 2014*

The committee recognizes the importance of the 2014 Nuclear Security Summit, which occurred in The Netherlands on March 24–25, 2014, in bringing together the international community to focus on and address efforts to reduce the risk of nuclear terrorism. Such efforts have resulted in 13 countries eliminating their stocks of nuclear weapons-grade materials.

The committee commends the Government of Japan for its announcement at the 2014 summit that it plans to transfer more than 700 pounds of weapons-usable plutonium and a large quantity of highly enriched uranium to the United States for disposition. This material is sufficient to make dozens of nuclear weapons if stolen or diverted. The committee believes the increased participation of foreign governments in the summit is important, particularly to increase recognition of the threat of nuclear terrorism and the need to secure vulnerable nuclear material and radioactive sources, as well as develop nuclear forensics capabilities.

The Nuclear Security Guidelines adopted at the summit are an important step toward adopting and implementing universal safety standards designed to secure nuclear and radioactive material. While the committee acknowledges that 35 of the participating nations agreed to adopt the Nuclear Security Guidelines, the committee encourages the U.S. Government to continue engaging with the remaining 18 participating nations to also adopt the guidelines. The committee believes effective prevention of the threat of nuclear terrorism requires all nations to adopt and follow the Nuclear Security Guidelines.

#### Naval Reactors

##### *Briefing on requirements and gaps for preserving the capability to study the use of Low-Enriched Uranium for Naval Reactors*

The committee notes that the report submitted in January 2014 by the Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, on the potential of using low-enriched uranium (LEU) in place of highly-enriched uranium (HEU) in naval nuclear propulsion systems found that “while it may be feasible to replace HEU fuel with LEU fuel in current U.S. Naval reactor plants, it is not economical or practical to do so.” The report notes that “substituting LEU for HEU would fundamentally decrease reactor energy density, increase

lifecycle and operating costs, increase operational radiation exposure, and increase the volume of radioactive wastes.”

The report also states that “recent work has shown that the potential exists to develop an advanced fuel system that could increase uranium loading beyond what is practical today while meeting the rigorous performance requirements for naval reactors” and that “the capability to develop advanced naval fuel resides within a small cadre of highly specialized, experienced, and qualified engineers and scientists.” The report also notes that “the investment to develop a fuel technology and determine its viability is estimated to be up to \$2 billion over at least 10 to 15 years.”

The committee directs the Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2015, on the requirements and costs to maintain the capability to develop an advanced fuel system, including the near-term gaps and investments in research and development that would be required to preserve the technical capability to do so once ongoing new design work is complete.

#### *Naval Reactors*

The budget request contained \$1.4 billion for the Naval Reactors program. Naval Reactors is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion efforts, including reactor plant technology design and development, reactor plant operation and maintenance, and reactor retirement and disposal. The program ensures the safe and reliable operation of reactor plants in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers that comprise over 40 percent of the Navy’s major combatants.

The committee is concerned that, due to funding challenges, Naval Reactors may be unable to execute key aspects of its mission to enable the nuclear Navy. In particular, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on April 8, 2014, the Director of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program noted that the program delayed purchase of a high-performance computer, “that is needed to deliver the *Ohio*-class Replacement reactor design on time . . . Cancelling this computer purchase in fiscal year 2014 has resulted in at least a 6-month delay to reactor core manufacturing, impacting the *Ohio*-class replacement lead-ship construction schedule.” The Director also noted that, “Naval Reactors will be required to shut down one of the two prototype reactor plants in upstate New York during the second quarter of fiscal year 2015 due to insufficient maintenance funding. This shutdown results in 450 sailors that will not be trained and will not be sent to the Fleet next year.”

The committee believes that these impacts, if realized, would be unacceptable to Navy operations. Most critically, a 6-month delay to the *Ohio*-class replacement submarine jeopardizes the Navy’s ability to fulfill U.S. Strategic Command’s at-sea deterrence requirements in the 2030s. The committee notes that the Director has stated that the full fiscal year 2015 budget request for Naval Reactors is essential to mitigating these impacts.

The committee recommends \$1.4 billion for the Naval Reactors program, an increase of \$10.0 million the budget request.

*Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project*

The budget request for Naval Reactors includes \$141.1 million for the Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project (SFHP). Authorized in fiscal year 2014, this project will replace the Expended Core Facility (ECF) in Idaho currently used for receipt, inspection, and packaging of expended naval nuclear reactor cores. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on April 8, 2014, the Director of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program noted that, “The existing ECF is more than 55 years old and the water pool that stores naval spent nuclear fuel is the oldest pool of its type in the nation. This old facility is showing accelerating signs of deterioration, including leaking water pool walls and cracked floors.”

The committee is concerned that, while it continues to be operated in a safe and environmentally responsible manner, due to its age and accompanying sustainment challenges, the ECF may suffer an irreparable failure at any time. Such a failure would have major and immediate impacts on Naval Reactors’ ability to support the Navy’s nuclear reactor refueling and defueling schedules.

Furthermore, the existing ECF is incapable of receiving and processing full-length aircraft carrier spent nuclear fuel. Until the new facility is built, the Navy will be required to purchase additional M-290 shipping containers to temporarily store this spent fuel as it is removed from aircraft carriers. This will result in additional, unexpected costs to the Navy of \$100.0 to \$150.0 million per year for each year of delay. The committee believes the most cost-effective approach is to fully fund the SFHP and thereby avoid forcing this unnecessary expense on the Navy.

The committee agrees with the Director’s April 8, 2014, testimony when he said, “To put simply, it is costing the country more to delay this facility than it is to just get on with building it,” and, “The fiscal year 2015 request for the SFHP is essential to the operational availability of aircraft carriers and submarines.” Therefore, the committee recommends \$141.1 million for the Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project, the amount of the budget request.

*Office of the Administrator**Improvements to National Nuclear Security Administration budget structure*

The committee notes the ongoing, collaborative effort between the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), the White House Office of Management and Budget, and Congress to update and streamline NNSA’s budget structure to provide better transparency, increased flexibility, and greater focus on NNSA’s mission and priorities. The committee is encouraged by this effort and believes, if carefully considered with input from all stakeholders, increased efficiency and agility can be achieved for NNSA programs while also ensuring robust transparency and accountability. The committee expects the Administrator to consult closely with the committee as budget structure changes are considered during the development of the fiscal year 2016 budget request.

*Reorganization and reform*

In the past year, the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) have continued to make organizational changes intended to more effectively and efficiently manage programs (particularly large nuclear infrastructure projects) and address chronic problems related to security, safety, duplicative and inconsistent inspections and policies, and confused lines of authority, responsibility, and accountability. These reorganization efforts are expected to continue into fiscal year 2015 and beyond.

The committee continues to be skeptical that reorganization efforts will lead to the fundamental and lasting change required to remedy the myriad problems with governance, management, and oversight of the nuclear security enterprise. The committee notes that only 2 years ago, in March 2012, NNSA created the Office of Infrastructure and Operations (NA-00), and in 2013 assigned this office responsibilities related to security inspections, security operations, and security budgets. Subsequently, in December 2013 these security functions were removed from NA-00 and distributed among several new and reformed offices under the Chief of Defense Nuclear Security, the new Department of Energy Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments, a new Departmental Security Committee, and supporting offices under the newly created Department of Energy Under Secretary for Management and Performance.

The committee understands that these shifts resulted from new senior leaders at the Department of Energy and NNSA, and recognize and appreciate that active measures are being taken to address these longstanding problems. However, past experiences at Department of Energy and NNSA have shown that reorganizations initiated by time- and attention-constrained senior leaders have had little effect on the intractable bureaucratic culture within Department of Energy and NNSA. The committee continues to be concerned with the long-term failure to implement meaningful and effective changes when the problems and possible solutions have been so thoroughly studied by so many groups.

On the other hand, the committee is guardedly hopeful to see Department of Energy/NNSA's security reforms include separation of security policy and security inspection functions, as well as clarification and simplification of lines of authority, responsibility, and accountability. Recommendations for these two actions have been a part of security reviews for over a decade, and the need for their implementation is urgent.

This summer, the committee expects to receive the final report of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise created by section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239). The committee encourages senior policymakers in the Administration and in Congress to keep sustained and in-depth attention on reform efforts. Strong leadership and robust actions are required now and into the foreseeable future. The committee will continue its oversight of these matters.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

## Overview

The budget request contained \$6.1 billion for environmental and other defense activities for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends \$5.6 billion, a decrease of \$451.7 million to the budget request.

## Defense Environmental Cleanup

*Environmental Management technology development program*

The budget request contained \$13.0 million for the technology development program of the Office of Environmental Management. This program provides key investments to mid- and long-term research and development projects that seek to develop and mature technologies to reduce cleanup costs and accelerate cleanup schedules.

Because the defense environmental cleanup program is expected to cost approximately \$200.0 billion and last until 2070, the committee believes that the small amounts of funding invested in this program have the potential to provide large cost savings in the decades to come. Therefore, the committee recommends \$19.0 million for the technology development program, an increase of \$6.0 million.

*Waste Isolation Pilot Plant*

The committee remains concerned about the incidents and contamination that occurred at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico, related to the February 2014 radiological release and underground fire, and has been closely monitoring these events. The committee notes that WIPP remains closed to new waste shipments as various investigations and reviews continue to identify the source of the contamination, the risk of additional events, and potential options to address this issue. Those reviews that have concluded have recommended a variety of actions to improve operations, oversight, and emergency response at WIPP and across the Department of Energy complex. The committee expects the Department of Energy to seriously consider all such recommendations and take robust action to prevent a reoccurrence of either incident.

## 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 2015, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and Federal Salaries and Expenses (formerly known as the Office of the Administrator), at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act. This section would also authorize several new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

### Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2015, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act. This section would also authorize several new plant projects for defense environmental cleanup.

### Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize appropriations for other defense activities for fiscal year 2015, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy, of 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 2015, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

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

### Section 3111—Design and Use of Prototypes of Nuclear Weapons for Intelligence Purposes

Section 3115 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) established the requirement to provide for the design and use of prototypes of nuclear weapons to further intelligence estimates with respect to foreign nuclear weapons activities.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee noted at the time that this requirement was consistent with the recommendations of the Bipartisan Congressional Commission of the Strategic Posture of the United States. The commission found that: “A particularly sensitive question is whether the laboratories should be permitted to do weapons design work in support of this intelligence mission. At issue is whether the United States should seek to improve its understanding of the feasibility of the weapons design efforts of others by replicating those designs in U.S. laboratories. In the commission’s view, this is possible and this work should be permitted. At a time of rising concern about efforts by proliferators to develop and improve their nuclear weapons, and of nuclear terrorism, such work is indeed critical. Such work would not involve the design of new weapons with new military characteristics for deployment by the United States. It can and should be done in accordance with U.S. policies not to produce fissile materials and not to conduct nuclear explosive tests. It would be limited to assessing whether adversarial efforts in development of new nuclear weapons will result in operational capabilities, and what technical, military, political, and other consequences might follow from the potential new capabilities. Working with partners in the intelligence community, the laboratories should be in a position to advise national leadership on foreign nuclear weap-

ons activities bearing on the interests of the United States and its allies. In short, the commission recommends that the laboratories be allowed to design, simulate, and experimentally assess foreign nuclear weapon designs for the purposes of defensive analysis.”

This section would update that requirement consistent with the direction of the Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration that such activity implicates a broader set of Department of Energy equities than those resident in the Administrator of that agency.

#### Section 3112—Authorized Personnel Levels of National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would amend section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a) to require that, by October 1, 2015, the total number of employees within the Office of the Administrator may not exceed 1,650.

With the fiscal year 2015 budget request, the Administration proposes changing the name of the “Office of the Administrator” account to “Federal Salaries and Expenses”. This section would also clarify that, for the purposes of section 3241A, these terms are considered the same. The committee expects the Administrator for Nuclear Security to follow past practice for counting the number of employees for the purposes of section 3241A.

#### Section 3113—Cost Containment for Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project

This section would express the sense of Congress that regarding the Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project (UCRP):

(1) A series of statements and policy documents from the Administration have identified the UCRP as a critical nuclear modernization priority;

(2) The failure of the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration to successfully and efficiently execute and oversee the UCRP undermines national security and jeopardizes the long-term credibility of the nuclear deterrent;

(3) The April 8, 2014, testimony of the Acting Administrator for Nuclear Security that “close to half” of the \$1.2 billion taxpayers have spent on the design of such project has been wasted is a grievous misuse of limited taxpayer funds, and the appropriate officials of the Federal Government and contractors must be held accountable;

(4) The uranium capabilities and modern infrastructure that are to be provided by all three phases of the UCRP are critical to national security and Congress fully supports efforts to deliver all of these capabilities efficiently and expeditiously;

(5) Focused attention and robust leadership from the highest levels of the executive branch and Congress are required to ensure that the UCRP delivers such critical national security capabilities; and

(6) The Secretary and the Administrator must ensure that lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability for the UCRP are clear going forward.



This section would also amend section 3123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as amended by section 3126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 1130966) to clarify that the Secretary of Energy may adjust the statutory cost cap of \$4.2 billion for Phase I of the UCRP if, by March 15, 2015, the Secretary of Energy submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed justification for such adjustment. This justification would be required to include: the amount of the adjustment and the proposed total cost of Phase I; a description of the changes that would be required to the UCRP if Phase I were restricted to a total cost of \$4.2 billion; a detailed description of accountability actions taken with respect to contractors and Federal employees; a description of the clear lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability for UCRP going forward; and a detailed description of the structural reforms planned or implemented by the Secretary of Energy to ensure Phase I is executed on time and on schedule.

This section would also require the Secretary of Energy to certify to the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of Defense by March 1 of each year through 2025 that Phase I of the UCRP will meet the cost limitation of \$4.2 billion (as adjusted) and that the UCRP will enable uranium operations in building 9212 of the Y–12 National Security Complex to cease by 2025 while uranium operations begin in a new facility constructed under the UCRP by 2025. If the Secretary of Energy does not make such a certification by March 1 in any year, the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees that identifies the resources of the Department of Energy that the chairman determines should be redirected to enable the Department of Energy to meet the cost and schedule targets.

Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy to jointly submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, on implementation of section 3123(e) of Public Law 112–239, as amended. This report would be required to include a description of the program management, oversight, design, and other responsibilities for UCRP given to the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) and the funding provided by the Secretary of Energy to NAVFAC to carry out these responsibilities.

#### Section 3114—Plutonium Pit Production Capacity

This section would make a series of findings related to the Administration's projections to achieve the required capacity to produce 50 to 80 plutonium pits by certain years. This section would also state the sense of Congress that: (1) the requirement to create a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure that includes the capability and capacity to produce, at minimum, 50 to 80 pits per year, is a national security priority; (2) delaying creation of a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure until the 2030s is an unacceptable risk to the nuclear deterrent and the national security of the United States; and (3) timelines for creating certain capacities for production of plutonium pits and other nuclear weapons components must be driven by the requirement to hedge against

technical and geopolitical risk and not solely by the needs of life extension programs.

This section would also add a new section to title 42 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521) to require the Secretary of Energy to ensure that the nuclear security enterprise produces at least 30 war reserve pits during 2023, at least 50 war reserve pits during 2026, and, during a pilot period of at least 90 days during 2027, demonstrate the capability to produce war reserve pits at a rate sufficient to produce 80 pits per year. The Secretary of Energy would be required to certify to the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of Defense by March 1 of each year until 2027 that the programs and budget of the Department of Energy will meet these pit production milestones. If the Secretary of Energy is unable to make such a certification in any year, the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council would be required to submit a plan to the congressional defense committees by May 1 of such year. This plan would be required to include identification of the resources of the Department of Energy that the chairman determines should be redirected to enable the nuclear security enterprise to meet the pit production milestones described by this section.

The committee is concerned that, despite the President's policy to create a responsive nuclear infrastructure to enable nuclear stockpile reductions without undue risk, the Department of Energy continues to slip schedules and programs needed to achieve this critical national security goal. With the proposed deferral of the first interoperable warhead, the Department has concurrently proposed to defer plans to achieve the Secretary of Defense's revalidated requirement for a plutonium pit production capacity of 50 to 80 pits per year. As a key component of a responsive nuclear infrastructure, continued delay in achieving this pit production capacity is unacceptable. The committee believes that waiting over 15 years to achieve a responsive nuclear infrastructure is too great a risk to national security.

#### Section 3115—Definition of Baseline and Threshold for Stockpile Life Extension Project

This section would amend section 4713 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2753) to clarify that the cost and schedule baseline of a nuclear stockpile life extension project established pursuant to such section shall be the cost and schedule contained in the weapon design and cost report required prior to the project entering into the development engineering phase.

This section would also lower the threshold for congressional notification on costs per warhead exceeding the baseline from 200 percent to 150 percent.

#### Section 3116—Production of Nuclear Warhead for Long-Range Standoff Weapon

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to deliver a first production unit for a nuclear warhead for the long-range standoff weapon not later than September 30, 2025. This section would also require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of

Defense to jointly develop a plan to carry out this mandate and require the Secretaries to submit this plan to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

This section would also require the Secretary of Energy, should the Secretary determine at any time that a first production unit will not be delivered by September 30, 2025, to notify the congressional defense committees, the Secretary of Defense, and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command of such determination, including an explanation for why delivery will not occur by such date. If the Secretary of Energy makes such a notification, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command would be required to submit an assessment to the congressional defense committees regarding the effects of such delay on national security and nuclear deterrence and assurance, as well as any mitigation options available.

Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the justification for the long-range standoff weapon.

The committee believes the proposed 3-year deferral of this cruise missile is contrary to the interests of national security. Therefore, the committee recommends this provision to ensure warhead production for this cruise missile is deferred only 1 year.

#### Section 3117—Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to specifically carry out construction and program support activities with fiscal year 2015 funds authorized for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF) for construction and program support activities. Program support activities are defined as those activities in support of the design, long-lead equipment, procurement, and site preparation for the MFFF.

If the Secretary of Energy determines that fiscal year 2015 funds for construction and program support activities associated with MFFF should be used for a purpose other than construction and program support activities for MFFF, the Secretary may utilize reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures provided to the Department of Energy defense-related program in section 4702 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2742).

This section would also require the Secretary to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to conduct a study to assess and validate the Department of Energy's analysis of options for the disposition of surplus weapons-grade plutonium. The Secretary shall then submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report shall include the FFRDC assessment, as well as the Department's identification and discussion of the life-cycle cost analyses, and explanation of how the alternatives conform with the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement between the Governments of the United States and the Russian Federation.

Section 3118—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security

This section would limit the availability of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Office of the Administrator to not more than 75 percent until several statutorily required reports are submitted to certain congressional committees in 2015. These include:

(1) The report on stockpile assessments required under section 4205(f)(2) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2525(f)(2));

(2) The Secretary of Energy's portion of the report required by section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81);

(3) The annual assessment required under section 3122 of Public Law 112-81; and

(4) The detailed report on the stockpile stewardship, management, and infrastructure plan required by section 4203(b) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523(b)).

The committee notes that in past years, the NNSA has not submitted several key statutorily required reports in a timely fashion, or in certain cases, at all. The committee is pleased that section 3115 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) appears to have provided NNSA the necessary incentive to submit these reports in a timely way in 2014. The committee therefore recommends a similar section for inclusion in this Act to ensure timely submission is continued into 2015. The committee believes these reports are critical to effective congressional oversight of the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile, NNSA programs, and the Administration's plans for the stockpile and enterprise.

Section 3119—Additional Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security

This section would limit the availability of funds, in addition to a limitation included elsewhere in this title, authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Office of the Administrator to not more than 90 percent until the date on which the Administrator for Nuclear Security submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the efficiencies proposed by the 2012 Joint Department of Energy/Department of Defense Study on Potential NNSA Management and Work Force Prioritization Efficiencies. The report would be required to include details on how the Administrator will carry out each efficiency measure proposed by the joint study during fiscal year 2015.

This section would also require the Nuclear Weapons Council to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, on the efficiencies that the Council recommends the Administrator carry out during fiscal year 2016. The council would also be required to include in the report the council's assessment of the reports submitted by the Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States pursuant to section 3123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law

112–81), as well as the council’s assessment of each of the matters contained in subsection 3123(a)(2) of Public Law 112–81.

The committee notes that, in the fiscal year 2014 budget request, NNSA proposed to find \$320.0 million in management and workforce prioritization efficiencies and use these savings to fund high priority nuclear modernization programs. These proposed efficiencies were based upon a joint study conducted by, and agreed to by, both the Department of Defense and NNSA. On May 9, 2013, the Acting Administrator for Nuclear Security testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces that, “if we were unable to realize all of the efficiencies that we have assumed in fiscal [year] 2014, 5-year budget, we definitely would have to . . . go back and rethink how we are going to execute the programs we have.” In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee expressed its concern that these efficiencies would not be achieved and major impacts to critical nuclear modernization programs would result.

The most recent information provided to the committee by NNSA indicates that only \$80.0 million of these efficiencies will actually be realized in fiscal year 2014, while \$240.0 million will not. The committee believes NNSA’s inability or unwillingness to aggressively pursue savings through efficiencies it agreed to in 2012 have directly contributed to forcing schedule slips in critical programs due to insufficient funding. Therefore, the committee recommends this section and expects NNSA and the Nuclear Weapons Council to aggressively seek efficiencies in fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016 to ensure high priority defense programs stay on track.

#### Section 3120—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Non-Proliferation Activities Between the United States and the Russian Federation

This section would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for any contact, cooperation, or transfer of technology between the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Russian Federation is respecting the sovereignty of Ukrainian territory, no longer acting inconsistently with the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and in compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The section would include a waiver for the Secretary of Energy, pending a notification, in coordination with the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, to the appropriate congressional committees that such contact, cooperation, or technology transfer is in the national interests of the United States and a period of 30 days has elapsed following the notification.

The committee notes that at the time that this report was filed, in response to ongoing Russian aggression toward Ukraine, the Secretary of Energy has suspended nuclear security cooperation. Similar to the position the committee has stated elsewhere in this report, the committee believes that U.S.-Russia nuclear security cooperation must remain suspended so long as Russia continues its

aggression toward Ukraine and continues to take actions inconsistent with its treaty obligations.

Section 3121—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Activities at Sites in Russian Federation

This section would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for any defense nuclear nonproliferation activities at sites in the Russian Federation until at least 30 days have elapsed following the date that the Secretary of Energy certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such sites are not actively engaged in Russian nuclear weapons, intelligence, or defense activities. This section would include a waiver for the President to submit a notification that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States and that none of the funds will be contributed to Russia's nuclear weapons program, and a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date of the notification.

SUBTITLE C—PLANS AND REPORTS

Section 3131—Cost Estimation and Program Evaluation by National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would amend section 3221(h) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2411) to clarify that the term "Administration", with respect to any authority, duty, or responsibility provided by section 3211, does not include the Office of Naval Reactors.

Section 3132—Analysis and Report on W88 Alt 370 Program High Explosives Options

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator for Nuclear Security, and the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council to submit a joint report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the W88 Alt 370 nuclear warhead program. The report would be required to contain analysis of the costs, benefits, risks, and feasibility of both including and not including a refresh of the conventional high explosives of the W88 warhead as part of the W88 Alt 370 program.

The report would be required to include, for each option:

- (1) Near-term and lifecycle cost estimates, including costs to both the Navy and the National Nuclear Security Administration;
- (2) Potential cost avoidance;
- (3) Operational effects to the Navy and to the capacity and throughput of the nuclear security enterprise of the National Nuclear Security Administration;
- (4) The expected longevity of the W88 warhead;
- (5) Near-term and long-term safety and security risks, as well as potential risk-mitigation measures; and
- (6) Any other matters the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Chairman considers appropriate.

The committee expects the Nuclear Weapons Council to arrive at a decision regarding whether or not to include a refresh of the con-

ventional high explosives as part of the W88 Alt 370 program in time to inform the budget request for fiscal year 2016.

#### Section 3133—Analysis of Existing Facilities

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act containing analysis of using or modifying existing facilities across the nuclear security enterprise to support the plutonium strategy of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The report would be required to include an analysis of the costs, benefits, cost-savings, risks, and effects of using or modifying existing facilities as compared to the carrying out all phases of the Administrator's current plan for the plutonium strategy. The report may also include such other matters as the Administrator determines appropriate.

#### SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 3141—Technical Corrections to Atomic Energy Defense Act

This section would make technical corrections to the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501).

#### Section 3142—Technical Corrections to National Nuclear Security Administration Act

This section would make technical corrections to section 3220 (50 U.S.C. 2410) and section 3236 (50 U.S.C. 2426) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act.

### TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

#### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained \$30.2 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2015. The committee recommends \$30.2 million, 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 2015.

#### Section 3202—Inspector General of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

This section would amend section 322 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286k(a)) to mandate that the Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall serve as the Inspector General of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, in accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App).

Section 3203—Number of Employees of Defense Nuclear Facilities  
Safety Board

This section would amend section 313(b)(1)(A) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286b(b)(1)(A)) to limit the number of full-time employees of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to 120. This section would specify that this limit would take effect on October 1, 2015.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize \$19.9 million for fiscal year 2015 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Obsolete Vessel “Best Value” Contracts

The committee notes that the Maritime Administration (MARAD) disposes of obsolete vessels pursuant to “best value” contracts. On February 12, 2014, the Government Accountability Office released a report assessing MARAD’s ship disposal program which indicated, “(a)lmost all of the contractors were unsure as to how MARAD determines best value under sales contracts. Most of the contractors told us that they did not always understand why they lost a ship recycling contract. Three contractors noted it was particularly confusing when they offered the best price with what they believed to be a reasonable schedule compared to other contractors, yet still lost the contract. A couple admitted that there were instances where they did not understand why they won a contract.” The committee believes that MARAD should provide better definition as to the selection procedures associated with “best value” contracts.

The committee is also concerned about the lack of transparency associated with the amounts of appropriated funds expended and sales accrued and disbursed through the ship disposal program.

Therefore, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, the committee directs the Secretary of Transportation to provide the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2015 a report on the ship disposal program that:

(1) Provides a 5-year program projection for vessel scrapping under the ship disposal program, and an estimate of the vessels remaining at the end of that 5-year period;

(2) Compares the MARAD ship disposal program with other federal ship disposal programs;



(3) Explains the criteria MARAD uses in determining “best value” when evaluating ship disposal procurement proposals, and the relative ranking of the importance of each of those criteria;

(4) Provides a detailed explanation of amounts appropriated and expended in carrying out in the ship disposal program, and of amount received and disbursed from the sales of vessels disposed of through that program over the previous 5 fiscal years.

#### Recapitalization of the U.S. Maritime Ready Reserve Force Fleet

The committee believes it is in the interest of U.S. national security that the U.S. merchant marine, both ships and mariners, serve as a national auxiliary in times of war or national emergency. The Ready Reserve Force of the U.S. Maritime Administration, a component of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, plays an important role in U.S. national security by providing necessary readiness and efficiency in the form of a government-owned sealift fleet. The committee believes it is important that the Ready Reserve Force fleet remains capable, modern, and efficient in order to best serve the national security needs of the United States in times of war or national emergency. Accordingly, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2014, on the options considered to modernize and recapitalize the Ready Reserve Force fleet and on the Commander’s recommended path forward.

### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

#### Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2015

This section would authorize appropriations for the national security aspects of the merchant marine for fiscal year 2015.

#### Section 3502—Special Rule for DD-17

This section would limit the application of section 55102 of title 46, United States Code to Drydock-17 (formerly known as USN-YFD-17) in the waters of the State of Alabama.

#### Section 3503—Sense of Congress on the Role of Domestic Maritime Industry in National Security

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the role of domestic maritime industry in national security.

### DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

#### Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables

This section would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, this section would also require that a decision by an Agency Head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the

basis of such funding tables be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and section 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015**

(In Thousands of Dollars)

|   | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change  | House<br>Authorized |
|---|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <b>DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE</b> |                    |                  |                     |
| <b>National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request</b>  |                    |                  |                     |
| <b>Function 051, Department of Defense-Military</b>   |                    |                  |                     |
| <b>Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations</b>                                     |                    |                  |                     |
| <b>Title I—Procurement</b>  |                    |                  |                     |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army .....  | 5,102,685          | 147,400          | 5,250,085           |
| Missile Procurement, Army .....   | 1,017,483          |                  | 1,017,483           |
| Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army .....   | 1,471,438          | 230,298          | 1,701,736           |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army .....   | 1,031,477          | -23,400          | 1,008,077           |
| Other Procurement, Army .....   | 4,893,634          | -192,400         | 4,701,234           |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund .....   | 115,058            | -115,058         | 0                   |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy .....  | 13,074,317         | 411,600          | 13,485,917          |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy .....   | 3,217,945          | 63,000           | 3,280,945           |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps .....  | 771,945            |                  | 771,945             |
| Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy .....   | 14,400,625         | 659,600          | 15,060,225          |
| Other Procurement, Navy .....   | 5,975,828          | 222,300          | 6,198,128           |
| Procurement, Marine Corps .....   | 983,352            | -25,100          | 958,252             |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force .....   | 11,542,571         | -122,671         | 11,419,900          |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force .....  | 4,690,506          | 132,000          | 4,822,506           |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force .....  | 677,400            |                  | 677,400             |
| Other Procurement, Air Force .....  | 16,566,018         | -64,000          | 16,502,018          |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide .....   | 4,221,437          | 172,100          | 4,393,537           |
| Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund .....   | 20,000             | -20,000          | 0                   |
| Prior Year Rescissions .....  | -265,685           | 265,685          | 0                   |
| Undistributed General Provisions .....  | 0                  | -265,685         | -265,685            |
| <b>Subtotal, Title I—Procurement .....</b>  | <b>89,508,034</b>  | <b>1,475,669</b> | <b>90,983,703</b>   |
| <b>Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation</b>                                  |                    |                  |                     |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army .....  | 6,593,898          | -13,896          | 6,580,002           |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy .....  | 16,266,335         | -82,500          | 16,183,835          |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force .....                                   | 23,739,892         | 125,500          | 23,865,392          |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide ....                                 | 16,766,084         | 223,348          | 16,989,432          |
| Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense .....  | 167,738            | 5,000            | 172,738             |
| <b>Subtotal, Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation .....</b>                  | <b>63,533,947</b>  | <b>257,452</b>   | <b>63,791,399</b>   |
| <b>Title III—Operation and Maintenance</b>  |                    |                  |                     |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army .....   | 33,240,148         | -369,100         | 32,871,048          |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve .....   | 2,490,569          | 11,300           | 2,501,869           |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard .....  | 6,030,773          | 182,800          | 6,213,573           |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

|  | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change   | House<br>Authorized |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy .....                                | 39,025,857         | -143,052          | 38,882,805          |
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps .....                        | 5,909,487          | -56,700           | 5,852,787           |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve .....                        | 1,007,100          | -2,800            | 1,004,300           |
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve .....                | 268,582            | -2,600            | 265,982             |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force .....                           | 35,331,193         | -180,129          | 35,151,064          |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve .....                   | 3,015,842          | -16,900           | 2,998,942           |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard .....                  | 6,392,859          | -19,800           | 6,373,059           |
| Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide .....                        | 31,198,232         | -550,096          | 30,648,136          |
| US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense .....            | 13,723             |                   | 13,723              |
| Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid .....                | 100,000            | 4,500             | 104,500             |
| Cooperative Threat Reduction .....                                 | 365,108            | -10,500           | 354,608             |
| Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund .....               | 212,875            | -3,500            | 209,375             |
| Environmental Restoration, Army .....                              | 201,560            |                   | 201,560             |
| Environmental Restoration, Navy .....                              | 277,294            |                   | 277,294             |
| Environmental Restoration, Air Force .....                         | 408,716            |                   | 408,716             |
| Environmental Restoration, Defense .....                           | 8,547              |                   | 8,547               |
| Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites .....               | 208,353            |                   | 208,353             |
| Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund .....                | 5,000              | -5,000            | 0                   |
| Support Of International Sporting Competitions, Defense .....      | 10,000             | -4,800            | 5,200               |
| <b>Subtotal, Title III—Operation and Maintenance .....</b>         | <b>165,721,818</b> | <b>-1,166,377</b> | <b>164,555,441</b>  |
| <b>Title IV—Military Personnel</b>                                 |                    |                   |                     |
| Military Personnel Appropriations .....                            | 128,957,593        | 49,430            | 129,007,023         |
| Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions .....          | 6,236,092          | 1,000             | 6,237,092           |
| <b>Subtotal, Title IV—Military Personnel .....</b>                 | <b>135,193,685</b> | <b>50,430</b>     | <b>135,244,115</b>  |
| <b>Title XIV—Other Authorizations</b>                              |                    |                   |                     |
| Working Capital Fund, Army .....                                   | 13,727             |                   | 13,727              |
| Working Capital Fund, Air Force .....                              | 61,717             |                   | 61,717              |
| Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide .....                           | 44,293             |                   | 44,293              |
| Working Capital Fund, DECA .....                                   | 1,114,731          | 100,000           | 1,214,731           |
| Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction .....                      | 828,868            |                   | 828,868             |
| Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities .....                | 820,687            |                   | 820,687             |
| Office of the Inspector General .....                              | 311,830            |                   | 311,830             |
| Defense Health Program .....                                       | 31,833,061         | -387,400          | 31,445,661          |
| <b>Subtotal, Title XIV—Other Authorizations .....</b>              | <b>35,028,914</b>  | <b>-287,400</b>   | <b>34,741,514</b>   |
| <b>Total, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations ...</b> | <b>488,986,398</b> | <b>329,774</b>    | <b>489,316,172</b>  |
| <b>Division B: Military Construction Authorizations</b>            |                    |                   |                     |
| <b>Military Construction</b>                                       |                    |                   |                     |
| Army .....   | 539,427            | 203,000           | 742,427             |
| Navy .....   | 1,018,772          | -20,000           | 998,772             |
| Air Force .....  | 811,774            |                   | 811,774             |
| Defense-Wide .....   | 2,061,890          | -29,000           | 2,032,890           |
| Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense .....              | 38,715             |                   | 38,715              |
| NATO Security Investment Program .....                             | 199,700            |                   | 199,700             |
| Army National Guard .....  | 126,920            | 34,800            | 161,720             |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

|  | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Authorized |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Army Reserve .....   | 103,946            | 60,300          | 164,246             |
| Navy and Marine Corps Reserve .....  | 51,528             |                 | 51,528              |
| Air National Guard .....   | 94,663             |                 | 94,663              |
| Air Force Reserve .....  | 49,492             |                 | 49,492              |
| <b>Subtotal, Military Construction .....</b>   | <b>5,096,827</b>   | <b>249,100</b>  | <b>5,345,927</b>    |
| <b>Family Housing</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| Construction, Army .....   | 78,609             |                 | 78,609              |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army .....  | 350,976            |                 | 350,976             |
| Construction, Navy and Marine Corps .....  | 16,412             |                 | 16,412              |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps .....   | 354,029            |                 | 354,029             |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force .....   | 327,747            |                 | 327,747             |
| Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide .....  | 61,100             |                 | 61,100              |
| Family Housing Improvement Fund .....  | 1,662              |                 | 1,662               |
| <b>Subtotal, Family Housing .....</b>  | <b>1,190,535</b>   |                 | <b>1,190,535</b>    |
| <b>Base Realignment and Closure</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| Base Realignment and Closure—Army .....  | 84,417             |                 | 84,417              |
| Base Realignment and Closure—Navy .....  | 94,692             |                 | 94,692              |
| Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force .....   | 90,976             |                 | 90,976              |
| <b>Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure .....</b>  | <b>270,085</b>     |                 | <b>270,085</b>      |
| <b>Undistributed Adjustments</b>   |                    |                 |                     |
| Prior Year Savings .....   | 0                  | -204,577        | -204,577            |
| General Reductions .....   | 0                  | -69,000         | -69,000             |
| <b>Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments .....</b>   | <b>0</b>           | <b>-273,577</b> | <b>-273,577</b>     |
| <b>Total, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations .....</b>                             | <b>6,557,447</b>   | <b>-24,477</b>  | <b>6,532,970</b>    |
| <b>Total, 051, Department of Defense-Military .....</b>  | <b>495,543,845</b> | <b>305,297</b>  | <b>495,849,142</b>  |
| <b>Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations</b> |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>Environmental and Other Defense Activities</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| Nuclear Energy .....   | 104,000            | 0               | 104,000             |
| Weapons Activities .....   | 8,314,902          | 147,700         | 8,462,602           |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....   | 1,555,156          | 10,000          | 1,565,156           |
| Naval Reactors .....   | 1,377,100          | 10,000          | 1,387,100           |
| Office of the Administrator .....  | 410,842            | -24,000         | 386,842             |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup .....  | 5,327,538          | -457,000        | 4,870,538           |
| Other Defense Activities .....   | 753,000            | 5,300           | 758,300             |
| <b>Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities .....</b>                                | <b>17,842,538</b>  | <b>-308,000</b> | <b>17,534,538</b>   |
| <b>Independent Federal Agency Authorization</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....  | 30,150             |                 | 30,150              |
| <b>Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization .....</b>                                  | <b>30,150</b>      |                 | <b>30,150</b>       |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

|  | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Authorized |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <b>Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations</b> ..... | <b>17,872,688</b>  | <b>-308,000</b> | <b>17,564,688</b>   |
| <b>Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b> .....   | <b>17,872,688</b>  | <b>-308,000</b> | <b>17,564,688</b>   |
| <b>Total, National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request</b> .....  | <b>513,416,533</b> | <b>-2,703</b>   | <b>513,413,830</b>  |
| <b>National Defense Funding, OCO Budget Request</b> .....  | <b>79,445,000</b>  |                 | <b>79,445,000</b>   |
| <b>Total, National Defense</b> .....   | <b>592,861,533</b> | <b>-2,703</b>   | <b>592,858,830</b>  |
| <b>MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600) ...  | 63,400             |                 | 63,400              |
| Title XIV—Cemeterial Expenses, Army (Function 700) .....   | 45,800             | 16,081          | 61,881              |
| Title XXXIV—Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves<br>(Function 270) .....                                       | 19,950             |                 | 19,950              |
| Title XXXV—Maritime Administration (Function 400) .....  | 148,400            |                 | 148,400             |
| <b>MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| Title X—General Transfer Authority .....   | [5,000,000]        |                 | [4,000,000]         |
| Title XV—Special Transfer Authority .....  |                    |                 | [3,000,000]         |
| <b>MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)</b>   |                    |                 |                     |
| Defense Production Act .....   | 21,638             |                 | 21,638              |

## NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

|   | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Authorized |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <b>Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee</b>  |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)</b> .....  | <b>495,543,845</b> | <b>305,297</b>  | <b>495,849,142</b>  |
| <b>SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)</b> .....   | <b>17,872,688</b>  | <b>-308,000</b> | <b>17,564,688</b>   |
| <b>TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)—BASE BILL</b> .....  | <b>513,416,533</b> | <b>-2,703</b>   | <b>513,413,830</b>  |
| <b>TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS</b> .....   | <b>79,445,000</b>  |                 | <b>79,445,000</b>   |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE</b> .....  | <b>592,861,533</b> | <b>-2,703</b>   | <b>592,858,830</b>  |
| <b>Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization</b> |                    |                 |                     |
| Defense Production Act Purchases .....  | 22,000             |                 | 22,000              |
| Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property .....   | 8,000              |                 | 8,000               |
| Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property .....  | 31,000             |                 | 31,000              |
| <b>Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051</b> .....  | <b>61,000</b>      |                 | <b>61,000</b>       |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program .....   | 100,000            |                 | 100,000             |
| <b>Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053</b> .....  | <b>100,000</b>     |                 | <b>100,000</b>      |
| Other Discretionary Programs .....  | 7,681,000          |                 | 7,681,000           |
| <b>Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054</b> .....  | <b>7,681,000</b>   |                 | <b>7,681,000</b>    |
| <b>Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)</b> .....  | <b>7,842,000</b>   |                 | <b>7,842,000</b>    |
| <b>Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary</b>   |                    |                 |                     |
| Department of Defense--Military (051) .....   | 575,049,845        | 305,297         | 575,355,142         |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) .....  | 17,972,688         | -308,000        | 17,664,688          |
| Defense-Related Activities (054) .....  | 7,681,000          |                 | 7,681,000           |
| <b>Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary</b> .....   | <b>600,703,533</b> | <b>-2,703</b>   | <b>600,700,830</b>  |
| <b>National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Estimates)</b>   |                    |                 |                     |
| Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund .....   | 7,071,000          |                 | 7,071,000           |
| Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory .....  | 1,169,000          |                 | 1,169,000           |
| Offsetting receipts .....   | -1,591,000         |                 | -1,591,000          |
| <b>Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051</b> .....  | <b>6,649,000</b>   |                 | <b>6,649,000</b>    |
| Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other .....   | 1,197,000          |                 | 1,197,000           |
| <b>Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053</b> .....  | <b>1,197,000</b>   |                 | <b>1,197,000</b>    |
| Radiation exposure compensation trust fund .....  | 59,000             |                 | 59,000              |
| Payment to CIA retirement fund and other .....  | 514,000            |                 | 514,000             |
| <b>Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054</b> .....  | <b>573,000</b>     |                 | <b>573,000</b>      |
| <b>Total National Defense Mandatory (050)</b> .....   | <b>8,419,000</b>   |                 | <b>8,419,000</b>    |
| <b>Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory</b>   |                    |                 |                     |
| Department of Defense--Military (051) .....   | 581,698,845        | 305,209         | 582,004,054         |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) .....  | 19,169,688         | -308,000        | 18,861,688          |
| Defense-Related Activities (054) .....  | 8,254,000          |                 | 8,254,000           |
| <b>Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory</b> .....   | <b>609,122,533</b> | <b>-2,791</b>   | <b>609,119,742</b>  |

# TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

## SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

### SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT (In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                              | Item  | FY 2015 Request |           | House Change |          | House Authorized |           |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------|--------------|----------|------------------|-----------|
|                                   |   | Qty             | Cost      | Qty          | Cost     | Qty              | Cost      |
| <b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> |   |                 |           |              |          |                  |           |
| <b>FIXED WING</b>                 |   |                 |           |              |          |                  |           |
| 002                               | UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT .....                            | 1               | 13,617    |              |          | 1                | 13,617    |
| 003                               | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP) .....                | 16              | 185,090   |              |          | 16               | 185,090   |
| 004                               | MQ-1 UAV .....  | 19              | 190,581   |              | 49,000   | 19               | 239,581   |
|                                   | Extended range modifications Per Army UFR .....       |                 |           |              | [49,000] |                  |           |
| 005                               | RQ-11 (RAVEN) .....                                   |                 | 3,964     |              |          |                  | 3,964     |
| <b>ROTARY</b>                     |   |                 |           |              |          |                  |           |
| 006                               | HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH) .....                 | 55              | 416,617   |              |          | 55               | 416,617   |
| 007                               | AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN .....                   | 25              | 494,009   |              |          | 25               | 494,009   |
| 008                               | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        |                 | 157,338   |              |          |                  | 157,338   |
| 012                               | UH-60 BLACKHAWK III MODEL (MYP) .....                 | 79              | 1,237,001 |              | 98,400   | 79               | 1,335,401 |
|                                   | ARNG Modernization—6 additional UH-60M aircraft ..... |                 |           |              | [98,400] |                  |           |
| 013                               | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        |                 | 132,138   |              |          |                  | 132,138   |
| 014                               | CH-47 HELICOPTER .....                                | 32              | 892,504   |              |          | 32               | 892,504   |
| 015                               | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        |                 | 102,361   |              |          |                  | 102,361   |
| <b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>   |   |                 |           |              |          |                  |           |
| 016                               | MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP) .....                              | 2               | 26,913    |              |          | 2                | 26,913    |
| 018                               | GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP) .....                            |                 | 14,182    |              |          |                  | 14,182    |
| 019                               | MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) .....                    |                 | 131,892   |              |          |                  | 131,892   |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |                  | House Change |                | House Authorized |                  |
|------|---|-----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost             | Qty          | Cost           | Qty              | Cost             |
| 020  | AH-64 MODS .....                                      |                 | 181,869          |              |                |                  | 181,869          |
| 021  | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP) .....               |                 | 32,092           |              |                |                  | 32,092           |
| 022  | UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS .....                     |                 | 15,029           |              |                |                  | 15,029           |
| 023  | UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS .....                         |                 | 76,515           |              | 6,800          |                  | 83,315           |
|      | ARNG Modernization-UH-60A to UH-60L conversions ..... |                 |                  |              | [6,800]        |                  |                  |
| 025  | NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN .....                        |                 | 114,182          |              |                |                  | 114,182          |
| 026  | COMMS. NAV SURVEILLANCE .....                         |                 | 115,795          |              |                |                  | 115,795          |
| 027  | GATM ROLLUP .....                                     |                 | 54,277           |              |                |                  | 54,277           |
| 028  | RQ-7 UAV MODS .....                                   |                 | 125,380          |              |                |                  | 125,380          |
|      | <b>GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS</b>                        |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 029  | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT .....                |                 | 66,450           |              | 32,400         |                  | 98,850           |
|      | Army requested realignment .....                      |                 |                  |              | [32,400]       |                  |                  |
| 030  | SURVIVABILITY CM .....                                |                 |                  |              | 7,800          |                  | 7,800            |
|      | Army requested realignment .....                      |                 |                  |              | [7,800]        |                  |                  |
| 031  | CMWS .....  |                 | 107,364          |              | -47,000        |                  | 60,364           |
|      | Army requested reduction .....                        |                 |                  |              | [-47,000]      |                  |                  |
|      | <b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>                                  |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 032  | AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                      |                 | 6,847            |              |                |                  | 6,847            |
| 033  | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT .....                         |                 | 29,231           |              |                |                  | 29,231           |
| 034  | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS .....                      |                 | 48,081           |              |                |                  | 48,081           |
| 035  | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL .....                             |                 | 127,232          |              |                |                  | 127,232          |
| 036  | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....                           |                 | 1,203            |              |                |                  | 1,203            |
| 037  | LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET .....                           | 387             | 2,931            |              |                | 387              | 2,931            |
|      | <b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> .....         | <b>616</b>      | <b>5,102,685</b> |              | <b>147,400</b> | <b>616</b>       | <b>5,250,085</b> |

**MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY**



|     |   |                  |              |          |                  |
|-----|---|------------------|--------------|----------|------------------|
| 002 | <b>SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM</b>              |                  |              |          |                  |
|     | LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) .....    | 110,300          |              |          | 110,300          |
| 003 | MSE MISSILE .....                                 | 384,605          | 70           |          | 384,605          |
| 004 | <b>AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM</b>              |                  |              |          |                  |
|     | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY .....                        | 4,452            |              |          | 4,452            |
| 005 | <b>ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS</b>              |                  |              |          |                  |
|     | JAVELIN (AAMS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY .....             | 77,668           | 338          |          | 77,668           |
| 006 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY .....                        | 50,368           | 1,008        |          | 50,368           |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                    | 19,984           |              |          | 19,984           |
| 008 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) .....                  | 127,145          | 534          |          | 127,145          |
| 009 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) .....  | 21,274           | 2,994        |          | 21,274           |
|     | <b>MODIFICATIONS</b>                              |                  |              |          |                  |
| 012 | PATRIOT MODS .....                                | 131,838          |              |          | 131,838          |
| 013 | STINGER MODS .....                                | 1,355            |              |          | 1,355            |
| 014 | AVENGER MODS .....                                | 5,611            |              |          | 5,611            |
| 015 | ITAS/TOW MODS .....                               | 19,676           |              |          | 19,676           |
| 016 | MLRS MODS .....                                   | 10,380           |              |          | 10,380           |
| 017 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS .....                        | 6,008            |              |          | 6,008            |
|     | <b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>                    |                  |              |          |                  |
| 018 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....                     | 36,930           |              |          | 36,930           |
|     | <b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>         |                  |              |          |                  |
| 019 | AIR DEFENSE TARGETS .....                         | 3,657            |              |          | 3,657            |
| 020 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES) .....           | 1,522            |              |          | 1,522            |
| 021 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT .....                     | 4,710            |              |          | 4,710            |
|     | <b>TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> .....      | <b>1,017,463</b> | <b>4,944</b> |          | <b>1,017,463</b> |
|     | <b>PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY</b>             |                  |              |          |                  |
|     | <b>TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>                    |                  |              |          |                  |
| 001 | STRYKER VEHICLE .....                             | 385,110          |              |          | 385,110          |
|     | <b>MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>    |                  |              |          |                  |
| 002 | STRYKER (MOD) .....                               | 39,683           |              |          | 39,683           |
|     | Unfunded requirement-Fourth DVH Brigade Set ..... |                  |              | 50,000   | 89,683           |
|     |   |                  |              | [50,000] |                  |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
| 003  | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) .....                              |                 | 26,759  |              |           |                  | 26,759  |
| 004  | BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) .....                           |                 | 107,506 |              |           |                  | 107,506 |
| 005  | HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD) .....          |                 | 45,411  |              |           |                  | 45,411  |
| 006  | PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) .....             | 18              | 247,400 |              |           | 18               | 247,400 |
| 007  | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES) .....      | 15              | 50,451  |              |           | 15               | 50,451  |
| 008  | ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD) .....                            |                 | 2,473   |              |           |                  | 2,473   |
| 009  | ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE .....                        | 7               | 36,583  |              |           | 7                | 36,583  |
| 010  | M88 FOV MODS .....                                    |                 | 1,975   |              | 72,000    |                  | 73,975  |
|      | Unfunded requirement-Industrial Base Initiative ..... |                 |         |              | [72,000]  |                  |         |
| 011  | JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE .....                            | 8               | 49,462  |              |           | 8                | 49,462  |
| 012  | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) .....                            |                 | 237,023 |              |           |                  | 237,023 |
| 013  | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM .....                          |                 |         |              | 120,000   |                  | 120,000 |
|      | Industrial Base Initiative .....                      |                 |         |              | [120,000] |                  |         |
|      | <b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>             |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 014  | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) .....              |                 | 6,478   |              |           |                  | 6,478   |
|      | <b>WEAPONS &amp; OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES</b>            |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 016  | MORTAR SYSTEMS .....                                  |                 | 5,012   |              |           |                  | 5,012   |
| 017  | XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) .....             | 8,959           | 28,390  |              |           | 8,959            | 28,390  |
| 018  | COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM .....            |                 | 148     |              |           |                  | 148     |
| 019  | CARBINE .....   | 38,234          | 29,366  |              |           | 38,234           | 20,616  |
|      | Army requested realignment .....                      |                 |         |              | -8,750    |                  |         |
|      |   |                 |         |              | [-8,750]  |                  |         |
| 021  | COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION .....        |                 | 8,409   |              |           |                  | 8,409   |
| 022  | HANDGUN .....   | 4,811           | 3,957   |              |           | 4,811            | 1,957   |
|      | Funding ahead of need .....                           |                 |         |              | -2,000    |                  |         |
|      |   |                 |         |              | [-2,000]  |                  |         |
|      | <b>MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH</b>            |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 024  | M777 MODS .....                                       |                 | 18,166  |              |           |                  | 18,166  |

|  |   |                  |                |                  |
|--|---|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 025  | M4 CARBINE MODS .....                             | 3,446            | 3,000          | 6,446            |
|  | Army requested realignment .....                  |                  | [3,000]        |                  |
| 026  | M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS .....                  | 25,296           |                | 25,296           |
| 027  | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS .....                   | 5,546            |                | 5,546            |
| 028  | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS .....                | 4,635            | -2,000         | 2,635            |
|  | Army requested realignment .....                  |                  | [-2,000]       |                  |
| 029  | SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS .....                 | 4,079            |                | 4,079            |
| 030  | M119 MODIFICATIONS .....                          | 72,718           |                | 72,718           |
| 031  | M16 RIFLE MODS .....                              | 1,952            | -1,952         | 0                |
|  | Army requested realignment .....                  |                  | [-1,952]       |                  |
| 032  | MORTAR MODIFICATION .....                         | 8,903            |                | 8,903            |
| 033  | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) .....  | 2,089            |                | 2,089            |
|  | <b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>         |                  |                |                  |
| 034  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) .....          | 2,005            |                | 2,005            |
| 035  | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) .....         | 8,911            |                | 8,911            |
| 036  | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS .....                     | 414              |                | 414              |
| 037  | SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG) .....     | 1,682            |                | 1,682            |
|  | <b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY .....</b> | <b>1,471,438</b> | <b>230,298</b> | <b>1,701,736</b> |
|  |   | <b>52,052</b>    | <b>52,052</b>  |                  |
| <br><b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</b> |   |                  |                |                  |
| <b>SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION</b>         |   |                  |                |                  |
| 001  | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES .....                      | 34,943           |                | 34,943           |
| 002  | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES .....                      | 12,418           |                | 12,418           |
| 003  | CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES .....                     | 9,655            | -1,500         | 8,155            |
|  | Funding ahead of need .....                       |                  | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 004  | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES .....                     | 29,304           |                | 29,304           |
| 006  | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES .....                        | 8,181            |                | 8,181            |
| 007  | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES .....                        | 52,667           |                | 52,667           |
| 008  | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES .....                        | 40,904           |                | 40,904           |
| <b>MORTAR AMMUNITION</b>                   |   |                  |                |                  |
| 009  | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....                      | 41,742           |                | 41,742           |
| 010  | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....                      | 42,433           |                | 42,433           |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
| 011  | 120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....                       |                 | 39,365  |              |           |                  | 39,365  |
|      | <b>TANK AMMUNITION</b>                              |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 012  | CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES .....  |                 | 101,900 |              |           |                  | 101,900 |
|      | <b>ARTILLERY AMMUNITION</b>                         |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 013  | ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES ..... |                 | 37,455  |              |           |                  | 37,455  |
| 014  | ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES .....        |                 | 47,023  |              |           |                  | 47,023  |
| 015  | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982 .....                | 416             | 35,672  |              |           | 416              | 35,672  |
| 016  | ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL ..... |                 | 94,010  |              | -20,000   |                  | 74,010  |
|      | Precision Guided Kits Schedule Delay .....          |                 |         |              | [-20,000] |                  |         |
|      | <b>ROCKETS</b>                                      |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 019  | SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES .....        |                 | 945     |              |           |                  | 945     |
| 020  | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES .....                   |                 | 27,286  |              |           |                  | 27,286  |
|      | <b>OTHER AMMUNITION</b>                             |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 021  | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES .....               |                 | 22,899  |              |           |                  | 22,899  |
| 022  | GRENADES, ALL TYPES .....                           |                 | 22,751  |              |           |                  | 22,751  |
| 023  | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES .....                            |                 | 7,082   |              |           |                  | 7,082   |
| 024  | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES .....                         |                 | 11,638  |              |           |                  | 11,638  |
|      | <b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>                                |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 025  | AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES .....                    |                 | 3,594   |              |           |                  | 3,594   |
| 027  | CAD/PAD ALL TYPES .....                             |                 | 5,430   |              |           |                  | 5,430   |
| 028  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (AMMO) .....            |                 | 8,337   |              |           |                  | 8,337   |
| 029  | AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT .....                 |                 | 14,906  |              |           |                  | 14,906  |
| 030  | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO) .....       |                 | 14,349  |              |           |                  | 14,349  |
| 031  | CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES .....                          |                 | 111     |              |           |                  | 111     |
|      | <b>PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT</b>                      |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 032  | PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....            |                 | 148,092 |              | -1,900    |                  | 146,192 |

|     |  |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
|-----|--|------------|------------------|----------------|------------|------------------|----|
| 033 | Unjustified request .....                                      |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
|     | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION .....                  | 113,881    |                  |                | 113,881    |                  |    |
| 034 | ARMS INITIATIVE .....  | 2,504      |                  |                | 2,504      |                  |    |
|     | <b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY .....</b>             | <b>416</b> | <b>1,031,477</b> | <b>-23,400</b> | <b>416</b> | <b>1,008,077</b> |    |
|     |  |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
|     | <b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>                                 |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
|     | <b>TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>                                       |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
| 001 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS .....                             | 7,987      |                  |                |            | 7,987            |    |
| 002 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED .....                                    | 160        |                  |                | 1          | 160              |    |
| 004 | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE .....                             | 164,615    |                  |                | 176        | 164,615          |    |
| 005 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) .....                     |            | 50,000           |                |            | 50,000           |    |
|     | Additional FMTVs - Industrial Base initiative .....            |            | [50,000]         |                |            |                  |    |
| 006 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP .....               | 8,415      |                  |                | 19         | 8,415            |    |
| 007 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) .....                 | 28,425     |                  |                | 444        | 28,425           |    |
|     | Additional HEMTT ESP Vehicles-Industrial Base initiative ..... |            | 50,000           |                |            |                  |    |
| 008 | PLS ESP .....  | 89,263     |                  |                | 198        | 89,263           | 38 |
| 013 | TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS .....                 | 38,226     |                  |                | 735        | 38,226           | 33 |
| 014 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP .....                             | 91,173     |                  | -8,000         | 768        | 83,173           |    |
|     | Early to need .....  |            |                  | [-8,000]       |            |                  |    |
| 015 | MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS .....              | 14,731     |                  |                | 1          | 14,731           |    |
|     | <b>NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>                                   |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
| 016 | HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN .....                                      | 175        |                  |                | 1          | 175              |    |
| 017 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES .....                              | 1,338      |                  |                | 25         | 1,338            |    |
| 018 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER .....                              | 11,101     |                  |                |            | 11,101           |    |
|     | <b>COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS</b>                               |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
| 019 | WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK .....                     | 763,087    |                  | -125,000       | 1,280      | 638,087          |    |
|     | Unobligated balances .....                                     |            |                  | [-125,000]     |            |                  |    |
| 020 | SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....                             | 21,157     |                  |                | 69         | 21,157           |    |
| 021 | JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY .....            | 7,915      |                  |                |            | 7,915            |    |
| 022 | JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) .....                                | 5,440      |                  |                |            | 5,440            |    |
|     | <b>COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS</b>                           |            |                  |                |            |                  |    |
| 023 | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS .....               | 118,085    |                  |                | 18         | 118,085          |    |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
| 024  | TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS ..... | 21              | 13,999  |              |           | 21               | 13,999  |
| 025  | S/F TERM .....                                      |                 | 6,494   |              |           |                  | 6,494   |
| 026  | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) .....     |                 | 1,635   |              |           |                  | 1,635   |
| 027  | SMART-T (SPACE) .....                               |                 | 13,554  |              |           |                  | 13,554  |
| 028  | GLOBAL BROADCAST SVC—GBS .....                      |                 | 18,899  |              |           |                  | 18,899  |
| 029  | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) .....                 |                 | 2,849   |              |           |                  | 2,849   |
| 030  | ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC) .....                 |                 | 100,000 |              |           |                  | 100,000 |
|      | <b>COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS</b>                   |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 033  | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM .....                   | 2,674           | 175,711 |              | -50,000   | 2,674            | 125,711 |
|      | Unobligated balances .....                          |                 |         |              | [-50,000] |                  |         |
| 034  | MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR) .....    |                 | 9,692   |              | -5,000    |                  | 4,692   |
|      | Unobligated balances .....                          |                 |         |              | [-5,000]  |                  |         |
| 035  | RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2) .....               | 620             | 17,136  |              |           | 620              | 17,136  |
| 037  | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2 .....                       | 3,081           | 22,099  |              |           | 3,081            | 22,099  |
| 038  | TRACTOR DESK .....                                  |                 | 3,724   |              |           |                  | 3,724   |
| 039  | SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT .....               |                 | 969     |              |           |                  | 969     |
| 040  | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMMELECTRONICS .....   |                 | 294     |              |           |                  | 294     |
| 041  | TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM ..... |                 | 24,354  |              |           |                  | 24,354  |
| 042  | UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE .....                         | 8,344           | 17,445  |              |           | 8,344            | 17,445  |
| 043  | RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY .....              |                 | 1,028   |              |           |                  | 1,028   |
| 044  | FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE .....   | 974             | 22,614  |              |           | 974              | 22,614  |
|      | <b>COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM</b>                       |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 046  | CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE .....                    |                 | 1,519   |              |           |                  | 1,519   |
| 047  | ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT .....                    | 305             | 12,478  |              |           | 305              | 12,478  |
|      | <b>INFORMATION SECURITY</b>                         |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 050  | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP .....      |                 | 2,113   |              |           |                  | 2,113   |

|     |  |       |         |       |           |
|-----|--|-------|---------|-------|-----------|
| 051 | COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC) .....             | 2,750 | 69,646  | 2,750 | 69,646    |
|     | <b>COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS</b>               |       |         |       |           |
| 052 | BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS .....                  |       | 28,913  |       | 28,913    |
|     | <b>COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS</b>                    |       |         |       |           |
| 053 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS .....                          |       | 97,091  |       | 97,091    |
| 054 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS) .....                 |       | 246     |       | 246       |
| 055 | EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....   |       | 5,362   |       | 5,362     |
| 056 | INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM ..... |       | 79,965  |       | 79,965    |
|     | <b>ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)</b>        |       |         |       |           |
| 060 | JTT/CIBS-M .....                                   |       | 870     |       | 870       |
| 061 | PROPHET GROUND .....                               | 11    | 55,896  | 11    | 55,896    |
| 063 | DCGS-A (MIP) .....                                 | 2,423 | 128,207 | 2,423 | 128,207   |
| 064 | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTGS) .....         | 2     | 5,286   | 2     | 5,286     |
| 065 | TROJAN (MIP) .....                                 |       | 12,614  |       | 12,614    |
| 066 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP) .....        |       | 3,901   |       | 3,901     |
| 067 | CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARGCS) .....    | 358   | 7,392   | 358   | 7,392     |
|     | <b>ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)</b>         |       |         |       |           |
| 068 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR .....             | 3     | 24,828  | 3     | 24,828    |
| 070 | AIR VIGILANCE (AV) .....                           |       | 7,000   |       | 7,000     |
| 072 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES ..... |       | 1,285   |       | 1,285     |
|     | <b>ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)</b>       |       |         |       |           |
| 075 | SENTINEL MODS .....                                | 81    | 44,305  | 81    | 44,305    |
| 076 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES .....                         | 9,700 | 160,901 | 9,700 | 160,901   |
| 078 | SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF .....    | 1,935 | 18,520  | 1,935 | 18,520    |
| 080 | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS .....   | 173   | 68,296  | 173   | 68,296    |
| 081 | FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS) .....                | 1,716 | 49,205  | 1,716 | 34,205    |
|     | Early to need .....                                |       |         |       | -15,000   |
|     |  |       |         |       | [-15,000] |
| 082 | ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP .....                     | 137   | 4,896   | 137   | 4,896     |
| 083 | PROFLER .....                                      |       | 3,115   |       | 3,115     |
| 084 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FINDER RADARS) .....          |       | 4,186   |       | 4,186     |
| 085 | JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P) .....        | 2,622 | 97,892  | 2,622 | 87,892    |
|     | Schedule delay .....                               |       |         |       | -10,000   |
|     |  |       |         |       | [-10,000] |

38  
85

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|--|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |  | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
| 086  | JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS) .....          | 41              | 27,450  |              |           | 41               | 27,450  |
| 087  | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR) .....                     | 34              | 14,085  |              |           | 34               | 14,085  |
| 088  | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM .....                     | 255             | 29,040  |              |           | 255              | 29,040  |
| 089  | COUNTERFIRE RADARS .....                             | 13              | 209,050 |              | -50,000   | 13               | 159,050 |
|      | Excessive LRIP/concurrency costs .....               |                 |         |              | [-50,000] |                  |         |
|      | <b>ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS</b>               |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 092  | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY .....                         |                 | 13,823  |              |           |                  | 13,823  |
| 095  | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS .....       | 5               | 27,374  |              |           | 5                | 27,374  |
| 097  | LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) .....             |                 | 2,508   |              |           |                  | 2,508   |
| 099  | NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE .....  |                 | 21,524  |              |           |                  | 21,524  |
| 100  | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) .....                  | 3,748           | 95,455  |              |           | 3,748            | 95,455  |
| 101  | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A) .....     |                 | 118,600 |              |           |                  | 118,600 |
| 102  | INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP) ..... |                 | 32,970  |              |           |                  | 32,970  |
| 104  | RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET .....    | 56              | 10,113  |              |           | 56               | 10,113  |
|      | <b>ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION</b>                        |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 105  | ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION .....                    |                 | 9,015   |              |           |                  | 9,015   |
| 106  | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP .....                |                 | 155,223 |              |           |                  | 155,223 |
| 107  | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM .....   |                 | 16,581  |              |           |                  | 16,581  |
| 108  | HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP) .....            |                 | 65,252  |              |           |                  | 65,252  |
| 110  | RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) .....        |                 | 17,631  |              |           |                  | 17,631  |
|      | <b>ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (AV)</b>             |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 112  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) .....     | 51              | 5,437   |              |           | 51               | 5,437   |
|      | <b>ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT</b>                           |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 113  | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) .....                  |                 | 426     |              |           |                  | 426     |
|      | <b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>                           |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 114A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                            |                 | 3,707   |              |           |                  | 3,707   |



|     |   |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
|-----|---|--------|--------|--------|--|--|--------|----------|
| 115 | <b>CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT</b>                 |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
| 116 | FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE) .....         | 937    | 937    |        |  |  |        | 937      |
| 117 | BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS) .....                    | 1,930  | 1,930  |        |  |  |        | 1,930    |
|     | CBRN DEFENSE .....                                  | 17,468 | 17,468 |        |  |  | 14,506 | 17,468   |
| 119 | <b>BRIDGING EQUIPMENT</b>                           |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
| 120 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON .....                 | 5,442  | 5,442  | 6      |  |  |        | 5,442    |
|     | COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (GBT) RECAP .....         | 11,013 | 11,013 |        |  |  |        | 11,013   |
| 121 | <b>ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT</b>        |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
|     | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS) .....    | 37,649 | 37,649 |        |  |  |        | 33,249   |
|     | Early to need .....                                 |        |        |        |  |  |        | -4,400   |
|     |   |        |        |        |  |  |        | [-4,400] |
| 122 | HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS) .....         | 18,545 | 18,545 | 84     |  |  |        | 18,545   |
| 123 | ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS) .....          | 4,701  | 4,701  | 1      |  |  |        | 4,701    |
| 124 | EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION .....         | 6,346  | 6,346  |        |  |  |        | 6,346    |
| 125 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) ..... | 15,856 | 15,856 | 133    |  |  |        | 15,856   |
| 126 | REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS .....                     | 4,485  | 4,485  |        |  |  |        | 4,485    |
| 127 | < \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT .....                 | 4,938  | 4,938  | 92     |  |  |        | 4,938    |
|     | <b>COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>             |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
| 128 | HEATERS AND ECUS .....                              | 9,235  | 9,235  | 628    |  |  |        | 9,235    |
| 130 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT .....                           | 1,677  | 1,677  | 1      |  |  |        | 1,677    |
| 131 | PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS) .....      | 16,728 | 16,728 | 12,273 |  |  |        | 16,728   |
| 132 | GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM .....                         | 84,761 | 84,761 | 3,581  |  |  |        | 84,761   |
| 134 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT .....                       | 15,179 | 15,179 | 141    |  |  |        | 15,179   |
| 135 | CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM ..... | 28,194 | 28,194 | 1,386  |  |  |        | 28,194   |
| 137 | FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS .....   | 41,967 | 41,967 | 336    |  |  |        | 41,967   |
| 138 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (ENG SPT) .....                | 20,090 | 20,090 | 859    |  |  |        | 20,090   |
|     | <b>PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT</b>                          |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
| 139 | QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT .....                | 1,435  | 1,435  |        |  |  |        | 1,435    |
| 140 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER .....       | 40,692 | 40,692 | 599    |  |  |        | 40,692   |
| 141 | <b>MEDICAL EQUIPMENT</b>                            |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
|     | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL .....                        | 46,957 | 46,957 | 2,388  |  |  |        | 46,957   |
| 142 | <b>MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT</b>                        |        |        |        |  |  |        |          |
|     | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS .....          | 23,758 | 23,758 | 60     |  |  |        | 23,758   |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
| 143  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ) .....             | 585             | 2,789   |              |           | 585              | 2,789   |
|      | <b>CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT</b>                       |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 144  | GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVI, 6X4 (CCE) .....             | 22              | 5,827   |              |           | 22               | 5,827   |
| 145  | SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING .....                         | 22              | 14,926  |              |           | 22               | 14,926  |
| 147  | COMPACTOR .....                                     | 617             | 4,348   |              |           | 617              | 4,348   |
| 148  | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR .....                           | 14              | 4,938   |              |           | 14               | 4,938   |
| 149  | TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED .....                         | 95              | 34,071  |              |           | 95               | 34,071  |
| 150  | ALL TERRAIN CRANES .....                            | 4               | 4,938   |              |           | 4                | 4,938   |
| 151  | PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING .....                         |                 | 667     |              |           |                  | 667     |
| 153  | ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP .....    |                 | 14,924  |              |           |                  | 14,924  |
| 154  | CONST EQUIP ESP .....                               | 79              | 15,933  |              |           | 79               | 15,933  |
| 155  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP) .....          | 53              | 6,749   |              |           | 53               | 6,749   |
|      | <b>RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT</b>        |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 156  | ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP .....                           |                 | 10,509  |              |           |                  | 10,509  |
| 157  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) .....           |                 | 2,166   |              |           |                  | 2,166   |
|      | <b>GENERATORS</b>                                   |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 158  | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP .....               | 3,882           | 115,190 |              | -10,000   | 3,882            | 105,190 |
|      | Cost savings from new contract .....                |                 |         |              | [-10,000] |                  |         |
|      | <b>MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>                  |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 160  | FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS .....                           | 146             | 14,327  |              |           | 146              | 14,327  |
|      | <b>TRAINING EQUIPMENT</b>                           |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 161  | COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT .....               | 1               | 65,062  |              |           | 1                | 65,062  |
| 162  | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM .....                   | 43              | 101,295 |              |           | 43               | 101,295 |
| 163  | CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER .....                 |                 | 13,406  |              |           |                  | 13,406  |
| 164  | AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER .....       |                 | 14,440  |              |           |                  | 14,440  |
| 165  | GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING ..... |                 | 10,165  |              |           |                  | 10,165  |

|     |   |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
|-----|---|------------------|--|---------------|--|-----------------|--|------------------|---------------|
| 166 | <b>TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)</b>                 |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
|     | CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT .....                            | 5,726            |  |               |  |                 |  | 5,726            |               |
| 167 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) .....            | 37,482           |  | 1,657         |  |                 |  | 37,482           | 1,657         |
| 168 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) .....                  | 16,061           |  | 415           |  |                 |  | 16,061           | 415           |
|     | <b>OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>                              |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
| 170 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....             | 2,380            |  |               |  |                 |  | 2,380            |               |
| 171 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) .....                      | 30,686           |  |               |  |                 |  | 30,686           |               |
| 172 | BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT .....                           | 1,008            |  |               |  |                 |  | 1,008            |               |
| 173 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) .....              | 98,559           |  | 3,209         |  |                 |  | 83,559           | 3,209         |
|     | Early to need—watercraft C4ISR .....                        |                  |  |               |  | -15,000         |  |                  |               |
|     |   |                  |  |               |  | [-15,000]       |  |                  |               |
| 174 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) .....                         | 1,697            |  |               |  |                 |  | 1,697            |               |
| 175 | SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING .....                    | 25,394           |  |               |  |                 |  | 25,394           |               |
| 176 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3 .....                               | 12,975           |  | 963           |  |                 |  | 12,975           | 963           |
|     | <b>OPAZ</b>   |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
| 180 | INITIAL SPARES—C&E .....                                    | 50,032           |  | 11            |  |                 |  | 50,032           | 11            |
|     | <b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> .....                  | <b>4,893,634</b> |  | <b>94,760</b> |  | <b>-192,400</b> |  | <b>4,701,234</b> | <b>94,760</b> |
|     |   |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
|     | <b>JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND</b>                 |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
|     | <b>STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b>                             |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
| 004 | OPERATIONS .....  | 115,058          |  |               |  |                 |  | 115,058          | 0             |
|     | Transfer of JIEDDO to Overseas Contingency Operations ..... |                  |  |               |  | -115,058        |  |                  |               |
|     | Unjustified request .....                                   |                  |  |               |  | [-65,558]       |  |                  |               |
|     |   |                  |  |               |  | [-49,500]       |  |                  |               |
|     | <b>TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND</b> .....     | <b>115,058</b>   |  |               |  | <b>-115,058</b> |  | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>      |
|     |   |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
|     | <b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>                           |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
|     | <b>COMBAT AIRCRAFT</b>                                      |                  |  |               |  |                 |  |                  |               |
| 001 | EA-18G .....  | 43,547           |  |               |  |                 |  | 43,547           |               |
|     | Additional EA-18G aircraft .....                            |                  |  |               |  | 450,000         |  |                  | 5             |
|     |   |                  |  |               |  | [-450,000]      |  |                  | [5]           |
| 005 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV .....                               | 610,652          |  | 2             |  |                 |  | 610,652          | 2             |
| 006 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                              | 29,400           |  |               |  |                 |  | 29,400           |               |
| 007 | JSF STOVL .....   | 1,200,410        |  | 6             |  |                 |  | 1,200,410        | 6             |
| 008 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                              | 143,885          |  |               |  |                 |  | 143,885          |               |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request |           | House Change |           | House Authorized |           |
|------|--|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
|      |  | Qty             | Cost      | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost      |
| 009  | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) .....                           | 19              | 1,487,000 |              |           | 19               | 1,487,000 |
| 010  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                     |                 | 45,920    |              |           |                  | 45,920    |
| 011  | H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z) .....                   | 26              | 778,757   |              |           | 26               | 778,757   |
| 012  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                     |                 | 80,926    |              |           |                  | 80,926    |
| 013  | MH-60S (MYP) .....                                 | 8               | 210,209   |              |           | 8                | 210,209   |
| 015  | MH-60R (MYP) .....                                 | 29              | 933,882   |              | -53,400   | 29               | 880,482   |
|      | CYN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |                 |           |              | [-53,400] |                  |           |
| 016  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                     |                 | 106,686   |              |           |                  | 106,686   |
| 017  | P-8A POSEIDON .....                                | 8               | 2,003,327 |              |           | 8                | 2,003,327 |
| 018  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                     |                 | 48,457    |              |           |                  | 48,457    |
| 019  | E-2D ADV HAWKEYE .....                             | 4               | 819,870   |              |           | 4                | 819,870   |
| 020  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                     |                 | 225,765   |              |           |                  | 225,765   |
|      | <b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>                              |                 |           |              |           |                  |           |
| 023  | KC-130J .....                                      | 1               | 92,290    |              |           | 1                | 92,290    |
| 026  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                     |                 | 37,445    |              |           |                  | 37,445    |
| 027  | MQ-8 UAV .....                                     |                 | 40,663    |              |           |                  | 40,663    |
|      | <b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>                    |                 |           |              |           |                  |           |
| 029  | EA-6 SERIES .....                                  |                 | 10,993    |              |           |                  | 10,993    |
| 030  | AEA SYSTEMS .....                                  |                 | 34,768    |              |           |                  | 34,768    |
| 031  | AV-8 SERIES .....                                  |                 | 65,472    |              |           |                  | 65,472    |
| 032  | ADVERSARY .....                                    |                 | 8,418     |              |           |                  | 8,418     |
| 033  | F-18 SERIES .....                                  |                 | 679,177   |              |           |                  | 679,177   |
| 034  | H-46 SERIES .....                                  |                 | 480       |              |           |                  | 480       |
| 036  | H-53 SERIES .....                                  |                 | 38,159    |              |           |                  | 38,159    |
| 037  | SH-60 SERIES .....                                 |                 | 108,850   |              |           |                  | 108,850   |
| 038  | H-1 SERIES .....                                   |                 | 45,033    |              |           |                  | 45,033    |

|     |  |           |          |           |
|-----|--|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 039 | EP-3 SERIES .....  | 32,890    | 18,000   | 50,890    |
|     | Obsolescence issues .....                                    |           | [5,000]  |           |
|     | SIGINT Architecture Modernization Common Configuration ..... |           | [13,000] |           |
| 040 | P-3 SERIES .....   | 2,823     |          | 2,823     |
| 041 | E-2 SERIES .....   | 21,208    |          | 21,208    |
| 042 | TRAINER A/C SERIES .....                                     | 12,608    |          | 12,608    |
| 044 | C-130 SERIES .....   | 40,378    |          | 40,378    |
| 045 | FEWSG .....  | 640       |          | 640       |
| 046 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES .....                             | 4,635     |          | 4,635     |
| 047 | E-6 SERIES .....   | 212,876   |          | 212,876   |
| 048 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES .....                           | 71,328    |          | 71,328    |
| 049 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT .....                               | 21,317    |          | 21,317    |
| 050 | T-45 SERIES .....  | 90,052    |          | 90,052    |
| 051 | POWER PLANT CHANGES .....                                    | 19,094    |          | 19,094    |
| 052 | JPATS SERIES .....   | 1,085     |          | 1,085     |
| 054 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT .....                                   | 155,644   |          | 155,644   |
| 055 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES .....                                | 157,531   |          | 157,531   |
| 056 | COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM .....                         | 1,958     |          | 1,958     |
| 057 | ID SYSTEMS .....   | 38,880    |          | 38,880    |
| 058 | P-8 SERIES .....   | 29,797    |          | 29,797    |
| 059 | MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION .....                                  | 14,770    |          | 14,770    |
| 060 | MQ-8 SERIES .....  | 8,741     |          | 8,741     |
| 061 | RQ-7 SERIES .....  | 2,542     |          | 2,542     |
| 062 | V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY .....                          | 135,584   |          | 135,584   |
| 063 | F-35 STOVL SERIES .....                                      | 285,968   |          | 285,968   |
| 064 | F-35 CV SERIES .....   | 20,502    |          | 20,502    |
|     | <b>AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b> .....                |           |          |           |
| 065 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....                                | 1,229,651 | -3,000   | 1,226,651 |
|     | Program decrease .....                                       |           | [-3,000] |           |
|     | <b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP &amp; FACILITIES</b> .....         |           |          |           |
| 066 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT .....                                | 418,355   |          | 418,355   |
| 067 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....                         | 23,843    |          | 23,843    |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request |                   | House Change |                | House Authorized |                   |
|------|--|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
|      |  | Qty             | Cost              | Qty          | Cost           | Qty              | Cost              |
| 068  | WAR CONSUMABLES .....                              |                 | 15,939            |              |                |                  | 15,939            |
| 069  | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES .....                     |                 | 5,630             |              |                |                  | 5,630             |
| 070  | SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                    |                 | 65,839            |              |                |                  | 65,839            |
| 071  | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION .....             |                 | 1,768             |              |                |                  | 1,768             |
|      | <b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....</b>      | <b>103</b>      | <b>13,074,317</b> | <b>5</b>     | <b>411,600</b> | <b>108</b>       | <b>13,485,917</b> |
|      | <b>WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>                   |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
|      | <b>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</b>                    |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 001  | TRIDENT II MODS .....                              |                 | 1,190,455         |              |                |                  | 1,190,455         |
| 002  | <b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>          |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
|      | MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....                |                 | 5,671             |              |                |                  | 5,671             |
| 003  | <b>STRATEGIC MISSILES</b>                          |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
|      | TOMAHAWK .....                                     | 100             | 194,258           | 96           | 82,000         | 196              | 276,258           |
|      | Minimum sustaining rate increase .....             |                 |                   | [96]         | [82,000]       |                  |                   |
|      | <b>TACTICAL MISSILES</b>                           |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 004  | AMRAAM .....                                       |                 | 32,165            |              |                |                  | 32,165            |
|      | Program decrease .....                             |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 005  | SIDEWINDER .....                                   | 167             | 73,928            |              |                | 167              | 73,928            |
| 006  | JSOW .....   | 200             | 130,759           |              |                | 200              | 130,759           |
| 007  | STANDARD MISSILE .....                             | 110             | 445,836           |              |                | 110              | 445,836           |
| 008  | RAM .....  | 90              | 80,792            |              |                | 90               | 80,792            |
| 011  | STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM) ..... | 14              | 1,810             |              |                | 14               | 1,810             |
| 012  | AERIAL TARGETS .....                               |                 | 48,046            |              |                |                  | 48,046            |
| 013  | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT .....                        |                 | 3,295             |              |                |                  | 3,295             |
|      | <b>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</b>                    |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 014  | ESSM .....   | 104             | 119,434           |              |                | 104              | 119,434           |

|     |  |                  |               |                  |
|-----|--|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 015 | HARM MODS .....                            | 111,739          |               | 111,739          |
|     | <b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>  |                  |               |                  |
| 016 | WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....        | 2,531            |               | 2,531            |
| 017 | FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON .....       | 208,700          | -9,000        | 199,700          |
|     | Excess to need .....                       |                  | [-9,000]      |                  |
| 018 | <b>ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>          | 73,211           |               | 73,211           |
|     | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....           |                  |               |                  |
|     | <b>TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP</b>         |                  |               |                  |
| 019 | SSTD .....                                 | 6,562            |               | 6,562            |
| 020 | MK-48 TORPEDO .....                        | 14,153           |               | 14,153           |
| 021 | ASW TARGETS .....                          | 2,515            |               | 2,515            |
|     | <b>MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP</b>  |                  |               |                  |
| 022 | MK-54 TORPEDO MODS .....                   | 98,928           |               | 98,928           |
| 023 | MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS .....             | 46,893           |               | 46,893           |
| 024 | QUICKSTRIKE MINE .....                     | 6,966            |               | 6,966            |
|     | <b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>                   |                  |               |                  |
| 025 | TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....            | 52,670           |               | 52,670           |
| 026 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT .....                    | 3,795            |               | 3,795            |
|     | <b>DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION</b>          |                  |               |                  |
| 027 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION .....     | 3,692            |               | 3,692            |
|     | <b>GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS</b>                 |                  |               |                  |
| 028 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS .....               | 13,240           |               | 13,240           |
|     | <b>MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS</b> |                  |               |                  |
| 029 | CIMS MODS .....                            | 75,108           |               | 75,108           |
| 030 | COAST GUARD WEAPONS .....                  | 18,948           |               | 18,948           |
| 031 | GUN MOUNT MODS .....                       | 62,651           |               | 62,651           |
| 033 | AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS ..... | 15,006           |               | 15,006           |
|     | <b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>             |                  |               |                  |
| 035 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....              | 74,188           |               | 74,188           |
|     | <b>TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>     | <b>785</b>       | <b>63,000</b> | <b>881</b>       |
|     | <b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY &amp; MC</b>  | <b>3,217,945</b> |               | <b>3,280,945</b> |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                           | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |      | House Authorized |         |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|------|------------------|---------|
|                                |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost | Qty              | Cost    |
| <b>NAVY AMMUNITION</b>         |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 001                            | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS .....                 |                 | 107,069 |              |      |                  | 107,069 |
| 002                            | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES .....           |                 | 70,396  |              |      |                  | 70,396  |
| 003                            | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION .....                |                 | 20,284  |              |      |                  | 20,284  |
| 004                            | PRACTICE BOMBS .....                        |                 | 26,701  |              |      |                  | 26,701  |
| 005                            | CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES .....    |                 | 53,866  |              |      |                  | 53,866  |
| 006                            | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES .....        |                 | 59,294  |              |      |                  | 59,294  |
| 007                            | JATOS .....                                 |                 | 2,766   |              |      |                  | 2,766   |
| 008                            | LRLAP 6" LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE ..... |                 | 113,092 |              |      |                  | 113,092 |
| 009                            | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION .....              |                 | 35,702  |              |      |                  | 35,702  |
| 010                            | INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION .....   |                 | 36,475  |              |      |                  | 36,475  |
| 011                            | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION .....             |                 | 43,906  |              |      |                  | 43,906  |
| 012                            | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO .....       |                 | 51,535  |              |      |                  | 51,535  |
| 013                            | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION .....            |                 | 11,652  |              |      |                  | 11,652  |
| 014                            | AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....      |                 | 4,473   |              |      |                  | 4,473   |
| <b>MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION</b> |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 015                            | SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION .....                 |                 | 31,708  |              |      |                  | 31,708  |
| 016                            | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES .....             |                 | 692     |              |      |                  | 692     |
| 017                            | 40 MM, ALL TYPES .....                      |                 | 13,630  |              |      |                  | 13,630  |
| 018                            | 60MM, ALL TYPES .....                       |                 | 2,261   |              |      |                  | 2,261   |
| 019                            | 81MM, ALL TYPES .....                       |                 | 1,496   |              |      |                  | 1,496   |
| 020                            | 120MM, ALL TYPES .....                      |                 | 14,855  |              |      |                  | 14,855  |
| 022                            | GRENADES, ALL TYPES .....                   |                 | 4,000   |              |      |                  | 4,000   |
| 023                            | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES .....                    |                 | 16,853  |              |      |                  | 16,853  |
| 024                            | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES .....                  |                 | 14,772  |              |      |                  | 14,772  |
| 026                            | FUZE, ALL TYPES .....                       |                 | 9,972   |              |      |                  | 9,972   |



|   |   |    |                |                |  |
|---|---|----|----------------|----------------|--|
| 027   | NON LETHALS .....                                     |    |                | 998            |  |
| 028   | AMMO MODERNIZATION .....                              |    | 12,319         | 12,319         |  |
| 029   | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                     |    | 11,178         | 11,178         |  |
|   | <b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY &amp; MC .....</b> |    | <b>771,945</b> | <b>771,945</b> |  |
| <br>  |   |    |                |                |  |
| <b>SHIPBUILDING &amp; CONVERSION, NAVY</b>          |   |    |                |                |  |
| <b>OTHER WARSHIPS</b>                               |   |    |                |                |  |
| 001   | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM .....                     |    | 1,300,000      | 1,300,000      |  |
| 002   | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE .....                        |    | 3,553,254      | 3,553,254      |  |
| 003   | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        | 2  | 2,330,325      | 2,330,325      |  |
| 004   | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS .....                         |    |                | 483,600        |  |
|   | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....    | 1  |                | [483,600]      |  |
| 006   | DDG 1000 .....  |    | 419,532        | 365,532        |  |
|   | DDG-1000 .....  |    |                | [-54,000]      |  |
| 007   | DDG-51 .....  | 2  | 2,671,415      | 2,671,415      |  |
| 008   | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        | 2  | 134,039        | 134,039        |  |
| 009   | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP .....                            | 3  | 1,427,049      | 977,049        |  |
|   | Reduction of 1 LCS .....                              | -1 |                | [-450,000]     |  |
| 009A  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        |    |                | 100,000        |  |
|   | Program requirement .....                             |    |                | [-100,000]     |  |
| <b>AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS</b>                             |   |    |                |                |  |
| 010   | LPD-17 .....  |    | 12,565         | 812,565        |  |
|   | Incremental funding for LPD-28 .....                  | 1  |                | 800,000        |  |
| 014   | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        |    | 29,093         | 29,093         |  |
| 015   | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL .....                         |    | 4,590          | 4,590          |  |
| <b>AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST</b> |   |    |                |                |  |
| 016   | MOORED TRAINING SHIP .....                            | 1  | 737,268        | 517,268        |  |
|   | Moored Training Ship .....                            |    |                | [-220,000]     |  |
| 017   | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                        |    | 64,388         | 64,388         |  |
| 018   | OUTFITTING .....                                      |    | 546,104        | 546,104        |  |
| 019   | SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR .....                         | 2  | 123,233        | 123,233        |  |
| 020   | LCAC SLEP .....                                       | 2  | 40,485         | 40,485         |  |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request |                   | House Change |                | House Authorized |                   |
|------|--|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
|      |  | Qty             | Cost              | Qty          | Cost           | Qty              | Cost              |
| 021  | COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS .....           |                 | 1,007,285         |              |                |                  | 1,007,285         |
|      | <b>TOTAL SHIPBUILDING &amp; CONVERSION, NAVY .....</b> | <b>12</b>       | <b>14,400,625</b> | <b>1</b>     | <b>659,600</b> | <b>13</b>        | <b>15,060,225</b> |
|      | <b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>                         |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
|      | <b>SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT</b>                       |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 001  | LM-2500 GAS TURBINE .....                              |                 | 7,822             |              |                |                  | 7,822             |
| 002  | ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE .....                         |                 | 2,155             |              |                |                  | 2,155             |
| 003  | HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED) .....                      |                 | 22,704            |              | -7,000         |                  | 15,704            |
|      | Hybrid Electric Drive .....                            |                 |                   |              | [-7,000]       |                  |                   |
|      | <b>GENERATORS</b>                                      |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 004  | SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E .....                           |                 | 29,120            |              | -7,000         |                  | 22,120            |
|      | Surface Combatant HM&E .....                           |                 |                   |              | [-7,000]       |                  |                   |
|      | <b>NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT</b>                            |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 005  | OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT .....                       |                 | 45,431            |              |                |                  | 45,431            |
|      | <b>PERISCOPES</b>                                      |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 006  | SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP .....                   |                 | 60,970            |              | -8,300         |                  | 52,670            |
|      | Submarine Periscopes and Imaging Equipment .....       |                 |                   |              | [-8,300]       |                  |                   |
|      | <b>OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT</b>                       |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 007  | DDG MOD .....  |                 | 338,569           |              |                |                  | 338,569           |
| 008  | FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT .....                           |                 | 15,486            |              |                |                  | 15,486            |
| 009  | COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD .....                  |                 | 2,219             |              |                |                  | 2,219             |
| 010  | LHA/LHD MIDLIFE .....                                  |                 | 17,928            |              |                |                  | 17,928            |
| 011  | LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM .....          |                 | 22,025            |              |                |                  | 22,025            |
| 012  | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT .....                      |                 | 12,607            |              |                |                  | 12,607            |
| 013  | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                      |                 | 16,492            |              |                |                  | 16,492            |
| 014  | VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                 |                 | 74,129            |              |                |                  | 74,129            |

|     |  |         |           |
|-----|--|---------|-----------|
| 015 | LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                  | 36,206  | 36,206    |
| 016 | SUBMARINE BATTERIES .....                          | 37,352  | 37,352    |
| 017 | LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                  | 49,095  | 49,095    |
| 018 | ELECTRONIC DRY AIR .....                           | 2,996   | 2,996     |
| 019 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP .....             | 11,558  | 11,558    |
| 020 | DSSP EQUIPMENT .....                               | 5,518   | 5,518     |
| 022 | LCAC .....   | 7,158   | 7,158     |
| 023 | UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS .....                      | 58,783  | 53,783    |
|     | Underwater EOD programs .....                      |         | -5,000    |
|     |  |         | [-5,000]  |
| 024 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                  | 68,748  | 68,748    |
| 025 | CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS .....                   | 2,937   | 2,937     |
| 026 | SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM .....                | 8,385   | 8,385     |
|     | <b>REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT</b>                     |         |           |
| 027 | REACTOR POWER UNITS .....                          |         | 298,200   |
|     | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |         | [298,200] |
| 028 | REACTOR COMPONENTS .....                           | 288,822 | 288,822   |
|     | <b>OCEAN ENGINEERING</b>                           |         |           |
| 029 | DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT .....                 | 10,572  | 10,572    |
|     | <b>SMALL BOATS</b>                                 |         |           |
| 030 | STANDARD BOATS .....                               | 129,784 | 80,784    |
|     | Standard Boats .....                               |         | -49,000   |
|     |  |         | [-49,000] |
|     | <b>TRAINING EQUIPMENT</b>                          |         |           |
| 031 | OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT .....               | 17,152  | 17,152    |
|     | <b>PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT</b>             |         |           |
| 032 | OPERATING FORCES IPE .....                         | 39,409  | 39,409    |
|     | <b>OTHER SHIP SUPPORT</b>                          |         |           |
| 033 | NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS .....                          | 118,129 | 118,129   |
| 034 | LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT .....         | 37,413  | 37,413    |
| 035 | LCS MCM MISSION MODULES .....                      | 15,270  | 15,270    |
| 036 | LCS ASW MISSION MODULES .....                      | 2,729   | 2,729     |
| 037 | LCS SUW MISSION MODULES .....                      | 44,208  | 44,208    |
| 038 | REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS) .....              | 42,276  | 42,276    |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                                    | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |      | House Authorized |         |
|---|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|------|------------------|---------|
|   |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost | Qty              | Cost    |
| <b>SHIP SONARS</b>                      |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 040                                     | SPQ-9B RADAR .....                                  |                 | 28,007  |              |      |                  | 28,007  |
| 041                                     | AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM .....              |                 | 79,802  |              |      |                  | 79,802  |
| 042                                     | SSN ACOUSTICS .....                                 |                 | 165,655 |              |      |                  | 165,655 |
| 043                                     | UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....            |                 | 9,487   |              |      |                  | 9,487   |
| 044                                     | SOMAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS .....                |                 | 11,621  |              |      |                  | 11,621  |
| <b>ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>         |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 046                                     | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM .....             |                 | 24,221  |              |      |                  | 24,221  |
| 047                                     | SSTD .....  |                 | 12,051  |              |      |                  | 12,051  |
| 048                                     | FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM .....                     |                 | 170,831 |              |      |                  | 170,831 |
| 049                                     | SURTASS .....                                       |                 | 9,619   |              |      |                  | 9,619   |
| 050                                     | MARITIME PATROL AND RECONSAISANCE FORCE .....       |                 | 14,390  |              |      |                  | 14,390  |
| <b>ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT</b>     |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 051                                     | AN/SIQ-32 .....                                     |                 | 214,582 |              |      |                  | 214,582 |
| <b>RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT</b>         |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 052                                     | SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT .....                          |                 | 124,862 |              |      |                  | 124,862 |
| 053                                     | AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS) .....         |                 | 164     |              |      |                  | 164     |
| <b>SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT</b> |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 054                                     | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG .....              |                 | 45,362  |              |      |                  | 45,362  |
| <b>OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>  |   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 055                                     | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY .....             |                 | 33,939  |              |      |                  | 33,939  |
| 056                                     | TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS) .....              |                 | 324     |              |      |                  | 324     |
| 057                                     | NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS) ..... |                 | 18,192  |              |      |                  | 18,192  |
| 058                                     | ATDLS .....   |                 | 16,768  |              |      |                  | 16,768  |
| 059                                     | NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS) .....        |                 | 5,219   |              |      |                  | 5,219   |
| 060                                     | MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT .....               |                 | 42,108  |              |      |                  | 42,108  |

|     |  |         |         |
|-----|--|---------|---------|
| 062 | NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) .....        | 15,232  | 15,232  |
| 063 | AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE ..... | 4,524   | 4,524   |
| 064 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP .....     | 6,382   | 6,382   |
|     | <b>TRAINING EQUIPMENT</b>                  |         |         |
| 065 | OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT .....             | 46,122  | 46,122  |
|     | <b>AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>       |         |         |
| 066 | MATCALS .....                              | 16,999  | 16,999  |
| 067 | SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL .....        | 9,366   | 9,366   |
| 068 | AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM .....     | 21,357  | 21,357  |
| 069 | NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM .....            | 26,639  | 26,639  |
| 070 | FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS .....    | 9,214   | 9,214   |
| 071 | LANDING SYSTEMS .....                      | 13,902  | 13,902  |
| 072 | ID SYSTEMS .....                           | 34,901  | 34,901  |
| 073 | NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS .....       | 13,950  | 13,950  |
|     | <b>OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>    |         |         |
| 074 | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL .....   | 1,205   | 1,205   |
| 075 | MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM ..... | 3,447   | 3,447   |
| 076 | TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS .....          | 16,766  | 16,766  |
| 077 | DCGS-N .....                               | 23,649  | 23,649  |
| 078 | CANES .....                                | 357,589 | 357,589 |
| 079 | RADIAC .....                               | 8,343   | 8,343   |
| 080 | CANES-INTELL .....                         | 65,015  | 65,015  |
| 081 | GPETE .....                                | 6,284   | 6,284   |
| 082 | INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY .....    | 4,016   | 4,016   |
| 083 | EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION .....          | 4,113   | 4,113   |
| 084 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....          | 45,053  | 45,053  |
|     | <b>SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS</b>            |         |         |
| 085 | SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS .....    | 14,410  | 14,410  |
| 086 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION .....       | 20,830  | 20,830  |
| 088 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M .....      | 14,145  | 14,145  |
|     | <b>SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS</b>            |         |         |
| 089 | SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT .....          | 11,057  | 11,057  |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |      | House Authorized |         |
|------|--|-----------------|---------|--------------|------|------------------|---------|
|      |  | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost | Qty              | Cost    |
| 090  | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT .....            |                 | 67,852  |              |      |                  | 67,852  |
|      | <b>SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS</b>                    |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 091  | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS .....             |                 | 13,218  |              |      |                  | 13,268  |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |                 |         |              |      | 50               |         |
| 092  | NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT) .....                |                 | 272,076 |              |      |                  | 272,076 |
|      | <b>SHORE COMMUNICATIONS</b>                        |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 093  | JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT .....                 |                 | 4,369   |              |      |                  | 4,369   |
| 094  | ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS .....                     |                 | 1,402   |              |      |                  | 1,402   |
|      | <b>CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT</b>                     |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 095  | INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) .....         |                 | 110,766 |              |      |                  | 110,766 |
| 096  | MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM .....                  |                 | 979     |              |      |                  | 979     |
|      | <b>CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT</b>                       |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 097  | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP .....             |                 | 11,502  |              |      |                  | 11,502  |
|      | <b>OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT</b>                    |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 098  | COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT .....                        |                 | 2,967   |              |      |                  | 2,967   |
|      | <b>SONOBUOYS</b>                                   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 100  | SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES .....                          |                 | 182,946 |              |      |                  | 182,946 |
|      | <b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>                  |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |
| 101  | WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....              |                 | 47,944  |              |      |                  | 47,944  |
| 103  | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                   |                 | 76,683  |              |      |                  | 76,683  |
| 106  | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT .....                     |                 | 12,575  |              |      | 300              | 12,875  |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |                 |         |              |      | [300]            |         |
| 107  | DCRS/DPL .....                                     |                 | 1,415   |              |      |                  | 1,415   |
| 109  | AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES .....                |                 | 23,152  |              |      |                  | 23,152  |
| 114  | AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                   |                 | 52,555  |              |      |                  | 52,555  |
|      | <b>SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT</b>                   |                 |         |              |      |                  |         |

|     |  |         |         |
|-----|--|---------|---------|
| 115 | SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT .....           | 5,572   | 5,572   |
|     | <b>SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT</b>      |         |         |
| 118 | SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....       | 165,769 | 165,769 |
| 123 | TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....           | 61,462  | 61,462  |
|     | <b>FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>               |         |         |
| 126 | STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP .....      | 229,832 | 229,832 |
|     | <b>ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>               |         |         |
| 127 | SSM COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS .....           | 66,020  | 66,020  |
| 128 | ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                | 7,559   | 7,559   |
|     | <b>OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>    |         |         |
| 132 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP .....    | 20,619  | 20,619  |
| 133 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....          | 11,251  | 11,251  |
|     | <b>OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE</b>           |         |         |
| 137 | TRAINING DEVICE MODS .....                 | 84,080  | 84,080  |
|     | <b>CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b> |         |         |
| 138 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES .....          | 2,282   | 2,282   |
| 139 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS .....               | 547     | 547     |
| 140 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP .....     | 8,949   | 8,949   |
| 141 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT .....              | 14,621  | 14,621  |
| 142 | TACTICAL VEHICLES .....                    | 957     | 957     |
| 143 | AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT .....                 | 8,187   | 8,187   |
| 144 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT .....          | 2,942   | 2,942   |
| 145 | ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION .....              | 17,592  | 17,592  |
| 146 | PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES .....           | 1,177   | 1,177   |
|     | <b>SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>            |         |         |
| 147 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT .....         | 10,937  | 10,937  |
| 148 | OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....       | 10,374  | 10,374  |
| 149 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION .....     | 5,668   | 5,668   |
| 150 | SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS .....       | 90,921  | 90,921  |
|     | <b>TRAINING DEVICES</b>                    |         |         |
| 151 | TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....           | 22,046  | 22,046  |
|     | <b>COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>           |         |         |





|     |  |        |        |
|-----|--|--------|--------|
| 005 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM .....          | 19,474 | 19,474 |
| 006 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION .....  | 7,250  | 7,250  |
|     | <b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>                                 |        |        |
| 007 | MODIFICATION KITS .....                              | 21,909 | 21,909 |
| 008 | WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM .....                    | 3,208  | 3,208  |
|     | <b>GUIDED MISSILES</b>                               |        |        |
| 009 | GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE .....                       | 31,439 | 31,439 |
| 010 | JAVELIN .....  | 343    | 343    |
| 011 | FOLLOW ON TO SMAM .....                              | 4,995  | 4,995  |
| 012 | ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAMS-H) .....       | 1,589  | 1,589  |
|     | <b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>                                 |        |        |
| 013 | MODIFICATION KITS .....                              | 5,134  | 5,134  |
|     | <b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS</b>                   |        |        |
| 014 | UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER .....                         | 9,178  | 9,178  |
| 015 | COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C) ..... | 12,272 | 12,272 |
|     | <b>REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT</b>                     |        |        |
| 016 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT .....                      | 30,591 | 30,591 |
|     | <b>OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)</b>                           |        |        |
| 017 | COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM .....                          | 2,385  | 2,385  |
|     | <b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)</b>          |        |        |
| 019 | ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) .....          | 4,205  | 4,205  |
| 020 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS .....                      | 8,002  | 8,002  |
|     | <b>RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>                   |        |        |
| 021 | RADAR SYSTEMS .....                                  | 19,595 | 19,595 |
| 022 | U .....  | 89,230 | 89,230 |
| 023 | RQ-21 UAS .....                                      | 70,565 | 70,565 |
|     | <b>INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>               |        |        |
| 024 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM .....                            | 11,860 | 11,860 |
| 025 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....                 | 44,340 | 44,340 |
| 028 | RQ-11 UAV .....                                      | 2,737  | 2,737  |
| 030 | DCGS-MC .....  | 20,620 | 20,620 |
|     | <b>OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>           |        |        |

2 3

2 3

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |        | House Change |           | House Authorized |        |
|------|---|-----------------|--------|--------------|-----------|------------------|--------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost   | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost   |
| 031  | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT .....                    |                 | 9,798  |              |           |                  | 9,798  |
|      | <b>OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)</b>                  |                 |        |              |           |                  |        |
| 032  | NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN) ..... |                 | 2,073  |              |           |                  | 2,073  |
| 033  | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES .....                 |                 | 33,570 |              |           |                  | 33,570 |
| 034  | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS .....                      |                 | 38,186 |              |           |                  | 38,186 |
| 035  | RADIO SYSTEMS .....                             |                 | 64,494 |              |           |                  | 64,494 |
| 036  | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS .....          |                 | 72,956 |              |           |                  | 72,956 |
| 037  | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT .....        |                 | 43,317 |              |           |                  | 43,317 |
|      | <b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>                      |                 |        |              |           |                  |        |
| 037A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                       |                 | 2,498  |              |           |                  | 2,498  |
|      | <b>ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES</b>                  |                 |        |              |           |                  |        |
| 038  | COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES .....             |                 | 332    |              |           |                  | 332    |
| 039  | COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES .....                 |                 | 11,035 |              |           |                  | 11,035 |
|      | <b>TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>                        |                 |        |              |           |                  |        |
| 040  | 5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP) .....                    |                 | 57,255 |              | -20,000   |                  | 37,255 |
|      | Early to need .....                             |                 |        |              | [-20,000] |                  |        |
| 041  | MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS .....             |                 | 938    |              |           |                  | 938    |
| 044  | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE .....              | 7               | 7,500  |              |           | 7                | 7,500  |
| 045  | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS .....               |                 | 10,179 |              |           |                  | 10,179 |
|      | <b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>                            |                 |        |              |           |                  |        |
| 046  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....               |                 | 11,023 |              |           |                  | 11,023 |
|      | <b>ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT</b>             |                 |        |              |           |                  |        |
| 047  | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT .....        |                 | 994    |              |           |                  | 994    |
| 048  | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT .....                     |                 | 1,256  |              |           |                  | 1,256  |
| 049  | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS .....                     |                 | 3,750  |              |           |                  | 3,750  |
| 050  | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED .....                  |                 | 8,985  |              |           |                  | 8,985  |

|     |   |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
|-----|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|----------------|
| 051 | AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....              |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 4,418          |
| 052 | EOD SYSTEMS .....                               |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 6,528          |
|     | <b>MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>             |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
| 053 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT .....               |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 26,510         |
| 054 | GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE) ..... |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 1,910          |
| 055 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP .....                   |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 8,807          |
| 056 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION .....          |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 128            |
|     | <b>GENERAL PROPERTY</b>                         |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
| 058 | TRAINING DEVICES .....                          |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 3,412          |
| 059 | CONTAINER FAMILY .....                          |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 1,662          |
| 060 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT .....          |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 3,669          |
|     | <b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>                            |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
| 062 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....               |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 4,272          |
|     | <b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>                  |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
| 063 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....                   |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 16,210         |
|     | <b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</b> .....    | <b>12</b> |  |  |  |  |  | <b>-25,100</b> | <b>958,252</b> |
|     |   |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
|     | <b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>          |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
|     | <b>TACTICAL FORCES</b>                          |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
| 001 | F-35 .....                                      | 26        |  |  |  |  |  |                | 3,553,046      |
| 002 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                  |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 291,880        |
|     | <b>TACTICAL AIRLIFT</b>                         |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
| 003 | KC-46A TANKER .....                             | 7         |  |  |  |  |  |                | 1,582,685      |
|     | LRIP 1 Ramp Rate .....                          |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | -1             |
|     |   |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | [-1]           |
|     | <b>OTHER AIRLIFT</b>                            |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |
| 004 | C-130J .....                                    | 7         |  |  |  |  |  |                | 482,396        |
| 005 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                  |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 140,000        |
| 006 | HC-130J .....                                   | 4         |  |  |  |  |  |                | 332,024        |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                  |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 50,000         |
| 008 | MC-130J .....                                   | 2         |  |  |  |  |  |                | 190,971        |
| 009 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                  |           |  |  |  |  |  |                | 80,000         |
|     | <b>MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT</b>                 |           |  |  |  |  |  |                |                |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
| 012  | CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C .....                    | 6               | 2,562   |              |           | 6                | 2,562   |
|      | <b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>                         |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 013  | TARGET DRONES .....                           | 37              | 98,576  |              |           | 37               | 98,576  |
| 016  | RQ-4 .....                                    |                 | 54,475  |              | -10,000   |                  | 44,475  |
|      | MPRTIP Sensor Trainer reduction .....         |                 |         |              | [-10,000] |                  |         |
| 017  | AC-130U .....                                 |                 | 1       |              |           |                  | 1       |
| 018  | MQ-9 .....                                    | 12              | 240,218 | 8            | 120,000   | 20               | 360,218 |
|      | Program increase .....                        |                 |         | [8]          | [120,000] |                  |         |
|      | <b>STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT</b>                     |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 020  | B-2A .....                                    |                 | 23,865  |              |           |                  | 23,865  |
| 021  | B-1B .....                                    |                 | 140,252 |              |           |                  | 140,252 |
| 022  | B-52 .....                                    |                 | 180,148 |              |           |                  | 180,148 |
| 023  | LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES ..... |                 | 13,159  |              |           |                  | 13,159  |
|      | <b>TACTICAL AIRCRAFT</b>                      |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 025  | F-15 .....                                    |                 | 387,314 |              |           |                  | 387,314 |
| 026  | F-16 .....                                    |                 | 12,336  |              |           |                  | 12,336  |
| 027  | F-22A .....                                   |                 | 180,207 |              |           |                  | 180,207 |
| 028  | F-35 MODIFICATIONS .....                      |                 | 187,646 |              |           |                  | 187,646 |
| 029  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                |                 | 28,500  |              |           |                  | 28,500  |
|      | <b>AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</b>                       |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 030  | C-5 .....                                     |                 | 14,731  |              |           |                  | 14,731  |
| 031  | C-5M .....                                    |                 | 331,466 |              | -50,000   |                  | 281,466 |
|      | Program execution delay .....                 |                 |         |              | [-50,000] |                  |         |
| 033  | C-17A .....                                   |                 | 127,494 |              |           |                  | 127,494 |
| 034  | C-21 .....                                    |                 | 264     |              |           |                  | 264     |
| 035  | C-32A .....                                   |                 | 8,767   |              |           |                  | 8,767   |

|     |  |          |          |
|-----|--|----------|----------|
| 036 | C-37A .....                                    | 18,457   | 18,457   |
|     | <b>TRAINER AIRCRAFT</b>                        |          |          |
| 038 | GLIDER MODS .....                              | 132      | 132      |
| 039 | T-6 .....                                      | 14,486   | 14,486   |
| 040 | T-1 .....                                      | 7,650    | 7,650    |
| 041 | T-38 .....                                     | 34,845   | 34,845   |
|     | <b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>                          |          |          |
| 044 | KC-10A (ATCA) .....                            | 34,313   | 34,313   |
| 045 | C-12 .....                                     | 1,960    | 1,960    |
| 048 | VC-25A MOD .....                               | 1,072    | 1,072    |
| 049 | C-40 .....                                     | 7,292    | 7,292    |
| 050 | C-130 .....                                    | 35,869   | 35,869   |
|     | 8.33kHz radios .....                           | 73,802   | 73,802   |
|     | C-130 8-Bladed Propeller upgrade .....         | [-7,447] | [-7,447] |
|     | C-130 AMP .....                                | [30,000] | [30,000] |
|     | CVR/DVR .....                                  | [35,800] | [35,800] |
|     | T-56 3.5 Engine Mod .....                      | [-7,151] | [-7,151] |
|     |  | [22,600] | [22,600] |
| 051 | C-130J MODS .....                              | 7,919    | 7,919    |
| 052 | C-135 .....                                    | 63,568   | 63,568   |
| 053 | COMPASS CALL MODS .....                        | 57,828   | 57,828   |
| 054 | RC-135 .....                                   | 152,746  | 152,746  |
| 055 | E-3 .....                                      | 16,491   | 16,491   |
|     | Program increase .....                         | 12,857   | 12,857   |
|     |  | [12,857] | [12,857] |
| 056 | E-4 .....                                      | 22,341   | 22,341   |
| 058 | AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....      | 160,284  | 160,284  |
| 059 | FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS ..... | 32,026   | 32,026   |
| 060 | H-1 .....                                      | 8,237    | 8,237    |
| 061 | H-60 .....                                     | 60,110   | 60,110   |
| 062 | RQ-4 MODS .....                                | 21,354   | 21,354   |
| 063 | HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS .....                  | 1,902    | 1,902    |
| 064 | OTHER AIRCRAFT .....                           | 32,106   | 32,106   |
| 065 | MQ-1 MODS .....                                | 4,755    | 4,755    |
|     |  | -3,200   | -3,200   |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
|      | Program reduction .....                             |                 |         |              | [-3,200]  |                  |         |
| 066  | MQ-9 MODS .....                                     |                 | 155,445 |              |           |                  | 155,445 |
| 069  | CV-22 MODS .....                                    |                 | 74,874  |              |           |                  | 74,874  |
| 069A | EJECTION SEAT RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ..... |                 |         |              | 7,000     |                  | 7,000   |
|      | Initial aircraft installation .....                 |                 |         |              | [7,000]   |                  |         |
|      | <b>AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b> .....       |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 070  | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS .....                   |                 | 466,562 |              | -42,030   |                  | 424,532 |
|      | Program decrease .....                              |                 |         |              | [-42,030] |                  |         |
|      | <b>COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b> .....               |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 071  | AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP .....            |                 | 22,470  |              |           |                  | 22,470  |
| 074  | B-2A .....  |                 | 44,793  |              |           |                  | 44,793  |
| 075  | B-52 .....  |                 | 5,249   |              |           |                  | 5,249   |
| 077  | C-17A .....   |                 | 20,110  |              | -5,000    |                  | 15,110  |
|      | Program execution delay .....                       |                 |         |              | [-5,000]  |                  |         |
| 078  | CV-22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT .....                 |                 | 16,931  |              |           |                  | 16,931  |
| 080  | C-135 .....   |                 | 4,414   |              |           |                  | 4,414   |
| 081  | F-15 .....  |                 | 1,122   |              |           |                  | 1,122   |
| 082  | F-16 .....  |                 | 10,994  |              |           |                  | 10,994  |
| 083  | F-22A .....   |                 | 5,929   |              |           |                  | 5,929   |
| 084  | OTHER AIRCRAFT .....                                |                 | 27      |              |           |                  | 27      |
|      | <b>INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS</b> .....                |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 085  | INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS .....                     |                 | 21,363  |              |           |                  | 21,363  |
|      | <b>WAR CONSUMABLES</b> .....                        |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 086  | WAR CONSUMABLES .....                               |                 | 82,906  |              |           |                  | 82,906  |
|      | <b>OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES</b> .....               |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |

|      |  |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
|------|--|------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|------------|-------------------|
| 087  | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES .....                     |            | 1,007,276         |          |                 |            | 1,007,276         |
|      | <b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>                         |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
| 087A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                          |            | 69,380            |          |                 |            | 69,380            |
|      | <b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b> | <b>101</b> | <b>11,542,571</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>-122,671</b> | <b>108</b> | <b>11,419,900</b> |
|      | <b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>              |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
|      | <b>MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC</b>     |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
| 001  | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC .....             |            | 80,187            |          |                 |            | 80,187            |
|      | <b>TACTICAL</b>                                    |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
| 003  | JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE .....           | 224        | 337,438           |          |                 | 224        | 337,438           |
| 004  | SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) .....                          | 303        | 132,995           |          |                 | 303        | 132,995           |
| 005  | AMRAAM .....                                       | 200        | 329,600           |          |                 | 200        | 329,600           |
| 006  | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE .....                    | 283        | 33,878            |          |                 | 283        | 33,878            |
| 007  | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB .....                          | 246        | 70,578            |          |                 | 246        | 70,578            |
|      | <b>INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES</b>                       |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
| 008  | INDUSTRI'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION .....         |            | 749               |          |                 |            | 749               |
|      | <b>CLASS IV</b>                                    |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
| 009  | MM III MODIFICATIONS .....                         |            | 28,477            |          |                 |            | 28,477            |
| 010  | AGM-65D MAVERICK .....                             |            | 276               |          |                 |            | 276               |
| 011  | AGM-88A HARM .....                                 |            | 297               |          |                 |            | 297               |
| 012  | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) .....             |            | 16,083            |          |                 |            | 16,083            |
| 013  | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB .....                          |            | 6,924             |          |                 |            | 6,924             |
|      | <b>MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>             |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
| 014  | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS .....                  |            | 87,366            |          |                 |            | 87,366            |
|      | <b>SPACE PROGRAMS</b>                              |            |                   |          |                 |            |                   |
| 015  | ADVANCED EHF .....                                 |            | 298,890           |          |                 |            | 298,890           |
| 016  | WIDEBAND GAPPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE) .....        |            | 38,971            |          |                 |            | 38,971            |
|      | Unjustified growth .....                           |            |                   |          | -3,000          |            |                   |
|      |  |            |                   |          | [-3,000]        |            |                   |
| 017  | GPS III SPACE SEGMENT .....                        | 1          | 235,397           |          |                 | 1          | 235,397           |
| 018  | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                     |            | 57,000            |          |                 |            | 57,000            |
| 019  | SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) .....                    |            | 16,201            |          |                 |            | 16,201            |
| 020  | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) .....                   |            | 52,090            |          |                 |            | 52,090            |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request |                  | House Change |                | House Authorized |                  |
|------|--|-----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
|      |  | Qty             | Cost             | Qty          | Cost           | Qty              | Cost             |
| 021  | DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE) .....           |                 | 87,000           |              |                |                  | 87,000           |
| 022  | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (INFRAST.) .....     |                 | 750,143          |              |                |                  | 750,143          |
| 023  | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE) .....         | 3               | 630,903          |              | 135,000        | 3                | 765,903          |
|      | DMSP 20 launch/Additional competition launch ..... |                 |                  |              | [135,000]      |                  |                  |
| 024  | SBIR HIGH (SPACE) .....                            |                 | 450,884          |              |                |                  | 450,884          |
|      | <b>SPECIAL PROGRAMS</b> .....                      |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 028  | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS .....                      |                 | 60,179           |              |                |                  | 60,179           |
|      | <b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b> .....                   |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 028A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                          |                 | 888,000          |              |                |                  | 888,000          |
|      | <b>TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b> .....  | <b>1,260</b>    | <b>4,690,506</b> |              | <b>132,000</b> | <b>1,260</b>     | <b>4,822,506</b> |
|      | <b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</b>        |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
|      | <b>ROCKETS</b>                                     |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 001  | ROCKETS .....                                      |                 | 4,696            |              |                |                  | 4,696            |
|      | <b>CARTRIDGES</b>                                  |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 002  | CARTRIDGES .....                                   |                 | 133,271          |              |                |                  | 133,271          |
|      | <b>BOMBS</b>                                       |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 003  | PRACTICE BOMBS .....                               |                 | 31,998           |              |                |                  | 31,998           |
| 004  | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS .....                        |                 | 148,614          |              |                |                  | 148,614          |
| 005  | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION .....                 | 2,973           | 101,400          |              |                | 2,973            | 101,400          |
|      | <b>OTHER ITEMS</b>                                 |                 |                  |              |                |                  |                  |
| 006  | CAD/PAD .....                                      |                 | 29,989           |              |                |                  | 29,989           |
| 007  | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) .....            |                 | 6,925            |              |                |                  | 6,925            |
| 008  | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....                      |                 | 494              |              |                |                  | 494              |
| 009  | MODIFICATIONS .....                                |                 | 1,610            |              |                |                  | 1,610            |
| 010  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                  |                 | 4,237            |              |                |                  | 4,237            |



|     |   |                |              |         |                |
|-----|---|----------------|--------------|---------|----------------|
| 011 | <b>FLARES</b>   |                |              |         |                |
|     | FLARES .....  | 86,101         |              |         | 86,101         |
| 012 | <b>FUZES</b>  |                |              |         |                |
|     | FUZES .....   | 103,417        |              |         | 103,417        |
| 013 | <b>SMALL ARMS</b>                                       |                |              |         |                |
|     | SMALL ARMS .....  | 24,648         |              |         | 24,648         |
|     | <b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</b> ..... | <b>677,400</b> | <b>2,973</b> |         | <b>677,400</b> |
|     | <b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>                     |                |              |         |                |
|     | <b>PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES</b>                      |                |              |         |                |
| 001 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES .....                       | 6,528          |              |         | 2,528          |
|     | Program reduction .....                                 |                |              | -4,000  | [-4,000]       |
| 002 | <b>CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES</b>                       |                |              |         |                |
|     | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE .....                           | 7,639          |              |         | 2,639          |
|     | Program reduction .....                                 |                |              | -5,000  | [-5,000]       |
| 003 | <b>CAP VEHICLES</b>                                     |                |              |         |                |
|     | CAP VEHICLES .....                                      | 961            |              |         | 961            |
| 004 | <b>ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION</b>                      |                |              |         |                |
|     | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                       | 11,027         |              |         | 5,027          |
|     | Program reduction .....                                 |                |              | -6,000  | [-6,000]       |
|     | <b>SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES</b>                         |                |              |         |                |
| 005 | SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES .....                    | 4,447          |              |         | 4,447          |
| 006 | <b>ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION</b>                      |                |              |         |                |
|     | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                       | 693            |              |         | 693            |
| 007 | <b>FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT</b>                          |                |              |         |                |
|     | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES .....               | 10,152         |              |         | 10,152         |
| 008 | <b>MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>                     |                |              |         |                |
|     | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                       | 15,108         |              |         | 5,108          |
|     | Program reduction .....                                 |                |              | -10,000 | [-10,000]      |
| 009 | <b>BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT</b>                         |                |              |         |                |
|     | RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP .....                | 10,212         |              |         | 6,212          |
|     | Program reduction .....                                 |                |              | -4,000  | [-4,000]       |
| 010 | <b>ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION</b>                      |                |              |         |                |
|     | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                       | 57,049         |              |         | 32,049         |
|     | Program reduction .....                                 |                |              | -25,000 | [-25,000]      |
|     | <b>COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)</b>                  |                |              |         |                |

411

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request |         | House Change |           | House Authorized |         |
|------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost    | Qty          | Cost      | Qty              | Cost    |
| 011  | COMSEC EQUIPMENT .....                              |                 | 106,182 |              |           |                  | 106,182 |
| 012  | MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC) .....                        |                 | 1,363   |              |           |                  | 1,363   |
|      | <b>INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS</b>                        |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 013  | INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT .....               |                 | 2,832   |              |           |                  | 2,832   |
| 014  | INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT .....                   |                 | 32,329  |              |           |                  | 32,329  |
| 016  | MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS .....                      |                 | 15,649  |              |           |                  | 15,649  |
|      | <b>ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS</b>                         |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 017  | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS .....             |                 | 42,200  |              |           |                  | 42,200  |
| 018  | NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM .....                      |                 | 6,333   |              |           |                  | 6,333   |
| 019  | BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED .....                   |                 | 2,708   |              |           |                  | 2,708   |
| 020  | THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS .....          |                 | 50,033  |              | -10,000   |                  | 40,033  |
|      | Program reduction .....                             |                 |         |              | [-10,000] |                  |         |
| 021  | WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST .....                  |                 | 16,348  |              |           |                  | 16,348  |
| 022  | STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL .....                 |                 | 139,984 |              |           |                  | 139,984 |
| 023  | CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX .....                     |                 | 20,101  |              |           |                  | 20,101  |
| 026  | INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN) ..... |                 | 9,060   |              |           |                  | 9,060   |
|      | <b>SPL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS</b>                |                 |         |              |           |                  |         |
| 027  | GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY .....                |                 | 39,100  |              |           |                  | 39,100  |
| 028  | AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS .....               |                 | 19,010  |              |           |                  | 19,010  |
| 029  | MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL .....                  |                 | 11,462  |              |           |                  | 11,462  |
| 030  | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM .....            |                 | 37,426  |              |           |                  | 37,426  |
| 031  | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES .....                        |                 | 26,634  |              |           |                  | 26,634  |
| 032  | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N .....            |                 | 1,289   |              |           |                  | 1,289   |
| 033  | C3 COUNTERMEASURES .....                            |                 | 11,508  |              |           |                  | 11,508  |
| 034  | GCSS-AF FOS .....                                   |                 | 3,670   |              |           |                  | 3,670   |
| 035  | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM ..... |                 | 15,298  |              |           |                  | 15,298  |

|     |   |  |         |           |         |
|-----|---|--|---------|-----------|---------|
| 036 | THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM .....                    |  | 9,565   |           |         |
| 037 | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS .....              |  | 25,772  |           | 25,772  |
| 038 | <b>AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS</b>                       |  |         |           |         |
|     | INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS .....                   |  | 81,286  | 31,300    | 112,586 |
|     | Air Force requested program transfer from AFNET ..... |  |         | [31,300]  |         |
| 039 | AFNET .....   |  | 122,228 | -31,300   | 90,928  |
|     | Air Force requested program transfer to BITI .....    |  |         | [-31,300] |         |
| 041 | USCENTCOM .....                                       |  | 16,342  |           | 16,342  |
|     | <b>SPACE PROGRAMS</b>                                 |  |         |           |         |
| 042 | FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS .....        |  | 60,230  |           | 60,230  |
| 043 | SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE .....                 |  | 26,100  |           | 26,100  |
| 044 | NAVSTAR GPS SPACE .....                               |  | 2,075   |           | 2,075   |
| 045 | NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE .....                       |  | 4,656   |           | 4,656   |
| 046 | AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE .....              |  | 54,630  |           | 54,630  |
| 047 | SPACE/LIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE .....                   |  | 69,713  |           | 69,713  |
| 048 | MILSATCOM SPACE .....                                 |  | 41,355  |           | 41,355  |
| 049 | SPACE MODS SPACE .....                                |  | 31,722  |           | 31,722  |
| 050 | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM .....                             |  | 61,603  |           | 61,603  |
|     | <b>ORGANIZATION AND BASE</b>                          |  |         |           |         |
| 051 | TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT .....                          |  | 50,335  |           | 50,335  |
| 053 | RADIO EQUIPMENT .....                                 |  | 14,846  |           | 14,846  |
| 054 | CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT .....                      |  | 3,635   |           | 3,635   |
| 055 | BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE .....                        |  | 79,607  |           | 79,607  |
|     | <b>MODIFICATIONS</b>                                  |  |         |           |         |
| 056 | COMM ELECT MODS .....                                 |  | 105,398 |           | 105,398 |
|     | <b>PERSONAL SAFETY &amp; RESCUE EQUIP</b>             |  |         |           |         |
| 057 | NIGHT VISION GOGGLES .....                            |  | 12,577  |           | 12,577  |
| 058 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....                     |  | 31,209  |           | 31,209  |
|     | <b>DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ</b>                  |  |         |           |         |
| 059 | MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP .....              |  | 7,670   |           | 7,670   |
|     | <b>BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>                         |  |         |           |         |
| 060 | BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT .....                         |  | 14,125  |           | 14,125  |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item                                      | FY 2015 Request |                   | House Change |                | House Authorized |                   |
|------|---|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
|      |   | Qty             | Cost              | Qty          | Cost           | Qty              | Cost              |
| 061  | CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS .....              |                 | 16,744            |              |                |                  | 16,744            |
| 062  | PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT .....     |                 | 2,495             |              |                |                  | 2,495             |
| 063  | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT .....                  |                 | 10,573            |              |                |                  | 10,573            |
| 064  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....         |                 | 5,462             |              |                |                  | 5,462             |
|      | <b>SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS</b>           |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 066  | DARP RC135 .....                          |                 | 24,710            |              |                |                  | 24,710            |
| 067  | DCGS-AF .....                             |                 | 206,743           |              |                |                  | 206,743           |
| 069  | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM .....              |                 | 537,370           |              |                |                  | 537,370           |
| 070  | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. ....   |                 | 77,898            |              |                |                  | 77,898            |
|      | <b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>                |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 070A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                 |                 | 13,990,196        |              |                |                  | 13,990,196        |
|      | <b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>            |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 072  | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....             |                 | 32,813            |              |                |                  | 32,813            |
|      | <b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b> |                 | <b>16,566,018</b> |              | <b>-64,000</b> |                  | <b>16,502,018</b> |
|      | <b>PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>          |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
|      | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA</b>              |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 001  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....         |                 | 1,594             |              |                |                  | 1,594             |
|      | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA</b>              |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 002  | MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....                     |                 | 4,325             |              |                |                  | 4,325             |
|      | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA</b>              |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 003  | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION .....            |                 | 17,268            |              |                |                  | 17,268            |
|      | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA</b>              |                 |                   |              |                |                  |                   |
| 008  | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY .....        |                 | 10,491            |              |                |                  | 10,491            |
| 010  | TELEPORT PROGRAM .....                    |                 | 80,622            |              |                |                  | 80,622            |
| 011  | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....         |                 | 14,147            |              |                |                  | 14,147            |

|     |   |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
|-----|---|----|--|--|---------|--|-----------|--|---------|
| 012 | NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) .....                  |    |  |  | 1,921   |  |           |  |         |
| 013 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK .....                      |    |  |  | 80,144  |  |           |  |         |
| 015 | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE .....                               |    |  |  | 8,755   |  |           |  |         |
| 016 | WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY .....                        |    |  |  | 33,737  |  |           |  |         |
| 017 | SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE .....                            |    |  |  | 32,544  |  |           |  |         |
| 018 | JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT .....                           |    |  |  | 13,300  |  |           |  |         |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA</b> .....                             |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 020 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....   |    |  |  | 7,436   |  |           |  | 7,436   |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT</b> .....                           |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 021 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....   | 3  |  |  | 11,640  |  |           |  | 11,640  |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA</b> .....                           |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 022 | AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS .....              |    |  |  | 1,269   |  |           |  | 1,269   |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS</b> .....                             |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 024 | VEHICLES .....  |    |  |  | 1,500   |  |           |  | 1,500   |
| 025 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....   |    |  |  | 1,039   |  |           |  | 1,039   |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY</b> ..... |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 026 | VEHICLES .....  | 1  |  |  | 50      |  |           |  | 50      |
| 027 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....                                   | 3  |  |  | 7,639   |  |           |  | 7,639   |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY</b> .....          |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 028 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) .....                                |    |  |  | 68,880  |  |           |  | 68,880  |
| 029 | THAAD .....   | 31 |  |  | 464,424 |  |           |  | 464,424 |
| 030 | AEGIS BMD .....   | 30 |  |  | 435,430 |  |           |  | 435,430 |
| 031 | BMD5 AMTPY-2 RADARS .....                                     |    |  |  | 48,140  |  |           |  | 48,140  |
| 032 | AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III .....                                  |    |  |  | 225,774 |  |           |  | 225,774 |
| 034 | IRON DOME .....   | 1  |  |  | 175,972 |  |           |  | 175,972 |
|     | Program increase for Iron Dome .....                          |    |  |  |         |  | 176,000   |  | 176,000 |
|     |   |    |  |  |         |  | [176,000] |  |         |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA</b> .....                             |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 041 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) .....             |    |  |  | 3,448   |  |           |  | 3,448   |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD</b> .....                             |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 042 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD .....                                    |    |  |  | 43,708  |  |           |  | 43,708  |
|     | <b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS</b> .....                             |    |  |  |         |  |           |  |         |
| 044 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS .....                                    |    |  |  | 10,783  |  |           |  | 10,783  |



|     |  |                  |            |                  |                   |
|-----|--|------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 072 | COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS .....                          | 51,937           |            |                  | 51,937            |
| 074 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS .....                                 | 31,017           |            |                  | 31,017            |
| 075 | TACTICAL VEHICLES .....                                | 63,134           |            |                  | 63,134            |
| 076 | WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M .....                            | 192,448          |            |                  | 192,448           |
| 078 | COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS .....                      | 19,984           |            |                  | 19,984            |
| 081 | GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES .....             | 5,044            |            |                  | 5,044             |
| 082 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE .....            | 38,126           |            |                  | 38,126            |
| 088 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS .....                         | 243,849          |            |                  | 243,849           |
|     | <b>CBDP</b>  |                  |            |                  |                   |
| 095 | CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS .....        | 170,137          |            |                  | 170,137           |
| 096 | CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION .....                | 150,392          |            |                  | 150,392           |
|     | <b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE .....</b>           | <b>4,221,437</b> | <b>69</b>  | <b>172,100</b>   | <b>4,393,537</b>  |
|     | <b>JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND</b>             |                  |            |                  |                   |
| 001 | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND .....              | 20,000           |            | -20,000          | 0                 |
|     | Unjustified request .....                              |                  |            | [-20,000]        |                   |
|     | <b>TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND .....</b> | <b>20,000</b>    |            | <b>-20,000</b>   | <b>0</b>          |
|     | <b>PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS</b>                          |                  |            |                  |                   |
| 001 | PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS .....                           | -265,685         |            | 265,685          | 0                 |
|     | Denied Prior Year Rescission request .....             |                  |            | [265,685]        |                   |
|     | <b>TOTAL PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS .....</b>              | <b>-265,685</b>  |            | <b>265,685</b>   | <b>0</b>          |
|     | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>                |                  |            |                  |                   |
| 001 | UNDISTRIBUTED GENERAL PROVISIONS .....                 |                  |            | -265,685         | -265,685          |
|     | Undistributed FY15 reduction .....                     |                  |            | [-265,685]       |                   |
|     | <b>TOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED GENERAL PROVISIONS .....</b>    |                  |            | <b>-265,685</b>  | <b>-265,685</b>   |
|     | <b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT .....</b>                         | <b>158,103</b>   | <b>109</b> | <b>1,475,669</b> | <b>90,983,703</b> |

417

# 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 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|--|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, ARMY</b> |                 |  |                 |              |                  |
| <b>BASIC RESEARCH</b>                               |                 |  |                 |              |                  |
| 001   | 0601101A        | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH ..... | 13,464          |              | 13,464           |
| 002   | 0601102A        | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES .....                | 238,167         |              | 238,167          |
| 003   | 0601103A        | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES .....          | 69,808          |              | 69,808           |
| 004   | 0601104A        | UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS ..... | 102,737         |              | 102,737          |
|   |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH .....</b>           | <b>424,176</b>  |              | <b>424,176</b>   |
| <b>APPLIED RESEARCH</b>                             |                 |  |                 |              |                  |
| 005   | 0602105A        | MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY .....                     | 28,006          |              | 28,006           |
| 006   | 0602120A        | SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY .....     | 33,515          |              | 33,515           |
| 007   | 0602122A        | TRACTOR HIP .....                              | 16,358          |              | 16,358           |
| 008   | 0602211A        | AVIATION TECHNOLOGY .....                      | 63,433          |              | 63,433           |
| 009   | 0602270A        | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY .....            | 18,502          |              | 18,502           |
| 010   | 0602303A        | MISSILE TECHNOLOGY .....                       | 46,194          |              | 46,194           |
| 011   | 0602307A        | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....              | 28,528          |              | 28,528           |
| 012   | 0602308A        | ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION .....         | 27,435          |              | 27,435           |
| 013   | 0602601A        | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY ..... | 72,883          |              | 72,883           |
| 014   | 0602618A        | BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY .....                    | 85,597          |              | 85,597           |



|     |          |  |               |                |
|-----|----------|--|---------------|----------------|
| 015 | 0602622A | CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY .....   | 3,971         |                |
| 016 | 0602623A | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM .....                     | 6,853         |                |
| 017 | 0602624A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY .....                     | 38,069        |                |
| 018 | 0602705A | ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES .....                   | 56,435        |                |
| 019 | 0602709A | NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY .....                              | 38,445        |                |
| 020 | 0602712A | COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS .....                                  | 25,939        |                |
| 021 | 0602716A | HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY .....                 | 23,783        |                |
| 022 | 0602720A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY .....                     | 15,659        |                |
| 023 | 0602782A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY .....          | 33,817        |                |
| 024 | 0602783A | COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY .....                     | 10,764        |                |
| 025 | 0602784A | MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY .....                      | 63,311        |                |
| 026 | 0602785A | MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY .....               | 23,295        |                |
| 027 | 0602786A | WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY .....                                | 28,330        |                |
|     |          | Joint Service Combat Feeding Technology .....              |               | 2,579          |
|     |          | MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY .....                                   |               | [2,579]        |
| 028 | 0602787A | <b>SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH .....</b>                     | <b>76,068</b> | <b>2,579</b>   |
|     |          |  |               | <b>865,190</b> |
|     |          |  |               |                |
| 029 | 0603001A | <b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</b>                     |               |                |
|     |          | WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                       | 65,139        | 674            |
|     |          | Joint Service Combat Feeding Tech Demo .....               |               | [674]          |
|     |          | MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                          | 67,291        |                |
| 030 | 0603002A | AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                         | 88,990        |                |
| 031 | 0603003A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....            | 57,931        |                |
| 032 | 0603004A | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....    | 110,031       |                |
| 033 | 0603005A | SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                | 6,883         |                |
| 034 | 0603006A | MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ..... | 13,580        |                |
| 035 | 0603007A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....               | 44,871        |                |
| 036 | 0603008A | TRACTOR HIKE .....   | 7,492         |                |
| 037 | 0603009A | NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS .....        | 16,749        |                |
| 038 | 0603015A | TRACTOR ROSE .....   | 14,483        |                |
| 039 | 0603020A | COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....           | 24,270        |                |
| 041 | 0603125A | TRACTOR NAIL .....   | 3,440         |                |
| 042 | 0603130A |  |               |                |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line   | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|--|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 043  | 0603131A        | TRACTOR EGGS .....   | 2,406           |              | 2,406            |
| 044  | 0603270A        | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY .....                            | 26,057          |              | 26,057           |
| 045  | 0603313A        | MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                   | 44,957          |              | 44,957           |
| 046  | 0603322A        | TRACTOR CAGE .....   | 11,105          |              | 11,105           |
| 047  | 0603461A        | HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....         | 181,609         |              | 181,609          |
| 048  | 0603606A        | LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....         | 13,074          |              | 13,074           |
| 049  | 0603607A        | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM .....                         | 7,321           |              | 7,321            |
| 050  | 0603710A        | NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                         | 44,138          |              | 44,138           |
| 051  | 0603728A        | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS .....          | 9,197           |              | 9,197            |
| 052  | 0603734A        | MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                 | 17,613          |              | 17,613           |
| 053  | 0603772A        | ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY ..... | 39,164          |              | 39,164           |
|  |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>          | <b>917,791</b>  | <b>674</b>   | <b>918,465</b>   |
| <b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES</b> |                 |  |                 |              |                  |
| 054  | 0603305A        | ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION .....                 | 12,797          |              | 12,797           |
| 055  | 0603308A        | ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION .....                           | 13,999          |              | 13,999           |
| 058  | 0603639A        | TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION .....                       | 29,334          |              | 29,334           |
| 060  | 0603747A        | SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY .....                        | 9,602           | 1,587        | 11,189           |
|  |                 | Food Advanced Development .....                                |                 | [1,587]      |                  |
| 061  | 0603766A        | TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV .....          | 8,953           |              | 8,953            |
| 062  | 0603774A        | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....                | 3,052           |              | 3,052            |
| 063  | 0603779A        | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEMVAL .....                  | 7,830           |              | 7,830            |
| 065  | 0603790A        | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....                            | 2,954           |              | 2,954            |
| 067  | 0603804A        | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV .....                 | 13,386          |              | 13,386           |
| 069  | 0603807A        | MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV .....                                  | 23,659          |              | 23,659           |
| 070  | 0603827A        | SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....                     | 6,830           | 3,000        | 9,830            |
|  |                 | Army requested realignment—Caliber Config Study .....          |                 | [3,000]      |                  |

|     |          |   |                |                |
|-----|----------|---|----------------|----------------|
| 072 | 0604100A | ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES .....  | 9,913          | 9,913          |
| 073 | 0604115A | TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES .....                                 | 74,740         | 74,740         |
| 074 | 0604120A | ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT) .....                  | 9,930          | 9,930          |
| 076 | 0604319A | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2—INTERCEPT (IFPC2) ..... | 96,177         | 71,177         |
|     |          | Schedule delay .....  |                | -25,000        |
|     |          | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES .....</b>   | <b>323,156</b> | <b>-20,413</b> |

**SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION**

|     |          |   |         |         |
|-----|----------|---|---------|---------|
| 079 | 0604201A | AIRCRAFT AVIONICS .....                                     | 37,246  | 37,246  |
| 081 | 0604270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....                        | 6,002   | 6,002   |
| 082 | 0604280A | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO .....                                  | 9,832   | 9,832   |
| 083 | 0604290A | MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVVR) .....           | 9,730   | 9,730   |
| 084 | 0604321A | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM .....                            | 5,532   | 5,532   |
| 085 | 0604328A | TRACTOR CAGE .....  | 19,929  | 19,929  |
| 086 | 0604601A | INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS .....                              | 27,884  | 34,586  |
|     |          | Army requested realignment .....                            |         | 6,702   |
|     |          |   |         | [6,702] |
| 087 | 0604604A | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES .....                              | 210     | 210     |
| 088 | 0604611A | JAVELIN .....   | 4,166   | 4,166   |
| 089 | 0604622A | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES .....                     | 12,913  | 12,913  |
| 090 | 0604633A | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL .....                                   | 16,764  | 16,764  |
| 091 | 0604641A | TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV) .....               | 6,770   | 6,770   |
| 092 | 0604710A | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV .....                          | 65,333  | 65,333  |
| 093 | 0604713A | COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT .....               | 1,335   | 1,897   |
|     |          | Military Subsistence Systems .....                          |         | 562     |
|     |          |   |         | [562]   |
| 094 | 0604715A | NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV .....                   | 8,945   | 8,945   |
| 096 | 0604741A | AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV ..... | 15,906  | 15,906  |
| 097 | 0604742A | CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....           | 4,394   | 4,394   |
| 098 | 0604746A | AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT .....                  | 11,084  | 11,084  |
| 099 | 0604760A | DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV .....    | 10,027  | 10,027  |
| 100 | 0604780A | COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE .....            | 42,430  | 42,430  |
| 101 | 0604798A | BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION .....          | 105,279 | 105,279 |
| 102 | 0604802A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV .....                         | 15,006  | 15,006  |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 103  | 0604804A        | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV .....   | 24,581          |              | 24,581           |
| 104  | 0604805A        | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV .....                                 | 4,433           |              | 4,433            |
| 105  | 0604807A        | MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV .....                    | 30,397          |              | 30,397           |
| 106  | 0604808A        | LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV .....   | 57,705          |              | 57,705           |
| 108  | 0604818A        | ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE .....                              | 29,683          |              | 29,683           |
| 109  | 0604820A        | RADAR DEVELOPMENT .....  | 5,224           |              | 5,224            |
| 111  | 0604823A        | FIREFINDER .....   | 37,492          |              | 37,492           |
| 112  | 0604827A        | SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEMVAL .....   | 6,157           |              | 6,157            |
| 113  | 0604854A        | ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD .....  | 1,912           |              | 1,912            |
| 116  | 0605013A        | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....   | 69,761          |              | 69,761           |
| 117  | 0605018A        | INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (PPS-A) .....                                 | 138,465         |              | 138,465          |
| 118  | 0605028A        | ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV) .....   | 92,353          |              | 92,353           |
| 119  | 0605030A        | JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC) .....   | 8,440           |              | 8,440            |
| 120  | 0605031A        | JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN) .....   | 17,999          |              | 17,999           |
| 121  | 0605035A        | COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM) .....  | 145,409         |              | 145,409          |
| 122  | 0605350A        | WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING .....  | 113,210         |              | 113,210          |
| 123  | 0605380A        | AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS) .....   | 6,882           |              | 6,882            |
| 124  | 0605450A        | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) .....   | 83,838          |              | 83,838           |
| 125  | 0605456A        | PAC-3/MSE MISSILE .....  | 35,009          |              | 35,009           |
| 126  | 0605457A        | ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD) .....                                  | 142,584         |              | 142,584          |
| 127  | 0605625A        | MANNED GROUND VEHICLE .....  | 49,160          |              | 49,160           |
| 128  | 0605626A        | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR .....   | 17,748          |              | 17,748           |
| 129  | 0605766A        | NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP) .....  | 15,212          |              | 15,212           |
| 130  | 0605812A        | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH ..... | 45,718          |              | 45,718           |
| 131  | 0605830A        | AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....  | 10,041          |              | 10,041           |
| 132  | 0210609A        | PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) .....  | 83,300          |              | 83,300           |
| 133  | 0303032A        | TROJAN—RH12 .....  | 983             |              | 983              |

|     |          |  |                  |                  |
|-----|----------|--|------------------|------------------|
| 134 | 0304270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....                         | 8,961            | 8,961            |
|     |          | <b>SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION .....</b> | <b>7,264</b>     | <b>1,726,638</b> |
|     |          |  |                  |                  |
|     |          | <b>ROT&amp;E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>                          |                  |                  |
| 135 | 0604256A | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT .....                           | 18,062           | 18,062           |
| 136 | 0604258A | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....                             | 10,040           | 10,040           |
| 137 | 0604759A | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT .....                                   | 60,317           | 60,317           |
| 138 | 0605103A | RAND ARROYO CENTER .....                                     | 20,612           | 20,612           |
| 139 | 0605301A | ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL .....                                   | 176,041          | 176,041          |
| 140 | 0605326A | CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM .....                       | 19,439           | 19,439           |
| 142 | 0605601A | ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES .....                        | 275,025          | 275,025          |
| 143 | 0605602A | ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS .....        | 45,596           | 45,596           |
| 144 | 0605604A | SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS .....                       | 33,295           | 33,295           |
| 145 | 0605606A | AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION .....                                 | 4,700            | 4,700            |
| 146 | 0605702A | METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO ROT&E ACTIVITIES .....             | 6,413            | 6,413            |
| 147 | 0605706A | MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS .....                              | 20,746           | 20,746           |
| 148 | 0605709A | EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS .....                          | 7,015            | 7,015            |
| 149 | 0605712A | SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING .....                         | 49,221           | 49,221           |
| 150 | 0605716A | ARMY EVALUATION CENTER .....                                 | 55,039           | 55,039           |
| 151 | 0605718A | ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG .....        | 1,125            | 1,125            |
| 152 | 0605801A | PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES .....                                 | 64,169           | 64,169           |
| 153 | 0605803A | TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES .....                       | 32,319           | 32,319           |
| 154 | 0605805A | MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY .....    | 49,052           | 49,052           |
| 155 | 0605857A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT .....          | 2,612            | 2,612            |
| 156 | 0605898A | MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D .....                                      | 49,592           | 49,592           |
|     |          | <b>SUBTOTAL ROT&amp;E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>           | <b>1,000,430</b> | <b>1,000,430</b> |
|     |          |  |                  |                  |
|     |          | <b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b>                       |                  |                  |
| 158 | 0603778A | MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....                       | 17,112           | 17,112           |
| 159 | 0607141A | LOGISTICS AUTOMATION .....                                   | 3,654            | 3,654            |
| 160 | 0607664A | BIOMETRIC ENABLING CAPABILITY (BEC) .....                    | 1,332            | 1,332            |
| 161 | 0607865A | PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT .....                            | 152,991          | 152,991          |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 162  | 0102419A        | AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE .....                               | 54,076          | -25,000      | 29,076           |
|      |                 | Unobligated balances .....  |                 | [-25,000]    |                  |
| 163  | 0203726A        | ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM .....                    | 22,374          |              | 22,374           |
| 164  | 0203728A        | JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCs) ..... | 24,371          |              | 24,371           |
| 165  | 0203735A        | COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS .....                         | 295,177         | 26,000       | 321,177          |
|      |                 | Stryker ECP risk mitigation .....                                 |                 | [26,000]     |                  |
| 166  | 0203740A        | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM .....                                     | 45,092          |              | 45,092           |
| 167  | 0203744A        | AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS .....         | 264,887         |              | 264,887          |
| 168  | 0203752A        | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....               | 381             |              | 381              |
| 169  | 0203758A        | DIGITIZATION .....  | 10,912          |              | 10,912           |
| 170  | 0203801A        | MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....             | 5,115           |              | 5,115            |
| 171  | 0203802A        | OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS .....                  | 49,848          | -5,000       | 44,848           |
|      |                 | Contract delay for ATACMS .....                                   |                 | [-5,000]     |                  |
| 172  | 0203808A        | TRACTOR CARD .....  | 22,691          |              | 22,691           |
| 173  | 0205402A        | INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV .....              | 4,364           |              | 4,364            |
| 174  | 0205410A        | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT .....                                | 834             |              | 834              |
| 175  | 0205412A        | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV .....     | 280             |              | 280              |
| 176  | 0205456A        | LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM .....             | 78,758          |              | 78,758           |
| 177  | 0205778A        | GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS) .....                | 45,377          |              | 45,377           |
| 178  | 0208053A        | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM .....                                | 10,209          |              | 10,209           |
| 181  | 0303028A        | SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES .....                        | 12,525          |              | 12,525           |
| 182  | 0303140A        | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....                        | 14,175          |              | 14,175           |
| 183  | 0303141A        | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM .....                                | 4,527           |              | 4,527            |
| 184  | 0303142A        | SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE) .....                           | 11,011          |              | 11,011           |
| 185  | 0303150A        | WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....                    | 2,151           |              | 2,151            |
| 187  | 0305204A        | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES .....                           | 22,870          |              | 22,870           |
| 188  | 0305208A        | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....                   | 20,155          |              | 20,155           |

|      |             |   |                  |                  |
|------|-------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| 189  | 0305219A    | MQ-1C GRAY EAGLE UAS .....                                      | 46,472           | 46,472           |
| 191  | 0305233A    | RQ-7 UAV .....  | 16,389           | 16,389           |
| 192  | 0307665A    | BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE .....                           | 1,974            | 1,974            |
| 193  | 0310349A    | WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING .....                      | 3,249            | 3,249            |
| 194  | 0708045A    | END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES .....               | 76,225           | 76,225           |
| 194A | 99999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                                       | 4,802            | 4,802            |
|      |             | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>           | <b>1,346,360</b> | <b>1,342,360</b> |
|      |             | <b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, ARMY .....</b> | <b>6,593,898</b> | <b>-13,896</b>   |
|      |             | <b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, NAVY</b>             |                  |                  |
|      |             | <b>BASIC RESEARCH</b>   |                  |                  |
| 001  | 0601103N    | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES .....                           | 113,908          | 118,908          |
|      |             | DURIP program increase .....                                    |                  | 5,000            |
|      |             |   |                  | [5,000]          |
| 002  | 0601152N    | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH .....                  | 18,734           | 18,734           |
| 003  | 0601153N    | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES .....                                 | 443,697          | 443,697          |
|      |             | <b>SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH .....</b>                            | <b>576,339</b>   | <b>5,000</b>     |
|      |             | <b>APPLIED RESEARCH</b>   |                  |                  |
| 004  | 0602114N    | POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH .....                         | 95,753           | 95,753           |
| 005  | 0602123N    | FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH .....                         | 139,496          | 139,496          |
| 006  | 0602131M    | MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY .....                     | 45,831           | 45,831           |
| 007  | 0602235N    | COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH .....                           | 43,541           | 43,541           |
| 008  | 0602236N    | WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH .....                   | 46,923           | 46,923           |
| 009  | 0602271N    | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH .....                  | 107,872          | 107,872          |
| 010  | 0602435N    | OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH .....            | 45,388           | 65,388           |
|      |             | Service Life extension for the AGOR ships .....                 |                  | 20,000           |
|      |             |   |                  | [20,000]         |
| 011  | 0602651M    | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH .....                 | 5,887            | 5,887            |
| 012  | 0602747N    | UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH .....                         | 86,880           | 86,880           |
| 013  | 0602750N    | FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH .....                | 170,786          | 170,786          |
| 014  | 0602782N    | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH .....           | 32,526           | 32,526           |
|      |             | <b>SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH .....</b>                          | <b>820,883</b>   | <b>20,000</b>    |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line   | Program Element | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</b>                 |                 |   |                 |              |                  |
| 015  | 0603114N        | POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                      | 37,734          |              | 37,734           |
| 016  | 0603123N        | FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                      | 25,831          |              | 25,831           |
| 017  | 0603271N        | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....               | 64,623          |              | 64,623           |
| 018  | 0603640M        | USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD) .....              | 128,397         |              | 128,397          |
| 019  | 0603651M        | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....           | 11,506          |              | 11,506           |
| 020  | 0603673N        | FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT ..... | 256,144         |              | 256,144          |
| 021  | 0603729N        | WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                 | 4,838           |              | 4,838            |
| 022  | 0603747N        | UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                      | 9,985           |              | 9,985            |
| 023  | 0603758N        | NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS .....           | 53,956          |              | 53,956           |
| 024  | 0603782N        | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....        | 2,000           |              | 2,000            |
|  |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>           | <b>595,014</b>  |              | <b>595,014</b>   |
| <b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES</b> |                 |   |                 |              |                  |
| 025  | 0603207N        | AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS .....                           | 40,429          |              | 40,429           |
| 026  | 0603216N        | AVIATION SURVIVABILITY .....                                    | 4,325           |              | 4,325            |
| 027  | 0603237N        | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL .....                      | 2,991           |              | 2,991            |
| 028  | 0603251N        | AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS .....  | 12,651          |              | 12,651           |
| 029  | 0603254N        | ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....                                   | 7,782           |              | 7,782            |
| 030  | 0603261N        | TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE .....                          | 5,275           |              | 5,275            |
| 031  | 0603382N        | ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY .....                        | 1,646           |              | 1,646            |
| 032  | 0603502N        | SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES .....            | 100,349         |              | 100,349          |
| 033  | 0603506N        | SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE .....                              | 52,781          |              | 52,781           |
| 034  | 0603512N        | CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....                               | 5,959           |              | 5,959            |
| 035  | 0603525N        | PILOT FISH .....  | 148,865         |              | 148,865          |
| 036  | 0603527N        | RETRACT LARCH .....   | 25,365          |              | 25,365           |



|     |          |   |         |          |
|-----|----------|---|---------|----------|
| 037 | 0603536N | RETRACT JUNIPER .....                               | 80,477  | 80,477   |
| 038 | 0603542N | RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL .....                          | 669     | 669      |
| 039 | 0603553N | SURFACE ASW .....                                   | 1,060   | 1,060    |
| 040 | 0603561N | ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT .....         | 70,551  | 70,551   |
| 041 | 0603562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS .....            | 8,044   | 8,044    |
| 042 | 0603563N | SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN .....                  | 17,864  | 17,864   |
| 043 | 0603564N | SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES ..... | 23,716  | 23,716   |
| 044 | 0603570N | ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS .....                | 499,961 | 499,961  |
| 045 | 0603573N | ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS .....            | 21,026  | 21,026   |
| 046 | 0603576N | CHALK EAGLE .....                                   | 542,700 | 542,700  |
| 047 | 0603581N | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS) .....                    | 88,734  | 88,734   |
| 048 | 0603582N | COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION .....                     | 20,881  | 20,881   |
| 049 | 0603595N | OHIO REPLACEMENT .....                              | 849,277 | 849,277  |
| 050 | 0603596N | LCS MISSION MODULES .....                           | 196,948 | 196,948  |
| 051 | 0603597N | AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT) .....             | 8,115   | 8,115    |
| 052 | 0603609N | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS .....                        | 7,603   | 7,603    |
| 053 | 0603611M | MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES .....                 | 105,749 | 105,749  |
|     |          | Acceleration of the ACV Increment 1.1 Program ..... |         |          |
| 054 | 0603635M | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM .....     | 1,342   | 1,342    |
| 055 | 0603654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT .....  | 21,399  | 21,399   |
| 056 | 0603658N | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT .....                        | 43,578  | 43,578   |
| 057 | 0603713N | OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....      | 7,764   | 7,764    |
| 058 | 0603721N | ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION .....                      | 13,200  | 13,200   |
| 059 | 0603724N | NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM .....                           | 69,415  | 69,415   |
| 060 | 0603725N | FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT .....                        | 2,588   | 2,588    |
| 061 | 0603734N | CHALK CORAL .....                                   | 176,301 | 176,301  |
| 062 | 0603739N | NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY .....                    | 3,873   | 3,873    |
| 063 | 0603746N | RETRACT MAPLE .....                                 | 376,028 | 376,028  |
| 064 | 0603748N | LINK PLUMERIA .....                                 | 272,096 | 272,096  |
| 065 | 0603751N | RETRACT ELM .....                                   | 42,233  | 42,233   |
| 066 | 0603764N | LINK EVERGREEN .....                                | 46,504  | 46,504   |
| 067 | 0603787N | SPECIAL PROCESSES .....                             | 25,109  | 25,109   |
|     |          |   |         | 85,100   |
|     |          |   |         | [85,100] |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line  | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change  | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|--|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 068   | 0603790N        | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....  | 9,659            |               | 9,659            |
| 069   | 0603795N        | LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY .....   | 318              |               | 318              |
| 070   | 0603851M        | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING .....   | 40,912           |               | 40,912           |
| 071   | 0603860N        | JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DE/MVAL .....                             | 54,896           | -27,000       | 27,896           |
|   |                 | Program delay .....  |                  | [-27,000]     |                  |
| 073   | 0603925N        | DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS .....                                      | 58,696           |               | 58,696           |
| 074   | 0604112N        | GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80) .....                        | 43,613           |               | 43,613           |
| 075   | 0604122N        | REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS) .....  | 21,110           |               | 21,110           |
| 076   | 0604272N        | TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM) .....                      | 5,657            |               | 5,657            |
| 077   | 0604279N        | ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION .....   | 8,033            |               | 8,033            |
| 078   | 0604454N        | LX (R) .....   | 36,859           |               | 36,859           |
| 079   | 0604653N        | JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW) .....                        | 15,227           |               | 15,227           |
| 081   | 0604707N        | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT .....              | 22,393           |               | 22,393           |
| 082   | 0604786N        | OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT .....                                | 202,939          |               | 202,939          |
| 083   | 0605812M        | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH ..... | 11,450           |               | 11,450           |
| 084   | 0303354N        | ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP .....  | 6,495            |               | 6,495            |
| 085   | 0304270N        | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP .....   | 332              |               | 332              |
|   |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES .....</b>                  | <b>4,591,812</b> | <b>58,100</b> | <b>4,649,912</b> |
| <b>SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION</b> |                 |  |                  |               |                  |
| 086   | 0603208N        | TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT .....   | 25,153           |               | 25,153           |
| 087   | 0604212N        | OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT .....   | 46,154           |               | 46,154           |
| 088   | 0604214N        | AV-8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV .....   | 25,372           |               | 25,372           |
| 089   | 0604215N        | STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT .....  | 53,712           |               | 53,712           |
| 090   | 0604216N        | MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT .....                                     | 11,434           |               | 11,434           |
| 091   | 0604218N        | AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING .....  | 2,164            |               | 2,164            |
| 092   | 0604221N        | P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....  | 1,710            |               | 1,710            |

|     |          |  |         |            |
|-----|----------|--|---------|------------|
| 093 | 0604230N | WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM .....   | 9,094   | 20,409     |
| 094 | 0604231N | TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM .....  | 70,248  | 71,565     |
| 095 | 0604234N | ADVANCED HAWKEYE .....   | 193,200 | 29,037     |
| 096 | 0604245N | H-1 UPGRADES .....   | 44,115  | 122,083    |
| 097 | 0604261N | ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS .....  | 23,227  | 144,706    |
| 098 | 0604262N | V-22A .....  | 61,249  | 72,695     |
| 099 | 0604264N | AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....   | 15,014  | 38,985     |
| 100 | 0604269N | EA-18 .....  | 18,730  | 48,470     |
| 101 | 0604270N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....   | 28,742  | 3,935      |
| 102 | 0604273N | EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT .....   | 388,086 | 132,602    |
| 103 | 0604274N | NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) .....   | 246,856 | 19,067     |
| 104 | 0604280N | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY) .....                               | 7,106   |            |
| 105 | 0604307N | SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING .....                                | 189,112 |            |
| 106 | 0604311N | LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION .....   | 376     |            |
| 107 | 0604329N | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) .....  | 71,849  |            |
| 108 | 0604366N | STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS .....  | 53,198  |            |
| 109 | 0604373N | AIRBORNE MCM .....   | 38,941  |            |
| 110 | 0604376M | MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION .....  | 7,832   |            |
| 111 | 0604378N | NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING .....              | 15,263  |            |
| 112 | 0604404N | UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM ..... | 403,017 | 200,017    |
|     |          | Program delay .....  |         | -203,000   |
|     |          |  |         | [-203,000] |
| 113 | 0604501N | ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS .....   | 20,409  | 20,409     |
| 114 | 0604503N | SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION .....  | 71,565  | 71,565     |
| 115 | 0604504N | AIR CONTROL .....  | 29,037  | 29,037     |
| 116 | 0604512N | SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS .....   | 122,083 | 122,083    |
| 118 | 0604522N | ADVANCED MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM .....                               | 144,706 | 144,706    |
| 119 | 0604558N | NEW DESIGN SSN .....   | 72,695  | 72,695     |
| 120 | 0604562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM .....  | 38,985  | 38,985     |
| 121 | 0604567N | SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E .....  | 48,470  | 48,470     |
| 122 | 0604574N | NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES .....   | 3,935   | 3,935      |
| 123 | 0604580N | VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM) .....  | 132,602 | 132,602    |
| 124 | 0604601N | MINE DEVELOPMENT .....   | 19,067  | 19,067     |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change    | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 125  | 0604610N        | LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT .....                        | 25,280           |                 | 25,280           |
| 126  | 0604654N        | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT .....           | 8,985            |                 | 8,985            |
| 127  | 0604703N        | PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS .....     | 7,669            |                 | 7,669            |
| 128  | 0604727N        | JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS .....                          | 4,400            |                 | 4,400            |
| 129  | 0604755N        | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL) .....                   | 56,889           |                 | 56,889           |
| 130  | 0604756N        | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL) .....                  | 96,937           |                 | 96,937           |
| 131  | 0604757N        | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW) .....               | 134,564          |                 | 134,564          |
| 132  | 0604761N        | INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING .....                               | 200              |                 | 200              |
| 133  | 0604771N        | MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT .....                                    | 8,287            |                 | 8,287            |
| 134  | 0604777N        | NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM .....                                   | 29,504           |                 | 29,504           |
| 135  | 0604800M        | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD .....                         | 513,021          |                 | 513,021          |
| 136  | 0604800N        | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD .....                         | 516,456          |                 | 516,456          |
| 137  | 0605013M        | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....                     | 2,887            |                 | 2,887            |
| 138  | 0605013N        | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....                     | 66,317           |                 | 66,317           |
| 139  | 0605212N        | CH-53K RDTE .....  | 573,187          |                 | 573,187          |
| 140  | 0605220N        | SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC) .....                          | 67,815           |                 | 67,815           |
| 141  | 0605450N        | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) .....                     | 6,300            |                 | 6,300            |
| 142  | 0605500N        | MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) .....                  | 308,037          | 15,000          | 323,037          |
|      |                 | Wideband Communication Development .....                     |                  | [15,000]        |                  |
| 143  | 0204202N        | DDG-1000 .....   | 202,522          |                 | 202,522          |
| 144  | 0304231N        | TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP .....                            | 1,011            |                 | 1,011            |
| 145  | 0304785N        | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS .....                           | 10,357           |                 | 10,357           |
| 146  | 0305124N        | SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM .....                           | 23,975           |                 | 23,975           |
|      |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION .....</b> | <b>5,419,108</b> | <b>-188,000</b> | <b>5,231,108</b> |
|      |                 | <b>MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>                                    |                  |                 |                  |
| 147  | 0604256N        | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT .....                           | 45,272           |                 | 45,272           |

|  |          |   |                |                |
|--|----------|---|----------------|----------------|
| 148                                    | 0604258N | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....  | 79,718         | 79,718         |
| 149                                    | 0604759N | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT .....  | 123,993        | 123,993        |
| 150                                    | 0605126N | JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION .....                              | 4,960          | 4,960          |
| 151                                    | 0605152N | STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY .....   | 8,296          | 8,296          |
| 152                                    | 0605154N | CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES .....   | 45,752         | 45,752         |
| 154                                    | 0605804N | TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES .....  | 876            | 876            |
| 155                                    | 0605853N | MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT .....                                   | 72,070         | 72,070         |
| 156                                    | 0605856N | STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT .....   | 3,237          | 3,237          |
| 157                                    | 0605861N | RD&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT .....  | 73,033         | 73,033         |
| 158                                    | 0605863N | RD&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT .....  | 138,304        | 138,304        |
| 159                                    | 0605864N | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT .....   | 336,286        | 336,286        |
| 160                                    | 0605865N | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY .....                                      | 16,658         | 16,658         |
| 161                                    | 0605866N | NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT .....                                 | 2,505          | 2,505          |
| 162                                    | 0605867N | SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT .....   | 8,325          | 8,325          |
| 163                                    | 0605873M | MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT .....   | 17,866         | 17,866         |
|  |          | <b>SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>  | <b>977,151</b> | <b>977,151</b> |
| <b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b> |          |   |                |                |
| 168                                    | 0604402N | UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT ..... | 35,949         | 35,949         |
| 169                                    | 0604766M | MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS .....   | 215            | 215            |
| 170                                    | 0605525N | CARRIER ONBOARD DELIVERY (COD) FOLLOW ON .....  | 8,873          | 8,873          |
| 172                                    | 0101221N | STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT .....  | 96,943         | 96,943         |
| 173                                    | 0101224N | SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....  | 30,057         | 30,057         |
| 174                                    | 0101226N | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....  | 4,509          | 4,509          |
| 175                                    | 0101402N | NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS .....   | 13,676         | 13,676         |
| 176                                    | 0203761N | RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT) .....   | 12,480         | 12,480         |
| 177                                    | 0204136N | F/A-18 SQUADRONS .....  | 76,216         | 76,216         |
| 179                                    | 0204163N | FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL) .....   | 27,281         | 27,281         |
| 180                                    | 0204228N | SURFACE SUPPORT .....   | 2,878          | 2,878          |
| 181                                    | 0204229N | TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC) .....                            | 32,385         | 32,385         |
| 182                                    | 0204311N | INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM .....  | 39,371         | 39,371         |
| 183                                    | 0204413N | AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT) .....                          | 4,609          | 4,609          |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 184  | 0204460M        | GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR) .....                 | 99,106          | -10,000      | 89,106           |
|      |                 | Unjustified cost growth .....                                 |                 | [-10,000]    |                  |
| 185  | 0204571N        | CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....               | 39,922          |              | 39,922           |
| 186  | 0204574N        | CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT .....                              | 1,157           |              | 1,157            |
| 187  | 0204575N        | ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT .....               | 22,067          |              | 22,067           |
| 188  | 0205601N        | HARM IMPROVEMENT .....  | 17,420          |              | 17,420           |
| 189  | 0205604N        | TACTICAL DATA LINKS .....                                     | 151,208         |              | 151,208          |
| 190  | 0205620N        | SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION .....                   | 26,366          |              | 26,366           |
| 191  | 0205632N        | MK-48 ADCAP .....   | 25,952          |              | 25,952           |
| 192  | 0205633N        | AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS .....                                   | 106,936         |              | 106,936          |
| 194  | 0205675N        | OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS .....                       | 104,023         |              | 104,023          |
| 195  | 0206313M        | MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS .....                     | 77,398          |              | 77,398           |
| 196  | 0206335M        | COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S) .....      | 32,495          |              | 32,495           |
| 197  | 0206623M        | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS .....      | 156,626         |              | 156,626          |
| 198  | 0206624M        | MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT .....                    | 20,999          |              | 20,999           |
| 199  | 0206625M        | USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP) .....      | 14,179          |              | 14,179           |
| 200  | 0207161N        | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES .....                                   | 47,258          |              | 47,258           |
| 201  | 0207163N        | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) .....       | 10,210          |              | 10,210           |
| 206  | 0303109N        | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE) .....                        | 41,829          |              | 41,829           |
| 207  | 0303138N        | CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (GAMES) ..... | 22,780          |              | 22,780           |
| 208  | 0303140N        | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....                    | 23,053          |              | 23,053           |
| 209  | 0303150M        | WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....                | 296             |              | 296              |
| 212  | 0305160N        | NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC) .....     | 359             |              | 359              |
| 213  | 0305192N        | MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES .....          | 6,166           |              | 6,166            |
| 214  | 0305204N        | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES .....                       | 8,505           |              | 8,505            |
| 216  | 0305208M        | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....               | 11,613          |              | 11,613           |
| 217  | 0305208N        | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....               | 18,146          |              | 18,146           |

|      |             |  |                   |                |                   |
|------|-------------|--|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| 218  | 0305220N    | RQ-4 UAV .....   | 498,003           | 32,400         | 530,403           |
|      |             | Triton Sensor Development Acceleration .....   |                   | [32,400]       |                   |
| 219  | 0305231N    | MQ-8 UAV .....   | 47,294            |                | 47,294            |
| 220  | 0305232M    | RQ-11 UAV .....  | 718               |                | 718               |
| 221  | 0305233N    | RQ-7 UAV .....   | 851               |                | 851               |
| 222  | 0305234N    | SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASLO) .....   | 4,813             |                | 4,813             |
| 223  | 0305239M    | RQ-21A .....   | 8,192             |                | 8,192             |
| 224  | 0305241N    | MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT .....  | 22,559            |                | 22,559            |
| 225  | 0305242M    | UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP) .....   | 2,000             |                | 2,000             |
| 226  | 0308601N    | MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT .....  | 4,719             |                | 4,719             |
| 227  | 0702207N    | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) .....   | 21,168            |                | 21,168            |
| 228  | 0708011N    | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS .....  | 37,169            |                | 37,169            |
| 229  | 0708730N    | MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARTTECH) .....   | 4,347             |                | 4,347             |
| 229A | 99999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....  | 1,162,684         |                | 1,162,684         |
|      |             | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>  | <b>3,286,028</b>  | <b>22,400</b>  | <b>3,308,428</b>  |
|      |             | <b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, NAVY .....</b>                                | <b>16,266,335</b> | <b>-82,500</b> | <b>16,183,835</b> |
|      |             | <b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, AF</b>  |                   |                |                   |
|      |             | <b>BASIC RESEARCH</b>  |                   |                |                   |
| 001  | 0601102F    | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES .....  | 314,482           |                | 314,482           |
| 002  | 0601103F    | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES .....  | 127,079           |                | 127,079           |
| 003  | 0601108F    | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES .....   | 12,929            |                | 12,929            |
|      |             | <b>SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH .....</b>   | <b>454,490</b>    |                | <b>454,490</b>    |
|      |             | <b>APPLIED RESEARCH</b>  |                   |                |                   |
| 004  | 0602102F    | MATERIALS .....  | 105,680           |                | 105,680           |
| 005  | 0602201F    | AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES .....   | 105,747           |                | 105,747           |
| 006  | 0602202F    | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH .....   | 81,957            |                | 81,957            |
| 007  | 0602203F    | AEROSPACE PROPULSION .....   | 172,550           | 197,000        | 369,550           |
|      |             | RD-180 replacement .....   |                   | [220,000]      |                   |
|      |             | Reduction for liquid engine combustion technologies and advanced liquid engine technologies .. |                   | [-23,000]      |                   |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line   | Program Element | Item  | FY 2015 Request  | House Change   | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|---|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 008  | 0602204F        | AEROSPACE SENSORS .....                                   | 118,343          |                | 118,343          |
| 009  | 0602601F        | SPACE TECHNOLOGY .....                                    | 98,229           |                | 98,229           |
| 010  | 0602602F        | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS .....                              | 87,387           |                | 87,387           |
| 011  | 0602605F        | DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY .....                          | 125,955          |                | 125,955          |
| 012  | 0602788F        | DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS .....           | 147,789          |                | 147,789          |
| 013  | 0602890F        | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH .....                          | 37,496           |                | 37,496           |
|  |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH .....</b>                    | <b>1,081,133</b> | <b>197,000</b> | <b>1,278,133</b> |
| <b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</b>                 |                 |   |                  |                |                  |
| 014  | 0603112F        | ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS .....               | 32,177           | 10,000         | 42,177           |
|  |                 | Metals Affordability Initiative .....                     |                  | [10,000]       |                  |
| 015  | 0603199F        | SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) .....            | 15,800           |                | 15,800           |
| 016  | 0603203F        | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS .....                          | 34,420           |                | 34,420           |
| 017  | 0603211F        | AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO .....                       | 91,062           |                | 91,062           |
| 018  | 0603216F        | AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY .....           | 124,236          |                | 124,236          |
| 019  | 0603270F        | ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY .....                        | 47,602           |                | 47,602           |
| 020  | 0603401F        | ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY .....                      | 69,026           |                | 69,026           |
| 021  | 0603444F        | MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS) .....               | 14,031           |                | 14,031           |
| 022  | 0603456F        | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT ..... | 21,788           |                | 21,788           |
| 023  | 0603601F        | CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....                     | 42,046           |                | 42,046           |
| 024  | 0603605F        | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....                         | 23,542           | 10,000         | 33,542           |
|  |                 | Program increase .....                                    |                  | [10,000]       |                  |
| 025  | 0603680F        | MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....                    | 42,772           |                | 42,772           |
| 026  | 0603788F        | BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION ..... | 35,315           |                | 35,315           |
|  |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>     | <b>593,817</b>   | <b>20,000</b>  | <b>613,817</b>   |
| <b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES</b> |                 |   |                  |                |                  |



|   |          |   |                  |               |                  |
|---|----------|---|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 027   | 0603260F | INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....                               | 5,408            |               |                  |
| 031   | 0603438F | SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY .....  | 6,075            |               |                  |
| 032   | 0603742F | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY .....                                | 10,980           |               |                  |
| 033   | 0603790F | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....                                   | 2,392            |               |                  |
| 034   | 0603791F | INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D .....                             | 833              |               |                  |
| 035   | 0603830F | SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM .....                              | 32,313           |               |                  |
| 037   | 0603851F | INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL .....                      | 30,885           |               |                  |
| 039   | 0603859F | POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL .....                                    | 1,798            |               |                  |
| 040   | 0604015F | LONG RANGE STRIKE .....   | 913,728          |               |                  |
| 042   | 0604317F | TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER .....   | 2,669            |               |                  |
| 045   | 0604422F | WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON .....  | 39,901           |               |                  |
|   |          | Realigned to DMSP-20 launch .....                                     |                  | -34,900       |                  |
| 049   | 0604800F | F-35—EMD .....  | 4,976            |               |                  |
| 050   | 0604857F | OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE .....                                  |                  | 30,000        |                  |
|   |          | ORS Office and ORS-5 Competition Launch .....                         |                  | [30,000]      |                  |
| 051   | 0604858F | TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM .....   | 59,004           |               |                  |
| 054   | 0207110F | NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE .....                                   | 15,722           |               |                  |
| 055   | 0207455F | THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR) .....                     | 88,825           |               |                  |
| 056   | 0305164F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE) .....      | 156,659          |               |                  |
|   |          | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES .....</b> | <b>1,372,168</b> | <b>-4,900</b> | <b>1,367,268</b> |
| <b>SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION</b> |          |   |                  |               |                  |
| 059   | 0604233F | SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING .....                       | 13,324           |               |                  |
| 060   | 0604270F | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....                                  | 1,965            |               |                  |
| 061   | 0604281F | TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE .....                               | 39,110           |               |                  |
| 062   | 0604287F | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT .....                                     | 3,926            |               |                  |
| 063   | 0604329F | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD .....                                   | 68,759           |               |                  |
| 064   | 0604421F | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS .....  | 23,746           |               |                  |
| 065   | 0604425F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS .....                               | 9,462            |               |                  |
|   |          | Program increase .....  |                  | 10,000        |                  |
|   |          | .....   |                  | [10,000]      |                  |
| 066   | 0604426F | SPACE FENCE .....   | 214,131          |               |                  |
| 067   | 0604429F | AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK .....                                      | 30,687           |               |                  |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change  | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 068  | 0604441F        | SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD .....           | 319,501          |               | 319,501          |
| 069  | 0604602F        | ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT .....                          | 31,112           |               | 31,112           |
| 070  | 0604604F        | SUBMUNITIONS .....   | 2,543            |               | 2,543            |
| 071  | 0604617F        | AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT .....                                   | 46,340           |               | 46,340           |
| 072  | 0604706F        | LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS .....                                   | 8,854            |               | 8,854            |
| 073  | 0604735F        | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES .....                                 | 10,129           |               | 10,129           |
| 075  | 0604800F        | F-35—EMD .....   | 563,037          |               | 563,037          |
| 078  | 0604932F        | LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON .....                             | 4,938            |               | 4,938            |
| 079  | 0604933F        | ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION .....                                | 59,826           |               | 59,826           |
| 080  | 0605030F        | JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC) .....                   | 78               |               | 78               |
| 081  | 0605213F        | F-22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B .....                      | 173,647          |               | 173,647          |
| 082  | 0605214F        | GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT .....                 | 5,332            |               | 5,332            |
| 083  | 0605221F        | KC-46 .....  | 776,937          |               | 776,937          |
| 084  | 0605223F        | ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING .....                                | 8,201            |               | 8,201            |
| 086  | 0605278F        | HC/MC-130 RECAP RD&E .....                                   | 7,497            |               | 7,497            |
| 087  | 0605431F        | ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) .....                         | 314,378          |               | 314,378          |
| 088  | 0605432F        | POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE) .....                                | 103,552          |               | 103,552          |
| 089  | 0605433F        | WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE) .....                         | 31,425           |               | 31,425           |
| 090  | 0605458F        | AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RD&E .....                       | 85,938           |               | 85,938           |
| 091  | 0605931F        | B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM .....                        | 98,768           |               | 98,768           |
| 092  | 0101125F        | NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION .....                          | 198,357          |               | 198,357          |
| 094  | 0207701F        | FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING .....                           | 8,831            |               | 8,831            |
| 095  | 0307581F        | NEXTGEN JSTARS .....   | 73,088           |               | 73,088           |
|      |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION .....</b> | <b>3,337,419</b> | <b>10,000</b> | <b>3,347,419</b> |
|      |                 | <b>MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>                                    |                  |               |                  |
| 097  | 0604256F        | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT .....                           | 24,418           |               | 24,418           |

|  |          |  |                  |                  |
|--|----------|--|------------------|------------------|
| 098                                    | 0604759F | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT .....   | 47,232           | 47,232           |
| 099                                    | 0605101F | RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE .....   | 30,443           | 30,443           |
| 101                                    | 0605712F | INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION .....                                | 12,266           | 12,266           |
| 102                                    | 0605807F | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT .....  | 689,509          | 689,509          |
| 103                                    | 0605860F | ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE) .....                                | 34,364           | 34,364           |
| 104                                    | 0605864F | SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP) .....   | 21,161           | 21,161           |
| 105                                    | 0605976F | FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT ..... | 46,955           | 46,955           |
| 106                                    | 0605978F | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT .....                   | 32,965           | 32,965           |
| 107                                    | 0606017F | REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION .....                                 | 13,850           | 13,850           |
| 108                                    | 0606116F | SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT .....                            | 19,512           | 19,512           |
| 110                                    | 0606392F | SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE .....                    | 181,727          | 181,727          |
| 111                                    | 0308602F | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS) .....                                | 4,938            | 4,938            |
| 112                                    | 0702806F | ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....                                   | 18,644           | 18,644           |
| 113                                    | 0804731F | GENERAL SKILL TRAINING .....   | 1,425            | 1,425            |
| 114                                    | 1001004F | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES .....   | 3,790            | 3,790            |
| 114A                                   | XXXXXXF  | EJECTION SEAT RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....                        | 3,500            | 3,500            |
|  |          | Initial Aircraft Qualification .....                                       | [3,500]          | [3,500]          |
|  |          | <b>SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>                                   | <b>1,183,199</b> | <b>1,186,699</b> |
| <b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b> |          |  |                  |                  |
| 115                                    | 0603423F | GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT .....            | 299,760          | 299,760          |
| 116                                    | 0604445F | WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE .....   | 2,000            | 2,000            |
|  |          | Implementation of the Secretary's Cruise Missile Defense Program .....     | [2,000]          | [2,000]          |
| 118                                    | 0604618F | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION .....   | 2,469            | 2,469            |
| 119                                    | 0605018F | AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS) .....                     | 90,218           | 90,218           |
| 120                                    | 0605024F | ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY .....                              | 34,815           | 34,815           |
| 122                                    | 0101113F | B-52 SQUADRONS .....   | 55,457           | 55,457           |
| 123                                    | 0101122F | AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) .....                                   | 450              | 450              |
| 124                                    | 0101126F | B-1B SQUADRONS .....   | 5,353            | 5,353            |
| 125                                    | 0101127F | B-2 SQUADRONS .....  | 131,580          | 102,180          |
|  |          | Flexible Strike execution delay .....                                      | [-29,400]        | [-29,400]        |
| 126                                    | 0101213F | MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS .....  | 139,109          | 139,109          |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 127  | 0101313F        | STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM .....                         | 35,603          |              | 35,603           |
| 128  | 0101314F        | NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM .....  | 32              |              | 32               |
| 130  | 0102326F        | REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM ..... | 1,522           |              | 1,522            |
| 131  | 0105921F        | SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES .....                 | 3,134           |              | 3,134            |
| 133  | 0205219F        | MQ-9 UAV .....   | 170,396         |              | 170,396          |
| 136  | 0207133F        | F-16 SQUADRONS .....   | 133,105         |              | 133,105          |
| 137  | 0207134F        | F-15E SQUADRONS .....  | 261,969         |              | 261,969          |
| 138  | 0207136F        | MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION .....                               | 14,831          |              | 14,831           |
| 139  | 0207138F        | F-22A SQUADRONS .....  | 156,962         |              | 156,962          |
| 140  | 0207142F        | F-35 SQUADRONS .....   | 43,666          |              | 43,666           |
| 141  | 0207161F        | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES .....  | 29,739          |              | 29,739           |
| 142  | 0207163F        | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) .....            | 82,195          |              | 82,195           |
| 144  | 0207171F        | F-15 EPAWSS .....  | 68,944          | -15,500      | 53,444           |
|      |                 | EPAWSS contract delays .....                                       |                 | [-15,500]    |                  |
| 145  | 0207224F        | COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY .....                                   | 5,095           |              | 5,095            |
| 146  | 0207227F        | COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE .....                                     | 883             |              | 883              |
| 147  | 0207247F        | AF TENCAP .....  | 5,812           | 10,000       | 15,812           |
|      |                 | Program increase .....   |                 | [10,000]     |                  |
| 148  | 0207249F        | PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT .....                         | 1,081           |              | 1,081            |
| 149  | 0207253F        | COMPASS CALL .....   | 14,411          |              | 14,411           |
| 150  | 0207268F        | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....                | 109,664         |              | 109,664          |
| 151  | 0207325F        | JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM) .....                | 15,897          |              | 15,897           |
| 152  | 0207410F        | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) .....                          | 41,066          |              | 41,066           |
| 153  | 0207412F        | CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC) .....                           | 552             |              | 552              |
| 154  | 0207417F        | AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) .....                  | 180,804         |              | 180,804          |
| 155  | 0207418F        | TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS .....                            | 3,754           |              | 3,754            |
| 157  | 0207431F        | COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES .....                    | 7,891           |              | 7,891            |

|     |          |  |         |
|-----|----------|--|---------|
| 158 | 0207444F | TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD .....                                 | 5,891   |
| 159 | 0207448F | C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK .....                                       | 1,782   |
| 161 | 0207452F | DCAPES .....   | 821     |
| 163 | 0207590F | SEEK EAGLE .....   | 23,844  |
| 164 | 0207601F | USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION .....                                   | 16,723  |
| 165 | 0207605F | WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS .....                               | 5,956   |
| 166 | 0207697F | DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES .....                             | 4,457   |
| 167 | 0208006F | MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS .....                                       | 60,679  |
| 169 | 0208059F | CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES .....                                       | 67,057  |
| 170 | 0208087F | AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS .....                             | 13,355  |
| 171 | 0208088F | AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS .....                             | 5,576   |
| 179 | 0301400F | SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE .....                                 | 12,218  |
| 180 | 0302015F | E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC) .....                | 28,778  |
| 181 | 0303131F | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) .....     | 81,035  |
| 182 | 0303140F | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....                           | 70,497  |
| 183 | 0303141F | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM .....                                   | 692     |
| 185 | 0303601F | MILSATCOM TERMINALS .....  | 55,208  |
| 187 | 0304260F | AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE .....                                     | 106,786 |
| 190 | 0305099F | GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM) .....                           | 4,157   |
| 193 | 0305110F | SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE) .....                              | 20,806  |
| 194 | 0305111F | WEATHER SERVICE .....  | 25,102  |
| 195 | 0305114F | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCAL) .....      | 23,516  |
| 196 | 0305116F | AERIAL TARGETS .....   | 8,639   |
| 199 | 0305128F | SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES .....                          | 498     |
| 200 | 0305145F | ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION .....                                    | 13,222  |
| 201 | 0305146F | DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES .....                   | 360     |
| 206 | 0305173F | SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER .....                   | 3,674   |
| 207 | 0305174F | SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT ..... | 2,480   |
| 208 | 0305179F | INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS) .....                             | 8,592   |
| 209 | 0305182F | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE) .....                                 | 13,462  |
| 210 | 0305202F | DRAGON U-2 .....   | 5,511   |
| 212 | 0305206F | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS .....                                | 28,113  |
|     |          |  | 10,000  |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
|      |                 | Per Air Force UFR                           |                 | [10,000]     |                  |
| 213  | 0305207F        | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS               | 13,516          |              | 13,516           |
| 214  | 0305208F        | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS   | 27,265          |              | 27,265           |
| 215  | 0305219F        | MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV                         | 1,378           |              | 1,378            |
| 216  | 0305220F        | RQ-4 UAV                                    | 244,514         |              | 244,514          |
| 217  | 0305221F        | NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING     | 11,096          |              | 11,096           |
| 218  | 0305236F        | COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)                      | 36,137          |              | 36,137           |
| 219  | 0305238F        | NATO AGS                                    | 232,851         |              | 232,851          |
| 220  | 0305240F        | SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE                  | 20,218          |              | 20,218           |
| 221  | 0305265F        | GPS III SPACE SEGMENT                       | 212,571         |              | 212,571          |
| 222  | 0305614F        | JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM                        | 73,779          |              | 73,779           |
| 223  | 0305881F        | RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION                     | 4,102           |              | 4,102            |
| 225  | 0305913F        | NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)              | 20,468          |              | 20,468           |
| 226  | 0305940F        | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS        | 11,596          |              | 11,596           |
| 227  | 0306250F        | CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT     | 4,938           |              | 4,938            |
| 228  | 0308699F        | SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)                  | 1,212           |              | 1,212            |
| 230  | 0401119F        | C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)                  | 38,773          |              | 38,773           |
| 231  | 0401130F        | C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)                          | 83,773          |              | 83,773           |
| 232  | 0401132F        | C-130J PROGRAM                              | 26,715          |              | 26,715           |
| 233  | 0401134F        | LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCMI) | 5,172           |              | 5,172            |
| 234  | 0401219F        | KC-10S                                      | 2,714           |              | 2,714            |
| 235  | 0401314F        | OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT                 | 27,784          |              | 27,784           |
| 236  | 0401318F        | CV-22                                       | 38,719          |              | 38,719           |
| 237  | 0401319F        | PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)     | 11,006          |              | 11,006           |
| 238  | 0408011F        | SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL            | 8,405           |              | 8,405            |
| 239  | 0702207F        | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)                  | 1,407           |              | 1,407            |
| 241  | 0708610F        | LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)    | 109,685         |              | 109,685          |

|      |            |  |                   |                 |                   |
|------|------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 242  | 0708611F   | SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....  | 16,209            |                 | 16,209            |
| 243  | 0804743F   | OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING .....  | 987               |                 | 987               |
| 244  | 0808716F   | OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES .....   | 126               |                 | 126               |
| 245  | 0901202F   | JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY .....                                      | 2,603             |                 | 2,603             |
| 246  | 0901218F   | CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM .....  | 1,589             |                 | 1,589             |
| 247  | 0901220F   | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION .....   | 5,026             |                 | 5,026             |
| 248  | 0901226F   | AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY .....                                | 1,394             |                 | 1,394             |
| 249  | 0901279F   | FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE .....                                  | 3,798             |                 | 3,798             |
| 250  | 0901538F   | FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....                 | 107,314           |                 | 107,314           |
| 250A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....  | 11,441,120        |                 | 11,363,920        |
|      |            | Classified program increase .....  |                   | -77,200         |                   |
|      |            | Classified program reduction .....   |                   | [25,000]        |                   |
|      |            | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>                      | <b>15,717,666</b> | <b>-100,100</b> | <b>15,617,566</b> |
|      |            | <b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, AF .....</b>              | <b>23,739,892</b> | <b>125,500</b>  | <b>23,865,392</b> |
|      |            | <b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, DW</b>                          |                   |                 |                   |
|      |            | <b>BASIC RESEARCH</b>  |                   |                 |                   |
| 001  | 0601000BR  | DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE .....                                       | 37,778            |                 | 37,778            |
| 002  | 0601101E   | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES .....  | 312,146           |                 | 312,146           |
| 003  | 0601110D8Z | BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES .....   | 44,564            | -10,000         | 34,564            |
|      |            | National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship program ..... |                   | [-10,000]       |                   |
| 004  | 0601117E   | BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE .....                           | 49,848            |                 | 49,848            |
| 005  | 0601120D8Z | NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM .....                                   | 45,488            | 10,000          | 55,488            |
|      |            | Pre-Kindergarten to 12th Grade STEM Programs .....                         |                   | [10,000]        |                   |
| 006  | 0601228D8Z | HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS .....   | 24,412            | 10,000          | 34,412            |
|      |            | Historically Black Colleges and Universities .....                         |                   | [10,000]        |                   |
| 007  | 0601384BP  | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM .....                              | 48,261            |                 | 48,261            |
|      |            | <b>SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH .....</b>                                       | <b>562,497</b>    | <b>10,000</b>   | <b>572,497</b>    |
|      |            | <b>APPLIED RESEARCH</b>  |                   |                 |                   |
| 008  | 0602000D8Z | JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY .....   | 20,065            |                 | 20,065            |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                                   | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|--|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 009                                    | 0602115E        | BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY .....  | 112,242          |              | 112,242          |
| 011                                    | 0602234D8Z      | LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM .....                                  | 51,875           |              | 51,875           |
| 012                                    | 0602251D8Z      | APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES .....               | 41,965           |              | 41,965           |
| 013                                    | 0602303E        | INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY .....                              | 334,407          |              | 334,407          |
| 015                                    | 0602383E        | BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE .....   | 44,825           |              | 44,825           |
| 016                                    | 0602384BP       | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM .....                              | 226,317          |              | 226,317          |
| 018                                    | 0602668D8Z      | CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH .....  | 15,000           |              | 15,000           |
| 020                                    | 0602702E        | TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY .....  | 305,484          |              | 305,484          |
| 021                                    | 0602715E        | MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY .....                                  | 160,389          |              | 160,389          |
| 022                                    | 0602716E        | ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY .....   | 179,203          |              | 179,203          |
| 023                                    | 0602718BR       | WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES .....                      | 151,737          |              | 151,737          |
| 024                                    | 0602751D8Z      | SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH .....                | 9,156            |              | 9,156            |
| 025                                    | 1160401BB       | SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....   | 39,750           |              | 39,750           |
|  |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH .....</b>                                     | <b>1,692,415</b> |              | <b>1,692,415</b> |
| <b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</b> |                 |  |                  |              |                  |
| 026                                    | 0603000D8Z      | JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                                  | 26,688           |              | 26,688           |
| 027                                    | 0603121D8Z      | SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....  | 8,682            |              | 8,682            |
| 028                                    | 0603122D8Z      | COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT .....                               | 69,675           | 20,000       | 89,675           |
|  |                 | Program emphasis for CT and Irregular Warfare Programs .....               |                  | [20,000]     |                  |
| 029                                    | 0603133D8Z      | FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING .....  | 30,000           | -6,000       | 24,000           |
|  |                 | Program decrease .....   |                  | [-6,000]     |                  |
| 030                                    | 0603160BR       | COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT ..... | 283,694          |              | 283,694          |
| 032                                    | 0603176C        | ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT .....                         | 8,470            |              | 8,470            |
| 033                                    | 0603177C        | DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY .....                                     | 45,110           |              | 45,110           |
| 034                                    | 0603178C        | WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....   | 14,068           | 13,348       | 27,416           |
|  |                 | MDA DE Ballistic Missile Kill Capability Development .....                 |                  | [13,348]     |                  |



|     |            |   |         |           |
|-----|------------|---|---------|-----------|
| 035 | 0603179C   | ADVANCED C4ISR .....  | 15,329  | 15,329    |
| 036 | 0603180C   | ADVANCED RESEARCH .....   | 16,584  | 16,584    |
| 037 | 0603225D8Z | JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....                      | 19,335  | 19,335    |
| 038 | 0603264S   | AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY ..... | 2,544   | 2,544     |
| 039 | 0603274C   | SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY .....                                      | 51,033  | 51,033    |
| 040 | 0603286E   | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS .....  | 129,723 | 129,723   |
| 041 | 0603287E   | SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY .....                                       | 179,883 | 179,883   |
| 042 | 0603288D8Z | ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS .....  | 12,000  | 12,000    |
| 043 | 0603289D8Z | ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS .....                           | 50,000  | 50,000    |
|     |            | Program decrease .....  | -10,000 | -10,000   |
|     |            | COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY .....                                      |         | [-10,000] |
| 044 | 0603294C   | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....        | 25,639  | 25,639    |
| 045 | 0603384BP  | JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....                                | 132,674 | 132,674   |
| 046 | 0603618D8Z | JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS .....                          | 10,965  | 10,965    |
| 047 | 0603648D8Z | Program decrease .....  | 131,960 | 121,960   |
|     |            | DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....           | 91,095  | 91,095    |
| 052 | 0603680D8Z | EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....                        | 33,706  | 33,706    |
| 053 | 0603699D8Z | GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS .....                     | 16,836  | 16,836    |
| 054 | 0603712S   | DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY .....                   | 29,683  | 29,683    |
| 055 | 0603713S   | STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM .....                            | 57,796  | 57,796    |
| 056 | 0603716D8Z | MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT .....                 | 72,144  | 72,144    |
| 057 | 0603720S   | JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM .....   | 7,405   | 7,405     |
| 058 | 0603727D8Z | ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES .....                                   | 92,246  | 92,246    |
| 059 | 0603739E   | COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS .....                          | 243,265 | 243,265   |
| 060 | 0603760E   | NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY .....                                  | 386,926 | 386,926   |
| 062 | 0603766E   | SENSOR TECHNOLOGY .....   | 312,821 | 312,821   |
| 063 | 0603767E   | DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....                | 10,692  | 10,692    |
| 064 | 0603769SE  | SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE .....                                      | 15,776  | 15,776    |
| 065 | 0603781D8Z | QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS .....                                     | 64,319  | 64,319    |
| 066 | 0603826D8Z | Program decrease .....  | -5,000  | -5,000    |
|     |            | DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE .....                       | 3,000   | 3,000     |
| 068 | 0603832D8Z | TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY .....                              | 81,148  | 81,148    |
| 071 | 0603941D8Z |   |         |           |

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line   | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|--|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 072  | 0604055D8Z      | OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT .....  | 31,800           |              | 31,800           |
| 073  | 0303310D8Z      | CWMD SYSTEMS .....   | 46,066           |              | 46,066           |
| 074  | 1160402BB       | SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....  | 57,622           |              | 57,622           |
|  |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>                                  | <b>2,933,402</b> | <b>2,348</b> | <b>2,935,750</b> |
| <b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES</b> |                 |  |                  |              |                  |
| 077  | 0603161D8Z      | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P .....                 | 41,072           |              | 41,072           |
| 079  | 0603600D8Z      | WALKOFF .....  | 90,558           |              | 90,558           |
| 080  | 0603714D8Z      | ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM .....   | 15,518           |              | 15,518           |
| 081  | 0603851D8Z      | ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM .....                           | 51,462           |              | 51,462           |
| 082  | 0603881C        | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT .....                               | 299,598          |              | 299,598          |
| 083  | 0603882C        | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT .....                              | 1,003,768        | 40,000       | 1,043,768        |
|  |                 | BMD program increase .....   |                  | [40,000]     |                  |
| 084  | 0603884BP       | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/WAL .....                                  | 179,236          |              | 179,236          |
| 085  | 0603884C        | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS .....  | 392,893          |              | 392,893          |
| 086  | 0603890C        | BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS .....  | 410,863          |              | 410,863          |
| 087  | 0603891C        | SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA .....   | 310,261          |              | 310,261          |
| 088  | 0603892C        | AEGIS BMD .....  | 929,208          |              | 929,208          |
| 089  | 0603893C        | SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM .....   | 31,346           |              | 31,346           |
| 090  | 0603895C        | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS .....                                  | 6,389            |              | 6,389            |
| 091  | 0603896C        | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI ..... | 443,484          |              | 443,484          |
| 092  | 0603898C        | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARRIGHTER SUPPORT .....                               | 46,387           |              | 46,387           |
| 093  | 0603904C        | MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC) .....                          | 58,530           |              | 58,530           |
| 094  | 0603906C        | REGARDING TRENCH .....   | 16,199           |              | 16,199           |
| 095  | 0603907C        | SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX) .....   | 64,409           |              | 64,409           |
| 096  | 0603913C        | ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS .....   | 96,803           | 172,000      | 268,803          |
|  |                 | Program increase for Israeli Cooperative Programs .....                                |                  | [172,000]    |                  |

|   |            |   |                  |                  |
|---|------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| 097   | 0603914C   | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST .....  | 386,482          | 386,482          |
| 098   | 0603915C   | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS .....   | 485,294          | 485,294          |
| 099   | 0603920D8Z | HUMANITARIAN DEMINING .....   | 10,194           | 10,194           |
| 100   | 0603923D8Z | COALITION WARFARE .....   | 10,139           | 10,139           |
| 101   | 0604016D8Z | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM .....                                       | 2,907            | 2,907            |
| 102   | 0604250D8Z | ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES .....  | 190,000          | 170,000          |
|   |            | Program decrease .....  |                  | -20,000          |
|   |            | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT ..... |                  | [-20,000]        |
| 103   | 0604400D8Z | WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE .....  | 3,702            | 3,702            |
| 104   | 0604445J   | JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION .....   | 53,000           | 53,000           |
| 107   | 0604787J   | JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM .....                             | 7,002            | 7,002            |
| 108   | 0604828J   | LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3) .....   | 7,102            | 7,102            |
| 109   | 0604880C   | AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT .....   | 123,444          | 123,444          |
| 110   | 0604881C   | SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION .....                               | 263,695          | 263,695          |
| 113   | 0605170D8Z | JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM .....                                | 12,500           | 12,500           |
| 114   | 0303191D8Z | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE .....   | 2,656            | 2,656            |
| 115   | 0305103C   | <b>SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES .....</b>                 | <b>961</b>       | <b>961</b>       |
|   |            |   | <b>6,047,062</b> | <b>6,239,062</b> |
| <b>SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION</b> |            |   |                  |                  |
| 116   | 0604161D8Z | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD .....                | 7,936            | 7,936            |
| 117   | 0604165D8Z | PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT .....                                   | 70,762           | 70,762           |
| 118   | 0604384BP  | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD .....                                   | 345,883          | 345,883          |
| 119   | 0604764K   | ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO) .....                          | 25,459           | 25,459           |
| 120   | 0604771D8Z | JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS) .....                        | 17,562           | 17,562           |
| 121   | 0605000BR  | WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES .....                               | 6,887            | 6,887            |
| 122   | 0605013BL  | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....  | 12,530           | 12,530           |
| 123   | 0605021SE  | HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE .....  | 286              | 286              |
| 124   | 0605022D8Z | DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM .....   | 3,244            | 3,244            |
| 125   | 0605027D8Z | OUSDC(IT) DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES .....   | 6,500            | 6,500            |
| 126   | 0605070S   | DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION .....                          | 15,326           | 15,326           |
| 127   | 0605075D8Z | DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION .....   | 19,351           | 19,351           |
| 128   | 0605080S   | DEFENSE AGENCY INITIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM .....                             | 41,465           | 41,465           |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                      | Program Element | Item   | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 129                       | 0605090S        | DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS) .....                              | 10,135          |              | 10,135           |
| 130                       | 0605210D8Z      | DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES .....                             | 9,546           |              | 9,546            |
| 131                       | 0303141K        | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM .....   | 14,241          |              | 14,241           |
| 132                       | 0305304D8Z      | DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEM) .....                           | 3,660           |              | 3,660            |
|                           |                 | <b>SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION .....</b>                         | <b>610,773</b>  |              | <b>610,773</b>   |
| <b>MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b> |                 |  |                 |              |                  |
| 133                       | 0604774D8Z      | DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS) .....                                    | 5,616           |              | 5,616            |
| 134                       | 0604875D8Z      | JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT .....                                       | 3,092           |              | 3,092            |
| 135                       | 0604940D8Z      | CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP) .....                   | 254,503         |              | 254,503          |
| 136                       | 0604942D8Z      | ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS .....  | 21,661          |              | 21,661           |
| 138                       | 0605100D8Z      | JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETS) .....                            | 27,162          |              | 27,162           |
| 139                       | 0605104D8Z      | TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS .....                                      | 24,501          |              | 24,501           |
| 142                       | 0605126J        | JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO) .....               | 43,176          |              | 43,176           |
| 145                       | 0605142D8Z      | SYSTEMS ENGINEERING .....  | 44,246          |              | 44,246           |
| 146                       | 0605151D8Z      | STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD .....   | 2,665           |              | 2,665            |
| 147                       | 0605161D8Z      | NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY .....  | 4,366           |              | 4,366            |
| 148                       | 0605170D8Z      | SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION .....                              | 27,901          |              | 27,901           |
| 149                       | 0605200D8Z      | GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) .....  | 2,855           |              | 2,855            |
| 150                       | 0605384BP       | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM .....                                      | 105,944         |              | 105,944          |
| 156                       | 0605502VA       | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH .....   | 400             |              | 400              |
| 159                       | 0605790D8Z      | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ..... | 1,634           |              | 1,634            |
| 160                       | 0605798D8Z      | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS .....  | 12,105          |              | 12,105           |
| 161                       | 0605801VA       | DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC) .....                                  | 50,389          |              | 50,389           |
| 162                       | 0605803SE       | R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION .....                     | 8,452           |              | 8,452            |
| 163                       | 0605804D8Z      | DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION .....  | 15,187          | 4,000        | 19,187           |
|                           |                 | Program increase .....   |                 | [4,000]      |                  |

|                                       |            |  |                |                |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--|----------------|----------------|
| 164                                   | 0605898E   | MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D .....  | 71,362         | 71,362         |
| 165                                   | 0606100D8Z | BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS .....   | 4,100          | 4,100          |
| 166                                   | 0203345D8Z | DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI) .....                                    | 1,956          | 1,956          |
| 167                                   | 0204571J   | JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT .....   | 10,321         | 10,321         |
| 170                                   | 0303166J   | SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES .....                              | 11,552         | 11,552         |
| 172                                   | 0305193D8Z | CYBER INTELLIGENCE .....   | 6,748          | 6,748          |
| 174                                   | 0804767D8Z | COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2) .....                    | 44,005         | 44,005         |
| 175                                   | 0901598C   | MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA .....  | 36,998         | 36,998         |
| 176                                   | 0901598D8W | MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS .....  | 612            | 612            |
| 177A                                  | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....  | 44,367         | 44,367         |
|                                       |            | <b>SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>   | <b>887,876</b> | <b>4,000</b>   |
|                                       |            |  |                | <b>891,876</b> |
|                                       |            |  |                |                |
| <b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT</b> |            |  |                |                |
| 178                                   | 0604130V   | ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS) .....   | 3,988          | 3,988          |
| 179                                   | 0605127T   | REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA ..... | 1,750          | 1,750          |
| 180                                   | 0605147T   | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS) .....              | 286            | 286            |
| 181                                   | 0607210D8Z | INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT .....                                 | 14,778         | 14,778         |
| 182                                   | 0607310D8Z | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....  | 2,953          | 2,953          |
| 183                                   | 0607327T   | GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS) .....    | 10,350         | 10,350         |
| 184                                   | 0607384BP  | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT) .....                | 28,496         | 28,496         |
| 185                                   | 0607828J   | JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY .....   | 11,968         | 11,968         |
| 186                                   | 0208043J   | PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS) .....  | 1,842          | 1,842          |
| 187                                   | 0208045K   | C4I INTEROPERABILITY .....   | 63,558         | 63,558         |
| 189                                   | 0301144K   | JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING .....                                       | 3,931          | 3,931          |
| 193                                   | 0302016K   | NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT .....                                    | 924            | 924            |
| 194                                   | 0302019K   | DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION .....                          | 9,657          | 9,657          |
| 195                                   | 0303126K   | LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS .....   | 25,355         | 25,355         |
| 196                                   | 0303131K   | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) .....                       | 12,671         | 12,671         |
| 197                                   | 0303135G   | PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI) .....  | 222            | 222            |
| 198                                   | 0303136G   | KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI) .....  | 32,698         | 32,698         |
| 199                                   | 0303140D8Z | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....   | 11,304         | 11,304         |
| 200                                   | 0303140G   | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....   | 125,854        | 145,854        |
|                                       |            |  |                | 20,000         |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
|      |                 | Accelerate SHARKSEER deployment .....                   |                 | [20,000]     |                  |
| 202  | 0303150K        | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....                 | 33,793          |              | 33,793           |
| 203  | 0303153K        | DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION .....                     | 13,423          |              | 13,423           |
| 204  | 0303170K        | NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) .....            | 3,774           |              | 3,774            |
| 205  | 0303260D8Z      | DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO) ..... | 951             |              | 951              |
| 206  | 0303610K        | TELEPORT PROGRAM .....                                  | 2,697           |              | 2,697            |
| 208  | 0304210BB       | SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES .....            | 19,294          |              | 19,294           |
| 212  | 0305103K        | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE .....                         | 3,234           |              | 3,234            |
| 213  | 0305125D8Z      | CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP) .....          | 8,846           |              | 8,846            |
| 217  | 0305186D8Z      | POLICY R&D PROGRAMS .....                               | 7,065           |              | 7,065            |
| 218  | 0305199D8Z      | NET CENTRICITY .....                                    | 23,984          |              | 23,984           |
| 221  | 0305208BB       | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....         | 5,286           |              | 5,286            |
| 224  | 0305208K        | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....         | 3,400           |              | 3,400            |
| 229  | 0305327V        | INSIDER THREAT .....                                    | 8,670           |              | 8,670            |
| 230  | 0305387D8Z      | HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM .....      | 2,110           |              | 2,110            |
| 239  | 0708011S        | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS .....                           | 22,366          |              | 22,366           |
| 240  | 0708012S        | LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....                      | 1,574           |              | 1,574            |
| 241  | 0902298J        | MANAGEMENT HQ—OICS .....                                | 4,409           |              | 4,409            |
| 242  | 1105219BB       | MQ-9 UAV .....  | 9,702           |              | 9,702            |
| 243  | 1105232BB       | RQ-11 UAV .....   | 259             |              | 259              |
| 245  | 1160403BB       | AVIATION SYSTEMS .....                                  | 164,233         |              | 164,233          |
| 247  | 1160405BB       | INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....                  | 9,490           |              | 9,490            |
| 248  | 1160408BB       | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS .....                          | 75,253          |              | 75,253           |
| 252  | 1160431BB       | WARRIOR SYSTEMS .....                                   | 24,661          |              | 24,661           |
| 253  | 1160432BB       | SPECIAL PROGRAMS .....                                  | 20,908          |              | 20,908           |
| 259  | 1160480BB       | SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES .....                             | 3,672           |              | 3,672            |
| 262  | 1160483BB       | MARITIME SYSTEMS .....                                  | 57,905          |              | 57,905           |

|      |            |   |                   |                |                   |
|------|------------|---|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| 264  | 1160489BB  | GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES .....                    | 3,788             |                | 3,788             |
| 265  | 1160490BB  | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE .....                   | 16,225            |                | 16,225            |
| 265A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                                     | 3,118,502         | -5,000         | 3,113,502         |
|      |            | Classified adjustment .....                                   |                   | [-5,000]       |                   |
|      |            | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT .....</b>          | <b>4,032,059</b>  | <b>15,000</b>  | <b>4,047,059</b>  |
|      |            | <b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, DW .....</b> | <b>16,766,084</b> | <b>223,348</b> | <b>16,989,432</b> |
|      |            | <b>OPERATIONAL TEST &amp; EVAL, DEFENSE</b>                   |                   |                |                   |
|      |            | <b>MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>                                     |                   |                |                   |
| 001  | 06051180TE | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION .....                         | 74,583            |                | 74,583            |
| 002  | 06051310TE | LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION .....                           | 45,142            |                | 45,142            |
| 003  | 06058140TE | OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES .....                | 48,013            | 5,000          | 53,013            |
|      |            | Information Assurance Testing and Exercises .....             |                   | [5,000]        |                   |
|      |            | <b>SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>                      | <b>167,738</b>    | <b>5,000</b>   | <b>172,738</b>    |
|      |            | <b>TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST &amp; EVAL, DEFENSE .....</b>       | <b>167,738</b>    | <b>5,000</b>   | <b>172,738</b>    |
|      |            | <b>TOTAL RDT&amp;E .....</b>                                  | <b>63,533,947</b> | <b>257,452</b> | <b>63,791,399</b> |

# TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

## SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

### SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                                     | Item  | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Authorized |
|--|---|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY</b> |   |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>                  |   |                    |                 |                     |
| 010                                      | MANEUVER UNITS .....  | 969,281            | 100,000         | 1,069,281           |
|  | Restore Critical Operations Tempo .....                         |                    | [100,000]       |                     |
| 020                                      | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES .....                                  | 61,990             |                 | 61,990              |
| 030                                      | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE .....                                    | 450,987            | -500            | 450,487             |
|  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                    | [-500]          |                     |
| 040                                      | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS .....                                      | 545,773            | -2,000          | 543,773             |
|  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                    | [-1,000]        |                     |
|  | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                    | [-1,000]        |                     |
| 050                                      | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                            | 1,057,453          | -11,000         | 1,046,453           |
|  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                    | [-10,000]       |                     |
|  | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                    | [-1,000]        |                     |
| 060                                      | AVIATION ASSETS .....   | 1,409,347          | 138,600         | 1,547,947           |
|  | Restore Critical Aviation Readiness .....                       |                    | [100,000]       |                     |
|  | UH-60A to UH-60L Conversions/ARNG Modernization .....           |                    | [38,600]        |                     |
| 070                                      | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                        | 3,592,334          | -25,000         | 3,567,334           |
|  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                    | [-19,500]       |                     |
|  | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                    | [-5,500]        |                     |
| 080                                      | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS .....                             | 411,388            |                 | 411,388             |
| 090                                      | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....                             | 1,001,232          | 99,500          | 1,100,732           |



|                                |   |                   |  |                |                   |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|----------------|-------------------|
|                                | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -500]        |                   |
|                                | Restore Critical Depot Maintenance .....                        |                   |  | [100,000]      |                   |
| 100                            | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                                   | 7,428,972         |  | -82,000        | 7,346,972         |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -27,000]     |                   |
|                                | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -55,000]     |                   |
| 110                            | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....       | 2,066,434         |  | -90,000        | 1,976,434         |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -7,000]      |                   |
|                                | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -58,000]     |                   |
|                                | Transfer to Arlington National Cemetery .....                   |                   |  | [ -25,000]     |                   |
| 120                            | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS .....                   | 411,863           |  | -500           | 411,363           |
|                                | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -500]        |                   |
| 130                            | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS .....                      | 179,399           |  | -500           | 178,899           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -500]        |                   |
| 170                            | COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT .....                 | 432,281           |  | -2,500         | 429,781           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -2,500]      |                   |
|                                | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                          | <b>20,018,734</b> |  | <b>124,100</b> | <b>20,142,834</b> |
|                                |   |                   |  |                |                   |
| <b>MOBILIZATION</b>            |   |                   |  |                |                   |
| 180                            | STRATEGIC MOBILITY .....  | 316,776           |  | -1,000         | 315,776           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -500]        |                   |
|                                | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -500]        |                   |
| 190                            | ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS .....                                 | 187,609           |  | -1,500         | 186,109           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -1,500]      |                   |
| 200                            | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS .....                                   | 6,463             |  | 80,000         | 86,463            |
|                                | Industrial Base Initiative-Body Armor .....                     |                   |  | [80,000]       |                   |
|                                | <b>SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION .....</b>                              | <b>510,848</b>    |  | <b>77,500</b>  | <b>588,348</b>    |
|                                |   |                   |  |                |                   |
| <b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b> |   |                   |  |                |                   |
| 210                            | OFFICER ACQUISITION .....                                       | 124,766           |  | -1,000         | 123,766           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -1,000]      |                   |
| 220                            | RECRUIT TRAINING .....  | 51,968            |  | -500           | 51,468            |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -500]        |                   |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                                 | Item  | FY 2015 Request  | House Change   | House Authorized |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 230                                  | ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING .....                                 | 43,735           |                | 43,735           |
| 240                                  | SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS .....                    | 456,563          | -500           | 456,063          |
|                                      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-500]         |                  |
| 250                                  | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....                                | 886,529          | -10,500        | 876,029          |
|                                      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-8,500]       |                  |
|                                      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-2,000]       |                  |
| 260                                  | FLIGHT TRAINING .....   | 890,070          |                | 890,070          |
| 270                                  | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....                        | 193,291          | -3,000         | 190,291          |
|                                      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-2,500]       |                  |
|                                      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-500]         |                  |
| 280                                  | TRAINING SUPPORT .....  | 552,359          | -1,000         | 551,359          |
|                                      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-500]         |                  |
|                                      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-500]         |                  |
| 290                                  | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                                | 466,927          | -5,500         | 461,427          |
|                                      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-5,500]       |                  |
| 300                                  | EXAMINING .....   | 194,588          |                | 194,588          |
| 310                                  | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....                          | 205,782          | -8,000         | 197,782          |
|                                      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-8,000]       |                  |
| 320                                  | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....                           | 150,571          | -1,500         | 149,071          |
|                                      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 330                                  | JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS .....                     | 169,784          | -7,000         | 162,784          |
|                                      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-7,000]       |                  |
|                                      | <b>SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>                   | <b>4,386,933</b> | <b>-38,500</b> | <b>4,348,433</b> |
| <b>ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES</b> |   |                  |                |                  |
| 350                                  | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....                                | 541,877          |                | 541,877          |
| 360                                  | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES .....                                 | 722,291          |                | 722,291          |

|      |   |                  |                |                  |
|------|---|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 370  | LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....                               | 604,034          | 2,000          | 604,034          |
|      | Corrosion Mitigation Activities .....                           | [5,000]          | [5,000]        |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-2,500]         | [-2,500]       |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
| 380  | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT .....                                     | 419,777          | -2,500         | 419,777          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... | [-2,000]         | [-2,000]       |                  |
| 390  | ADMINISTRATION .....  | 404,942          | -500           | 404,942          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
| 400  | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....                                | 1,622,742        | -2,000         | 1,622,742        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... | [-1,500]         | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 410  | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT .....                                       | 289,271          | -500           | 289,271          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
| 420  | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT .....                                   | 390,924          | -5,500         | 385,424          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-5,500]         | [-5,500]       |                  |
| 430  | OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT .....                                     | 1,118,540        | -1,500         | 1,117,040        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-1,500]         | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 440  | ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES .....                                    | 241,234          | -1,500         | 239,734          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-1,500]         | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 450  | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT .....                                    | 243,509          | -1,000         | 242,509          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-1,000]         | [-1,000]       |                  |
| 460  | FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS .....                  | 200,615          | -1,500         | 199,115          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-1,500]         | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 470  | INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS .....                       | 462,591          | -500           | 462,091          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
| 480  | MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS .....                            | 27,375           | -1,000         | 27,375           |
| 520A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                                       | 1,029,411        | [-500]         | 1,029,411        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... | [-500]           | [-500]         |                  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>            | <b>8,323,633</b> | <b>-16,000</b> | <b>8,307,633</b> |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request   | House Change    | House Authorized  |
|------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|      | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>                                      |                   |                 |                   |
| 530  | UNDISTRIBUTED   |                   | -516,200        | -516,200          |
|      | Civilian personnel underexecution                         |                   | [-80,000]       |                   |
|      | Foreign Currency adjustments                              |                   | [-48,900]       |                   |
|      | Unobligated balances                                      |                   | [-387,300]      |                   |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED</b>                             |                   | <b>-516,200</b> | <b>-516,200</b>   |
|      | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY</b>            | <b>33,240,148</b> | <b>-369,100</b> | <b>32,871,048</b> |
|      | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES</b>              |                   |                 |                   |
|      | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>                                   |                   |                 |                   |
| 020  | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES                                  | 15,200            |                 | 15,200            |
| 030  | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE                                    | 502,664           | 29,500          | 532,164           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                   | [-500]          |                   |
|      | Restore Critical Operations Tempo                         |                   | [30,000]        |                   |
| 040  | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS                                      | 107,489           |                 | 107,489           |
| 050  | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT                            | 543,989           |                 | 543,989           |
| 060  | AVIATION ASSETS   | 72,963            |                 | 72,963            |
| 070  | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT                        | 360,082           | -2,000          | 358,082           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                   | [-1,500]        |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance |                   | [-500]          |                   |
| 080  | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS                             | 72,491            |                 | 72,491            |
| 090  | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE                             | 58,873            | 35,000          | 93,873            |
|      | Restore Critical Depot Maintenance                        |                   | [35,000]        |                   |
| 100  | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT                                   | 388,961           | -2,500          | 386,461           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                   | [-2,500]        |                   |
| 110  | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION       | 228,597           | -9,500          | 219,097           |

|     |  |  |                  |          |               |                  |     |
|-----|--|--|------------------|----------|---------------|------------------|-----|
| 120 |  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                  |                  |          | [-500]        |                  |     |
|     |  | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....  |                  |          | [-9,000]      |                  |     |
|     |  | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS .....                    | 39,590           |          |               | 39,590           |     |
|     |  | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES</b> .....                           | <b>2,390,899</b> |          | <b>50,500</b> | <b>2,441,399</b> |     |
| 130 |  | <b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>                              |                  |          |               |                  |     |
| 140 |  | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....                                 | 10,608           |          |               | 10,608           |     |
| 150 |  | ADMINISTRATION .....   | 18,587           |          |               | 18,587           |     |
| 160 |  | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....                                 | 6,681            |          |               | 6,681            |     |
| 170 |  | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT .....  | 9,192            |          |               | 9,192            |     |
|     |  | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                                 | 54,602           |          |               | 54,102           |     |
|     |  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                  |                  |          | [-500]        |                  |     |
|     |  | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b> .....               | <b>99,670</b>    |          | <b>-500</b>   | <b>99,170</b>    |     |
| 180 |  | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>   |                  |          |               |                  |     |
|     |  | UNDISTRIBUTED .....  |                  |          |               |                  | 455 |
|     |  | Unobligated balances .....                                       |                  |          |               | -38,700          |     |
|     |  | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....                              |                  |          |               | <b>-38,700</b>   |     |
|     |  | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES</b> .....         | <b>2,490,569</b> |          | <b>11,300</b> | <b>2,501,869</b> |     |
| 010 |  | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARNG</b>                         |                  |          |               |                  |     |
|     |  | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>  |                  |          |               |                  |     |
|     |  | MANEUVER UNITS .....   | 660,648          |          | 249,100       | 909,748          |     |
|     |  | National Guard combat training center rotations activities ..... |                  | [70,000] |               |                  |     |
|     |  | National Guard critical operations tempo activities .....        |                  | [99,600] |               |                  |     |
|     |  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                  |                  |          |               |                  |     |
|     |  | Restore Critical Operations Tempo .....                          |                  | [-500]   |               |                  |     |
|     |  | Restore Critical Operations Tempo .....                          |                  | [80,000] |               |                  |     |
| 020 |  | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES .....                                   | 165,942          |          |               | 165,942          |     |
| 030 |  | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE .....                                     | 733,800          |          |               | 733,800          |     |
| 040 |  | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS .....                                       | 83,084           |          |               | 83,084           |     |
| 050 |  | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                             | 22,005           |          |               | 22,005           |     |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                                | Item  | FY 2015 Request  | House Change   | House Authorized |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 060                                 | AVIATION ASSETS .....   | 920,085          |                | 920,085          |
| 070                                 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                        | 680,887          | -7,000         | 673,887          |
|                                     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-5,000]       |                  |
|                                     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-2,000]       |                  |
| 080                                 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS .....                             | 69,726           |                | 69,726           |
| 090                                 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....                             | 138,263          | 47,600         | 185,863          |
|                                     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-500]         |                  |
|                                     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-1,500]       |                  |
|                                     | Restore Critical Depot Maintenance .....                        |                  | [49,600]       |                  |
| 100                                 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                                   | 804,517          | -12,500        | 792,017          |
|                                     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-2,500]       |                  |
|                                     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-10,000]      |                  |
| 110                                 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....       | 490,205          | -18,500        | 471,705          |
|                                     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-18,500]      |                  |
| 120                                 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS .....                   | 872,140          | -1,000         | 871,140          |
|                                     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
|                                     | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                          | <b>5,641,302</b> | <b>257,700</b> | <b>5,899,002</b> |
| <b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b> |   |                  |                |                  |
| 130                                 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....                                | 6,690            |                | 6,690            |
| 140                                 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT .....                                    | 1,765            |                | 1,765            |
| 150                                 | ADMINISTRATION .....  | 63,075           | 2,000          | 65,075           |
|                                     | National Guard State Partnership Program .....                  |                  | [2,000]        |                  |
| 160                                 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....                                | 37,372           |                | 37,372           |
| 170                                 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT .....                                       | 6,484            |                | 6,484            |
| 180                                 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT .....                                   | 274,085          | -4,500         | 269,585          |
|                                     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-4,500]       |                  |

|     |  |                  |                |                  |
|-----|--|------------------|----------------|------------------|
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b> .....   | <b>389,471</b>   | <b>-2,500</b>  | <b>386,971</b>   |
|     | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>                                 |                  |                |                  |
| 190 | UNDISTRIBUTED .....                                  |                  | -72,400        | -72,400          |
|     | Unobligated balances .....                           |                  | [-72,400]      |                  |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....                  |                  | <b>-72,400</b> | <b>-72,400</b>   |
|     | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARNG</b> ..... | <b>6,030,773</b> | <b>182,800</b> | <b>6,213,573</b> |
|     | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY</b>             |                  |                |                  |
|     | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>                              |                  |                |                  |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS .....            | 4,947,202        | 55,000         | 5,002,202        |
|     | FHP Unit Level Maintenance .....                     |                  | [56,000]       |                  |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....      |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
| 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING .....                             | 1,647,943        | 11,500         | 1,659,443        |
|     | FHP Unit Level Maintenance .....                     |                  | [12,000]       |                  |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....      |                  | [-500]         |                  |
| 030 | AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES ..... | 37,050           | -500           | 37,050           |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT .....              | 96,139           | [-500]         | 95,639           |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....      |                  | -1,000         |                  |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....                            | 363,763          | [-1,000]       | 362,763          |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....      |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....                     | 814,770          | 121,100        | 935,870          |
|     | Aviation Depot Maintenance .....                     |                  | [111,000]      |                  |
|     | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....   |                  | [10,100]       |                  |
| 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....              | 36,494           | 122,500        | 36,494           |
| 080 | AVIATION LOGISTICS .....                             | 350,641          | [123,000]      | 473,141          |
|     | Aviation Logistics .....                             |                  | [-500]         |                  |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....      |                  | 94,500         |                  |
| 090 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS .....              | 3,865,379        | [10,000]       | 3,959,879        |
|     | Joint High Speed Vessel Operations .....             |                  | [10,000]       |                  |
|     | CLF steaming days .....                              |                  | [13,000]       |                  |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
|      | Corrosion Mitigation Activities .....                           |                 | [5,000]      |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-5,500]     |                  |
|      | T-AKES to Full Operational Status .....                         |                 | [72,000]     |                  |
| 100  | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING .....                        | 711,243         | -1,500       | 709,743          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-500]       |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [-1,000]     |                  |
| 110  | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....                                    | 5,296,408       | 31,200       | 5,327,608        |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....              |                 | [33,700]     |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-2,000]     |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [-500]       |                  |
| 120  | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                             | 1,339,077       | -3,200       | 1,335,877        |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....              |                 | [300]        |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-3,500]     |                  |
| 130  | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS .....                                     | 708,634         | -2,000       | 706,634          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-2,000]     |                  |
| 140  | ELECTRONIC WARFARE .....  | 91,599          | -500         | 91,099           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-500]       |                  |
| 150  | SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE .....                            | 207,038         | -500         | 206,538          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-500]       |                  |
| 160  | WARFARE TACTICS .....   | 432,715         | -1,000       | 431,715          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-1,000]     |                  |
| 170  | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY .....                  | 338,116         | -500         | 337,616          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-500]       |                  |
| 180  | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES .....                                     | 892,316         | -1,000       | 891,316          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [-1,000]     |                  |
| 190  | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE .....                                     | 128,486         |              | 128,486          |
| 200  | DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                                  | 2,472           |              | 2,472            |



|                                |   |                   |                |                   |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| 210                            | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS .....                      | 101,200           | -500           | 100,700           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-500]         |                   |
| 220                            | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT .....               | 188,920           | -2,500         | 186,420           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-2,500]       |                   |
| 230                            | CRUISE MISSILE .....  | 109,911           |                | 109,911           |
| 240                            | FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE .....                                   | 1,172,823         |                | 1,172,823         |
| 250                            | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....                        | 104,139           |                | 104,139           |
| 260                            | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE .....                                       | 490,911           | -500           | 490,411           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-500]         |                   |
| 270                            | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....                              | 324,861           | -1,000         | 323,861           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-1,000]       |                   |
| 290                            | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION .....                                    | 936,743           | -2,500         | 934,243           |
|                                | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-2,500]       |                   |
| 300                            | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION .....                | 1,483,495         | -60,500        | 1,422,995         |
|                                | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-60,500]      |                   |
| 310                            | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....                                    | 4,398,667         | -34,500        | 4,364,167         |
|                                | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-34,500]      |                   |
|                                | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                          | <b>31,619,155</b> | <b>322,100</b> | <b>31,941,255</b> |
| <b>MOBILIZATION</b>            |   |                   |                |                   |
| 320                            | SHIP REPOSITIONING AND SURGE .....                              | 526,926           |                | 526,926           |
| 330                            | READY RESERVE FORCE .....                                       | 195               |                | 195               |
| 340                            | AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS .....                        | 6,704             |                | 6,704             |
| 350                            | SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS .....                            | 251,538           | -46,000        | 205,538           |
|                                | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....              |                   | [-46,000]      |                   |
| 360                            | EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS .....                     | 124,323           |                | 124,323           |
| 370                            | INDUSTRIAL READINESS .....                                      | 2,323             |                | 2,323             |
| 380                            | COAST GUARD SUPPORT .....                                       | 20,333            |                | 20,333            |
|                                | <b>SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION .....</b>                              | <b>932,342</b>    | <b>-46,000</b> | <b>886,342</b>    |
| <b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b> |   |                   |                |                   |
| 390                            | OFFICER ACQUISITION .....                                       | 156,214           | -500           | 155,714           |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|--|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 400  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-500]       |                  |
|      | RECRUIT TRAINING .....                             | 8,863            | 100          | 8,963            |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |                  | [100]        |                  |
| 410  | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS .....              | 148,150          |              | 148,150          |
| 420  | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....                   | 601,501          | 2,700        | 604,201          |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |                  | [7,200]      |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-4,500]     |                  |
| 430  | FLIGHT TRAINING .....                              | 8,239            |              | 8,239            |
| 440  | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....           | 164,214          | 1,148        | 165,362          |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |                  | [1,000]      |                  |
|      | Naval Sea Cadets .....                             |                  | [1,148]      |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-1,000]     |                  |
| 450  | TRAINING SUPPORT .....                             | 182,619          | 400          | 183,019          |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) ..... |                  | [900]        |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-500]       |                  |
| 460  | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                   | 230,589          | -500         | 230,089          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-500]       |                  |
| 470  | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....             | 115,595          | -1,500       | 114,095          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-1,500]     |                  |
| 480  | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....              | 79,606           | -500         | 79,106           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-500]       |                  |
| 490  | JUNIOR ROTC .....                                  | 41,664           | -2,000       | 39,664           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....    |                  | [-2,000]     |                  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>      | <b>1,737,254</b> | <b>-652</b>  | <b>1,736,602</b> |
| 500  | <b>ADMIN &amp; SRWWD ACTIVITIES</b> .....          | 858,871          | -6,000       | 852,871          |
|      | ADMINISTRATION .....                               |                  |              |                  |

|      |   |                  |                  |                  |
|------|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  |                  |                  |
| 510  | EXTERNAL RELATIONS  | 12,807           | [-6,000]         | 12,807           |
| 520  | CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT                | 119,863          |                  | 119,863          |
| 530  | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT                | 356,113          |                  | 353,013          |
|      | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)              |                  | [900]            |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-4,000]         |                  |
| 540  | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT                                   | 255,605          |                  | 255,105          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-500]           |                  |
| 550  | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS                                | 339,802          |                  | 337,802          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-2,000]         |                  |
| 570  | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION                                | 172,203          |                  | 172,203          |
| 590  | PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN                          | 283,621          |                  | 282,621          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-1,000]         |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance |                  | [-500]           |                  |
| 600  | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT                        | 1,111,464        |                  | 1,110,464        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-500]           |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance |                  | [-500]           |                  |
| 610  | HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT                   | 43,232           |                  | 43,232           |
| 620  | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS                                    | 25,689           |                  | 25,689           |
| 630  | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS                      | 73,159           |                  | 72,659           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-500]           |                  |
| 640  | NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE                               | 548,640          |                  | 548,140          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-500]           |                  |
| 700  | INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES                   | 4,713            |                  | 4,713            |
| 720A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS                                       | 531,324          |                  | 530,324          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services                 |                  | [-1,000]         |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance |                  | [-500]           |                  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>              | <b>4,737,106</b> | <b>[-15,600]</b> | <b>4,721,506</b> |
|      | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>                                      |                  |                  |                  |
| 730  | UNDISTRIBUTED   | -402,900         |                  | -402,900         |
|      | Civilian personnel underexecution                         |                  | [-80,000]        |                  |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request   | House Change    | House Authorized  |
|------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|      | Foreign Currency adjustments .....                              |                   | [-74,200]       |                   |
|      | Unobligated balances .....                                      |                   | [-248,700]      |                   |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....                             |                   | <b>-402,900</b> | <b>-402,900</b>   |
|      | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY</b> .....            | <b>39,025,857</b> | <b>-143,052</b> | <b>38,882,805</b> |
|      | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</b>                |                   |                 |                   |
|      | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>   |                   |                 |                   |
| 010  | OPERATIONAL FORCES .....  | 905,744           | 38,300          | 944,044           |
|      | Corrosion Mitigation Activities .....                           |                   | [5,000]         |                   |
|      | Crisis Response Operations Unfunded Requirement .....           |                   | [33,800]        |                   |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-500]          |                   |
| 020  | FIELD LOGISTICS .....   | 921,543           | -1,000          | 920,543           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-500]          |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-500]          |                   |
| 030  | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....   | 229,058           | 51,000          | 280,058           |
|      | Restore Critical Depot Maintenance .....                        |                   | [51,000]        |                   |
| 040  | MARITIME PREPOSITIONING .....                                   | 87,660            |                 | 87,660            |
| 050  | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....                  | 573,926           | -17,000         | 556,926           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-1,000]        |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-16,000]       |                   |
| 060  | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....                                    | 1,983,118         | -5,500          | 1,977,618         |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-1,500]        |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-4,000]        |                   |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES</b> .....                          | <b>4,701,049</b>  | <b>65,800</b>   | <b>4,766,849</b>  |
|      | <b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>                                  |                   |                 |                   |

|      |   |                  |                  |  |
|------|---|------------------|------------------|--|
| 070  | RECRUIT TRAINING .....  | 18,227           | 18,227           |  |
| 080  | OFFICER ACQUISITION .....                                       | 948              | 948              |  |
| 090  | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....                                | 98,448           | 98,448           |  |
| 100  | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....                        | 42,305           | 42,305           |  |
| 110  | TRAINING SUPPORT .....  | 330,156          | 330,156          |  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | -2,000           |  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-500]           |  |
| 120  | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                                | 161,752          | 161,752          |  |
| 130  | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....                          | 19,137           | 18,637           |  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | -500             |  |
| 140  | JUNIOR ROTC .....   | 23,277           | 23,277           |  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>                   | <b>694,250</b>   | <b>691,750</b>   |  |
|      | <b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>                             |                  |                  |  |
| 150  | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....                                | 36,359           | 36,359           |  |
| 160  | ADMINISTRATION .....  | 362,608          | 352,508          |  |
|      | Marine Museum Unjustified Growth .....                          |                  | -10,100          |  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-9,100]         |  |
| 180  | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....                        | 70,515           | 70,515           |  |
| 180A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                                       | 44,706           | 44,706           |  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES .....</b>              | <b>514,188</b>   | <b>504,088</b>   |  |
| 190  | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>  |                  |                  |  |
|      | Foreign Currency adjustments .....                              |                  | -109,900         |  |
|      | Unobligated balances .....                                      |                  | [-28,400]        |  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>                             |                  | <b>-109,900</b>  |  |
|      | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS .....</b>    | <b>5,909,487</b> | <b>5,852,787</b> |  |
|      | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES</b>                    |                  |                  |  |
|      | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>   |                  |                  |  |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line                                | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 010                                 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS .....                       | 565,842         | 7,900        | 573,742          |
|                                     | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....              |                 | [7,900]      |                  |
| 020                                 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE .....                                  | 5,948           |              | 5,948            |
| 040                                 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....                                | 82,636          | 2,300        | 84,936           |
|                                     | CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....              |                 | [2,300]      |                  |
| 050                                 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....                         | 353             |              | 353              |
| 060                                 | AVIATION LOGISTICS .....  | 7,007           |              | 7,007            |
| 070                                 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS .....                         | 8,190           |              | 8,190            |
| 080                                 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING .....                        | 556             |              | 556              |
| 090                                 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....                                    | 4,571           |              | 4,571            |
| 100                                 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS .....                                     | 14,472          |              | 14,472           |
| 110                                 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES .....                                     | 119,056         |              | 119,056          |
| 120                                 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE .....                                       | 1,852           |              | 1,852            |
| 130                                 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION .....                                    | 25,354          |              | 25,354           |
| 140                                 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION .....                | 48,271          | -2,000       | 46,271           |
|                                     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [-2,000]     |                  |
| 150                                 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....                                    | 101,921         | -500         | 101,421          |
|                                     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [-500]       |                  |
|                                     | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                          | <b>986,029</b>  | <b>7,700</b> | <b>993,729</b>   |
| <b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b> |   |                 |              |                  |
| 160                                 | ADMINISTRATION .....  | 1,520           |              | 1,520            |
| 170                                 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT .....                | 12,998          |              | 12,998           |
| 180                                 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....                                | 3,395           |              | 3,395            |
| 190                                 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....                        | 3,158           |              | 3,158            |
|                                     | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES .....</b>              | <b>21,071</b>   |              | <b>21,071</b>    |

|     |   |                  |  |                |                  |
|-----|---|------------------|--|----------------|------------------|
| 210 | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>  |                  |  |                |                  |
|     | UNDISTRIBUTED .....   |                  |  | -10,500        | -10,500          |
|     | Unobligated balances .....                                      |                  |  | [-10,500]      |                  |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....                             |                  |  | <b>-10,500</b> | <b>-10,500</b>   |
|     | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES</b> .....        | <b>1,007,100</b> |  | <b>-2,800</b>  | <b>1,004,300</b> |
|     | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE</b>                  |                  |  |                |                  |
|     | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>   |                  |  |                |                  |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES .....  | 93,093           |  |                | 93,093           |
| 020 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....   | 18,377           |  |                | 18,377           |
| 030 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION .....                | 29,232           |  | -1,500         | 27,732           |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  |  | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 040 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....                                    | 106,447          |  | -1,000         | 105,447          |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  |  | [-1,000]       |                  |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES</b> .....                          | <b>247,149</b>   |  | <b>-2,500</b>  | <b>244,649</b>   |
|     | <b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>                             |                  |  |                |                  |
| 050 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....                                | 914              |  |                | 914              |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION .....  | 11,831           |  |                | 11,831           |
| 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                                | 8,688            |  |                | 8,688            |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b> .....              | <b>21,433</b>    |  |                | <b>21,433</b>    |
| 080 | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>  |                  |  |                |                  |
|     | UNDISTRIBUTED .....   |                  |  | -100           | -100             |
|     | Unobligated balances .....                                      |                  |  | [-100]         |                  |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....                             |                  |  | <b>-100</b>    | <b>-100</b>      |
|     | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE</b> .....      | <b>268,582</b>   |  | <b>-2,600</b>  | <b>265,982</b>   |
|     | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</b>                   |                  |  |                |                  |
|     | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>   |                  |  |                |                  |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 010  | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES .....                                     | 3,163,457       | 93,100       | 3,256,557        |
|      | Corrosion Prevention .....                                      |                 | [5,000]      |                  |
|      | Cyber Weapon System Ops .....                                   |                 | [50,000]     |                  |
|      | Cyberspace Defense Weapon System and Cyber Mission Forces ..... |                 | [30,000]     |                  |
|      | Nuclear Force Improvement Program—Security Forces .....         |                 | [8,600]      |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [—500]       |                  |
| 020  | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES .....                                 | 1,694,339       | —8,000       | 1,686,339        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [—8,000]     |                  |
| 030  | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) .....            | 1,579,178       | —4,500       | 1,574,678        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [—2,000]     |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [—2,500]     |                  |
| 040  | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....   | 6,119,522       | —8,000       | 6,111,522        |
|      | RC/OC—135 Contractor Logistics Support Unjustified Growth ..... |                 | [—8,000]     |                  |
| 050  | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....       | 1,453,589       | —5,600       | 1,447,989        |
|      | Nuclear Force Improvement Program—Installation Surety .....     |                 | [3,400]      |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [—9,000]     |                  |
| 060  | BASE SUPPORT .....  | 2,599,419       | —12,000      | 2,587,419        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [—2,000]     |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [—10,000]    |                  |
| 070  | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING .....                              | 908,790         | 11,071       | 919,861          |
|      | Program increase .....  |                 | [14,571]     |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [—1,500]     |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                 | [—2,000]     |                  |
| 080  | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS .....                             | 856,306         | 6,600        | 862,906          |
|      | Nuclear Force Improvement Program—ICBM Training Hardware .....  |                 | [9,600]      |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                 | [—3,000]     |                  |
| 090  | TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES .....               | 800,689         | —500         | 800,189          |



|     |   |                   |  |               |                   |
|-----|---|-------------------|--|---------------|-------------------|
| 100 | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  |               |                   |
|     | LAUNCH FACILITIES .....   | 282,710           |  | [ -500]       | 282,710           |
| 110 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS .....                                     | 397,818           |  | -500          | 397,318           |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -500]       |                   |
| 120 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT .....               | 871,840           |  | 12,600        | 884,440           |
|     | PACOM Prepositioned Munition Shortfall Mitigation .....         |                   |  | [19,100]      |                   |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -6,000]     |                   |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -500]       |                   |
| 130 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS .....                      | 237,348           |  |               | 237,348           |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                          | <b>20,965,005</b> |  | <b>84,271</b> | <b>21,049,276</b> |
|     | <b>MOBILIZATION</b>   |                   |  |               |                   |
| 140 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS .....  | 1,966,810         |  | -2,500        | 1,966,310         |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -2,500]     |                   |
| 150 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS .....                                 | 139,743           |  | -500          | 139,243           |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -500]       |                   |
| 160 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....   | 1,534,560         |  | -2,000        | 1,534,560         |
| 170 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....       | 173,627           |  | [ -2,000]     | 171,627           |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -2,000]     |                   |
| 180 | BASE SUPPORT .....  | 688,801           |  | -2,500        | 686,301           |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -500]       |                   |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -2,000]     |                   |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION .....</b>                              | <b>4,505,541</b>  |  | <b>-7,500</b> | <b>4,498,041</b>  |
|     | <b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>                                  |                   |  |               |                   |
| 190 | OFFICER ACQUISITION .....                                       | 82,396            |  |               | 82,396            |
| 200 | RECRUIT TRAINING .....  | 19,852            |  |               | 19,852            |
| 210 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) .....                    | 76,134            |  | -3,000        | 73,134            |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   |  | [ -3,000]     |                   |
| 220 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....       | 212,226           |  | -3,500        | 208,726           |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   |  | [ -3,500]     |                   |
| 230 | BASE SUPPORT .....  | 759,809           |  | -5,500        | 754,309           |

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request  | House Change   | House Authorized |
|------|---|------------------|----------------|------------------|
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-4,500]       |                  |
| 240  | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....                                | 356,157          |                | 356,157          |
| 250  | FLIGHT TRAINING .....   | 697,594          | -3,000         | 694,594          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-500]         |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-2,500]       |                  |
| 260  | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....                        | 219,441          | -1,000         | 218,441          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
| 270  | TRAINING SUPPORT .....  | 91,001           |                | 91,001           |
| 280  | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....   | 316,688          |                | 316,688          |
| 290  | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                                | 73,920           |                | 73,920           |
| 300  | EXAMINING .....   | 3,121            |                | 3,121            |
| 310  | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....                          | 181,718          | -7,500         | 174,218          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-7,500]       |                  |
| 320  | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....                           | 147,667          | -500           | 147,167          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-500]         |                  |
| 330  | JUNIOR ROTC .....   | 63,250           | -3,000         | 60,250           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-3,000]       |                  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>                   | <b>3,300,974</b> | <b>-27,000</b> | <b>3,273,974</b> |
|      | <b>ADMIN &amp; SRWD ACTIVITIES</b>                              |                  |                |                  |
| 340  | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS .....                                      | 1,003,513        | 40,500         | 1,044,013        |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-500]         |                  |
|      | SDT Program .....   |                  | [41,000]       |                  |
| 350  | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....                              | 843,449          | -2,000         | 841,449          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-2,000]       |                  |
| 360  | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....   | 78,126           |                | 78,126           |

|      |   |                   |                 |                   |
|------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 370  | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....       | 244,177           | -3,500          | 244,177           |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-3,500]        |                   |
| 380  | BASE SUPPORT .....  | 1,103,442         | -7,000          | 1,096,442         |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-1,500]        |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-5,500]        |                   |
| 390  | ADMINISTRATION .....  | 597,234           | -1,000          | 596,234           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-500]          |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-500]          |                   |
| 400  | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....                                | 506,840           |                 | 506,840           |
| 410  | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES .....                              | 892,256           | -3,000          | 889,256           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-2,000]        |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-1,000]        |                   |
| 420  | CIVIL AIR PATROL .....  | 24,981            |                 | 24,981            |
| 450  | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT .....                                     | 92,419            | -500            | 91,919            |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-500]          |                   |
| 450A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....                                       | 1,169,736         | -10,500         | 1,159,236         |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-9,500]        |                   |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                   | [-1,000]        |                   |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES .....</b>              | <b>6,559,673</b>  | <b>13,000</b>   | <b>6,572,673</b>  |
|      | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....                                      |                   |                 |                   |
| 460  | UNDISTRIBUTED .....   |                   | -242,900        | -242,900          |
|      | Civilian personnel underexecution .....                         |                   | [-80,000]       |                   |
|      | Foreign Currency adjustments .....                              |                   | [-51,900]       |                   |
|      | Readiness support .....   |                   | [221,500]       |                   |
|      | Unobligated balances .....                                      |                   | [-332,500]      |                   |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>                             |                   | <b>-242,900</b> | <b>-242,900</b>   |
|      | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE .....</b>       | <b>35,331,193</b> | <b>-180,129</b> | <b>35,151,064</b> |
|      | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE</b>                  |                   |                 |                   |
|      | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>   |                   |                 |                   |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request  | House Change   | House Authorized |
|------|---|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 010  | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES .....                                     | 1,719,467        |                | 1,719,467        |
| 020  | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS .....                                | 211,132          |                | 211,132          |
| 030  | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....   | 530,301          |                | 530,301          |
| 040  | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....       | 85,672           | -1,000         | 84,672           |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
| 050  | BASE SUPPORT .....  | 367,966          | -2,500         | 365,466          |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance ..... |                  | [-2,500]       |                  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                          | <b>2,914,538</b> | <b>-3,500</b>  | <b>2,911,038</b> |
|      | <b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>                |                  |                |                  |
| 060  | ADMINISTRATION .....  | 59,899           |                | 59,899           |
| 070  | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                                | 14,509           |                | 14,509           |
| 080  | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC) .....                    | 20,345           |                | 20,345           |
| 090  | OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP) .....                      | 6,551            |                | 6,551            |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b> | <b>101,304</b>   |                | <b>101,304</b>   |
|      | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>  |                  |                |                  |
| 110  | UNDISTRIBUTED .....   |                  | -13,400        | -13,400          |
|      | Unobligated balances .....                                      |                  | [-13,400]      |                  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>                             |                  | <b>-13,400</b> | <b>-13,400</b>   |
|      | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE .....</b>      | <b>3,015,842</b> | <b>-16,900</b> | <b>2,998,942</b> |
|      | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ANG</b>                         |                  |                |                  |
|      | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>   |                  |                |                  |
| 010  | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS .....                                       | 3,367,729        | -1,000         | 3,366,729        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |

|     |  |                  |                |                  |
|-----|--|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS .....                                 | 718,295          | -1,000         | 717,295          |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                  |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....  | 1,528,695        |                | 1,528,695        |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....        | 137,604          | -4,000         | 133,604          |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....  |                  | [-4,000]       |                  |
| 050 | BASE SUPPORT .....   | 581,536          | -12,500        | 569,036          |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....  |                  | [-12,500]      |                  |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                           | <b>6,333,859</b> | <b>-18,500</b> | <b>6,315,359</b> |
|     | <b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES</b>                |                  |                |                  |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION .....   | 27,812           |                | 27,812           |
| 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....                                 | 31,188           | -500           | 30,688           |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                  |                  | [-500]         |                  |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b> | <b>59,000</b>    | <b>-500</b>    | <b>58,500</b>    |
|     | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>   |                  |                |                  |
| 080 | UNDISTRIBUTED .....  |                  | -800           | -800             |
|     | Unobligated balances .....                                       |                  | [-800]         |                  |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>                              |                  | <b>-800</b>    | <b>-800</b>      |
|     | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ANG .....</b>              | <b>6,392,859</b> | <b>-19,800</b> | <b>6,373,059</b> |
|     | <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>                 |                  |                |                  |
|     | <b>OPERATING FORCES</b>  |                  |                |                  |
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF .....                                      | 462,107          | -1,500         | 460,607          |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                  |                  | [-1,500]       |                  |
| 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES .....                | 4,762,245        | -54,300        | 4,707,945        |
|     | MSV—USSOCOM Maritime Support Vessel .....                        |                  | [-20,300]      |                  |
|     | NCR—USSOCOM National Capitol Region Office .....                 |                  | [-5,000]       |                  |
|     | POTFF—Human Performance .....                                    |                  | [-23,300]      |                  |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                  |                  | [-26,000]      |                  |
|     | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....  |                  | [-5,000]       |                  |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change   | House Authorized |
|------|--|------------------|----------------|------------------|
|      | RSCC—Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers ..... |                  | [-3,600]       |                  |
|      | USSOCOM Flight Operations (Flight Hours) .....                     |                  | [31,460]       |                  |
|      | USSOCOM Joint Special Operations University .....                  |                  | [-2,560]       |                  |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES .....</b>                             | <b>5,224,352</b> | <b>-55,800</b> | <b>5,168,552</b> |
|      | <b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>                                     |                  |                |                  |
| 030  | DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY .....                               | 135,437          |                | 135,437          |
| 040  | NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY .....                                  | 80,082           |                | 80,082           |
| 050  | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....           | 371,620          |                | 371,620          |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>                      | <b>587,139</b>   |                | <b>587,139</b>   |
|      | <b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>                   |                  |                |                  |
| 060  | CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS .....                                      | 119,888          | 21,000         | 140,888          |
|      | STARBASE .....   |                  | [21,000]       |                  |
| 080  | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY .....                                | 556,493          |                | 556,493          |
| 090  | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY .....                           | 1,340,374        | -500           | 1,339,874        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                    |                  | [-500]         |                  |
| 100  | DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY .....                             | 633,300          | -20,000        | 613,300          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                    |                  | [-20,000]      |                  |
| 110  | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY .....                           | 1,263,678        | -5,000         | 1,258,678        |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                    |                  | [-4,000]       |                  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                    |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....    |                  |                |                  |
| 130  | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY .....                                | 26,710           | -1,000         | 26,710           |
| 140  | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY .....                                     | 381,470          | [-1,000]       | 380,470          |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                    |                  | [-1,000]       |                  |
| 150  | DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY .....                                       | 194,520          | -11,500        | 183,020          |
|      | Program decrease .....   |                  | [-10,000]      |                  |

|      |   |            |  |            |            |
|------|---|------------|--|------------|------------|
| 160  | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                     |            |  |            |            |
|      | DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE .....  | 21,485     |  |            | 21,485     |
| 170  | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY .....                           | 544,786    |  |            | 523,786    |
|      | Global Security Contingency Fund .....                              |            |  | [-30,000]  |            |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                     |            |  | [-1,000]   |            |
|      | Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership For Peace .....                  |            |  | [10,000]   |            |
| 180  | DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE .....                                      | 527,812    |  | -500       | 527,312    |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                     |            |  | [-500]     |            |
| 200  | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION .....                    | 32,787     |  |            | 32,787     |
| 230  | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY .....                      | 2,566,424  |  |            | 2,551,924  |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                     |            |  | [-14,500]  |            |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....     |            |  | [-6,000]   |            |
| 240  | MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY .....  | 416,644    |  |            | 415,144    |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                     |            |  | [-1,000]   |            |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....     |            |  | [-500]     |            |
| 260  | OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT .....                                 | 186,987    |  |            | 106,391    |
|      | Office of Economic Adjustment .....                                 |            |  | [-80,596]  |            |
| 265  | OFFICE OF NET ASSESSMENT .....                                      |            |  | 18,944     | 18,944     |
|      | Program Increase .....  |            |  | [10,000]   |            |
|      | Transfer from line 270 .....  |            |  | [8,944]    |            |
| 270  | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE .....                            | 1,891,163  |  |            | 1,790,419  |
|      | BRAC 2015 Round Planning and Analyses .....                         |            |  | [-100,744] |            |
|      | Corrosion Prevention Program Office .....                           |            |  | [-4,800]   |            |
|      | DOD Rewards Program Underexecution .....                            |            |  | [5,000]    |            |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                     |            |  | [-4,000]   |            |
|      | Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance .....     |            |  | [-51,500]  |            |
|      | Transfer funding for Office of Net Assessment to new line 265 ..... |            |  | [-36,500]  |            |
| 280  | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES .....        | 87,915     |  |            | 87,915     |
| 290  | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES .....                              | 610,982    |  |            | 609,982    |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                     |            |  | [-1,000]   |            |
| 290A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....   | 13,983,323 |  |            | 13,987,323 |
|      | Classified adjustment .....   |            |  | 4,000      |            |
|      |   |            |  | [10,000]   |            |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item  | FY 2015 Request   | House Change    | House Authorized  |
|------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-6,000]        |                   |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b> | <b>25,386,741</b> | <b>-213,896</b> | <b>25,172,845</b> |
|      | <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>  |                   |                 |                   |
| 300  | UNDISTRIBUTED .....   |                   | -280,400        | -280,400          |
|      | Civilian personnel underexecution .....                         |                   | [-75,000]       |                   |
|      | Foreign Currency adjustments .....                              |                   | [-17,500]       |                   |
|      | Impact Aid .....  |                   | [25,000]        |                   |
|      | Unobligated balances .....                                      |                   | [-212,900]      |                   |
|      | <b>SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>                             |                   | <b>-280,400</b> | <b>-280,400</b>   |
|      | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE .....</b>    | <b>31,198,232</b> | <b>-550,096</b> | <b>30,648,136</b> |
|      | <b>MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS</b>                             |                   |                 |                   |
| 010  | US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE .....         | 13,723            |                 | 13,723            |
| 020  | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID .....             | 100,000           | 4,500           | 104,500           |
|      | Humanitarian Mine Action .....                                  |                   | [5,000]         |                   |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-500]          |                   |
| 030  | COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION .....                              | 365,108           | -10,500         | 354,608           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-10,500]       |                   |
| 040  | ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD .....                                      | 212,875           | -3,500          | 209,375           |
|      | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....                 |                   | [-3,500]        |                   |
| 050  | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY .....                           | 201,560           |                 | 201,560           |
| 060  | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY .....                           | 277,294           |                 | 277,294           |
| 070  | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE .....                      | 408,716           |                 | 408,716           |
| 080  | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE .....                        | 8,547             |                 | 8,547             |
| 090  | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES .....             | 208,353           |                 | 208,353           |



|     |   |                    |                   |                    |
|-----|---|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 100 | OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND .....           | 5,000              | -5,000            |                    |
|     | Program decrease .....  |                    | [-5,000]          |                    |
| 110 | SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE ..... | 10,000             | -4,800            | 5,200              |
|     | Reduction in contracts for Other Services .....               |                    | [-500]            |                    |
|     | Unjustified program increase .....                            |                    | [-4,300]          |                    |
|     | <b>SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS .....</b>            | <b>1,811,176</b>   | <b>-19,300</b>    | <b>1,791,876</b>   |
|     | <b>TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS .....</b>               | <b>1,811,176</b>   | <b>-19,300</b>    | <b>1,791,876</b>   |
|     | <b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE .....</b>                | <b>165,721,818</b> | <b>-1,166,377</b> | <b>164,555,441</b> |

# TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

## SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

### SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL (In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item  | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Authorized |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <b>Military Personnel Appropriations</b> .....                                    | <b>128,957,593</b> | <b>49,430</b>   | <b>129,007,023</b>  |
| Air Force airborne warning and control system personnel .....                     | 12,200             | [48,000]        |                     |
| CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....                                |                    | [-193,200]      |                     |
| Foreign Currency Adjustments .....  |                    | [-360,470]      |                     |
| Military Personnel unobligated balances .....                                     |                    | [534,900]       |                     |
| Recalculation from CPI-1 to CPI .....   |                    | [8,000]         |                     |
| Special training and exercises for National Guard State Partnership Program ..... | <b>6,236,092</b>   | <b>1,000</b>    | <b>6,237,092</b>    |
| <b>Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions</b> .....                  |                    | <b>[1,000]</b>  |                     |
| CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH) .....                                |                    |                 |                     |

# TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

## SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

### SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS (In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item  | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Authorized |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY</b>                     |                    |                 |                     |
| PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS .....                | 13,727             |                 | 13,727              |
| <b>TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY .....</b>         | <b>13,727</b>      |                 | <b>13,727</b>       |
| <b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE</b>                |                    |                 |                     |
| SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (MEDICAL/DENTAL) .....         | 61,717             |                 | 61,717              |
| <b>TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE .....</b>    | <b>61,717</b>      |                 | <b>61,717</b>       |
| <b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>             |                    |                 |                     |
| DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA) .....                  | 44,293             |                 | 44,293              |
| <b>TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE .....</b> | <b>44,293</b>      |                 | <b>44,293</b>       |
| <b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA</b>                     |                    |                 |                     |
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA .....                      | 1,114,731          | 100,000         | 1,214,731           |
| Working Capital Fund, DECA .....                      |                    | [100,000]       |                     |
| <b>TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA .....</b>         | <b>1,114,731</b>   | <b>100,000</b>  | <b>1,214,731</b>    |
| <b>CHEM AGENTS &amp; MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION</b>        |                    |                 |                     |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE .....                         | 222,728            |                 | 222,728             |
| RD&E .....  | 595,913            |                 | 595,913             |
| PROCUREMENT .....                                     | 10,227             |                 | 10,227              |

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item  | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>TOTAL CHEM AGENTS &amp; MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION</b> .....          | <b>828,868</b>  |              | <b>828,868</b>   |
| <b>DRUG INTERDICTION &amp; CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF</b> .....       |                 |              |                  |
| DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE .....        | 719,096         |              | 719,096          |
| DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM .....                                 | 101,591         |              | 101,591          |
| <b>TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION &amp; CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF</b> ..... | <b>820,687</b>  |              | <b>820,687</b>   |
| <b>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL</b> .....                        |                 |              |                  |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....                                     | 310,830         |              | 310,830          |
| PROCUREMENT .....   | 1,000           |              | 1,000            |
| <b>TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL</b> .....                  | <b>311,830</b>  |              | <b>311,830</b>   |
| <b>DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM</b> .....                                 |                 |              |                  |
| <b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</b> .....                            |                 |              |                  |
| IN-HOUSE CARE .....   | 8,799,086       | 85,300       | 8,884,386        |
| Implementation of Benefit Reform Proposal .....                     |                 | [-30,000]    |                  |
| Restoration of MHS Modernization .....                              |                 | [92,000]     |                  |
| USSOCOM Behavioral Health and Warrior Care Management Program ..... |                 | [23,300]     |                  |
| PRIVATE SECTOR CARE .....   | 15,412,599      | -58,000      | 15,354,599       |
| Implementation of Benefit Reform Proposal .....                     |                 | [-58,000]    |                  |
| CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT .....                                   | 2,462,096       |              | 2,462,096        |
| INFORMATION MANAGEMENT .....  | 1,557,347       |              | 1,557,347        |
| MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....   | 366,223         |              | 366,223          |
| EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....  | 750,866         |              | 750,866          |
| BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS .....                                | 1,683,694       |              | 1,683,694        |
| <b>RESEARCH &amp; DEVELOPMENT</b> .....                             |                 |              |                  |

|  |                   |                 |                   |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| R&D RESEARCH .....                             | 10,317            | 10,000          | 20,317            |
| Surgical Critical Care Research .....          |                   | [10,000]        |                   |
| R&D EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT .....              | 49,015            |                 | 49,015            |
| R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....                 | 226,410           |                 | 226,410           |
| R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION .....             | 97,787            |                 | 97,787            |
| R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT .....              | 217,898           |                 | 217,898           |
| R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT .....               | 38,075            |                 | 38,075            |
| R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT .....             | 15,092            |                 | 15,092            |
| <b>PROCUREMENT</b>                             |                   |                 |                   |
| PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING .....                  | 13,057            |                 | 13,057            |
| PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION .....         | 283,030           |                 | 283,030           |
| PROC THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM ..... | 3,145             |                 | 3,145             |
| PROC IEHR .....                                | 9,181             |                 | 9,181             |
| <b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>                           |                   |                 |                   |
| UNDISTRIBUTED .....                            | -161,857          | -424,700        | -586,557          |
| Foreign Currency adjustments .....             |                   | [-13,100]       |                   |
| Unobligated balances .....                     |                   | [-411,600]      |                   |
| <b>TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM</b> .....      | <b>31,833,061</b> | <b>-387,400</b> | <b>31,445,661</b> |
| <b>TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS</b> .....        | <b>35,028,914</b> | <b>-287,400</b> | <b>34,741,514</b> |

# TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

### SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/<br>Country     | Installation                    | Project Title  | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Agreement |
|---------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Army    | CALIFORNIA            | Concord                         | Access Control Point .....                               | 9,900              |                 | 9,900              |
| Army    | CALIFORNIA            | Concord                         | General Purpose Maintenance Shop .....                   | 5,300              |                 | 5,300              |
| Army    | CALIFORNIA            | Fort Irwin                      | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar .....                     | 45,000             |                 | 45,000             |
| Army    | COLORADO              | Fort Carson, Colorado           | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar .....                        | 60,000             |                 | 60,000             |
| Army    | COLORADO              | Fort Carson, Colorado           | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar .....                     | 29,000             |                 | 29,000             |
| Army    | GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA  | Guantanamo Bay                  | Dining Facility .....                                    | 12,000             |                 | 12,000             |
| Army    | GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA  | Guantanamo Bay                  | Health Clinic .....                                      | 11,800             |                 | 11,800             |
| Army    | GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA  | Guantanamo Bay                  | High Value Detainee Complex .....                        | 0                  | 69,000          | 69,000             |
| Army    | GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA  | Fort Shafter                    | Command and Control Facility (SCIF) .....                | 96,000             | -13,000         | 83,000             |
| Army    | HAWAII                | Kadena AB                       | Missile Magazine .....                                   | 10,600             |                 | 10,600             |
| Army    | KENTUCKY              | Blue Grass Army Depot           | Shipping and Receiving Building .....                    | 0                  | 15,000          | 15,000             |
| Army    | KENTUCKY              | Fort Campbell, Kentucky         | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar .....                     | 23,000             |                 | 23,000             |
| Army    | NEW YORK              | Fort Drum, New York             | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar .....                     | 27,000             |                 | 27,000             |
| Army    | NEW YORK              | U.S. Military Academy           | Cadet Barracks, Incr 3 .....                             | 58,000             |                 | 58,000             |
| Army    | PENNSYLVANIA          | Letterkenny Army Depot          | Rebuild Shop .....                                       | 16,000             |                 | 16,000             |
| Army    | SOUTH CAROLINA        | Fort Jackson                    | Trainee Barracks Complex 3, Ph1 .....                    | 52,000             |                 | 52,000             |
| Army    | Texas                 | Fort Hood                       | Simulations Center .....                                 | 0                  | 46,000          | 46,000             |
| Army    | VIRGINIA              | Fort Lee                        | Adv. Individual Training Barracks Complex, Phase 3 ..... | 0                  | 86,000          | 86,000             |
| Army    | VIRGINIA              | Joint Base Langley-Eustis       | Tactical Vehicle Hardstand .....                         | 7,700              |                 | 7,700              |
| Army    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Host Nation Support FY15 .....                           | 33,000             |                 | 33,000             |
| Army    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Minor Construction FY15 .....                            | 25,000             |                 | 25,000             |
| Army    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design FY15 .....                           | 18,127             |                 | 18,127             |

| Total Military Construction, Army |                      | 539,427                                       | 203,000 | 742,427 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|---------|---------|
| Navy                              | ARIZONA              | Yuma  |         |         |
| Navy                              | BAHRAIN ISLAND       | SW Asia                                       | 16,608  | 16,608  |
| Navy                              | CALIFORNIA           | Bridgeport                                    | 27,826  | 27,826  |
| Navy                              | CALIFORNIA           | San Diego                                     | 16,180  | 16,180  |
| Navy                              | DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | District Of Columbia                          | 47,110  | 47,110  |
| Navy                              | DJIBOUTI             | Camp Lemonier, Djibouti                       | 31,735  | 31,735  |
| Navy                              | FLORIDA              | Jacksonville                                  | 9,923   | 9,923   |
| Navy                              | FLORIDA              | Jacksonville                                  | 8,583   | 8,583   |
| Navy                              | FLORIDA              | Mayport                                       | 21,652  | 21,652  |
| Navy                              | FLORIDA              | Mayport                                       | 20,520  | 20,520  |
| Navy                              | GUAM                 | Joint Region Marianas                         | 21,880  | 21,880  |
| Navy                              | GUAM                 | Joint Region Marianas                         | 28,771  | 28,771  |
| Navy                              | HAWAII               | Kaneohe Bay                                   | 51,182  | 51,182  |
| Navy                              | HAWAII               | Kaneohe Bay                                   | 2,200   | 2,200   |
| Navy                              | HAWAII               | Pearl Harbor                                  | 9,698   | 9,698   |
| Navy                              | JAPAN                | Iwakuni                                       | 6,415   | 6,415   |
| Navy                              | JAPAN                | Kadena AB                                     | 19,411  | 19,411  |
| Navy                              | JAPAN                | MCAS Futenma                                  | 4,639   | 4,639   |
| Navy                              | JAPAN                | Okinawa                                       | 35,685  | 35,685  |
| Navy                              | MARYLAND             | Annapolis                                     | 120,112 | 100,112 |
| Navy                              | MARYLAND             | Indian Head                                   | 15,346  | 15,346  |
| Navy                              | MARYLAND             | Patuxent River                                | 9,860   | 9,860   |
| Navy                              | NEVADA               | Fallon  | 27,763  | 27,763  |
| Navy                              | NEVADA               | Fallon  | 3,499   | 3,499   |
| Navy                              | NORTH CAROLINA       | Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station         | 41,588  | 41,588  |
| Navy                              | PENNSYLVANIA         | Philadelphia                                  | 23,985  | 23,985  |
| Navy                              | SOUTH CAROLINA       | Charleston                                    | 35,716  | 35,716  |
| Navy                              | SPAIN                | Rota  | 20,233  | 20,233  |
| Navy                              | VIRGINIA             | Dahlgren                                      | 27,313  | 27,313  |
| Navy                              | VIRGINIA             | Norfolk                                       | 39,274  | 39,274  |
|                                   |                      | Aviation Maintenance and Support Complex      |         |         |
|                                   |                      | P-8A Hangar                                   |         |         |
|                                   |                      | E-LMR Communications Towers                   |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Stream Distribution System Decentralization   |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Electronics Science and Technology Laboratory |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Entry Control Point                           |         |         |
|                                   |                      | MH60 Parking Apron                            |         |         |
|                                   |                      | P-8A Runway Thresholds and Taxiways           |         |         |
|                                   |                      | LCS Operational Training Facility             |         |         |
|                                   |                      | GSE Shops at North Ramp                       |         |         |
|                                   |                      | MWSS Facilities at North Ramp                 |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Facility Modifications for VMU, MMSD, & CH53E |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Road and Infrastructure Improvements          |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Submarine Maneuvering Room Trainer Facility   |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Security Mods DPRI MC167-I (CW-5 E2D EA-18G)  |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Aircraft Maint Hangar Alterations and SAP-F   |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Hangar & Rinse Facility Modernizations        |         |         |
|                                   |                      | LHD Practice Site Improvements                |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Center for Cyber Security Studies Building    |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Advanced Energetics Research Lab Complex Ph 2 |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Atlantic Test Range Facility                  |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Air Wing Training Facility                    |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Facility Alteration for F-35 Training Mission |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Water Treatment Plant Replacement             |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Ohio Replacement Power & Propulsion Facility  |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Nuclear Power Operational Support Facility    |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Ship Berthing Power Upgrades                  |         |         |
|                                   |                      | Missile Support Facility                      |         |         |
|                                   |                      | EOD Consolidated Ops & Logistics Facilities   |         |         |

SEC. 4601, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/<br>Country     | Installation                    | Project Title                                       | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Agreement |
|---------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Navy    | VIRGINIA              | Portsmouth                      | Submarine Maintenance Facility .....                | 9,743              |                 | 9,743              |
| Navy    | VIRGINIA              | Quantico                        | Ammunition Supply Point Expansion .....             | 12,613             |                 | 12,613             |
| Navy    | VIRGINIA              | Yorktown                        | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters .....                    | 19,152             |                 | 19,152             |
| Navy    | VIRGINIA              | Yorktown                        | FAST Company Training Facility .....                | 7,836              |                 | 7,836              |
| Navy    | WASHINGTON            | Bremerton                       | Integrated Water Treatment Syst. DD 1, 2, & 5 ..... | 16,401             |                 | 16,401             |
| Navy    | WASHINGTON            | Kitsap                          | Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (INC) .....            | 83,778             |                 | 83,778             |
| Navy    | WASHINGTON            | Port Angeles                    | TPS Port Angeles Forward Operating Location .....   | 20,638             |                 | 20,638             |
| Navy    | WASHINGTON            | Whidbey Island                  | P-8A Aircraft Apron and Supporting Facilities ..... | 24,390             |                 | 24,390             |
| Navy    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | F-35C Facility Addition and Modification .....      | 16,594             |                 | 16,594             |
| Navy    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | F-35C Operational Training Facility .....           | 22,391             |                 | 22,391             |
| Navy    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | MCON Design Funds .....                             | 33,366             |                 | 33,366             |
| Navy    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction .....                | 7,163              |                 | 7,163              |
|         |                       |                                 | <b>Total Military Construction, Navy .....</b>      | <b>1,018,772</b>   | <b>-20,000</b>  | <b>998,772</b>     |
| AF      | ALASKA                | Clear AFS                       | Emergency Power Plant Fuel Storage .....            | 11,500             |                 | 11,500             |
| AF      | ARIZONA               | Luke AFB                        | F-35 Aircraft Mx Hangar—Sqdn #2 .....               | 11,200             |                 | 11,200             |
| AF      | ARIZONA               | Luke AFB                        | F-35 Flightline Filistands .....                    | 15,600             |                 | 15,600             |
| AF      | GUAM                  | Joint Region Marianas           | Guam Strike Fuel Systems Maint.Hangar Inc 2 .....   | 64,000             |                 | 64,000             |
| AF      | GUAM                  | Joint Region Marianas           | PRTC—Combat Comm Infrastr Facility .....            | 3,750              |                 | 3,750              |
| AF      | GUAM                  | Joint Region Marianas           | PRTC—RED HORSE Logistics Facility .....             | 3,150              |                 | 3,150              |
| AF      | GUAM                  | Joint Region Marianas           | PRTC—Satellite Fire Station .....                   | 6,500              |                 | 6,500              |
| AF      | KANSAS                | McConnell AFB                   | KC-46A ADAL Mobility Bag Strg Expansion .....       | 2,300              |                 | 2,300              |
| AF      | KANSAS                | McConnell AFB                   | KC-46A ADAL Regional Mx Tng Facility .....          | 16,100             |                 | 16,100             |
| AF      | KANSAS                | McConnell AFB                   | KC-46A Alter Composite Mx Shop .....                | 4,100              |                 | 4,100              |
| AF      | KANSAS                | McConnell AFB                   | KC-46A Alter Taxiway Foxtrot .....                  | 5,500              |                 | 5,500              |
| AF      | KANSAS                | McConnell AFB                   | KC-46A Fuselage Trainer .....                       | 6,400              |                 | 6,400              |
| AF      | MARYLAND              | Fort Meade                      | CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center, Increment 2 ....  | 166,000            |                 | 166,000            |



|    |   |                                  |   |                |                |
|----|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| AF | MASSACHUSETTS                                 | Hanscom AFB                      | Dormitory (72 RM)                       | 13,500         | 13,500         |
| AF | NEBRASKA                                      | Offutt AFB                       | USSTRATCOM Replacement Facility- Incr 4 | 180,000        | 180,000        |
| AF | NEVADA  | Nellis AFB                       | F-22 Flight Simulator Facility          | 14,000         | 14,000         |
| AF | NEVADA  | Nellis AFB                       | F-35 Aircraft Mx Unit—4 Bay Hangar      | 31,000         | 31,000         |
| AF | NEVADA  | Nellis AFB                       | F-35 Weapons School Facility            | 8,900          | 8,900          |
| AF | NEW JERSEY                                    | Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | Fire Station                            | 5,900          | 5,900          |
| AF | OKLAHOMA                                      | Tinker AFB                       | KC-46A Depot Maint Complex Spt Infrastr | 48,000         | 48,000         |
| AF | OKLAHOMA                                      | Tinker AFB                       | KC-46A Two-Bay Depot Mx Hangar          | 63,000         | 63,000         |
| AF | TEXAS   | Joint Base San Antonio           | Fire Station                            | 5,800          | 5,800          |
| AF | UNITED KINGDOM                                | Croughton RAF                    | JAC Consolidation—Phase 1               | 92,223         | 92,223         |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                         | Various Worldwide Locations      | Planning and Design                     | 10,738         | 10,738         |
| AF | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                         | Various Worldwide Locations      | Unspecified Minor Military Construction | 22,613         | 22,613         |
|    | <b>Total Military Construction, Air Force</b> |                                  |   | <b>811,774</b> | <b>811,774</b> |

463

|          |                      |                                |   |         |         |
|----------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------|---------|
| Def-Wide | ARIZONA              | Fort Huachuca                  | JTC Building 52120 Renovation                 | 1,871   | 1,871   |
| Def-Wide | AUSTRALIA            | Geraldton                      | Combined Communications Gateway Geraldton     | 9,600   | 9,600   |
| Def-Wide | BELGIUM              | Brussels                       | Brussels Elementary/High School Replacement   | 41,626  | 41,626  |
| Def-Wide | BELGIUM              | Brussels                       | NATO Headquarters Facility                    | 37,918  | 37,918  |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA           | Camp Pendleton, California     | SOF Comm/Elec Maintenance Facility            | 11,841  | 11,841  |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA           | Coronado                       | SOF Logistics Support Unit 1 Ops Facility #1  | 41,740  | 41,740  |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA           | Coronado                       | SOF Support Activity Ops Facility #2          | 28,600  | 28,600  |
| Def-Wide | CALIFORNIA           | Lemoore                        | Replace Fuel Storage & Distribution Fac.      | 52,500  | 52,500  |
| Def-Wide | COLORADO             | Peterson AFB                   | Dental Clinic Replacement                     | 15,200  | 15,200  |
| Def-Wide | CONUS                | Various Locations              | East Coast Missile Site Planning and Design   | 0       | 20,000  |
| Def-Wide | CONUS CLASSIFIED     | Classified Location            | SOF Skills Training Facility                  | 53,073  | 53,073  |
| Def-Wide | GEORGIA              | Hunter Army Airfield           | SOF Company Operations Facility               | 7,692   | 7,692   |
| Def-Wide | GEORGIA              | Robins AFB                     | Replace Hydrant Fuel System                   | 19,900  | 19,900  |
| Def-Wide | GERMANY              | Rhine Ordnance Barracks        | Medical Center Replacement Incr 4             | 259,695 | 189,695 |
| Def-Wide | GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA | Guantanamo Bay                 | Replace Fuel Tank                             | 11,100  | 11,100  |
| Def-Wide | GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA | Guantanamo Bay                 | W.T. Sampson E/M and HS Consolid./Replacement | 65,190  | 65,190  |
| Def-Wide | HAWAII               | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | Replace Fuel Tanks                            | 3,000   | 3,000   |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account  | State/<br>Country | Installation                    | Project Title                                       | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Agreement |
|----------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Def-Wide | HAWAII            | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam  | Upgrade Fire Suppression & Ventilation Sys. ....    | 49,900             |                 | 49,900             |
| Def-Wide | JAPAN             | Misawa AB                       | Edgren High School Renovation .....                 | 37,775             |                 | 37,775             |
| Def-Wide | JAPAN             | Okinawa                         | Killin Elementary Replacement/Renovation .....      | 71,481             |                 | 71,481             |
| Def-Wide | JAPAN             | Okinawa                         | Kubasaki High School Replacement/Renovation .....   | 99,420             |                 | 99,420             |
| Def-Wide | JAPAN             | Sasebo                          | E.J. King High School Replacement/Renovation .....  | 37,681             |                 | 37,681             |
| Def-Wide | KENTUCKY          | Fort Campbell, Kentucky         | SOF System Integration Maintenance Office Fac ..... | 18,000             |                 | 18,000             |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND          | Fort Meade                      | NSAW Campus Feeders Phase 1 .....                   | 54,207             |                 | 54,207             |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND          | Fort Meade                      | NSAW Recapitalize Building #1/Site M Inc 3 .....    | 45,521             |                 | 45,521             |
| Def-Wide | MARYLAND          | Joint Base Andrews              | Construct Hydrant Fuel System .....                 | 18,300             |                 | 18,300             |
| Def-Wide | MICHIGAN          | Selfridge Angb                  | Replace Fuel Distribution Facilities .....          | 35,100             |                 | 35,100             |
| Def-Wide | MISSISSIPPI       | Stennis                         | SOF Applied Instruction Facility .....              | 10,323             |                 | 10,323             |
| Def-Wide | MISSISSIPPI       | Stennis                         | SOF Land Acquisition Western Maneuver Area .....    | 17,224             |                 | 17,224             |
| Def-Wide | NEVADA            | Fallon                          | SOF Tactical Ground Mob. Vehicle Maint Fac. ....    | 20,241             |                 | 20,241             |
| Def-Wide | NEW MEXICO        | Cannon AFB                      | SOF Squadron Operations Facility (STS) .....        | 23,333             |                 | 23,333             |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA    | Camp Lejeune, North Carolina    | Lejeune High School Addition/Renovation .....       | 41,306             |                 | 41,306             |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA    | Camp Lejeune, North Carolina    | SOF Intel/Ops Expansion .....                       | 11,442             |                 | 11,442             |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA    | Fort Bragg                      | SOF Battalion Operations Facility .....             | 37,074             |                 | 37,074             |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA    | Fort Bragg                      | SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility .....   | 8,000              |                 | 8,000              |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA    | Fort Bragg                      | SOF Training Command Building .....                 | 48,062             |                 | 48,062             |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA    | Seymour Johnson AFB             | Replace Hydrant Fuel System .....                   | 8,500              |                 | 8,500              |
| Def-Wide | NORTH CAROLINA    | Beaufort                        | Replace Fuel Distribution Facilities .....          | 40,600             |                 | 40,600             |
| Def-Wide | SOUTH CAROLINA    | Ellsworth AFB                   | Construct Hydrant System .....                      | 8,000              |                 | 8,000              |
| Def-Wide | SOUTH DAKOTA      | Ellsworth AFB                   | Hospital Replacement Incr 6 .....                   | 131,500            | 70,000          | 201,500            |
| Def-Wide | TEXAS             | Fort Bliss                      | Medical Clinic Replacement .....                    | 38,300             |                 | 38,300             |
| Def-Wide | TEXAS             | Joint Base San Antonio          | Replace & Alter Fuel Distribution Facilities .....  | 36,500             |                 | 36,500             |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA          | Craney Island                   | Replace Access Control Point .....                  | 5,700              |                 | 5,700              |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA          | Def Distribution Depot Richmond | Parking Lot .....                                   | 7,239              |                 | 7,239              |
| Def-Wide | VIRGINIA          | Fort Belvoir                    |   |                    |                 |                    |

|            |                       |  |  |                  |                |
|------------|-----------------------|--|--|------------------|----------------|
| Def-Wide   | VIRGINIA              | Joint Base Langley-Eustis                                    | Hospital Addition/CUP Replacement      | 41,200           | 41,200         |
| Def-Wide   | VIRGINIA              | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story                  | SOF Human Performance Center           | 11,200           | 11,200         |
| Def-Wide   | VIRGINIA              | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story                  | SOF Indoor Dynamic Range               | 14,888           | 14,888         |
| Def-Wide   | VIRGINIA              | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story                  | SOF Mobile Comm Det Support Facility   | 13,500           | 13,500         |
| Def-Wide   | VIRGINIA              | Pentagon   | Redundant Chilled Water Loop           | 15,100           | 15,100         |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Contingency Construction               | 9,000            | 0              |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | ECIP Design                            | 10,000           | -9,000         |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Energy Conservation Investment Program | 150,000          | 10,000         |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Exercise Related Minor Construction    | 8,581            | 150,000        |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Planning and Design                    | 745              | 8,581          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Planning and Design                    | 38,704           | 745            |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Planning and Design                    | 1,183            | 18,704         |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Planning and Design                    | 42,387           | 1,183          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Planning and Design                    | 599              | 42,387         |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Planning and Design                    | 24,425           | 599            |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Unspecified Minor Construction         | 5,932            | 4,425          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Unspecified Minor Construction         | 6,846            | 5,932          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Unspecified Minor Construction         | 10,334           | 6,846          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Unspecified Minor Construction         | 2,700            | 10,334         |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Unspecified Minor Construction         | 2,000            | 2,700          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Unspecified Minor Construction         | 4,100            | 2,000          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations                              | Unspecified Minor Milcon               | 2,994            | 4,100          |
| Def-Wide   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Various Worldwide Locations                                  | Planning and Design                    | 24,197           | 2,994          |
|            |                       | <b>Total Military Construction, Defense-Wide</b>             |  | <b>2,061,890</b> | <b>-29,000</b> |
| Chem Demil | KENTUCKY              | Blue Grass Army Depot  | Ammunition Demilitarization Ph XV      | 38,715           | 38,715         |
|            |                       | <b>Total Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense</b> |  | <b>38,715</b>    | <b>0</b>       |

**SEC. 4601, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account   | State/<br>Country     | Installation                      | Project Title                           | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Agreement |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| NATO  | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Nato Security Investment Pro-gram | Nato Security Investment Program        | 199,700            |                 | 199,700            |
| <b>Total NATO Security Investment Program</b> ..... <b>199,700</b> <b>0</b> <b>199,700</b>                |                       |                                   |   |                    |                 |                    |
| Army NG   | DELAWARE              | Dagsboro                          | National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop | 0                  | 10,800          | 10,800             |
| Army NG   | MAINE                 | Augusta                           | National Guard Reserve Center           | 30,000             |                 | 30,000             |
| Army NG   | MARYLAND              | Havre De Grace                    | National Guard Readiness Center         | 12,400             |                 | 12,400             |
| Army NG   | MONTANA               | Helena                            | National Guard Readiness Center Add/Alt | 38,000             |                 | 38,000             |
| Army NG   | NEW MEXICO            | Alamogordo                        | National Guard Readiness Center         | 0                  | 5,000           | 5,000              |
| Army NG   | NORTH DAKOTA          | Valley City                       | National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop | 10,800             |                 | 10,800             |
| Army NG   | VERMONT               | North Hyde Park                   | National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop | 4,400              |                 | 4,400              |
| Army NG   | WASHINGTON            | Yakima                            | Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training   | 0                  | 19,000          | 19,000             |
| Army NG   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations   | Planning and Design                     | 17,600             |                 | 17,600             |
| Army NG   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations   | Unspecified Minor Construction          | 13,720             |                 | 13,720             |
| <b>Total Military Construction, Army National Guard</b> ..... <b>126,920</b> <b>34,800</b> <b>161,720</b> |                       |                                   |   |                    |                 |                    |
| Army Res  | CALIFORNIA            | Fresno                            | Army Reserve Center/AMSA                | 22,000             |                 | 22,000             |
| Army Res  | CALIFORNIA            | March (Riverside)                 | Army Reserve Center                     | 0                  | 25,000          | 25,000             |
| Army Res  | COLORADO              | Fort Carson, Colorado             | Training Building Addition              | 5,000              |                 | 5,000              |
| Army Res  | ILLINOIS              | Arlington Heights                 | Army Reserve Center                     | 0                  | 26,000          | 26,000             |
| Army Res  | MISSISSIPPI           | Starkville                        | Army Reserve Center                     | 0                  | 9,300           | 9,300              |
| Army Res  | NEW JERSEY            | Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst  | Army Reserve Center                     | 26,000             |                 | 26,000             |
| Army Res  | NEW YORK              | Matthdale                         | Army Reserve Center/AMSA                | 23,000             |                 | 23,000             |
| Army Res  | VIRGINIA              | Fort Lee                          | TASS Training Center                    | 16,000             |                 | 16,000             |
| Army Res  | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations   | Planning and Design                     | 8,337              |                 | 8,337              |
| Army Res  | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations   | Unspecified Minor Construction          | 3,609              |                 | 3,609              |

|             |   | Total Military Construction, Army Reserve |  | 103,946       | 60,300   | 164,246       |
|-------------|---|---|--|---------------|----------|---------------|
| N/MC Res    | PEENNSYLVANIA   | Pittsburgh                                | Reserve Training Center—Pittsburgh, PA         | 17,650        |          | 17,650        |
| N/MC Res    | WASHINGTON  | Whidbey Island                            | C-40 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar               | 27,755        |          | 27,755        |
| N/MC Res    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED   | Unspecified Worldwide Locations           | MCMR Planning & Design                         | 2,123         |          | 2,123         |
| N/MC Res    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED   | Unspecified Worldwide Locations           | MCMR Unspecified Minor Construction            | 4,000         |          | 4,000         |
|             | <b>Total Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps Reserve</b> |   |  | <b>51,528</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>51,528</b> |
| Air NG      | CONNECTICUT   | Bradley IAP                               | Construct C-130 Fuel Cell and Corrosion Contr  | 16,306        |          | 16,306        |
| Air NG      | IOWA  | Des Moines Map                            | REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT AND TARGETING GROUP. | 8,993         |          | 8,993         |
| Air NG      | MICHIGAN  | W. K. Kellogg Regional Airport            | RPA Beddown                                    | 6,000         |          | 6,000         |
| Air NG      | NEW HAMPSHIRE   | Pease International Trade Port            | KC-46A ADAL Airfield Pavements & Hydrant Syst  | 7,100         |          | 7,100         |
| Air NG      | NEW HAMPSHIRE   | Pease International Trade Port            | KC-46A ADAL Fuel Cell Building 253             | 16,800        |          | 16,800        |
| Air NG      | NEW HAMPSHIRE   | Pease International Trade Port            | KC-46A ADAL Maint Hangar Building 254          | 18,002        |          | 18,002        |
| Air NG      | PENNSYLVANIA  | Willow Grove ARF                          | RPA Operations Center                          | 5,662         |          | 5,662         |
| Air NG      | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED   | Various Worldwide Locations               | Planning and Design                            | 7,700         |          | 7,700         |
| Air NG      | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED   | Various Worldwide Locations               | Unspecified Minor Construction                 | 8,100         |          | 8,100         |
|             | <b>Total Military Construction, Air National Guard</b>            |   |  | <b>94,663</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>94,663</b> |
| AF Res      | GEORGIA   | Robins AFB                                | AFRC Consolidated Mission Complex, Ph 1        | 27,700        |          | 27,700        |
| AF Res      | NORTH CAROLINA  | Seymour Johnson AFB                       | KC-135 Tanker Parking Apron Expansion          | 9,800         |          | 9,800         |
| AF Res      | TEXAS   | Fort Worth                                | EOD Facility                                   | 3,700         |          | 3,700         |
| AF Res      | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED   | Various Worldwide Locations               | Planning and Design                            | 6,892         |          | 6,892         |
| AF Res      | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED   | Various Worldwide Locations               | Unspecified Minor Military Construction        | 1,400         |          | 1,400         |
|             | <b>Total Military Construction, Air Force Reserve</b>             |   |  | <b>49,492</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>49,492</b> |
| FH Con Army | ILLINOIS  | Rock Island                               | Family Housing New Construction                | 19,500        |          | 19,500        |
| FH Con Army | KOREA   | Camp Walker                               | Family Housing New Construction                | 57,800        |          | 57,800        |
| FH Con Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED   | Unspecified Worldwide Locations           | Family Housing P & D                           | 1,309         |          | 1,309         |
|             | <b>Total Family Housing Construction, Army</b>                    |   |  | <b>78,609</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>78,609</b> |

**SEC. 4601, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account     | State/<br>Country     | Installation                    | Project Title   | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Agreement |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings   | 14,136             |                 | 14,136             |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leased Housing  | 112,504            |                 | 112,504            |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance of Real Property Facilities                         | 65,245             |                 | 65,245             |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account  | 43,480             |                 | 43,480             |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account  | 3,117              |                 | 3,117              |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Military Housing Privatization Initiative                       | 20,000             |                 | 20,000             |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Miscellaneous   | 700                |                 | 700                |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Services  | 9,108              |                 | 9,108              |
| FH Ops Army | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities   | 82,686             |                 | 82,686             |
|             |                       |                                 | <b>Total Family Housing Operation &amp; Maintenance, Army</b>   | <b>350,976</b>     | <b>0</b>        | <b>350,976</b>     |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account   | 38,543             |                 | 38,543             |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Housing Privatization   | 40,761             |                 | 40,761             |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing   | 43,651             |                 | 43,651             |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Maintenance   | 99,934             |                 | 99,934             |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Management Account  | 47,834             |                 | 47,834             |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Miscellaneous Account   | 1,993              |                 | 1,993              |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Services Account  | 12,709             |                 | 12,709             |
| FH Ops AF   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Utilities Account   | 42,322             |                 | 42,322             |
|             |                       |                                 | <b>Total Family Housing Construction, Air Force</b>             | <b>327,747</b>     | <b>0</b>        | <b>327,747</b>     |
| FH Con Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Design  | 472                |                 | 472                |
| FH Con Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Improvements  | 15,940             |                 | 15,940             |
|             |                       |                                 | <b>Total Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps</b> | <b>16,412</b>      | <b>0</b>        | <b>16,412</b>      |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Furnishings Account   | 17,881             |                 | 17,881             |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Leasing   | 65,999             |                 | 65,999             |

|             |  |                                  |  |                |          |
|-------------|--|----------------------------------|--|----------------|----------|
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Maintenance of Real Property             | 97,612         | 97,612   |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Management Account                       | 55,124         | 55,124   |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Miscellaneous Account                    | 366            | 366      |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Privatization Support Costs              | 27,876         | 27,876   |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Services Account                         | 18,079         | 18,079   |
| FH Ops Navy | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Utilities Account                        | 71,092         | 71,092   |
|             | <b>Total Family Housing Operation &amp; Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps</b> |                                  |  | <b>354,029</b> | <b>0</b> |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Furnishings Account                      | 3,362          | 3,362    |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Furnishings Account                      | 20             | 20       |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Furnishings Account                      | 746            | 746      |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Leasing                                  | 11,179         | 11,179   |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Leasing                                  | 42,083         | 42,083   |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Maintenance of Real Property             | 2,128          | 2,128    |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Maintenance of Real Property             | 344            | 344      |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Management Account                       | 378            | 378      |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Services Account                         | 31             | 31       |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Utilities Account                        | 170            | 170      |
| FH Ops DW   | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Utilities Account                        | 659            | 659      |
|             | <b>Total Family Housing Operation &amp; Maintenance, Defense-Wide</b>          |                                  |  | <b>61,100</b>  | <b>0</b> |
| FHIF        | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | Family Housing Improvement Fund          | 1,662          | 1,662    |
|             | <b>Total DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund</b>                               |                                  |  | <b>1,662</b>   | <b>0</b> |
| BRAC        | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Base Realignment & Closure, Army | Base Realignment and Closure             | 84,417         | 84,417   |
| BRAC        | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Base Realignment & Closure, Navy | Base Realignment & Closure               | 57,406         | 57,406   |
| BRAC        | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | DoD BRAC Activities—Air Force            | 90,976         | 90,976   |
| BRAC        | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | DON-100: Planning, Design and Management | 7,682          | 7,682    |
| BRAC        | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | DON-101: Various Locations               | 21,416         | 21,416   |
| BRAC        | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED  | Unspecified Worldwide Locations  | DON-138: NAS Brunswick, ME               | 904            | 904      |

**SEC. 4601, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/<br>Country                                 | Installation                    | Project Title                             | FY 2015<br>Request | House<br>Change | House<br>Agreement |
|---------|---|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| BRAC    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                             | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-157: MCSA Kansas City, MO             | 40                 |                 | 40                 |
| BRAC    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                             | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA      | 6,066              |                 | 6,066              |
| BRAC    | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                             | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP | 1,178              |                 | 1,178              |
|         | <b>Total Base Realignment and Closure Account</b> |                                 |   | <b>270,085</b>     | <b>0</b>        | <b>270,085</b>     |
| PYS     | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                             | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | 42 USC 3374                               | 0                  | -100,000        | -100,000           |
| PYS     | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                             | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Army                                      | 0                  | -79,577         | -79,577            |
| PYS     | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                             | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | NATO Security Investment Program          | 0                  | -25,000         | -25,000            |
|         | <b>Total Prior Year Savings</b>                   |                                 |   | <b>0</b>           | <b>-204,577</b> | <b>-204,577</b>    |
| GR      | WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED                             | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | General Reductions                        | 0                  | -69,000         | -69,000            |
|         | <b>Total General Reductions</b>                   |                                 |   | <b>0</b>           | <b>-69,000</b>  | <b>-69,000</b>     |
|         | <b>Total Military Construction</b>                |                                 |   | <b>6,557,447</b>   | <b>-24,477</b>  | <b>6,532,970</b>   |



# 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 2015<br>Request | House Change    | House<br>Authorized |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <b>Discretionary Summary By Appropriation</b>                    |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies</b>        |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>Appropriation Summary:</b>                                    |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>Energy Programs</b>   |                    |                 |                     |
| Nuclear Energy .....   | 104,000            |                 | 104,000             |
| <b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>                          |                    |                 |                     |
| <b>National nuclear security administration:</b>                 |                    |                 |                     |
| Weapons activities .....   | 8,314,902          | 147,700         | 8,462,602           |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....                           | 1,555,156          | 10,000          | 1,565,156           |
| Naval reactors .....   | 1,377,100          | 10,000          | 1,387,100           |
| Federal salaries and expenses .....                              | 410,842            | -24,000         | 386,842             |
| <b>Total, National nuclear security administration .....</b>     | <b>11,658,000</b>  | <b>143,700</b>  | <b>11,801,700</b>   |
| <b>Environmental and other defense activities:</b>               |                    |                 |                     |
| Defense environmental cleanup .....                              | 5,327,538          | -457,000        | 4,870,538           |
| Other defense activities .....                                   | 753,000            | 5,300           | 758,300             |
| <b>Total, Environmental &amp; other defense activities .....</b> | <b>6,080,538</b>   | <b>-451,700</b> | <b>5,628,838</b>    |
| <b>Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities .....</b>             | <b>17,738,538</b>  | <b>-308,000</b> | <b>17,430,538</b>   |

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program   | FY 2015 Request   | House Change    | House Authorized  |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Total, Discretionary Funding</b> .....           | <b>17,842,538</b> | <b>-308,000</b> | <b>17,534,538</b> |
| <b>Nuclear Energy</b>                               |                   |                 |                   |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security .....        | 104,000           |                 | 104,000           |
| <b>Weapons Activities</b>                           |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Directed stockpile work</b>                      |                   |                 |                   |
| <b>Life extension programs</b>                      |                   |                 |                   |
| B61 Life extension program .....                    | 643,000           |                 | 643,000           |
| W76 Life extension program .....                    | 259,168           | 14,600          | 273,768           |
| W88 Alt 370 .....                                   | 165,400           | 1,200           | 166,600           |
| Cruise missile warhead life extension program ..... | 9,418             | 7,600           | 17,018            |
| <b>Total, Life extension programs</b> .....         | <b>1,076,986</b>  | <b>23,400</b>   | <b>1,100,386</b>  |
| <b>Stockpile systems</b>                            |                   |                 |                   |
| B61 Stockpile systems .....                         | 109,615           |                 | 109,615           |
| W76 Stockpile systems .....                         | 45,728            |                 | 45,728            |
| W78 Stockpile systems .....                         | 62,703            | 3,700           | 66,403            |
| W80 Stockpile systems .....                         | 70,610            |                 | 70,610            |
| B83 Stockpile systems .....                         | 63,136            |                 | 63,136            |
| W87 Stockpile systems .....                         | 91,255            |                 | 91,255            |
| W88 Stockpile systems .....                         | 88,060            |                 | 88,060            |
| <b>Total, Stockpile systems</b> .....               | <b>531,107</b>    | <b>3,700</b>    | <b>534,807</b>    |
| <b>Weapons dismantlement and disposition</b>        |                   |                 |                   |
| Operations and maintenance .....                    | 30,008            |                 | 30,008            |

|   |                  |               |                  |  |
|---|------------------|---------------|------------------|--|
| <b>Stockpile services</b>   |                  |               |                  |  |
| Production support .....  | 350,942          | 12,300        | 363,242          |  |
| Research and development support .....                              | 29,649           |               | 29,649           |  |
| R&D certification and safety .....                                  | 201,479          | 11,000        | 212,479          |  |
| Management, technology, and production .....                        | 241,805          |               | 241,805          |  |
| Plutonium sustainment .....   | 144,575          | 28,300        | 172,875          |  |
| Tritium readiness .....   | 140,053          |               | 140,053          |  |
| <b>Total, Stockpile services</b> .....                              | <b>1,106,503</b> | <b>51,600</b> | <b>1,160,103</b> |  |
| <b>Total, Directed stockpile work</b> .....                         | <b>2,746,604</b> | <b>78,700</b> | <b>2,825,304</b> |  |
| <b>Campaigns:</b>   |                  |               |                  |  |
| <b>Science campaign</b>   |                  |               |                  |  |
| Advanced certification .....  | 58,747           |               | 58,747           |  |
| Primary assessment technologies .....                               | 112,000          |               | 112,000          |  |
| Dynamic materials properties .....                                  | 117,999          |               | 117,999          |  |
| Advanced radiography .....  | 79,340           |               | 79,340           |  |
| Secondary assessment technologies .....                             | 88,344           |               | 88,344           |  |
| <b>Total, Science campaign</b> .....                                | <b>456,430</b>   |               | <b>456,430</b>   |  |
| <b>Engineering campaign</b>   |                  |               |                  |  |
| Enhanced surety .....   | 52,003           | 2,400         | 54,403           |  |
| Weapon systems engineering assessment technology .....              | 20,832           |               | 20,832           |  |
| Nuclear survivability .....   | 25,371           |               | 25,371           |  |
| Enhanced surveillance .....   | 37,799           | 3,600         | 41,399           |  |
| <b>Total, Engineering campaign</b> .....                            | <b>136,005</b>   | <b>6,000</b>  | <b>142,005</b>   |  |
| <b>Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign</b> |                  |               |                  |  |
| Ignition .....  | 77,994           | 0             | 77,994           |  |
| Support of other stockpile programs .....                           | 23,598           |               | 23,598           |  |
| Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support .....              | 61,297           |               | 61,297           |  |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion .....                      | 5,024            |               | 5,024            |  |
| Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas .....       | 9,100            |               | 9,100            |  |

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program   | FY 2015<br>Request | House Change  | House<br>Authorized |
|---|--------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Facility operations and target production .....                         | 335,882            |               | 335,882             |
| <b>Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign .....</b> | <b>512,895</b>     |               | <b>512,895</b>      |
| Advanced simulation and computing campaign .....                        | 610,108            |               | 610,108             |
| Nonnuclear Readiness Campaign .....                                     | 125,909            |               | 125,909             |
| <b>Total, Campaigns .....</b>   | <b>1,841,347</b>   | <b>6,000</b>  | <b>1,847,347</b>    |
| <b>Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)</b>                |                    |               |                     |
| <b>Operations of facilities</b>   |                    |               |                     |
| Kansas City Plant .....   | 125,000            |               | 125,000             |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory .....                            | 71,000             |               | 71,000              |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory .....                                    | 198,000            |               | 198,000             |
| Nevada National Security Site .....                                     | 89,000             |               | 89,000              |
| Pantex .....  | 75,000             |               | 75,000              |
| Sandia National Laboratory .....  | 106,000            |               | 106,000             |
| Savannah River Site .....   | 81,000             |               | 81,000              |
| Y-12 National security complex .....                                    | 151,000            |               | 151,000             |
| <b>Total, Operations of facilities .....</b>                            | <b>896,000</b>     |               | <b>896,000</b>      |
| Program readiness .....   | 136,700            |               | 136,700             |
| Material recycle and recovery .....                                     | 138,900            |               | 138,900             |
| Containers .....  | 26,000             |               | 26,000              |
| Storage .....   | 40,800             |               | 40,800              |
| Maintenance and repair of facilities .....                              | 205,000            | 15,000        | 220,000             |
| Recapitalization .....  | 209,321            | 39,000        | 248,321             |
| <b>Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities .....</b>       | <b>756,721</b>     | <b>54,000</b> | <b>810,721</b>      |

|  |                |                  |
|--|----------------|------------------|
| <b>Construction:</b>   |                |                  |
| 15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12 .....                                 | 2,000          | 2,000            |
| 15-D-612 Emergency Operations Center, LLNL .....                                 | 2,000          | 2,000            |
| 15-D-611 Emergency Operations Center, SNL .....                                  | 4,000          | 4,000            |
| 15-D-301 HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX .....                             | 11,800         | 11,800           |
| 15-D-302, TA-55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL .....                        | 16,062         | 16,062           |
| 12-D-301 TRU waste facilities, LANL .....  | 6,938          | 6,938            |
| 11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL .....                          | 10,000         | 10,000           |
| 07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL ..... | 15,000         | 15,000           |
| 06-D-141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y-12 .....   | 335,000        | 335,000          |
| <b>Total, Construction</b> .....   | <b>402,800</b> | <b>402,800</b>   |
| <b>Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities</b> .....                   | <b>54,000</b>  | <b>2,109,521</b> |
| <b>Secure transportation asset</b>   |                |                  |
| Operations and equipment .....   | 132,851        | 132,851          |
| Program direction .....  | 100,962        | 100,962          |
| <b>Total, Secure transportation asset</b> .....                                  | <b>233,813</b> | <b>233,813</b>   |
| Nuclear counterterrorism incident response .....                                 | 173,440        | 182,440          |
| Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs .....                         | 76,901         | 76,901           |
| <b>Site stewardship</b>  |                |                  |
| Environmental projects and operations .....                                      | 53,000         | 53,000           |
| Nuclear materials integration .....  | 16,218         | 16,218           |
| Minority serving institution partnerships program .....                          | 13,231         | 13,231           |
| <b>Total, Site stewardship</b> .....   | <b>82,449</b>  | <b>82,449</b>    |
| <b>Defense nuclear security</b>  |                |                  |
| Operations and maintenance .....   | 618,123        | 618,123          |
| <b>Total, Defense nuclear security</b> .....                                     | <b>618,123</b> | <b>618,123</b>   |

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program  | FY 2015 Request  | House Change   | House Authorized |
|--|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Information technology and cybersecurity .....                           | 179,646          |                | 179,646          |
| Legacy contractor pensions .....   | 307,058          |                | 307,058          |
| <b>Total, Weapons Activities</b> .....                                   | <b>8,314,902</b> | <b>147,700</b> | <b>8,462,602</b> |
| <b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>                                  |                  |                |                  |
| <b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs</b>                         |                  |                |                  |
| Global threat reduction initiative .....                                 | 333,488          | 80,000         | 413,488          |
| <b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&amp;D</b>                          |                  |                |                  |
| Operations and maintenance .....   | 360,808          | 70,000         | 430,808          |
| Nonproliferation and international security .....                        | 141,359          | 36,400         | 177,759          |
| International material protection and cooperation .....                  | 305,467          | -176,400       | 129,067          |
| <b>Fissile materials disposition</b>                                     |                  |                |                  |
| <b>U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition</b>                        |                  |                |                  |
| Operations and maintenance   |                  |                |                  |
| U.S. plutonium disposition .....   | 85,000           |                | 85,000           |
| U.S. uranium disposition .....   | 25,000           |                | 25,000           |
| <b>Total, Operations and maintenance</b> .....                           | <b>110,000</b>   |                | <b>110,000</b>   |
| <b>Construction:</b>   |                  |                |                  |
| 99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC ..... | 196,000          | 0              | 196,000          |
| 99-D-141-02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC .....      | 5,125            |                | 5,125            |

|  |           |           |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Total, Construction .....  | 201,125   | 201,125   |
| Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition .....  | 311,125   | 311,125   |
| Russian surplus fillite materials disposition .....  |           |           |
| Total, Fissile materials disposition .....   | 311,125   | 311,125   |
| Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs .....   | 1,452,247 | 1,462,247 |
| Legacy contractor pensions .....   | 102,909   | 102,909   |
| Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....  | 1,555,156 | 1,565,156 |
| <b>Naval Reactors</b>  |           |           |
| Naval reactors operations and infrastructure .....   | 412,380   | 422,380   |
| Naval reactors development .....   | 425,700   | 425,700   |
| Ohio replacement reactor systems development .....   | 156,100   | 156,100   |
| S8G Prototype refueling .....  | 126,400   | 126,400   |
| Program direction .....  | 46,600    | 46,600    |
| <b>Construction:</b>   |           |           |
| 15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3 .....  | 400       | 400       |
| 15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade .....  | 600       | 600       |
| 15-D-902 KS Engine room team trainer facility .....  | 1,500     | 1,500     |
| 15-D-901 KS Central office building and prototype staff facility .....                               | 24,000    | 24,000    |
| 14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF .....                                     | 141,100   | 141,100   |
| 13-D-905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL .....  | 14,420    | 14,420    |
| 13-D-904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO .....  | 20,100    | 20,100    |
| 10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL .....  | 7,400     | 7,400     |
| 08-D-190 Expedient Core Facility M-290 receiving/discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID ..... | 400       | 400       |
| Total, Construction .....  | 209,920   | 209,920   |
| Total, Naval Reactors .....  | 1,377,100 | 1,387,100 |
| <b>Federal Salaries And Expenses</b>   |           |           |
| Program direction .....  | 410,842   | 386,842   |
|  |           | -24,000   |

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program   | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| <b>Total, Office Of The Administrator</b> .....   | 410,842         | -24,000      | 386,842          |
| <b>Defense Environmental Cleanup</b>              |                 |              |                  |
| <b>Closure sites:</b>                             |                 |              |                  |
| Closure sites administration .....                | 4,889           |              | 4,889            |
| <b>Hanford site:</b>                              |                 |              |                  |
| River corridor and other cleanup operations ..... | 332,788         |              | 332,788          |
| <b>Central plateau remediation:</b>               |                 |              |                  |
| Central plateau remediation .....                 | 474,292         |              | 474,292          |
| <b>Construction:</b>                              |                 |              |                  |
| 15-D-401 Contaminized sludge (RI-0012) .....      | 26,290          |              | 26,290           |
| <b>Total, Central plateau remediation</b> .....   | 500,582         |              | 500,582          |
| Richland community and regulatory support .....   | 14,701          |              | 14,701           |
| <b>Total, Hanford site</b> .....                  | 848,071         |              | 848,071          |
| <b>Idaho National Laboratory:</b>                 |                 |              |                  |
| Idaho cleanup and waste disposition .....         | 364,293         |              | 364,293          |
| Idaho community and regulatory support .....      | 2,910           |              | 2,910            |
| <b>Total, Idaho National Laboratory</b> .....     | 367,203         |              | 367,203          |
| <b>NNSA sites</b>                                 |                 |              |                  |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory .....      | 1,366           |              | 1,366            |
| Nevada .....                                      | 64,851          |              | 64,851           |
| Sandia National Laboratories .....                | 2,801           |              | 2,801            |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory .....              | 196,017         |              | 196,017          |



|   |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Construction:</b>  |                |                |
| 15-D-406 Hexavalent chromium D & D (VI-LanI-0030) .....                           | 28,600         | 28,600         |
| <b>Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites .....</b>                               | <b>293,635</b> | <b>293,635</b> |
| <b>Oak Ridge Reservation:</b>   |                |                |
| <b>OR Nuclear facility D &amp; D</b>  |                |                |
| OR Nuclear facility D & D .....   | 73,155         | 73,155         |
| <b>Construction:</b>  |                |                |
| 14-D-403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility .....                             | 9,400          | 9,400          |
| <b>Total, OR Nuclear facility D &amp; D .....</b>                                 | <b>82,555</b>  | <b>82,555</b>  |
| U233 Disposition Program .....  | 41,626         | 41,626         |
| <b>OR cleanup and disposition:</b>  |                |                |
| OR cleanup and disposition .....  | 71,137         | 71,137         |
| <b>Construction:</b>  |                |                |
| 15-D-405—Sludge Buildout .....  | 4,200          | 4,200          |
| <b>Total, OR cleanup and disposition .....</b>                                    | <b>75,337</b>  | <b>75,337</b>  |
| OR reservation community and regulatory support .....                             | 4,365          | 4,365          |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition, Oak Ridge technology development ..... | 3,000          | 3,000          |
| <b>Total, Oak Ridge Reservation .....</b>   | <b>206,883</b> | <b>206,883</b> |
| <b>Office of River Protection:</b>  |                |                |
| <b>Waste treatment and immobilization plant</b>                                   |                |                |
| 01-D-416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction .....                                  | 575,000        | 575,000        |
| 01-D-16E Pretreatment facility .....  | 115,000        | 115,000        |
| <b>Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant .....</b>                      | <b>690,000</b> | <b>690,000</b> |
| <b>Tank farm activities</b>   |                |                |
| Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition .....                         | 522,000        | 522,000        |
| <b>Construction:</b>  |                |                |
|   |                | 499            |

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program   | FY 2015 Request  | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 15-D-409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford .....    | 23,000           |              | 23,000           |
| <b>Total, Tank farm activities</b> .....                          | <b>545,000</b>   |              | <b>545,000</b>   |
| <b>Total, Office of River protection</b> .....                    | <b>1,235,000</b> |              | <b>1,235,000</b> |
| <b>Savannah River sites:</b>                                      |                  |              |                  |
| Savannah River risk management operations .....                   | 416,276          |              | 416,276          |
| SR community and regulatory support .....                         | 11,013           |              | 11,013           |
| <b>Radioactive liquid tank waste:</b>                             |                  |              |                  |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition ..... | 553,175          |              | 553,175          |
| <b>Construction:</b>  |                  |              |                  |
| 15-D-402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6 .....                         | 34,642           |              | 34,642           |
| 05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River .....     | 135,000          |              | 135,000          |
| <b>Total, Construction</b> .....                                  | <b>169,642</b>   |              | <b>169,642</b>   |
| <b>Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste</b> .....                 | <b>722,817</b>   |              | <b>722,817</b>   |
| <b>Total, Savannah River site</b> .....                           | <b>1,150,106</b> |              | <b>1,150,106</b> |
| Waste isolation pilot plant .....                                 | 216,020          |              | 216,020          |
| Program direction .....   | 280,784          |              | 280,784          |
| Program support .....   | 14,979           |              | 14,979           |
| <b>Safeguards and Security:</b>                                   |                  |              |                  |
| Oak Ridge Reservation .....                                       | 16,382           |              | 16,382           |
| Paducah .....   | 7,297            |              | 7,297            |
| Portsmouth .....  | 8,492            |              | 8,492            |
| Richland/Hanford Site .....                                       | 63,668           |              | 63,668           |

|  |                  |                 |                  |
|--|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Savannah River Site .....                                    | 132,196          |                 | 132,196          |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Project .....                          | 4,455            |                 | 4,455            |
| West Valley .....  | 1,471            |                 | 1,471            |
| Technology development .....                                 | 13,007           | 6,000           | 19,007           |
| <b>Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup .....</b>         | <b>4,864,538</b> | <b>6,000</b>    | <b>4,870,538</b> |
| Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution .....               | 463,000          | -463,000        | 0                |
| <b>Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup .....</b>            | <b>5,327,538</b> | <b>-457,000</b> | <b>4,870,538</b> |
| <b>Other Defense Activities</b>                              |                  |                 |                  |
| Specialized security activities .....                        | 202,152          | 5,300           | 207,452          |
| <b>Environment, health, safety and security</b>              |                  |                 |                  |
| Environment, health, safety and security .....               | 118,763          |                 | 118,763          |
| Program direction .....                                      | 62,235           |                 | 62,235           |
| <b>Total, Environment, Health, safety and security .....</b> | <b>180,998</b>   |                 | <b>180,998</b>   |
| <b>Independent enterprise assessments</b>                    |                  |                 |                  |
| Independent enterprise assessments .....                     | 24,068           |                 | 24,068           |
| Program direction .....                                      | 49,466           |                 | 49,466           |
| <b>Total, Independent enterprise assessments .....</b>       | <b>73,534</b>    |                 | <b>73,534</b>    |
| <b>Office of Legacy Management</b>                           |                  |                 |                  |
| Legacy management .....                                      | 158,639          |                 | 158,639          |
| Program direction .....                                      | 13,341           |                 | 13,341           |
| <b>Total, Office of Legacy Management .....</b>              | <b>171,980</b>   |                 | <b>171,980</b>   |
| <b>Defense-related activities</b>                            |                  |                 |                  |
| <b>Defense related administrative support</b>                |                  |                 |                  |
| Chief financial officer .....                                | 46,877           |                 | 46,877           |

| SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS<br>(In Thousands of Dollars) |                 |              |                  |  |
|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------|--|
| Program   | FY 2015 Request | House Change | House Authorized |  |
| Chief information officer .....   | 71,959          |              | 71,959           |  |
| <b>Total, Defense related administrative support .....</b>                              | <b>118,836</b>  |              | <b>118,836</b>   |  |
| Office of hearings and appeals .....  | 5,500           |              | 5,500            |  |
| <b>Subtotal, Other defense activities .....</b>   | <b>753,000</b>  | <b>5,300</b> | <b>758,300</b>   |  |
| <b>Total, Other Defense Activities .....</b>  | <b>753,000</b>  | <b>5,300</b> | <b>758,300</b>   |  |

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

APRIL 1, 2014.

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 2015", that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th 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.

Enclosure: As Stated

MAY 5, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. KING.

Enclosure: As Stated

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,  
SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

*Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology 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 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. 4435 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,  
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
*Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources, including:

Sec. 602. No fiscal year 2015 increase in basic pay for general and flag officers

Sec. 611. One-year extension of certain expiring bonus and special pay authorities

Sec. 2841. Land conveyance, Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial, La Jolla, California

Sec. 2861. Memorial to the victims of the shooting attack at the Washington Navy Yard

Sec. 2864. Designation of Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in Riverside, California

Sec. 2865. Renaming site of Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio

Sec. 2866. Manhattan Project National Historical Park

Title 29, Subtitle A—Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada

Sec. 2911. Redesignation of Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area, California

Sec. 2921. Elimination of termination date for public land withdrawals and reservations under Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999

Title 29, Subtitle D—Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California

Title 29, Subtitle D—White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

Sec. xxx. National security considerations for inclusion of federal property on National Register of Historic Places or designation as National Historic Landmark under the National Historic Preservation Act

To expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, and because of the extensive cooperation shown by you and your staff, the Committee will forego seeking a sequential referral of the bill. The Natural Resources 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. 4435 on the House Floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,  
*Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 9, 2014.*

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. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, however in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee waives consideration of the bill.

The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4435 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

With warm personal regards, I am  
Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,  
*Chairman.*



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. JEFF MILLER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, which contains substantial matter that falls within the Rule X legislative jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I appreciate the cooperation that allowed us to work out mutually agreeable text on numerous matters prior to your markup.

Based on that cooperation and our associated understandings, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup. However, this decision in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Foreign Affairs Committee in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request your support for the appointment of House Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Finally, I respectfully request that you include this letter and your response in your committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4435 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee 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 Foreign Affairs Committee 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 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 4435 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
 COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,  
 House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

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

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
 COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
 House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on the Judiciary in matters being considered in H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4435 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 Judiciary Committee, 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 Judiciary 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,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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. 4435 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 12, 2014.*

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. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 4435 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 4435, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 4435 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

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. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 4435, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

While the bill was referred to your Committee exclusively, there are several provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. However, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration, the Committee on Energy and Commerce will not request a sequential referral on the bill.

This is done with our mutual understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on H.R. 4435 or similar legislation, and will be consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. The Committee on Energy and Commerce also reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such a request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4435 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

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. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 COM-  
MITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,  
*Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.*

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. 4435, the "Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Bill," the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in H.R. 4435, 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, including in connection with any subsequent consideration of the bill by the House. 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. 4435. 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 12, 2014.*

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. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 AGRICULTURE,  
*Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.*

Hon. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
 House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of the text of H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The Agriculture Committee has a valid claim to jurisdiction over H.R. 4435.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 4435 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into both the Congressional Record and the Committee Report during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter, and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. LUCAS,  
*Chairman.*



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Agriculture Committee has a valid jurisdictional claim to a 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 Agriculture Committee 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 9, 2014.*

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. 4435, the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business pursuant to Rule X(q) of the House of Representatives.

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. 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 within its Rule X(q) jurisdiction, including future bills that the Committee on Armed Services will consider. I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint 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. 4435 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 12, 2014.*

Hon. SAM GRAVES,  
*Chairman, Committee on Small Business,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. 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 WAYS AND MEANS,  
*Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.*

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. McKEON: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. This legislation contains a provision requiring a strategy to prioritize U.S. interests in the Asia-Pacific region that is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee will waive consideration of the bill. The 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. 4435 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

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. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has a valid jurisdictional claim to a 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 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 HOMELAND SECURITY,  
*Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.*

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. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2015. There are certain provisions of this legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to the House floor, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 4435. However, I do so only with the mutual understanding that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security over matters contained in this or similar legislation is in no way diminished or altered. I further request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of this Committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Finally, I request you include this letter and your response into the committee report on H.R. 4435 and into the Congressional Record. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCAUL,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2014.*

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,  
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I am most appreciative of your support and interest in this important legislation. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

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

#### FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2015 and each of the following 5 fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE

MAY 12, 2014.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON  
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed a preliminary estimate of the direct spending effects of H.R. 4435, the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 8, 2014. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 4435, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

Based on legislative language for H.R. 4435, which was provided to CBO on May 9, 2014, CBO estimates that enacting this bill would decrease net direct spending by \$1 million in 2015, but increase such spending by \$1 million over the 2015–2024 period (see attached table). Because the bill would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply.

A provision to authorize special immigrant visas for certain Afghan allies would increase direct spending by \$70 million over that 10-year period. Those costs would be offset by a provision that

would increase, by \$70 million, receipts from sales of material from the National Defense Stockpile. The bill also would require the Secretary of Defense to award the Purple Heart to certain service members who were killed or wounded in attacks in the United States that were motivated or inspired by foreign terrorist organizations. Enacting that provision would increase military retirement payments to some of those awardees by a total of about \$1 million over the 2015–2024 period.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is David Newman, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF, DIRECTOR.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF THE IMPACT OF H.R. 4435, THE HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, ON  
DIRECT SPENDING

|   | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars— |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |               |               |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------------|---------------|
|   | 2015                                    | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2015-<br>2019 | 2015-<br>2024 |
| Special Immigrant Visas for Afghan Allies |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |               |               |
| Estimated Budget Authority                | 1                                       | 10   | 9    | 8    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 35            | 70            |
| Estimated Outlays                         | 1                                       | 10   | 9    | 8    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 35            | 70            |
| National Defense Stockpile                |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |               |               |
| Estimated Budget Authority                | -2                                      | -40  | -20  | -8   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | -70           | -70           |
| Estimated Outlays                         | -2                                      | -40  | -20  | -8   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | -70           | -70           |
| Purple Heart Awards                       |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |               |               |
| Estimated Budget Authority                | *                                       | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *             | 1             |
| Estimated Outlays                         | *                                       | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *    | *             | 1             |
| Total Changes in Direct Spending          | -1                                      | -30  | -11  | *    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | -35           | 1             |
| Estimated Budget Authority                | -1                                      | -30  | -11  | *    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | -35           | 1             |
| Estimated Outlays                         | -1                                      | -30  | -11  | *    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | 7    | -35           | 1             |

Note: \* = less than \$500,000.

## 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 2015 and for the ensuing 5 fiscal years; and

(3) The CBO Estimate does not identify any new budget authority for assistance to state and local governments by this measure at the time that this report was filed.

## COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(2)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Budget Office Estimate included in this report satisfies the requirement for the committee to include an estimate by the committee of the costs incurred in carrying out this bill.

## ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

The committee finds that H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, 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.

## 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. 4435 is to meet the national security needs of a nation at war while preparing our warfighters for the threats of tomorrow wherever and whenever they might emerge. This legislation would meet that goal while balancing the responsibilities of fiscal stewardship incumbent upon Congress in a time of economic stress. Only by providing for the common defense in an efficient, fiscally responsible manner can the nation address our national security challenges.

The bill would sustain equipment and weapon systems vital to the success of our service men and women while taking steps to provide them more efficiently. As discussed elsewhere in this re-

port, the committee took steps to promote competition and to provide authorities to the Department of Defense to procure systems more cost-effectively.

The committee continues to reiterate the need for fiscal accountability and transparency. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would establish an independent advisory panel on Department of Defense audit readiness. The advisory panel would actively monitor the Department of Defense's audit readiness and audit work and to report to Congress on problems that need to be resolved with the intention to shed light on the best, most efficient path forward to meet the 2017 and 2019 deadlines relating to auditability.

In keeping with the committee's intent to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy, the bill would also direct the Secretary of Defense to report on consolidating the number of combatant commands and on combining combatant command back office functions to achieve greater efficiencies and cost savings. The committee would also task the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department of Defense's headquarter reduction efforts, building off the Comptroller General's previous work conducted for the committee on examining growth in defense headquarters.

The committee has taken significant steps in the past to increase transparency with regard to services contracting. The bill would extend these efforts, encouraging the Secretary of Defense to improve data collection for services contracting and conduct better analysis of the data to identify waste. The committee would also require the Government Accountability Office to report on opportunities to improve the services contract processes.

The committee supports efforts to drive unnecessary cost from the development, test, fielding and sustainment of weapon systems. While much attention has been paid to the development of systems, less has been paid on operational testing. The bill would mandate that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation consider the potential for increase in program cost estimates or delays in schedule estimates in the implementation of policies, procedures, and activities related to operational test and evaluation.

On the battlefield, the committee would expand authorities aimed at combating contracting with the enemy, to ensure taxpayer dollars are not inadvertently going to opposing forces. This measure would expand efforts that have worked well within U.S. Central Command.

The bill also would examine and revise the Quadrennial Defense Review requirement and the strategic planning process in order to provide a solid basis for future defense strategic reviews. The committee believes that proper strategic planning, particularly when conducted regularly and within authorized frameworks, can reduce waste while protecting the joint warfighting capability of the Department of Defense from arbitrary cuts.

#### STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104-4, this legislation contains no Federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no Federal intergovernmental mandates.



## FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

Consistent with the requirements of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the committee finds that the functions of the proposed advisory committee authorized in the bill are not currently being nor could they be performed by one or more agencies, an advisory committee already in existence or by enlarging the mandate of an existing advisory committee.

## APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee finds that this legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104-1).

## DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

No provision of H.R. 4435 establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

## DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULE MAKINGS

The committee estimates that H.R. 4435 requires no directed rule makings.

## COMMITTEE VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 4435. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 4435 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 61-0, a quorum being present.

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 1

H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Shea-Porter amendment, Log 64.

Description: Requires assigning a new DOD work requirement to military or civilian personnel, or a contractor based on determining which workforce can perform the work in the most appropriate and cost-efficient manner, excluding inherently governmental, critical, or like functions.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           | x         |           |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          | x         |           |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>37</b> | <b>24</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 2

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Johnson amendment, Log 197r1.

Description: Add direct solar to the Department's list of qualified renewable energy technologies for the purpose of meeting the statutory 25% renewable energy target.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>50</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 3

H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Conaway amendment, Log 207.  
 Description: Exempts DOD from Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.  
 Wednesday: May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Smith .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         | x         |           |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Brady .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             | x         |           |          | Mrs. Davis .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Langevin .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           | x         |           |          | Mr. Larsen .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Cooper .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Courtney .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Johnson .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Speier .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Barber .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Carson .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Maffei .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          | x         |           |          | Mr. Castro .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               | x         |           |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Peters .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Enyart .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Veasey .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>33</b> | <b>28</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 4

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Conaway amendment, Log 208r1.  
 Description: SecDef may not enter into a contract to refurbish or  
 construct a biofuel facility unless authorized by law.  
 Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Smith .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         | x         |           |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Brady .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             | x         |           |          | Mrs. Davis .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Langevin .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           | x         |           |          | Mr. Larsen .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Cooper .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Courtney .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Johnson .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Speier .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Barber .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Carson .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Maffei .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          | x         |           |          | Mr. Castro .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               | x         |           |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Peters .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Enyart .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Gallego .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Veasey .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>32</b> | <b>29</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 5

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Shea-Porter amendment, Log 66.

Description: Strike subtitle C of title 29, relating to Elimination of Termination Date for Public Land Withdrawals and Reservations Under Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           |           |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>28</b> | <b>32</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 6

H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Sanchez amendment, Log 232.

Description: Decreasing federal salaries and expenses program direction by \$20.0M and increasing Weapons Dismantlement and Disposition O&M by \$20.0M. Directs a briefing on dismantling nuclear weapons.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    |     |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     |     |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      |     |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>24</b> | <b>34</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 7

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Rigell amendment, Log 14.

Description: Establishes an eighth exemption to the Services Contract Act of 1965 for military exchanges and military Morale, Welfare and Recreation activities.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Smith .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         | x         |           |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Brady .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             | x         |           |          | Mrs. Davis .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Langevin .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Cooper .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Courtney .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Johnson .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Speier .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Barber .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Carson .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Maffei .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          | x         |           |          | Mr. Castro .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               | x         |           |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Enyart .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Gallego .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Veasey .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>28</b> | <b>34</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |



## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 8

H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Hunter amendment, Log 201r1.

Description: Prohibits the SecDef and Service Secretaries from implementing any policy that restricts certain sales in exchanges or commissaries already in inventory as of January 1, 2014.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No       | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         | x         |          |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              | x         |          |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             | x         |          |          | Mrs. Davis .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Langevin .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           | x         |          |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             | x         |          |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              | x         |          |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             | x         |          |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Johnson .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            | x         |          |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            | x         |          |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            | x         |          |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          | x         |          |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               | x         |          |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              | x         |          |          | Mr. Enyart .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x        |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             | x         |          |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>53</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 9

H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Speier amendment, Log 264.

Description: Gives the authority of whether to prosecute all serious non military offenses to the Chief Prosecutor of the respective service. The amendment also requires that an O-6 JAG or higher convenes the court martial.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>49</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

113th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 10

H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Speier amendment, Log 125r2.

Description: This amendment gives the authority of whether to prosecute a sexual assault-related offense to the Chief Prosecutor of the respective service. The amendment also requires that an O-6 JAG or higher convenes the court-martial.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>28</b> | <b>34</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 11

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Barber amendment, Log 239r2.

Description: Sets up a GAO report on Close Air Support capability airframes in the USAF. Authorizes funding for FY15 operations, maintenance, and upgrades of A-10 fleet.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           | x         |           |          | Mr. Larsen .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            | x         |           |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          | x         |           |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              | x         |           |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             | x         |           |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>41</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 12

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Peters amendment, Log 266.

Description: Increase funding for MQ-9 (section 4101 - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force) by \$120.0 million with an offset from MOX Fuel Fabrication facility, Savanah River, SC.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             | x         |           |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           | x         |           |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            | x         |           |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               | x         |           |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              | x         |           |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>32</b> | <b>29</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 13

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Smith amendment, Log 88.  
Description: Strike section 1032 and 1033.  
Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      |     | x  |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     |     | x  |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>23</b> | <b>38</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 14

## H.R. 4435

On agreeing to the Johnson amendment, Log 187r1.

Description: Requires a report on potential threats to the personnel of United States Naval Forces Central Command and the United States Fifth Fleet in Bahrain.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No        | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             | x         |           |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         |           | x         |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |           |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             |           | x         |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           |           | x         |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            |           | x         |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          |           | x         |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               |           | x         |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              |           | x         |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            |           | x         |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             |           | x         |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             |           | x         |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              |           | x         |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>29</b> | <b>32</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

## 113th Congress

## ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 15

## H.R. 4435

Description: On motion by Mr. Thornberry to report the bill H.R. 4435, as amended, favorably to the House, with a recommendation that it do pass.

Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

| Member                       | Aye       | No       | Present  | Member                | Aye | No | Present |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------------|-----|----|---------|
| Mr. McKeon .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Smith .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Thornberry .....         | x         |          |          | Ms. Sanchez .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Jones .....              |           |          |          | Mr. McIntyre .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Forbes .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Brady .....       | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Miller .....             | x         |          |          | Mrs. Davis .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wilson .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Langevin .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. LoBiondo .....           | x         |          |          | Mr. Larsen .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Bishop .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Cooper .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Turner .....             | x         |          |          | Ms. Bordallo .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Kline .....              | x         |          |          | Mr. Courtney .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rogers .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Loeb sack .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Franks .....             | x         |          |          | Ms. Tsongas .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Shuster .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Garamendi .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Conaway .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Johnson .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Lamborn .....            | x         |          |          | Ms. Hanabusa .....    | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Wittman .....            | x         |          |          | Ms. Speier .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Hunter .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Barber .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Fleming .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Carson .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Coffman .....            | x         |          |          | Ms. Shea-Porter ..... | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Rigell .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Maffei .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Gibson .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Kilmer .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Hartzler .....          | x         |          |          | Mr. Castro .....      | x   |    |         |
| Dr. Heck .....               | x         |          |          | Ms. Duckworth .....   | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Runyan .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Peters .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Scott .....              | x         |          |          | Mr. Enyart .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Palazzo .....            | x         |          |          | Mr. Gallego .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Brooks .....             | x         |          |          | Mr. Veasey .....      | x   |    |         |
| Mr. Nugent .....             | x         |          |          | Ms. Gabbard .....     | x   |    |         |
| Mrs. Noem .....              | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Cook .....               | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Bridenstine .....        | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Dr. Wenstrup .....           | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mrs. Walorski .....          | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| Mr. Byrne .....              | x         |          |          |                       |     |    |         |
| <b>Roll Call Vote Total:</b> | <b>61</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |                       |     |    |         |



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 LORETTA SANCHEZ

I would like to clarify the report language related to Section 3121 related to Limitation on Availability of Funds for Non-Proliferation Activities Between the United States and the Russian Federation, which may be misleading about the status of US-Russian cooperation. As I understand, the Secretary of Energy has suspended certain nuclear cooperation with Russia in the context of the on-going situation with Ukraine and the Department of Energy is conducting an ongoing review of all Russian-related activities. However, critical bilateral nuclear nonproliferation activities are continuing in a number of key areas.

I believe effective cooperation with Russia remains necessary to effectively address the threat posed by vulnerable fissile material, and would like to note the important progress made toward securing and eliminating and securing highly-enriched uranium in Russia. Nuclear nonproliferation efforts that eliminate or secure this material reduce the risk of nuclear terrorism and strengthen US security. I encourage the Department of Energy to conduct a careful review of its programs with Russia and look forward to status updates of these programs.

LORETTA SANCHEZ.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN GARAMENDI

I congratulate the Chairman on the passage of the committee mark for the 53rd National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, his final one. I deeply appreciated working with my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee in preparing the committee mark that provides for a smart and strong defense. However, there are several areas of concern that I have for this critically important piece of legislation.

Despite these reservations, I supported the overall bill because of the bipartisan effort of this committee to address a number of issues vital to national security. I commend the committee's consensus to limit the retirement of both the U-2 and KC-10 aircraft until the Department of Defense is able to adequately report to Congress that it can maintain the same level of capability following these divestitures. In addition, I am pleased that the committee acknowledged and addressed the need for increased oversight of Department of Defense funds utilized for Afghan contract projects and security forces funding. I applaud the committee for adopting my amendments calling for the Department of Defense to provide briefings to Congress on future Long Range Standoff Weapon (LRSO) and the justification on the requirement for increased plutonium pit production capacity. Further discussion and oversight on both of these strategic topics are especially important in this time of fiscal austerity. Finally, I am pleased the committee shares my concern with necessity to combat wildlife trafficking through the strengthening of partnerships with international partners, local communities, and NGOs in conjunction with the existing defense and law enforcement construct.

However, this bill continues to significantly expand our already excessive nuclear arsenal and still includes wasteful spending on projects such as the over-budget MOX facilities at the Savannah River site. These are funds the Department of Energy itself has specifically said it does not need. Moreover, the committee once again chose to avoid an informed discussion on the scale of the current nuclear arsenal or the rationale for the forward deployment of B-61s in Europe. This issue remains increasingly necessary for this committee to address, especially in this time of fiscal austerity where I believe our resources could be better spent on more essential programs. Finally, this bill calls for \$79 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funding, with a substantial portion going towards continuing military operations in Afghanistan. However, it once again fails to address or even question America's continued military involvement in Afghanistan. In doing so, the committee has failed to fulfill one of its most basic responsibilities. Congress must debate and ultimately decide together with the President what America's role is in Afghanistan. I am hopeful that such a de-

bate will be allowed when the NDAA comes to the floor of the House, where amendments can force a vote on this critical issue.

I am confident that through the Floor amendment and conference processes, we can find ways to address these concerns and shape the current draft legislation into a bill that is even more consistent with American values and that moves us beyond both the Cold War and the wars of the last decade. As the representative for service members at Travis Air Force Base, in Fairfield, California, which carries out a critical air mobility mission, and Beale Air Force Base near Marysville, which conducts a vital Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance mission, I will continue to advocate for investing in the technologies and military capabilities that are effective against 21st century threats.

JOHN GARAMENDI.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE RON BARBER

I strongly disagree with Tactical Air and Land Subcommittee's item of special interest regarding the planned retirement of the A-10 Thunderbolt by the Air Force because it fails to consider the most important aspect of the A-10's mission, Close Air Support (CAS).

The Air Force's proposal to divest the A-10 fleet beginning in fiscal year 2015 will create a dangerous gap in close air support that would negatively impact ground troops in future combat operations.

The Warthog represents a proven aircraft of unmatched survivability, maneuverability, and lethal armaments that is only surpassed by the deeply-ingrained close air support culture of its pilots. No other fixed-wing close air support assets are as proficient as the A-10 in conducting visual support operations below 1000 foot ceilings while being able to effectively target the enemy.

Experience in Iraq and Afghanistan clearly demonstrates the A-10s well-documented capability to operate in rugged environments with low visibility while still providing effective close air support. However, the Air Force would argue that other platforms in the Air Force inventory can replace the CAS capabilities of the A-10.

The F-15, F-16, B-1, and B-52 are incredibly effective aircraft that are important components of the Air Force inventory, yet none of these platforms can fully replace the capabilities and focus of the A-10 in many CAS situations. The A-10's low altitudes, slow flying speeds, and armored hull allow it to be more intimately involved on the battlefield than other faster, lighter, and higher altitude flying fighters. This closer communication and relationship with troops engaged in combat make the A-10's close air support more accurate and lethal, on top of the psychological effects on the enemy by a mere fly-by of the Warthog.

While I commend the Chairman and the committee for rightly recognizing the risk involved by this planned reduction in fighter aircraft capacity, keeping the A-10 aircraft in Type-1000 storage is simply divestment of the aircraft by another name. Further, the institutional knowledge and deeply ingrained CAS expertise would be lost and could not be quickly regained when we are engaged in combat again.

RON BARBER.

○