AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

112TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
112–479

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4310

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 11, 2012.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

112TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
112–479

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4310

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 11, 2012.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

74–128 WASHINGTON : 2012

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

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

ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN C. FLEMING, M.D., Louisiana
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
TOM ROONEY, Florida
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia
CHRIS GIBSON, New York
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri
JOE HECK, Nevada
BOBBY SCHILLING, Illinois
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas
STEVEN PALAZZO, Mississippi
ALLEN B. WEST, Florida
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
MO BROOKS, Alabama
TODD YOUNG, Indiana

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

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Legislation	1
Rationale for the Committee Bill	2
Hearings	7
Committee Position	7
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	7
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	8
Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill	8
Budget Authority Implication	19
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	23
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	23
OVERVIEW	23
Aircraft Procurement, Army	23
Overview	23
Items of Special Interest	23
UH–72A Lakota Helicopter	23
Missile Procurement, Army	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	24
Patriot Mods	24
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	24
Heavy Brigade Combat Team force structure and industrial base	24
Abrams tank upgrades	26
Bradley fighting vehicle program	26
Improved recovery vehicle	27
Paladin integrated management program	27
Small arms modernization and sustainment	28
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	29
Overview	29
Other Procurement, Army	29
Overview	29
Items of Special Interest	29
Army and Marine Corps multi-mission radar development	29
Civil Support Team information management system	30
Joint Tactical Radio System Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form Fit radio program	30
Network Integration Exercises	31
Spider Alpha Remote Control Units	31
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	31
Overview	31
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	32
Overview	32
Items of Special Interest	32
EA–18G advance procurement	32
Reporting of the April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap at Marana, Arizona	32
Weapons Procurement, Navy	33
Overview	33
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	33
Overview	33
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	33
Overview	33
Items of Special Interest	33

Page
Littoral Combat Ship 33
Mine warfare 34
Navy Shipbuilding Program 34
Other Procurement, Navy 36
Overview 36
Procurement, Marine Corps 36
Overview 36
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 36
Overview 36
Items of Special Interest 36
F–35 aircraft program 36
Global Hawk Block 30 Aircraft 37
Inter-theater airlift aircraft 39
Intra-theater airlift aircraft 40
Long Range Stand-Off 42
Long-range strike bomber programs 43
Reaper unmanned aircraft system 44
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 44
Overview 44
Missile Procurement, Air Force 44
Overview 44
Other Procurement, Air Force 44
Overview 44
Procurement, Defense-Wide 45
Overview 45
Items of Special Interest 45
Aircraft Survivability Equipment 45
Aviation Foreign Internal Defense and Non-Standard Aviation program 45
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund 46
Metrics for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Capabilities for Manned and Unmanned Medium Altitude Systems 48
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense 48
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 48
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 48
Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations 48
Subtitle B—Army Programs 49
Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Army CH–47 Helicopters 49
Section 112—Reports on Airlift Requirements of the Army 49
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 49
Section 121—Retirement of Nuclear-Powered Ballistic Submarines 49
Section 122—Extension of Ford-Class Aircraft Carrier Construction Authority 49
Section 123—Extension of Multiyear Procurement Authority for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G Aircraft 49
Section 124—Multiyear Procurement Authority for V–22 Joint Aircraft Program 50
Section 125—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Arleigh Burke-Class Destroyers and Associated Systems 50
Section 126—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Virginia-Class Submarine Program 50
Section 127—Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln 50
Section 128—Report on Littoral Combat Ship Designs 50
Section 129—Comptroller General Reviews of Littoral Combat Ship Program 50
Section 130—Sense of Congress on Importance of Engineering in Early Stages of Shipbuilding 51
Section 131—Sense of Congress on Marine Corps Amphibious Lift and Presence Requirements 51
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 51
Section 141—Retirement of B–1 Bomber Aircraft 51
Section 142—Maintenance of Strategic Airlift Aircraft 51
Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment or Retirement of C–27J Aircraft 51

Page

Section 144—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Termination of C–130 Avionics Modernization Program 52
Section 145—Review of C–130 Force Structure 52
Section 146—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program 52
Section 147—Procurement of Space-Based Infrared Systems 53
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters 54
Section 151—Requirement to Set F–35 Aircraft Initial Operational Capability Dates 54
Section 152—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of RQ–4 Global Hawk Unmanned Aircraft Systems 54
Section 153—Common Data Link for Manned and Unmanned Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Systems 54
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 55
OVERVIEW 55
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army 55
Overview 55
Items of Special Interest 55
Acute lung injury medical research 55
Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle 55
Autonomous Sustainment Cargo Container 56
Body armor enhancements and personnel protection equipment for female soldiers 56
Cellular networking to the tactical edge 58
Efforts to improve the sustainment of body armor 58
Ground robotic vehicle development 59
Joint Air-to-Ground Missile program 59
M4 carbine product improvement program 60
Occupant-centric survivability technology development program 60
Patriot Product Improvement Program 61
Pilot aid for helicopter landing and cargo handling 61
Research, Development, and Engineering Command 62
Robotics for surgical procedures 62
Rotary-wing performance surface 62
Shadow unmanned aerial system alternative engine 63
Smartphone application development for the battlefield 63
Turbo fuel cell advanced technology development 63
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy 64
Overview 64
Items of Special Interest 64
Defense University Research Instrumentation Program 64
Development of Unmanned Systems Weapon, Sensor, and Payload Integration and Interoperability Capabilities 64
Electromagnetic Railgun 65
Marine Corps early transition activities 65
Naval use of non-lethal systems 66
Navy directed energy programs 66
Shipbuilding material comparison 66
Surface Combatant Combat System Engineering 67
Universal tactical controller for unmanned systems 67
Unmanned aircraft programs for Navy aircraft carriers 67
Unmanned cargo-carrying-capable unmanned aerial system 68
Utilization of Navy airship for airborne test and evaluation 68
Unmanned Undersea Vehicles 69
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force 69
Overview 69
Items of Special Interest 70
Aerial networking 70
Aerospace sensing and measurement standards 70
Enhanced weather data support 70
Global Positioning System 70
Hypervelocity ground testing with full scale vehicles 71
Industrial base for space surveillance optics 72
Infrared search and track system development 72
Joint Space Operations Center Mission System 72
Materials Affordability Initiative 73
Operationally Responsive Space 73

Page

Realignment of airbase technologies division 74
Space-Based Nuclear Detection 75
Space Situational Awareness Fence Program 75
Space Test Program 75
Specialized Undergraduate Flight Training Advanced Trainer Replacement 76
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 76
Overview 76
Items of Special Interest 76
Active denial technology and roadmap 76
Aegis Ashore Program 77
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Combat System 77
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense 78
Airborne Infrared and Advanced Remote Sensor Technology 78
AN/TPY–2 radar 79
Assessment on inner-aural communications hearing protection capabilities 79
Basic research 80
Blast gauges 80
Chemical Demilitarization and Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program 80
Combating terrorism and emergency response technology innovation 81
Comparative effectiveness research for orthotics and prosthetics 81
Concerns related to high concurrency and technical risk associated with the EPAA 82
Conventional Prompt Global Strike 83
Counterterrorism and irregular warfare capabilities 84
Critical gaps in undersea mobility capabilities 85
Cyber research of embedded systems 86
Defense microelectronics 86
Department of Defense unmanned aircraft system operations in the National Airspace System 87
Design research to improve safety of health information technology 88
Detection of non-signature based cyber threats 89
Diluted nerve agent laboratory decertification 89
Directed Energy Missile Defense Program 90
Early development activities to improve acquisition outcomes 90
Foreign materiel exploitation 91
Ground-based Midcourse Defense 91
Information Technology Discharge Solutions 92
Innovation program at the Defense Information Systems Agency 92
Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense 93
Medical countermeasures advanced development and manufacturing 93
Medium Extended Altitude Defense System 94
Mitochondrial research 94
Modeling and simulation for cyber 95
Modeling and Simulation Grand Challenges 95
National Defense Education Program 95
National Defense University research program 96
Non-lethal weapons and irregular warfare 97
Phoenix program 97
Physical barrier protection 97
Plan for testing of the missile defense systems against accidental or unauthorized launches originating from the Russian Federation or the People's Republic of China 98
Potential threats posed by open source publication of medical research 98
Precision Tracking Space System 99
Production of critical materials for protection against chemical, biological, and radiological agents 99
Rapid Innovation Fund 100
Report by Secretary of Defense on SM–3 IIB Missile 100
Report on fragility in the missile defense industrial base 100
Report on Space-Based Interceptors 101
Report on U.S. European Phased Adaptive Approach spending and U.S. export controls 102
Risk mitigation for enterprise resource planning systems 102

Page

Sea-based X-band radar 103
SM–3 IB missile 103
SM–3 IIA Development 103
SM–3 IIB missile 104
U.S. Missile Defense data sharing with Israel 104
U.S. Northern Command report on plan to enhance Ground-based Midcourse Defense reliability and discrimination and change shot doctrine 105
Use of bone samples in research 105
Vertical lift platform technologies 105
Weapons of Mass Destruction Defeat Technologies 106
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense 106
Overview 106
Items of Special Interest 106
Testing of information system controls 106
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 107
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 107
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 107
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 107
Section 211—Next-Generation Long-Range Strike Bomber Aircraft Nuclear Certification Requirement 107
Section 212—Unmanned Combat Air System 107
Section 213—Extension of Limitation on Availability of Funds for Unmanned Carrier-Launched Surveillance and Strike System Program . 107
Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Future Manned Ground Moving Target Indicator Capability of the Air Force 107
Section 215—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Milestone A Activities for the MQ–18 Unmanned Aircraft System 108
Section 216—Vertical Lift Platform Technology Demonstrations 108
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs 108
Section 221—Procurement of AN/TPY–2 Radars 108
Section 222—Development of Advanced Kill Vehicle 109
Section 223—Missile Defense Site on the East Coast 109
Section 224—Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System 110
Section 225—Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Interceptor Test 110
Section 226—Deployment of SM–3 IIB Interceptors on Land and Sea 110
Section 227—Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense Program 111
Section 228—Sea-Based X–Band Radar 111
Section 229—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the MEADS Program 111
Section 230—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Phased, Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense in Europe 112
Section 231—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Precision Tracking Space System 113
Section 232—Plan To Improve Discrimination and Kill Assessment Capability of Ballistic Missile Defense Systems 115
Section 233—Plan To Increase Rate of Flight Tests of Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System 115
Section 234—Report on Regional Missile Defense Architectures 115
Section 235—Use of Funds for Conventional Prompt Global Strike Program 116
Section 236—Transfer of Aegis Weapon System Equipment to Missile Defense Agency 116
Subtitle D—Reports 116
Section 241—Study on Electronic Warfare Capabilities of the Marine Corps 116
Section 242—National Research Council Review of Defense Science and Technical Graduate Education Needs 116
Section 243—Report on Three-Dimensional Integrated Circuit Manufacturing Capabilities 116
Section 244—Report on Efforts To Field New Directed Energy Weapons 117
Subtitle E—Other Matters 117
Section 251—Eligibility for Department of Defense Laboratories To Enter into Educational Partnerships with Educational Institutions in Territories and Possessions of the United States 117
Section 252—Regional Advanced Technology Clusters 117

Page

Section 253—Briefing on Power and Energy Research Conducted at University Affiliated Research Center 117
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 117
OVERVIEW 117
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 119
Budget Request Adjustments 119
Office of Net Assessment 119
Reduction in Army Depot Maintenance Due to Carryover 120
Energy Issues 121
Energy and Fuel Budget Justification 121
Marine Energy Technologies 122
Navy Hybrid Electric Technology 122
Procurement Procedures To Incorporate the Use of Fuel Cells 122
Logistics and Sustainment Issues 123
Army Management of the Organic Industrial Base 123
Consolidated Guidance for Mine-Resistant Ambush-Protected Vehicle Sustainment 123
Corrosion Mitigation Information Sharing 124
Department of Defense Counterfeit Parts 124
Depot Maintenance Carryover Definition 125
Operating and Support Cost Estimation Reporting 125
Testing and Evaluation of Materials Degradation 126
Safety and Security Standards for Transportation Protective Service (TPS) Commercial Carriers 126
Surveying and Mapping 127
Readiness Issues 127
Analysis of Readiness Trends 127
Army Immersive Gaming and Simulation Training Architecture 128
Army Rotary Wing Aviation Water Egress Training 129
Chemical Protective Over-Garment Stockpile 129
Civil Reserve Air Fleet Program 129
Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Training 130
Defense Cultural Training 131
Maintenance and Sustainment Readiness 131
MC–12W Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Aircraft Program 132
Operation and Maintenance Budget Transparency Requirements 132
Operational Clothing and Individual Equipment 133
Paramedic Training and Certification for Army Medical Evacuation Aircrews 133
Simulated Tactical Flight Training 134
Space Training 134
Strategic Mobility Study Plan 135
Training Range Encroachment 135
Unmanned Aircraft Training Strategic Plan 136
Other Matters 137
Alternatives for Hexavalent Chromium 137
Capital Investment Program 137
Congressional Budget Office and Government Accountability Office Information Access 137
Consolidated Guidance for Equipment Retrograde and Disposition 138
Contracted Hospitality and Food Services 139
Defense Biometrics 139
Digitization of Defense Media Activity Material 139
Disposal of Department of Defense Computers 140
Joint Airborne Hazards Action Plan 140
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 140
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 140
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 140
Section 302—Authorization of Appropriations of Funds for Inactivation Execution of U.S.S. Enterprise 140
Subtitle B—Energy and Environmental Provisions 141
Section 311—Training Range Sustainment Plan and Training Range Inventory 141
Section 312—Modification of Definition of Chemical Substance 141
Section 313—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement 141

Page

Section 314—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Procurement of Alternative Fuel 141
Section 315—Plan on Environmental Exposures to Members of the Armed Forces 141
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment 141
Section 321—Expansion and Reauthorization of Multi-Trades Demonstration Project 141
Section 322—Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair 142
Subtitle D—Readiness 142
Section 331—Intergovernmental Support Agreements with State and Local Governments 142
Section 332—Extension and Expansion of Authority To Provide Assured Business Guarantees to Carriers Participating in Civil Reserve Air Fleet 142
Section 333—Expansion and Reauthorization of Pilot Program for Availability of Working-Capital Funds for Product and Process Improvements 142
Section 334—Center of Excellence for the National Guard State Partnership Program 142
Subtitle E—Reports 143
Section 341—Report on Joint Strategy for Readiness and Training in a C4ISR-Denied Environment 143
Section 342—Comptroller General Review of Annual Department of Defense Report on Prepositioned Materiel and Equipment 143
Section 343—Modification of Report on Maintenance and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards 143
Section 344—Extension of Deadline for Comptroller General Report on Department of Defense Service Contract Inventory 143
Section 345—GAO Report Reviewing Methodology of Department of Defense Relating to Costs of Performance by Civilian Employees, Military Personnel, and Contractors 143
Section 346—Report on Medical Evacuation Policies 143
Subtitle F—Limitations and Extensions of Authority 144
Section 351—Repeal of Authority To Provide Certain Military Equipment and Facilities To Support Civilian Law Enforcement and Emergency Response 144
Section 352—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Disestablishment of Aerospace Control Alert Locations 144
Section 353—Limitation on Authorization of Appropriations for the National Museum of the United States Army 144
Section 354—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships 144
Section 355—Renewal of Expired Prohibition on Return of Veterans Memorial Objects Without Specific Authorization in Law 144
Subtitle G—Other Matters 145
Section 361—Retirement, Adoption, Care, and Recognition of Military Working Dogs 145
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 145
OVERVIEW 145
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 146
Subtitle A—Active Forces 146
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 146
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels 147
Section 403—Limitations on End Strength Reductions for Regular Component of the Army and Marine Corps 147
Section 404—Exclusion of Members Within the Integrated Disability Evaluation System from End Strength Levels for Active Forces 147
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 148
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 148
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 148
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 148
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2013 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians 149
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support 150

Page

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 150
Section 421—Military Personnel 150
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 150
OVERVIEW 150
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 151
Assistance for Service Members Transitioning to the Civilian Sector 151
Award of Prisoner-of-War Medal to Service Members Held at Wauwilermoos, Switzerland 151
Biometric Identification for Recruiting 152
Comptroller General Review of the Secretary of Defense's Efforts To Increase the Capability and Capacity of the Department of Defense To Account for Missing Persons 153
Department of Defense Outreach Efforts To Increase the Hiring of Wounded Warriors 154
Fair Treatment for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Service Members 154
Increased Flexibility of Military Families To Choose Enrollment of Their Dependents in Local Educational Agencies 154
Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps 155
Marketing and Advertising for Recruiting 156
Military Technician (Dual Status) 156
Private John Sipe Medal of Honor Review 156
Recognition for Remotely Piloted Aircraft Pilots 156
Recognition for the Surviving Children of Those Who Die While Serving Our Nation 157
Report on Metrics To Track Sexual Assault 157
Robust Diversity Outreach Efforts for Officer Accessions 157
Support for Naval Heritage Initiatives 158
Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program 158
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 159
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally 159
Section 501—Limitation on Number of Navy Flag Officers on Active Duty 159
Section 502—Exception to Required Retirement After 30 Years of Service for Regular Navy Warrant Officers in the Grade of Chief Warrant Officer, W–5 159
Section 503—Air Force Chief and Deputy Chief of Chaplains 159
Section 504—Extension of Temporary Authority To Reduce Minimum Length of Active Service as a Commissioned Officer Required for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer 159
Section 505—Temporary Increase in the Time-in-Grade Retirement Waiver Limitation for Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps and Commanders and Captains in the Navy 159
Section 506—Modification to Limitations on Number of Officers for Whom Service-in-Grade Requirements May Be Reduced for Retirement in Grade Upon Voluntary Retirement 160
Section 507—Diversity in Military Leadership and Related Reporting Requirements 160
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 160
Section 511—Codification of Staff Assistant Positions for Joint Staff Related to National Guard and Reserve Matters 160
Section 512—Automatic Federal Recognition of Promotion of Certain National Guard Warrant Officers 160
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities 160
Section 521—Modifications to Career Intermission Pilot Program 160
Section 522—Authority for Additional Behavioral Health Professionals To Conduct Pre-Separation Medical Exams for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder 161
Section 523—Authority To Accept Voluntary Services To Assist Department of Defense Efforts To Account for Missing Persons 161
Section 524—Authorized Leave Available for Members of the Armed Forces Upon Birth or Adoption of a Child 161
Section 525—Command Responsibility and Accountability for Remains of Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps Who Die Outside the United States 161

Page

Section 526—Report on Feasibility of Developing Gender-Neutral Occupational Standards for Military Occupational Specialties Currently Closed to Women 161
Section 527—Compliance with Medical Profiles Issued for Members of the Armed Forces 162
Subtitle D—Military Justice and Legal Matters 162
Section 531—Clarification and Enhancement of the Role of Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps 162
Section 532—Persons Who May Exercise Disposition Authority Regarding Charges Involving Certain Sexual Misconduct Offenses Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice 162
Section 533—Independent Review and Assessment of Uniform Code of Military Justice and Judicial Proceedings of Sexual Assault Cases . 162
Section 534—Collection and Retention of Records on Disposition of Reports of Sexual Assault 162
Section 535—Briefing, Plan, and Recommendations Regarding Efforts To Prevent and Respond to Hazing Incidents Involving Members of the Armed Forces 163
Section 536—Protection of Rights of Conscience of Members of the Armed Forces and Chaplains of Such Members 163
Section 537—Use of Military Installations as Sites for Marriage Ceremonies or Marriage-Like Ceremonies 163
Subtitle E—Member Education and Training Opportunities and Administration 164
Section 541—Transfer of Troops-to-Teachers Program from Department of Education to Department of Defense and Enhancements to the Program 164
Section 542—Support of Naval Academy Athletic and Physical Fitness Programs 164
Section 543—Department of Defense Inspector General Review of Access to Military Installations by Representatives of For-Profit Educational Institutions 164
Subtitle F—Decorations and Awards 164
Section 551—Issuance of Prisoner-of-War Medal 164
Section 552—Award of Purple Heart to Members of the Armed Forces Who Were Victims of the Attacks at Recruiting Station in Little Rock, Arkansas, and at Fort Hood, Texas 164
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters 165
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 165
Section 562—Transitional Compensation for Dependent Children Who Were Carried During Pregnancy at the Time of the Dependent-Abuse Offense Committed by an Individual While a Member of the Armed Forces 165
Section 563—Modification of Authority To Allow Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools To Enroll Certain Students 165
Section 564—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces 165
Section 565—Treatment of Relocation of Members of the Armed Forces for Active Duty for Purposes of Mortgage Refinancing 166
Section 566—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Yellow Ribbon Day 166
Subtitle H—Improved Sexual Assault Prevention and Response in the Armed Forces 166
Section 571—Establishment of Special Victim Teams To Respond to Allegations of Child Abuse, Serious Domestic Violence, or Sexual Offenses 166
Section 572—Enhancement to Training and Education for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response 166
Section 573—Enhancement to Requirements for Availability of Information on Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Resources 166
Section 574—Modification of Annual Department of Defense Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Assaults 167

Page

Section 575—Inclusion of Sexual Harassment Incidents in Annual Department of Defense Reports on Sexual Assaults 167
Section 576—Continued Submission of Progress Reports Regarding Certain Incident Information Management Tools 167
Section 577—Briefings on Department of Defense Actions Regarding Sexual Assault Prevention and Response in the Armed Forces 167
Section 578—Armed Forces Workplace and Gender Relations Surveys .. 167
Section 579—Requirement for Commanders To Conduct Annual Organizational Climate Assessments 167
Section 580—Additional Requirements for Organizational Climate Assessment 167
Section 581—Review of Unrestricted Reports of Sexual Assault and Subsequent Separation of Members Making Such Reports 168
Section 582—Limitation on Release from Active Duty or Recall to Active Duty of Reserve Component Members Who Are Victims of Sexual Assault While on Active Duty 168
Section 583—Inclusion of Information on Substantiated Reports of Sexual Harassment in Member's Official Service Record 168
Subtitle I—Other Matters 168
Section 590—Inclusion of Freely Associated States Within Scope of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Program 168
Section 591—Preservation of Editorial Independence of Stars and Stripes 168
Section 592—Sense of Congress Regarding Designation of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps" as National Song of Remembrance 168
Section 593—Recommended Conduct During Sounding of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps" 169
Section 594—Inspection of Military Cemeteries Under the Jurisdiction of Department of Defense 169
Section 595—Pilot Program To Provide Transitional Assistance to Members of the Armed Forces with a Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics 169
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 169
OVERVIEW 169
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 170
Military Resale Participation in Container Deposit Programs 170
Military Retirement Modernization Commission 170
Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Nonappropriated Fund Contract Options 171
Physical Evaluation Board Liaison Officers 171
Transition of U.S. Territories from Overseas Housing Allowance to Basic Allowance for Housing 172
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 172
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 172
Section 601—Fiscal Year 2013 Increase in Military Basic Pay 172
Section 602—Basic Allowance for Housing for Two-Member Couples When One Member Is on Sea Duty 172
Section 603—No Reduction in Basic Allowance for Housing for Army National Guard and Air National Guard Members Who Transition Between Active Duty and Full-Time National Guard Duty Without a Break in Active Service 173
Section 604—Modification of Program Guidance Relating to the Award of Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence Administrative Absence Days to Members of the Reserve Components Under DOD Instruction 1327.06 173
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 173
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 173
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals 173
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers 174
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities 174
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays 174

Page

Section 616—Increase in Maximum Amount of Officer Affiliation Bonus for Officers in the Selected Reserve 174
Section 617—Increase in Maximum Amount of Incentive Bonus for Reserve Component Members Who Convert Military Occupational Specialty To Ease Personnel Shortages 174
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances Generally 174
Section 621—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Members Receiving Care in a Residential Treatment Program 174
Subtitle D—Benefits and Services for Members Being Separated or Recently Separated 175
Section 631—Extension of Authority To Provide Two Years of Commissary and Exchange Benefits After Separation 175
Section 632—Transitional Use of Military Family Housing 175
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 175
Section 641—Charitable Organizations Eligible for Donations of Unusable Commissary Store Food and Other Food Prepared for the Armed Forces 175
Section 642—Repeal of Certain Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements Applicable to Commissary and Exchange Stores Overseas 175
Section 643—Treatment of Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, as a Fisher House 175
Section 644—Purchase of Sustainable Products, Local Food Products, and Recyclable Materials for Resale in Commissary and Exchange Store Systems 176
Subtitle F—Disability, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits 176
Section 651—Repeal of Requirement for Payment of Survivor Benefit Plan Premiums When Participant Waives Retired Pay To Provide a Survivor Annuity Under Federal Employees Retirement System and Terminating Payment of the Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity 176
Subtitle G—Other Matters 176
Section 661—Consistent Definition of Dependent for Purposes of Applying Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Certain Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents 176
Section 662—Limitation on Reduction in Number of Military and Civilian Personnel Assigned to Duty with Service Review Agencies 176
Section 663—Equal Treatment for Members of Coast Guard Reserve Called to Active Duty Under Title 14, United States Code 177
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 177
OVERVIEW 177
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 178
Assessment of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operators Mental Health 178
Comptroller General Report on Chiropractic Health Care Professionals 178
Improvements to the Measurement of Vital Signs 178
Modification to the Report on Department of Defense Autism Pilot and Demonstration Projects 179
Optimizing Blood Transfusions for Service Members 179
Overseas Medical Research Laboratories 179
Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Training for Mental Health Providers 180
Prostate Imaging 180
Safety of Blood Products 180
Substance Abuse 180
Traumatic Brain Injury 181
Treatment of Musculoskeletal Injuries 182
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 182
Subtitle A—Improvements to Health Benefits 182
Section 701—Sense of Congress on Nonmonetary Contributions to Health Care Benefits Made by Career Members of the Armed Forces and Their Families 182
Section 702—Extension of TRICARE Standard Coverage and TRICARE Dental Program for Members of the Selected Reserve Who Are Involuntarily Separated 182
Section 703—Medical and Dental Care Contracts for Certain Members of the National Guard 182
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration 183

Page

Section 711—Unified Medical Command 183
Section 712—Authority for Automatic Enrollment in TRICARE Prime of Dependents of Members in Pay Grades Above Pay Grade E–4 183
Section 713—Cooperative Health Care Agreements Between the Military Departments and Non-Military Health Care Entities 183
Section 714—Requirement To Ensure the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Health Engagements 183
Section 715—Clarification of Applicability of Federal Tort Claims Act to Subcontractors Employed To Provide Health Care Services to the Department of Defense 183
Section 716—Pilot Program on Increased Third-Party Collection Reimbursements in Military Medical Treatment Facilities 183
Section 717—Pilot Program for Refills of Maintenance Medications for TRICARE for Life Beneficiaries Through the TRICARE Mail-Order Pharmacy Program 184
Section 718—Cost-Sharing Rates for Pharmacy Benefits Program of the TRICARE Program 184
Section 719—Review of the Administration of the Military Health System 184
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters 184
Section 721—Extension of Comptroller General Report on Contract Health Care Staffing for Military Medical Treatment Facilities 184
Section 722—Extension of Comptroller General Report on Women-Specific Health Services and Treatment for Female Members of the Armed Forces 185
Section 723—Establishment of TRICARE Working Group 185
Section 724—Report on Strategy To Transition to Use of Human-Based Methods for Certain Medical Training 185
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 186
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 186
Comptroller General Report of the Air Force Launch Services New Entrant Certification Guide 186
Counterfeit Electronic Parts 186
Incentives To Combat Counterfeit Microelectronics 186
Incorporation of a Proposal Adequacy Checklist for Certain Solicitations .. 187
Inspector General Review of Database of Senior Department of Defense Officials Seeking Employment with Defense Contractors 187
Report on Contingency Contracting Lessons Learned 187
Review of Department of Defense Processes and Procedures Related to Federal Retail Excise Tax 188
Service and Support Business Model for Certain Simulation Capabilities . 189
Ship Maintenance and Modernization 189
Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Certain Commercial Items 190
Titanium Procurement Restrictions of Domestic Manufacturers 191
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 191
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 191
Section 801—Pilot Exemption Regarding Treatment of Procurements on Behalf of the Department of Defense in Accordance with the Department of Energy's Work for Others Program 191
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 192
Section 811—Modification of Time Period for Congressional Notification of the Lease of Certain Vessels by the Department of Defense 192
Section 812—Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Certain Commercial Items 192
Section 813—Codification and Amendment Relating to Life-Cycle Management and Product Support Requirements 193
Section 814—Codification of Requirement Relating to Government Performance of Critical Acquisition Functions 193
Section 815—Limitation on Funding Pending Certification of Implementation of Requirements for Competition 193
Section 816—Contractor Responsibilities in Regulations Relating to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts 194
Section 817—Additional Definition Relating to Production of Specialty Metals Within the United States 194

Page

Section 818—Requirement for Procurement of Infrared Technologies from National Technology and Industrial Base 194
Section 819—Compliance with Berry Amendment Required for Uniform Components Supplied to Afghan Military or Afghan National Police .. 194
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan 194
Section 821—Extension and Expansion of Authority To Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan 194
Section 822—Limitation on Authority To Acquire Products and Services Produced in Afghanistan 195
Subtitle D—Other Matters 195
Section 831—Enhancement of Review of Acquisition Process for Rapid Fielding of Capabilities in Response to Urgent Operational Needs 195
Section 832—Location of Contractor-Operated Call Centers in the United States 196
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 196
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 196
Assessment of Department of Defense Future Years Defense Program Workforce Requirements 196
Assessment of Legal Authorities for Cyberspace Operations 197
Commercial Satellite Imagery 198
Department of Defense Intelligence Activities 198
Improving the Strategic Management Plan 199
National Centers of Excellence in Information Assurance Education and Research 199
Policy Matters Related to the Defense Supply Chain 200
Study on National Air and Space Intelligence Center and Marine Corps Intelligence Activity Management Structure 201
The Role of National Guard Cyber Defense Units 201
Use of Open Source Information in Intelligence Analysis 201
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 202
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 202
Section 901—Additional Duties of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy and Amendments to Strategic Materials Protection Board 202
Section 902—Requirement for Focus on Urgent Operational Needs and Rapid Acquisition 202
Section 903—Designation of Department of Defense Senior Official for Enterprise Resource Planning System Data Conversion 203
Section 904—Additional Responsibilities and Resources for Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation . 203
Section 905—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 203
Subtitle B—Space Activities 204
Section 911—Annual Assessment of the Synchronization of Segments in Space Programs That Are Major Defense Acquisition Programs 204
Section 912—Report on Overhead Persistent Infrared Technology 204
Section 913—Prohibition on Use of Funds To Implement International Agreement on Space Activities That Has Not Been Ratified by the Senate or Authorized by Statute 205
Section 914—Assessment of Foreign Components and the Space Launch Capability of the United States 206
Section 915—Report on Counterspace Technology 206
Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related Activities 206
Section 921—Authority To Provide Geospatial Intelligence Support to Certain Security Alliances and Regional Organizations 206
Section 922—Technical Amendments To Reflect Change in Name of National Defense Intelligence College to National Intelligence University 207
Subtitle D—Total Force Management 207
Section 931—Limitation on Certain Funding Until Certification That Inventory of Contracts for Services Has Begun 207
Section 932—Requirement To Ensure Sufficient Levels of Government Management, Control, and Oversight of Functions Closely Associated with Inherently Governmental Functions 207

Page

Section 933—Special Management Attention Required for Certain Functions Identified in Inventory of Contracts for Services 207
Subtitle E—Cyberspace-Related Matters 208
Section 941—Military Activities in Cyberspace 208
Section 942—Quarterly Cyber Operations Briefings 208
Subtitle F—Other Matters 208
Section 951—Advice on Military Requirements by Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff and Joint Requirements Oversight Council 208
Section 952—Expansion of Persons Eligible for Expedited Federal Hiring Following Completion of National Security Education Program Scholarship 209
Section 953—Annual Briefing to Congressional Defense Committees on Certain Written Policy Guidance 209
Section 954—One-Year Extension of Authority To Waive Reimbursement of Costs of Activities for Nongovernmental Personnel at Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies 209
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 210
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 210
Counter-Drug Activities 210
Counter-Drug Activities in Afghanistan 210
Humanitarian Efforts in U.S. Southern Command 210
National Guard Bureau Counter-Drug Threat Based Resource Model 211
Study on Terrorist Organization Linkages in the Western Hemisphere 211
Other Matters 212
Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Strategic Portfolio Review 212
B61 Gravity Bomb Tail Kit 212
Comptroller General Review of Combatant Commands 213
Counterterrorism Policy and the Growing Threat of Al Qaeda Regional Affiliates 213
Defense Business Board Public-Private Cooperation Review 215
Disposition of Detainees in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan 216
Electromagnetic Pulse Survivability 216
Global Rebalancing of U.S. Special Operations Forces 217
Humanitarian Mine Action and Security Force Assistance 218
Improving Certification and Accreditation for Information Technology Systems 219
Independent Report on China's Nuclear Weapons Program 220
Information Operations Programs 220
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Cost-Benefit Analysis Tool 221
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Task Force 221
Military Auxiliary Radio System 222
Navy Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officer Program 223
Personal Mobile Device Policy 223
Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance 223
Public Key Infrastructure Tokens for Classified Network Access 224
Report by Commander U.S. Strategic Command on Locating and Targeting Mobile Ballistic Missiles 224
Report on Command and Control Arrangements of the European Phased Adaptive Approach and NATO Ballistic Missile Defense Systems 225
Report on Joint Task Force for U.S. Northern Command 225
Report on the Assessed Efficacy of the Location of X-band Radar on the East Coast of the United States 226
Report Regarding Impacts of W76 Nuclear Warhead Life Extension Program Delay 226
Research and Development Assessments in Quadrennial Defense Review and the Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff 227
Resiliency and Survivability for Nuclear Air-Launched Cruise Missile Basing 227
Role of State Government Sponsored Aerospace Infrastructure 227
Use of Existing Authorities for U.S. Special Operations Forces 228
Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team Reductions 229
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 230

Page
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 230
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority 230
Section 1002—Budgetary Effects of This Act 230
Section 1003—Annual Report on Armed Forces Unfunded Priorities 230
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 231
Section 1011—Extension of the Authority of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau To Establish and Operate National Guard Counterdrug Schools 231
Section 1012—Reporting Requirement on Expenditures To Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities 231
Section 1013—Extension of Authority To Support Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia 231
Section 1014—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces To Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-Terrorism Activities 231
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 232
Section 1021—Policy Relating to Major Combatant Vessels of the Strike Forces of the United States Navy 232
Section 1022—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Delayed Annual Naval Vessel Construction Plan 232
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 232
Section 1031—Findings on Detention Pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Enacted in 2001 232
Section 1032—Findings Regarding Habeas Corpus Rights 232
Section 1033—Habeas Corpus Rights 232
Section 1034—Extension of Authority To Make Rewards for Combating Terrorism 232
Section 1035—Prohibition on Travel to the United States for Certain Detainees Repatriated to the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands 233
Section 1036—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 233
Section 1037—Requirements for Certifications Relating to the Transfer of Detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities 233
Section 1038—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 234
Section 1039—Reports on Recidivism of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, That Have Been Transferred to Foreign Countries 234
Section 1040—Notice and Report on Use of Naval Vessels for Detention of Individuals Captured Outside Afghanistan Pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force 234
Section 1041—Notice Required Prior to Transfer of Certain Individuals Detained at the Detention Facility at Parwan, Afghanistan 234
Section 1042—Report on Recidivism of Individuals Formerly Detained at the Detention Facility at Parwan, Afghanistan 234
Section 1043—Additional Requirements Relating to the Transfer of Individuals Detained at Guantanamo to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities 235
Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces 235
Section 1051—Nuclear Weapons Employment Strategy of the United States 235
Section 1052—Commitments for Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Modernization 235
Section 1053—Limitation and Report in the Event of Insufficient Funding for Modernization of Nuclear Weapons Stockpile 235
Section 1054—Progress of Modernization 236
Section 1055—Limitation on Strategic Delivery System Reductions 236
Section 1056—Prevention of Asymmetry of Nuclear Weapon Stockpile Reductions 237
Section 1057—Consideration of Expansion of Nuclear Forces of Other Countries 237
Section 1058—Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility and Uranium Processing Facility 237

Page

Section 1059—Nuclear Warheads on Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles of the United States 237
Section 1060—Nonstrategic Nuclear Weapon Reductions and Extended Deterrence Policy. 238
Section 1061—Improvements to Nuclear Weapons Council 238
Section 1062—Interagency Council on the Strategic Capability of the National Laboratories 238
Section 1063—Report on Capability of Conventional and Nuclear Forces Against Certain Tunnel Sites 239
Section 1064—Report on Conventional and Nuclear Forces in the Western Pacific Region 239
Section 1065—Sense of Congress on Nuclear Arsenal 239
Subtitle F—Studies and Reports 239
Section 1066—Assessment of Department of Defense Use of Electromagnetic Spectrum 239
Section 1067—Electronic Warfare Strategy of the Department of Defense 240
Section 1068—Report on Counterproliferation Capabilities and Limitations 240
Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 240
Section 1071—Rule of Construction Relating to Prohibition on Infringing on the Individual Right To Lawfully Acquire, Possess, Own, Carry, and Otherwise Use Privately Owned Firearms, Ammunition, and Other Weapons 240
Section 1072—Expansion of Authority of the Secretary of the Army To Loan or Donate Excess Small Arms for Funeral and Other Ceremonial Purposes 241
Section 1073—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for Manufacturing Beyond Low-Rate Initial Production at Certain Prototype Integration Facilities 241
Section 1074—Interagency Collaboration on Unmanned Aircraft Systems 241
Section 1075—Authority To Transfer Surplus Mine-Resistant Ambush-Protected Vehicles and Spare Parts 241
Section 1076—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of Aircraft 242
Section 1077—Prohibition on Department of Defense Use of Nondisclosure Agreements To Prevent Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department from Communicating with Members of Congress 242
Subtitle H—Other Matters 242
Section 1081—Bipartisan Independent Strategic Review Panel 242
Section 1082—Notification of Delayed Reports 243
Section 1083—Technical and Clerical Amendments 243
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 243
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 243
Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System 243
Guidance Regarding the Conversion of Performance of Certain Functions 243
National Security Education Program 244
Pay Parity for Department of Defense Federal Wage System Employees Employed at Joint Military Institutions 244
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 244
Subtitle A—General Provisions 244
Section 1101—Expansion of Personnel Management Authority Under Experimental Program with Respect to Certain Scientific and Technical Positions 244
Section 1102—Authority To Pay for the Transport of Family Household Pets for Federal Employees During Certain Evacuation Operations ... 245
Section 1103—Extension of Authority To Fill Shortage Category Positions for Certain Federal Acquisition Positions for Civilian Agencies .. 245
Section 1104—One-Year Extension of Authority To Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas 245
Section 1105—Policy on Senior Mentors 245
Subtitle B—Interagency Personnel Rotations 246
Section 1111—Interagency Personnel Rotations 246
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS 246

Page

OVERVIEW 246
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 248
Accountability and Stewardship of Department of Defense Reconstruction Activities in Afghanistan 248
Afghan National Security Forces 248
Bilateral Security Agreement with Afghanistan 249
Challenges with Military-to-Military and Security Force Assistance Efforts 250
Commendation for Operation Unified Protector 251
Competitive Strategies Study 251
Comptroller General Review of Use of General Purpose Forces and Special Operations Forces for Security Force Assistance 252
Concerns About Supporting Data on Impact and Sustainability of Authorities Relating to Program To Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces 253
Counter Lord's Resistance Army and Related Operations 254
Developments in Syria 254
European Union Support for Arms Embargo on the People's Republic of China 255
Funding Source for the Authority for Support of Special Operations To Combat Terrorism 255
Geographic Positioning of the Headquarters for U.S. Africa Command 256
Global Security Contingency Fund 256
Ground Lines of Communication Through Pakistan 257
Iranian Influence in Iraq 258
National Guard State Partnership Program 258
Rebalancing to Asia-Pacific Region 259
Report on North Atlantic Treaty Organization Chicago Summit 259
Strategic Partnership with the Kingdom of Bahrain 260
Strengthening Asia-Pacific Partnerships 260
Study of Post Combat Role of U.S. Forces in Afghanistan 261
Support for Security Cooperation Efforts Between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan 261
United States Military Capabilities in the Central Command Area of Responsibility 262
United States Participation in Headquarters Eurocorps 262
U.S. Military Relationship with People's Republic of China 263
Use of Security Force Assistance Advisory Teams in Afghanistan 263
Village Stability Operations and Afghan Local Police 264
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 265
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 265
Section 1201—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan 265
Section 1202—Modification of Authorities Relating to Program To Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces 265
Section 1203—Three-Year Extension of Authority for Non-Reciprocal Exchanges of Defense Personnel Between the United States and Foreign Countries 266
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan 266
Section 1211—One-Year Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations 266
Section 1212—Authority To Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq 266
Section 1213—One-Year Extension of Authority To Use Funds for Reintegration Activities in Afghanistan 267
Section 1214—Prohibition on Use of Private Security Contractors and Members of the Afghan Public Protection Force To Provide Security for Members of the Armed Forces and Military Installations and Facilities in Afghanistan 267
Section 1215—Report on Updates and Modifications to Campaign Plan for Afghanistan 268
Section 1216—United States Military Support in Afghanistan 268
Section 1217—Extension and Modification of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund 268
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Iran 269
Section 1221—Declaration of Policy 269

Page
Section 1222—United States Military Preparedness in the Middle East 269
Section 1223—Annual Report on the Military Power of Iran 269
Subtitle D—Reports and Other Matters 270
Section 1231—Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 270
Section 1232—Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea 270
Section 1233—Report on Host Nation Support for Overseas United States Military Installations and United States Armed Forces Deployed in Country 270
Section 1234—NATO Special Operations Headquarters 270
Section 1235—Reports on Exports of Missile Defense Technology to Certain Countries 271
Section 1236—Limitation on Funds To Provide the Russian Federation with Access to Missile Defense Technology 271
Section 1237—International Agreements Relating to Missile Defense 271
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION 272
OVERVIEW 272
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 273
Cooperative Biological Engagement Program 273
Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Metrics 273
Cooperative Threat Reduction Biological Surveillance Network 274
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 274
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 274
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 274
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 275
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 275
Working Capital Fund Cash Corpus Concerns 275
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 275
Subtitle A—Military Programs 275
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds 275
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund 275
Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 275
Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 276
Section 1405—Defense Inspector General 276
Section 1406—Defense Health Program 276
Section 1407—Cemeterial Expenses 276
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 276
Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds 276
Section 1412—Additional Security of Strategic Materials Supply Chains 276
Subtitle C—Other Matters 276
Section 1421—Reduction of Unobligated Balances Within the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund 276
Section 1422—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 1423—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 277
National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund 277
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 278
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations 278
Section 1501—Purpose 278
Section 1502—Procurement 278
Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 279
Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance 279
Section 1505—Military Personnel 279
Section 1506—Working Capital Funds 279
Section 1507—Defense Health Program 279

Page

Section 1508—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 279
Section 1509—Defense Inspector General 279
Subtitle B—Financial Matters 279
Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations 279
Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority 279
Subtitle C—Limitations and Other Matters 280
Section 1531—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 280
Section 1532—One-Year Extension of Project Authority and Related Requirements of Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan 280
Section 1533—Limitations on Availability of Funds in Afghanistan Security Forces Fund 280
TITLE XVI—INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS 281
OVERVIEW 281
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 282
Audit Agencies 282
Effect of Drawdown on Manufacturing Industrial Base 282
Export Control Reform 282
Germanium Wafer Procurement 283
Impact of Federal Prison Industries on the Clothing and Textile Industry 284
Importance of Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé Program 284
Inclusion of Small Business Participation Statistics in Annual Assessments of Selected Weapon Programs 284
Inspector General Review of Intellectual Property Issues 285
Procurement Technical Assistance Program 285
Recycling of Rare Earth Elements 286
Sector-by-Sector, Tier-by-Tier Review 287
Service Disabled Veteran Contracting Within the Department of Defense 287
Small Business Specialists in the Acquisition Workforce 288
Strategic Materials Protection Board 288
Transfer of Technology to Foreign Entities 289
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 289
Subtitle A—Defense Industrial Base Matters 289
Section 1601—Disestablishment of Defense Materiel Readiness Board .. 289
Section 1602—Assessment of Effects of Foreign Boycotts 290
Section 1603—Advancing Innovation Pilot Program 290
Section 1604—National Security Strategy for National Technology and Industrial Base 290
Subtitle B—Department of Defense Activities Related to Small Business Matters 291
Section 1611—Pilot Program To Assist in the Growth and Development of Advanced Small Business Concerns 291
Section 1612—Role of the Directors of Small Business Programs in Requirements Development and Acquisition Decision Processes of the Department of Defense 291
Section 1613—Small Business Advocate for Defense Audit Agencies 291
Section 1614—Independent Assessment of Federal Procurement Contracting Performance of the Department of Defense 291
Section 1615—Assessment of Small Business Programs Transition 292
Section 1616—Additional Responsibilities of Inspector General of the Department of Defense 292
Section 1617—Restoration of 1 Percent Funding for Administrative Expenses of Commercialization Readiness Program of Department of Defense 292
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Small Business Concerns 292
Part I—Procurement Center Representatives 292
Section 1621—Procurement Center Representatives 292
Section 1622—Small Business Act Contracting Requirements Training . 292
Section 1623—Acquisition Planning 293
Part II—Goals for Procurement Contracts Awarded to Small Business Concerns 293
Section 1631—Goals for Procurement Contracts Awarded to Small Business Concerns 293
Section 1632—Reporting on Goals for Procurement Contracts Awarded to Small Business Concerns 293
Section 1633—Senior Executives 294

Page

Part III—Mentor-Protégé Program 294
Section 1641—Mentor-Protégé Programs 294
Section 1642—Government Accountability Office Report 294
Part IV—Transparency in Subcontracting 294
Subpart A—Limitations on Subcontracting 294
Section 1651—Limitations on Subcontracting 294
Section 1652—Penalties 294
Section 1653—Conforming Amendments 295
Section 1654—Regulations 295
Subpart B—Subcontracting Plans 295
Section 1655—Subcontracting Plans 295
Section 1656—Notices of Subcontracting Opportunities 295
Section 1657—Regulations 295
Subpart C—Publication of Certain Documents 295
Section 1658—Publication of Certain Documents 295
Part V—Small Business Concern Size Standards 296
Section 1661—Small Business Concern Size Standards 296
Part VI—Contract Bundling 296
Section 1671—Consolidation of Provisions Relating to Contract Bundling 296
Section 1672—Repeal of Redundant Provisions 296
Section 1673—Technical Amendments 296
Part VII—Increased Penalties for Fraud 296
Section 1681—Safe Harbor for Good Faith Compliance Efforts 296
Section 1682—Office of Hearings and Appeals 297
Section 1683—Requirement Fraudulent Businesses Be Suspended or Debarred 297
Section 1684—Annual Report on Suspensions and Debarments Proposed by Small Business Administration 297
Part VIII—Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Business Units 297
Section 1691—Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization 297
Section 1692—Small Business Procurement Advisory Council 298
Part IX—Other Matters 298
Section 1695—Surety Bonds 298

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 298
PURPOSE 298
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 298
Section 2001—Short Title 299
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law 299
Section 2003—Effective Date 299
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 299
SUMMARY 299
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 299
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 299
Section 2102—Family Housing 299
Section 2103—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 299
Section 2104—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project 299
Section 2105—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects 300
Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects 300
Section 2107—Extension of Limitation on Obligation or Expenditure of Funds for Tour Normalization 300
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 300
SUMMARY 300
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 300
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 300
Section 2202—Family Housing 300
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 301
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 301

Page

Section 2205—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project 301
Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects 301
Section 2207—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects 301
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 301
SUMMARY 301
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 301
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 301
Section 2302—Family Housing 302
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 302
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 302
Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects 302
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 302
SUMMARY 302
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 302
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 302
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 303
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations 303
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 303
Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects 303
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies 303
Section 2404—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects 303
Section 2405—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project 303
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations 304
Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide 304
Section 2412—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 1997 Project 304
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM 304
SUMMARY 304
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 304
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 304
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO 304
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES 304
SUMMARY 304
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 305
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations 305
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 305
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 305
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 305
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 305
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 305
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve 306
Subtitle B—Other Matters 306
Section 2611—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects 306
Section 2612—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project 306
Section 2613—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project 306
Section 2614—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects 306

Page
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES 306
SUMMARY 306
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 307
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 307
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 307
Section 2702—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 307
Subtitle B—Other Matters 307
Section 2711—Consolidation of Department of Defense Base Closure Accounts and Authorized Uses of Base Closure Account Funds 307
Section 2712—Air Armament Center, Eglin Air Force Base 307
Section 2713—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round 307
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS 308
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 308
Alternative Financing Instruments 308
Alternative Site Assessment for the Broadway Complex, San Diego, California 308
Army Energy Initiatives Task Force 309
Briefing on Alternative Power Applications on Military Installations 309
Briefing on Direct Solar and Other Energy Efficient Technologies Applications on Military Installations 310
Building Conversions 310
Decentralized Steam Generation 310
Department of Defense Energy Demonstration and Validation 311
Departments of Defense and Energy Collaboration and Technology Transition 311
Department of Defense Energy Technologies 312
Facility Demolition Program 312
Inclusion of Cost-Benefit Analysis for Energy Security 312
Increased Utilization of Third Party Financing for Energy Efficiency Projects 312
Leasing Real Property 313
Local Communities' Capacity To Support Military Installation Change 313
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 314
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 314
Section 2801—Preparation of Military Installation Master Plans 314
Section 2802—Sustainment Oversight and Accountability for Military Housing Privatization Projects and Related Annual Reporting Requirements 314
Section 2803—One-Year Extension of Authority To Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States 314
Section 2804—Treatment of Certain Defense Nuclear Facility Construction Projects as Military Construction Projects 315
Section 2805—Execution of Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement Nuclear Facility and Limitation on Alternative Plutonium Strategy 316
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 316
Section 2811—Authority of Military Museums To Accept Gifts and Services and To Enter into Leases and Cooperative Agreements 316
Section 2812—Clarification of Parties with Whom the Department of Defense May Conduct Exchanges of Real Property at Certain Military Installations 316
Section 2813—Indemnification of Transferees of Property at Any Closed Military Installation 317
Section 2814—Identification Requirement for Entry on Military Installations 317
Section 2815—Plan To Protect Critical Department of Defense Critical Assets from Electromagnetic Pulse Weapons 317
Subtitle C—Energy Security 317

Page

Section 2821—Congressional Notification for Contracts for the Provision and Operation of Energy Production Facilities Authorized To Be Located on Real Property Under the Jurisdiction of a Military Department 317
Section 2822—Continuation of Limitation on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold or Platinum Certification and Expansion To Include Implementation of ASHRAE Building Standard 189.1 317
Section 2823—Availability and Use of Department of Defense Energy Cost Savings To Promote Energy Security 317
Subtitle D—Provisions Related to Guam Realignment 318
Section 2831—Use of Operation and Maintenance Funding To Support Community Adjustments Related to Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam 318
Section 2832—Certification of Military Readiness Need for Firing Range on Guam as Condition on Establishment of Range 318
Section 2833—Repeal of Conditions on Use of Funds for Guam Realignment 318
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances 318
Section 2841—Modification to Authorized Land Conveyance and Exchange, Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson, Alaska 318
Section 2842—Modification of Financing Authority, Broadway Complex of the Department of the Navy, San Diego, California 319
Section 2843—Land Conveyance, John Kunkel Army Reserve Center, Warren, Ohio 319
Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Castner Range, Fort Bliss, Texas 319
Section 2845—Modification of Land Conveyance, Fort Hood, Texas 319
Section 2846—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Fort Lee Military Reservation and Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia 319
Subtitle F—Other Matters 319
Section 2861—Inclusion of Religious Symbols as Part of Military Memorials 319
Section 2862—Redesignation of the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies as the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies 320
Section 2863—Sense of Congress Regarding Establishment of Military Divers Memorial at Washington Navy Yard 320
Section 2864—Gold Star Mothers National Monument, Arlington National Cemetery 320
Section 2865—Naming of Training and Support Complex, Fort Bragg, North Carolina 320
Section 2866—Naming of Electrochemistry Engineering Facility, Naval Support Activity Crane, Crane, Indiana 320
Section 2867—Retention of Core Functions of the Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts 320
Section 2868—Retention of Core Functions of the Air Force Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 320
TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 321
SUMMARY 321
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 321
Section 2901—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 321
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 321
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 321
OVERVIEW 321
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 321
National Nuclear Security Administration 321
Overview 321
Weapons Activities 322
Consideration and Incorporation of Surety Features in Life Extension Programs 322
Directed Stockpile Work and Life Extension Program 322
Ignition and Support of Other Stockpile Programs 322

Page
Prioritization of Resources and Programs 323
Work for Others at the Nuclear Security Laboratories 324
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation 325
Adopting the Gold Standard for Section 123 Agreements 325
Assessment of Location and Vulnerability of Highly-Enriched Uranium 326
Conversion of Research Reactors 326
Global Security Through Science Partnership Programs 326
Nuclear Security Summit 2012 327
Plutonium Disposition Program and Mixed Oxide Fabrication Facility 327
Naval Reactors 328
Naval Reactors 328
Report by the Director of Naval Reactors 328
Report on potential use of low-enriched uranium for naval reactors 329
Office of the Administrator 329
Governance, Management, and Oversight of the Nuclear Security Enterprise 329
National Nuclear Security Administration Budget Categories 331
Nuclear Security Laboratories as Federally Funded Research and Development Centers 331
Public Release of Management and Operating Contractor Performance Evaluations 332
Report and implementation actions for findings and recommendations related to governance, management, and oversight of the nuclear security enterprise 333
Environmental and Other Defense Activities 333
Overview 333
Defense Environmental Cleanup 333
Environmental Management Technology Development Program 333
Prioritization of environmental cleanup efforts 334
Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant 334
Other Defense Activities 335
Department of Energy Office of Health, Safety, and Security 335
Review of the Supply Chain Security and Integrity of the Nuclear Weapons Complex 335
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal 336
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Blue Ribbon Commission, and Investigation of Salt Dome Disposal 336
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 337
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations 337
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration 337
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup 337
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities 337
Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance 337
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 337
Section 3111—Authorized Personnel Levels of the Office of the Administrator 337
Section 3112—Budget Justification Materials 338
Section 3113—Contractor Governance, Oversight, and Accountability 339
Section 3114—National Nuclear Security Administration Council 340
Section 3115—Safety, Health, and Security of the National Nuclear Security Administration 340
Section 3116—Design and Use of Prototypes of Nuclear Weapons 343
Section 3117—Improvement and Streamlining of the Missions and Operations of the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration 344
Section 3118—Cost-Benefit Analyses for Competition of Management and Operating Contracts 344
Section 3119—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign 345
Section 3120—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Global Security Through Science Partnerships Program 345
Section 3121—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security 346

Page

Section 3122—Two-Year Extension of Schedule for Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium at Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina ... 346
Subtitle C—Improvements to National Security Energy Laws ... 346
Section 3131—Improvements to the Atomic Energy Defense Act ... 346
Section 3132—Improvements to the National Nuclear Security Administration Act ... 346
Section 3133—Clarification of the Role of the Administrator for Nuclear Security ... 346
Section 3134—Consolidated Reporting Requirements Relating to Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship, Management, and Infrastructure ... 347
Section 3135—Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements ... 348
Subtitle D—Reports ... 348
Section 3141—Notification of Nuclear Criticality and Non-Nuclear Incidents ... 348
Section 3142—Reports on Lifetime Extension Programs ... 348
Section 3143—National Academy of Sciences Study on Peer Review and Design Competition Related to Nuclear Weapons ... 349
Section 3144—Report on Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs ... 350
Section 3145—Study on Reuse of Plutonium Pit ... 350
Subtitle E—Other Matters ... 351
Section 3151—Use of Probabilistic Risk Assessment To Ensure Nuclear Safety ... 351
Section 3152—Advice to President and Congress Regarding Safety, Security, and Reliability of United States Nuclear Weapons Stockpile and Nuclear Forces ... 351
Section 3153—Classification of Certain Restricted Data ... 352
Section 3154—Independent Cost Assessments for Life Extension Programs, New Nuclear Facilities, and Other Matters ... 352
Section 3155—Assessment of Nuclear Weapon Pit Production Requirement ... 352
Section 3156—Intellectual Property Related to Uranium Enrichment ... 353
Section 3157—Sense of Congress on Competition and Fees Related to the Management and Operating Contracts of the Nuclear Security Enterprise ... 354
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ... 354
OVERVIEW ... 354
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 354
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 354
Section 3201—Authorization ... 354
Section 3202—Improvements to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board ... 354
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ... 356
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 356
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations ... 356
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ... 356
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 356
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2013 ... 356
Section 3502—Application of the Federal Acquisition Regulation ... 356
Section 3503—Procurement of Ship Disposal ... 356
Section 3504—Limitation of National Defense Reserve Fleet Vessels to Those over 1,500 Gross Tons ... 356
Section 3505—Donation of Excess Fuel to Maritime Academies ... 356
Section 3506—Clarification of Heading ... 357
Section 3507—Transfer of Vessels into the National Defense Reserve Fleet ... 357
Section 3508—Amendments Relating to the National Defense Reserve Fleet ... 357
Section 3509—Extension of Maritime Security Fleet Program ... 357

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES ... 357
Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables ... 357
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT ... 358
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ... 410
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ... 444
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL ... 472
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ... 474

Page

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 479
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 500

DEPARTMENTAL DATA 511
Department of Defense Authorization Request 511
Communications from Other Committees 515
Fiscal Data 529
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 529
Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act 530
Committee Cost Estimate 530
Advisory of Earmarks 530
Oversight Findings 530
General Performance Goals and Objectives 530
Statement of Federal Mandates 532
Federal Advisory Committee Statement 532
Applicability to the Legislative Branch 532
Committee Votes 532
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 555
Additional Views
Additional Views of Representative Loretta Sanchez 556
Additional Views of Representative Hank Johnson 556
Dissenting Views
Dissenting Views of Representative John R. Garamendi 558

112TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
112–479

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

MAY 11, 2012.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4310]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, 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 2013 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2013: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the

74–128

personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and Reserve Components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for the Maritime Administration.

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, is a key mechanism through which the Congress of the United States fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense (DOD) generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the House Committee on Armed Services. The committee bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

The bill reflects the House Armed Services Committee's steadfast support of the courageous, professional, and dedicated men and women of the United States Armed Forces and the committee's appreciation for the sacrifices they make to accomplish their required missions. Events of the last year—ranging from on-going operations in Afghanistan, support to Operation Odyssey Dawn in Libya, robust counter-terrorism efforts around the globe, to time-sensitive disaster and humanitarian responses—serve to highlight the United States military's flexibility and responsiveness in defending our nation's interests and addressing security challenges, wherever and whenever they may arise. The committee understands that the capabilities of our Armed Forces are underpinned by the dedicated civilian employees of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, as well as the defense industrial base. Each of these elements is required to enable the U.S. military to be the guarantor of peace and economic security that it has been for generations. The committee is deeply committed to providing full authorization for the funding required to restore the readiness of our military; enhance the quality of life of military service members and their families; sustain and improve the Armed Forces; and properly safeguard the national security of the United States.

In addition to providing authorization of appropriations, the committee bill ensures our troops deployed in Afghanistan and around the world have the equipment, resources, authorities, training, and time needed to successfully complete their missions and return

home; provides our warfighters and their families with the resources and support they need, deserve, and have earned; invests in the capabilities and force structure needed to protect the United States from current and future threats; mandates fiscal responsibility, transparency and accountability within the Department of Defense; and incentivizes competition for every tax-payer dollar associated with funding Department of Defense requirements.

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

The committee considers it critical that the capabilities and capacity of the armed forces continue to improve so they can accomplish the full range of diverse 21st century missions, minimize risks associated with such challenges and effectively engage in hostilities, when necessary, as far from American shores as possible. Thus, the committee's top priority remains ensuring that our military personnel receive the best equipment, weapons systems and training possible. As such, H.R. 4310 would provide for both near and longer-term military personnel and force structure requirements.

As terrorists have decentralized and sought new safe havens from which to carry out attacks on U.S. soil, Congress acted last year to ensure our military men and women risking their lives to defend us from such attacks are on solid legal ground. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) reaffirmed the military's authority to detain terrorists who are part of or substantially supporting al Qaeda, the Taliban, or associated forces. This year, through the incorporation of the Right to Habeas Corpus Act, the bill makes clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that any person detained in the United States pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force will have his day in court. The committee bill also includes several additional provisions to strengthen detention policies and procedures.

The committee bill also includes a subtitle regarding the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee is concerned about Iranian actions that may destabilize the security situation in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Republic of Iraq, and the Syrian Arab Republic. Moreover, the committee is discouraged by Iran's continuing commitment to its nuclear weapon program, in spite of increasing international pressure and sanctions. Therefore, the bill seeks to clarify that the United States should use all elements of national power, including military force, if necessary, to prevent Iran from threatening the United States, our allies, or its neighbors with a nuclear weapon. Moreover, the bill requires the President to develop a plan to enhance the credibility of U.S. military capabilities to counter Iranian military aggression and its nuclear weapon program, including military exercises and the prepositioning of supplies.

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

Commander of U.S. Pacific Command to provide an annex to this report that identifies any gaps in intelligence, capabilities, capacity, or authority to address threats from DPRK.

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

The committee bill authorizes appropriations for aircraft, ground vehicles, shipbuilding, missile defense, military space assets, force protection equipment. The bill further enables and fully funds U.S. Special Operations Forces. The committee also authorizes robust funding for defense research and development to ensure the Department meets future defense needs.

With the nation at war, but still preparing for an uncertain future security environment, the committee further addresses adversarial use of the internet as a new battlespace. The committee includes a provision that would affirm the Defense Department's authority to use cyberspace to confront certain threats. The committee also maintains a focus on increasing oversight of cyberspace operations, as well as fostering a better understanding of the challenges facing the Department when operating in cyberspace by also calling for quarterly operational briefings, an assessment of the legal authorities and policy challenges in conducting full spectrum cyber operations, and a briefing on the National Guard's role in providing cyber defense capabilities.

The ballistic missile threat continues to increase both qualitatively and quantitatively. The committee bill would provide additional resources for development, testing and fielding of missile defenses to protect the U.S. homeland, including a new East Coast site for missile defense, and support the implementation of the Administration's European phased adaptive approach for missile defense, with increased focus on equitable distribution of the costs of the system with our allies who would benefit from its defense capability.

A credible and reliable nuclear deterrent has been fundamental to U.S. security for decades and will continue to be for the foreseeable future. As such, the committee provides additional funds beyond the Administration's budget request to meet the promised level of funding for nuclear modernization activities, including nuclear warhead life extension programs, consistent with the Administration's pledge during ratification of the New START treaty. The committee bill would also hold the Administration to its promises for the next generation ballistic missile submarine, would require the next generation bomber to be nuclear-capable, and would require that the Administration ensure the next generation cruise missile be nuclear capable. Moreover, the bill would address longstanding and well-documented problems related to governance, management, and oversight of the nation's nuclear security enterprise.

Preserving Key Capabilities in a Time of Fiscal Austerity

In April, 2011, the President announced his intention to seek over $400.0 billion in savings within the Department of Defense over the next decade. Subsequently, the Congress passed the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) in August, 2011. The BCA signifi-

cantly reduced discretionary spending across the Federal Government and for the military in particular. The President's budget request for national defense for fiscal year 2013 is $51.0 billion less than the President's estimated fiscal year 2013 requirement for national defense contained in last year's budget request.

The committee acknowledges that hard choices will have to be made to prioritize capabilities that allow our military to remain flexible, responsive, and decisive in any engagement. However, the committee recommends changes to the President's proposed force structure, in order to preserve depth and capacity within the force. For example, the committee is concerned with the Navy's overall size of the fleet and sustained demand for naval forces, particularly in light of the strategic pivot to the Asia-Pacific. In fiscal year 2013, the budget request proposed to retire four additional Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers well before the end of their expected service life. The committee has reinstated the requisite funding to operate and maintain, modernize and upgrade the U.S.S. Cowpens (CG 63), U.S.S. Anzio (CG 68), and the U.S.S. Vicksburg (CG 69) in fiscal year 2013 and expects the Navy to properly maintain these critical assets in the fleet in the future. The committee notes that it is less costly to maintain existing assets and supports providing the correct naval capabilities and fleet mix through a balance of new procurement and adequately maintaining the existing force structure for the length of time for which assets were initially programmed. In keeping with these concerns, the committee also authorizes a multi-year procurement for up to 10 Virginia-class submarines and a multi-year procurement for up to 10 DDG–51 Arleigh Burke class destroyers.

Likewise, the committee preserves tactical airlift crucial to the military's ability to support warfighters on the ground with agile combat support, such as C–130 Hercules, C–23 Sherpas, and C–27J Spartan aircraft, which were also proposed for early retirement. H.R. 4310 would also maintain close air support and ground interdiction capabilities provided by A–10 Warthogs and F–16 Fighting Falcons slated for premature divestment prior to end of the forecasted service-life of each aircraft. The bill would retain the Air Force's Global Hawk Block 30 unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft as they support the deployed warfighter, rather than shifting these assets to storage, as proposed by the budget request. The committee recommends maintaining the option for additional airborne electronic warfare capabilities by supporting advance procurement for the EA–18G Growler. The committee also recommends sustaining America's heavy armored production base by maintaining minimum sustained production of Abrams tanks, Bradley fighting vehicles, and Hercules recovery vehicles. These changes preserve capability in the Active Component, as well as the Guard and Reserve, but not at the expense of the readiness of the Active Component.

In making these changes, the committee heeded the testimony of the service chiefs, who stressed the importance of ensuring the United States does not repeat the mistakes of the past by hollowing force structure in response to budget cuts. Therefore, for every change to force structure recommended by this bill includes funding for military personnel and operation and maintenance costs associated with such force structure. Moreover, each of these

changes was funded within the top line funding allocation provided by the House-passed fiscal year 2013 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

Resources for Warfighters and Families

Recognizing that the service and sacrifice of our military men and women is a down payment on future health care benefits, the committee bill takes a sensible approach to TRICARE. The bill includes a provision that would allow for a modest fee increase in pharmacy fees, while protecting military families from steep fee increases in other TRICARE programs. The bill also provides a 1.7 percent increase in military basic pay.

The committee is concerned with the pace of the reductions while the United States is still decisively engaged in armed conflict in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and required to maintain a robust global security posture. The Army and the Marine Corps will make the largest reductions over the next 5 years of 72,000 and 20,000, respectively, from their fiscal year 2012 authorization levels. This bill would limit the reduction for the Regular Component of the Army and Marine Corps by no more than 15,000 and 5,000 a year, respectively, during fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

The committee is also concerned with the reductions in the Reserve Components. The services have relied heavily on their respective Reserve Components over the past 10 years of conflict and have embraced the operational reserve as a practice versus a concept. It is imperative the Active and Reserve Components work together as a total force to maintain the All-Volunteer Force. The committee believes that the Reserve Components must be an operational reserve, mobilized periodically for real-world operational missions to maintain and sustain the level of skills and competence so that they are capable of responding to crises or combat requirements. To achieve this objective, the committee supports sustaining a robust and viable force structure mix between the Active and Reserves to ensure the dwell time goals of 1 to 3 for Active and 1 to 5 for Reserves are met during peace and war.

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

Fiscal Responsibility, Transparency, and Accountability

The committee scrutinized the Department of Defense's budget and identified inefficiencies to invest those savings into higher national security priorities. The committee bill reflects the fact that as a nation, we must make tough choices in order to provide for America's common defense by examining every aspect of the defense enterprise to find ways that we can accomplish the mission of providing for the common defense more effectively. Over the past year, in order to enhance the committee's oversight of fiscal responsibility within the Department of Defense and to identify opportunities to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse, the committee established both the Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform and the Panel on Business Challenges within

the Defense Industry, which examined the role of defense regulations and the defense auditing agencies. The findings of both panels have guided the committee's consideration of legislation included in this bill.

Incentivizing Competition

The committee remains steadfast in its belief that competition reduces costs, increases quality, and improves vendor performance. For this reason, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending more than 80 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2013 until such time as the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense is implementing the requirements of section 202(d) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23), as amended. This section would also require that the certification be accompanied by a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the processes and procedures that have been implemented across the military departments and defense agencies to maximize competition throughout the life-cycle of major defense acquisition programs.

Similarly, the committee expresses that assured access to space remains critical to national security and the Air Force's launch plan should maintain mission assurance, stabilize the industrial base, reduce costs, and provide opportunities for competition.

Furthermore, the Panel on Business Challenges in the Defense Industry, appointed by Chairman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon and Ranking Member Adam Smith, specifically examined barriers to entry, contracting and regulatory burdens, and opportunities to strengthen the defense industrial base. As a result of the Panel's efforts, H.R. 4310 includes several provisions that are specifically aimed at fostering the defense industrial base and increasing opportunities for small and midsize businesses in order to increase competition.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 results from hearings that began on February 15, 2012, and that were completed on March 29, 2012. The full committee conducted 9 sessions. In addition, a total of 15 sessions were conducted by 6 different subcommittees.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 9, 2012, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 4310, as amended, by a vote of 56–5.

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 4310. 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 $631.6 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee for fiscal year 2013. Of this amount, $525.3 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $88.5 billion was requested for the overseas contingency operations requirements covering the entire fiscal year, and $17.8 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 $635.2 billion in fiscal year 2013, including $88.5 billion for overseas contingency operations. The base committee authorization of $546.8 billion is a $0.2 billion decrease below the levels provided for in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

The following table summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2013 and compares these amounts to the President's request.

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
National Defense Function (050) Funding, Base Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I - Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,853,729		5,853,729
Missile Procurement, Army	1,302,689	60,000	1,362,689
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,501,706	382,494	1,884,200
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,739,706	-107,800	1,631,906
Other Procurement, Army	6,326,245	-80,000	6,246,245
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	227,414	-227,414	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	17,129,296	99,000	17,228,296
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,117,578	55,631	3,173,209
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	13,579,845	893,000	14,472,845
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	759,539	-12,547	746,992
Other Procurement, Navy	6,169,378	102,653	6,272,031
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,622,955	-140,900	1,482,055
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,002,999	313,700	11,316,699
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	599,194		599,194
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,491,846	15,000	5,506,846
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,720,848		16,720,848

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,187,935	436,200	4,624,135
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	99,477	-99,477	0
Subtotal, Title I - Procurement	**97,432,379**	**1,689,540**	**99,121,919**
Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	8,929,415	-472,111	8,457,304
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	16,882,877	835,525	17,718,402
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	25,428,046	84,950	25,512,996
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	17,982,161	496,125	18,478,286
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	185,268	35,000	220,268
Subtotal, Title II - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**69,407,767**	**979,489**	**70,387,256**
Title III - Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	36,608,592	-160,147	36,448,445
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	41,606,943	-474,378	41,132,565
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,983,163	8,900	5,992,063
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	35,435,360	304,800	35,740,160
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	31,993,013	-10,700	31,982,313
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	3,162,008	21,800	3,183,808
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,246,982		1,246,982
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	272,285		272,285
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,166,482	168,317	3,334,799

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	7,108,612	-30,300	7,078,312
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,015,455	315,005	6,330,460
US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense	13,516		13,516
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	108,759		108,759
Cooperative Threat Reduction	519,111		519,111
Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund	274,198		274,198
Environmental Restoration, Army	335,921		335,921
Environmental Restoration, Navy	310,594		310,594
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	529,263		529,263
Environmental Restoration, Defense	11,133		11,133
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites	237,543		237,543
Subtotal, Title III - Operation and Maintenance	**174,938,933**	**143,297**	**175,082,230**
Title IV - Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	135,111,799	615,056	135,726,855
Subtotal, Title IV - Military Personnel	**135,111,799**	**615,056**	**135,726,855**
Title XIV - Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	60,037		60,037
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	45,452		45,452
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	39,135		39,135
Working Capital Fund, DECA	1,371,560		1,371,560

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
National Defense Sealift Fund	608,136		608,136
Defense Health Program	32,528,718	229,900	32,758,618
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	1,301,786		1,301,786
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	999,363		999,363
Office of the Inspector General	273,821		273,821
Subtotal, Title XIV - Other Authorizations	**37,228,008**	**229,900**	**37,457,908**
Subtotal, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	**514,118,886**	**3,657,282**	**517,776,168**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Military Construction, Army	1,923,323		1,923,323
Military Construction, Navy	1,701,985	-152,821	1,549,164
Military Construction, Air Force	388,200		388,200
Milcon,Def-Wide	3,654,623	-85,000	3,569,623
Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense	151,000		151,000
NATO Security Investment Program	254,163		254,163
Military Construction, Army National Guard	613,799		613,799
Military Construction, Army Reserve	305,846		305,846
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	49,532		49,532
Military Construction, Air National Guard	42,386		42,386
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	10,979		10,979

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Subtotal, Military Construction	**9,095,836**	**-237,821**	**8,858,015**
Family Housing			
Fam Hsg Const,A	4,641		4,641
Fam Hsg Op&Dt,A	530,051		530,051
Fam Hsg Const,N	102,182		102,182
Fam Hsg Op&Dt,N	378,230		378,230
Fam Hs Op&Dt,AF	497,829		497,829
Fam Hsg Con,AF	83,824		83,824
Fam Hsg Op&Dt,D-W	52,238		52,238
DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,786		1,786
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,650,781**		**1,650,781**
Base Realignment and Closure			
BRAC - Air Force	2,268		2,268
BRAC - Army	106,219		106,219
BRAC - Navy	18,210		18,210
BRAC, A	79,893		79,893
BRAC, AF	122,552		122,552
BRAC, N	146,951		146,951
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	**476,093**		**476,093**
Undistributed Adjustments			

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Prior Year Savings	0	-146,697	-146,697
Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments	**0**	**-146,697**	**-146,697**
Subtotal, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	**11,222,710**	**-384,518**	**10,838,192**
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**525,341,596**	**3,272,764**	**528,614,360**
Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations			
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	6,000	0	6,000
Weapons Activities	7,577,341	323,638	7,900,979
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,458,631	27,000	2,485,631
Naval Reactors	1,088,635	99,000	1,187,635
Office of the Administrator	411,279	-48,000	363,279
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,472,001	10,000	5,482,001
Other Defense Activities	735,702	-50,000	685,702
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**17,749,589**	**361,638**	**18,111,227**
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	29,415	2,000	31,415
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**29,415**	**2,000**	**31,415**
Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authori	**17,779,004**	**363,638**	**18,142,642**
Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,779,004**	**363,638**	**18,142,642**

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, National Defense Function (050) Funding, Base Budget Request	**543,120,600**	**3,636,402**	**546,757,002**
National Defense Function (050) Funding, OCO Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Overseas Contingency Operations			
Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	486,200		486,200
Missile Procurement, Army	49,653		49,653
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	15,422		15,422
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	357,493	-19,000	338,493
Other Procurement, Army	2,015,907	-38,000	1,977,907
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	1,675,400	227,400	1,902,800
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	164,582		164,582
Weapons Procurement, Navy	23,500		23,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	285,747		285,747
Other Procurement, Navy	98,882		98,882
Procurement, Marine Corps	943,683		943,683
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	305,600		305,600
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	116,203		116,203
Missile Procurement, Air Force	34,350		34,350
Other Procurement, Air Force	2,818,270		2,818,270

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Procurement, Defense-Wide	196,349		196,349
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	100,000	-50,000	50,000
National Guard & Reserve Equipment	0	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Procurement	**9,687,241**	**620,400**	**10,307,641**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	19,860		19,860
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	60,119		60,119
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	53,150		53,150
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	112,387	915,000	1,027,387
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**245,516**	**915,000**	**1,160,516**
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	28,591,441	-758,700	27,832,741
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	5,880,395	-22,100	5,858,295
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,066,340	-15,600	4,050,740
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	9,241,613	-34,700	9,206,913
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	7,824,579	-679,300	7,145,279
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	154,537		154,537
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	55,924		55,924
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	25,477		25,477
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	120,618		120,618

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	382,448		382,448
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	19,975		19,975
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	5,749,167		5,749,167
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund	400,000	-25,000	375,000
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**62,512,514**	**-1,535,400**	**60,977,114**
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	14,060,094		14,060,094
Subtotal, Military Personnel	**14,060,094**		**14,060,094**
Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	42,600		42,600
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	240,400		240,400
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	220,364		220,364
Defense Health Program	993,898		993,898
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	469,025		469,025
Office of the Inspector General	10,766		10,766
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**1,977,053**		**1,977,053**
Military Construction			
Military Construction, Navy	0	150,768	150,768
Prior Year Savings	0	-150,768	-150,768
Subtotal, Military Construction	**0**	**0**	**0**

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2013

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Subtotal, Overseas Contingency Operations	**88,482,418**	**0**	**88,482,418**
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**88,482,418**	**0**	**88,482,418**
Total, National Defense Function (050) Funding, OCO Budget Request	**88,482,418**	**0**	**88,482,418**
Total, National Defense	**631,603,018**	**3,636,402**	**635,239,420**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV - Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	67,590		67,590
Title XIV - Cemeterial Expenses, Army (Function 700)	45,800	25,000	70,800
Title XXXIV - Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270)	14,909		14,909
Title XXXV - Maritime Administration (Function 400)	146,298		146,298
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)			
Title X - General Transfer Authority	[3,500,000]		[3,500,000]
Title XV - Special Transfer Authority	[3,000,000]		[3,000,000]
MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)			
Defense Production Act	[89,189]		[89,189]

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2013 is $650.6 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 2013, and mandatory programs.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	525,341,596	3,272,764	528,614,360
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	17,779,004	363,638	18,142,642
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050) -- BASE BILL	543,120,600	3,636,402	546,757,002
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	88,482,418		88,482,418
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**631,603,018**	**3,636,402**	**635,239,420**
Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization			
Defense Production Act Purchases	89,189		89,189
Indefinite Account: National Science Center, Army	25		25
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	7,855		7,855
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	12,029		12,029
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**109,098**		**109,098**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	104,000		104,000
Nuclear Energy	93,000		93,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**197,000**		**197,000**
Other Discretionary Programs	7,168,000		7,168,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**7,168,000**		**7,168,000**
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	**7,474,098**		**7,474,098**

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	613,933,112	3,272,764	617,205,876
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,976,004	363,638	18,339,642
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,168,000		7,168,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary	**639,077,116**	**3,636,402**	**642,713,518**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Estimates)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	6,849,000		6,849,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,100,000		1,100,000
Offsetting receipts	-1,794,000		-1,794,000
Net change of provisions in the FY 2013 NDAA		-26,000	-26,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**6,155,000**	**-26,000**	**6,129,000**
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,165,000		1,165,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**1,165,000**		**1,165,000**
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	57,000		57,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**571,000**		**571,000**
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	**7,891,000**	**-26,000**	**7,865,000**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	620,088,112	3,246,764	623,334,876

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,141,004	363,638	19,504,642
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,739,000		7,739,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory	**646,968,116**	**3,610,402**	**650,578,518**

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $98.8 billion for procurement. This represents a $4.8 billion increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommends authorization of $99.1 billion, an increase of $1.7 billion from the fiscal year 2013 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 procurement program are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $5.9 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $5.9 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

UH–72A Lakota Helicopter

The committee notes that the UH–72A Lakota Helicopter has proven to be a capable multi-role aircraft used in support of the Army National Guard's unique set of missions including, border security, disaster response, medical evacuation, and troop transport. The committee is aware that the Army has completed a survivability analysis and initial cost assessment on modifications that, if made, would allow the UH–72 to operate in non-permissive environments. The results of the analysis indicate that the UH–72A could be an effective and cost-efficient option to be used in support of additional operations in the continental United States (CONUS) and outside the continental United States (OCONUS), and in combat zones in support of contingency operations. The committee believes that further assessment should be conducted to evaluate potential courses of action for expanding the operational spectrum for the utilization of the Light UH–72A.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to include the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2013, that identifies where the UH–72A could provide operational efficiencies in support of permissive and non-permissive CONUS, OCONUS, and contingency missions. The report should include, at a minimum, a cost assessment that includes the costs associated with integrating aircraft survivability systems, testing costs to qualify the aircraft to operate in non-permissive environments, and costs associated with sustaining the aircraft in non-permissive environments.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.3 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.4 billion, an increase of $60.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Patriot Mods

The budget request contained $199.6 million for Patriot Mods in Missile Procurement, Army.

In view of the Department of Defense's decision regarding the Medium Extended Altitude Defense System as noted elsewhere in this title, the committee remains interested in ensuring that the Department takes all necessary and appropriate steps to maintain and improve the Patriot program.

The committee recommends $199.6 million, the full amount requested, for Patriot Mods.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.5 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.9 billion, an increase of $382.5 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Heavy Brigade Combat Team Force Structure and Industrial Base

The committee notes that the Army has announced that it will decrease end strength over the next 5 years. The decrease in end strength has forced the Army to also announce plans to eliminate at least eight active component Brigade Combat Teams (BCT), reducing the total number from 45 to 37. The active Army has 17 Heavy BCTs (HBCT), 20 Infantry BCTs, and 8 Stryker BCTs. The Army has stated that at least two of the eight BCTs eliminated will be HBCTs. The committee notes that the HBCT, 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 heavy forces, the committee notes a Rand Corporation report from 2010 that concluded, "Heavy forces—based on tanks and infantry fighting vehicles—are key elements of any force that will fight hybrid enemies that have a modicum of training, organization, and advanced weapons. Light and medium forces can complement heavy forces, particularly in urban and other complex

terrain; they do not provide the survivability, lethality, or mobility inherent in heavy forces. Quite simply, heavy forces reduce operational risks and minimize friendly casualties."

The committee is concerned that the Army may eliminate too many HBCTs based on resource constraints rather than meeting the needs of combatant commanders. The committee understands the Army is currently conducting a force structure and BCT mix analysis, however, it does not believe the results will be available in time to inform the committee. The committee also understands the Army is considering adding a third maneuver battalion back into the Heavy and Infantry BCTs which may also impact the total amount of BCTs. The committee is supportive of all BCTs having a third maneuver battalion and notes that the committee opposed the Army's original decision of two maneuver battalions per BCT in the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

In addition to the mix of BCTs, the committee is also concerned about the Army's proposal to let the HBCT vehicle production lines go "cold" for 3-to-4 years, beginning in fiscal year 2013, and the associated impact this decision will have on the industrial base at both the prime contractor and vendor level. The HBCT industrial base is not dependent upon one platform. The committee believes insufficient information is available to the Army and Congress to make an informed decision on what the potential risks would be of closing HBCT production lines. The committee needs to understand the ramifications to the future HBCT industrial base capabilities regarding the Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, Paladin howitzer, Hercules recovery vehicle, Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle, and the Ground Combat Vehicle. The committee needs to be informed of the Army's projected requirements in fiscal year 2017 to maintain a public and private workforce to sustain the current level of HBCTs, and what capabilities the Army will need in the future to produce new platforms. The committee also believes that Foreign Military Sales (FMS) may help to mitigate some of the risk to the industrial base, but believes FMS alone will not be enough to ensure that the HBCT industrial base is maintained at viable levels in the near term. In the absence of a force mix BCT analysis, and a detailed quantitative analysis of the impacts to the HBCT industrial base, the committee recommends adjustments to the Army's budget request elsewhere in this report.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, to brief the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the results of the recent force mix analysis. At a minimum, the briefing should include the assumptions and scenarios used to determine the type and mix of Brigade Combat Teams, the rationale for the force mix, and the risks involved with the recommended force mix. The committee also directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or his designee, to brief the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on how the Army's recent force structure and BCT mix analysis meet the needs of the combatant commanders, and what the Joint Staff believes are the potential risks regarding the adequacy of the force mix, if the assumptions behind the scenarios used do not materialize. In addition, the committee further directs the Secretary of the Army, in

coordination with the Chairman of the Joints Chief of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees to accompany the fiscal year 2014 budget request, on the results and impacts of the force mix analysis.

Abrams tank upgrades

The budget request contained $74.4 million for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

The committee notes that the Army must maintain the ability for its Heavy Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) to overmatch any possible threat in the future. The committee continues to be concerned that Abrams tank production is expected to shut down from fiscal year 2014–16, and that the Army is unsure that the production line and supporting industrial base would be available when it starts future upgrades to Abrams tanks. The Army has completed limited analysis of the impact that the shutdown will have on the industrial base and is scheduled to complete a comprehensive analysis in summer 2012. However, based on data the Army has provided, the committee believes that the cost to shut down and restart the Abrams production line will total almost $1.0 billion, and that the Army has not yet budgeted these funds. The committee believes that the best course of action would be a combination of the minimum economical sustainment rate and Foreign Military Sales. The committee notes that the cost of shutting down and then restarting the Abrams production line would be significant and yield nothing. However, for almost the same level of funding, the Army could keep the Abrams production line "warm" while at the same time modernizing a portion of National Guard Heavy BCTs to a digital tank capability. Finally, the committee believes that a viable Heavy BCT industrial base is critical to national security, and therefore has requested in a standalone letter that the Comptroller General of the United States review and report to the committee all of the current and ongoing RAND analyses as they pertain to the Abrams industrial base.

The committee recommends $255.4 million, an increase of $181.0 million, for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

Bradley fighting vehicle program

The budget request contained $148.2 million for the Bradley fighting vehicle program for procurement and installation of upgrade kits for engineering change proposal (ECP) plans.

The committee is concerned that even with the funds requested for fiscal year 2013, production of the Bradley fighting vehicle will shut down as early as 2013, for a minimum of 3 years, and that the Army is unsure that the production line and supporting industrial base will be available when it restarts production of upgraded Bradley fighting vehicles. Moreover, the committee is concerned about the Army's current plan to install ECP components in Bradley fighting vehicles only at unit field locations and its impact on the industrial base. The committee understands that the Army may have a fiscal year 2012 funded reset program for the Bradley fighting vehicle that will take place at the contractor's industrial base facility. The committee believes that the most prudent course of action is to execute a portion of the funds for installation of ECP components at the production base facility in conjunction with the

planned fiscal year 2012 funded reset program. The Army should also explore opportunities for accelerating some follow-on ECP capabilities into the current ECP plan. Additionally, the committee suggests that any Bradley fighting vehicles in storage at the contractor's facility, and not yet delivered to the Army, should be programmed to receive ECP kits prior to delivery to unit locations. The committee also believes that as part of the production contract any further production of the Bradley Operation Desert Storm-Situational Awareness vehicle for the National Guard should be given priority in fielding ECP kits.

The committee recommends $288.2 million, an increase of $140.0 million, for the Bradley fighting vehicle program.

Improved recovery vehicle

The budget request contained $107.9 million for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

The committee is aware that in order to provide greater protection for soldiers, the Army's current and future fleet of combat vehicles has grown significantly in weight. As a result, the M88A1 recovery vehicles are approaching their maximum capability with the current fleet, and its capability will be greatly exceeded by the future fleet. While the Army is examining the need to increase the number of M88A2 recovery vehicles to support these heavier combat vehicles, with the potential of adjusting their acquisition objective for M88A2's based on future force structure, the committee is concerned that a delay in a decision to either add to the M88A2 inventory or to completely pure-fleet the vehicles to an all-A2 configuration, could come after the M88 industrial base is closed. The committee supports the Army's decision to include funds in the budget request for the procurement of an additional 31 M88A2 vehicles, but believes additional funds are necessary to maintain production and reduce the impacts of stopping production. The committee believes this will provide the Army with ample time to finalize its force structure and Brigade Combat Team adjustments and to determine a more accurate requirement for the procurement of additional M88A2s.

The committee recommends $169.9 million, an increase of $62.0 million, for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

Paladin integrated management program

The budget request contained $206.1 million for the Paladin integrated management (PIM) program.

The PIM program is scheduled to receive milestone C authority in June 2013. The current acquisition strategy includes four years of low-rate initial production (LRIP), followed by eight years of full-rate production (FRP). The committee notes that the first FRP is not planned for delivery until fiscal year 2019, which is more than 6 years after the milestone C decision, and the last FRP is not planned for completion until fiscal year 2028. The committee believes this protracted build and fielding schedule will likely add significant cost to the overall program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on various courses of actions for possible acceleration of the PIM program. At a min-

imum, the report should include the possibility and ramifications of a more realistic production schedule, and the associated funding requirements, that includes moving from 4 years of LRIP down to 2 years, and the acceleration of FRP to less than the planned 8 years of procurement. The report should also identify potential test efficiencies for efforts required, prior to a full-rate production decision, to move the FRP decision sooner than currently planned.

The committee recommends $206.1 million, the full amount requested, for the PIM program.

Small Arms Modernization and Sustainment

The budget request contained $4.9 million for M249 squad automatic weapons and modifications, and contained $6.8 million for M240 medium machine guns and modifications.

The committee understands that small arms modernization is a component of the U.S. Army's continued effort to modernize key weapon systems, including the M249 squad automatic weapon (SAW) and the M240 medium machine gun. The committee believes the Army has the responsibility to provide the soldier with the best individual and crew-served weapons, and to continuously modernize, adapt, and incrementally improve small arms weapon systems as the threat to deployed military personnel evolves. The committee notes that small arms are key components to the survivability and lethality of the warfighter. The committee is aware that most small arms programs are nearing the end of their procurement objectives. The committee notes the M249 SAW and M240 machine guns will complete procurement in fiscal year 2013, and the committee is concerned about the perceived lack of a long-term sustainment strategy for the small arms industrial base, specifically the light and medium machine gun industrial base.

The committee understands there has been significant investment by industry and the Army in training, infrastructure, and material required to develop and produce the highest quality light and medium machine gun weapon systems. The committee is concerned that any significant break in production could be detrimental to the small arms industrial base, and in turn to the readiness of the military services. The committee needs to better understand the ramifications to the small arms industrial base capabilities across the Future Years Defense Program in light of the constraints of the current fiscal environment. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to adequately resource the small arms industrial base in order to prevent any unnecessary breaks in production.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to perform an objective assessment of the Army's approach to satisfying light and medium machine gun capability requirements. The assessment should include a review of current and projected lightweight and medium machine gun requirements; assess performance of current systems against requirements; establish acquisition and life-cycle costs; evaluate cost and capability of current development and procurement plans; and consider future requirements and capabilities that can be acquired today, and those which require research and development. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the congressional de-

fense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the results of the assessment.

The committee recommends $4.9 million, the full amount of the request, for M249 squad automatic weapons and modifications, and $6.8 million, the full amount of the request, for M240 medium machine guns and modifications.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.7 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.6 billion, a decrease of $107.8 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $6.3 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $6.2 billion, a decrease of $80.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Army and Marine Corps Multi-Mission Radar Development

The budget request contained $316.3 million for development and procurement of 15 Enhanced AN/TPQ–36 (EQ–36) counterfire radar systems. The budget request also contained $33.4 million for upgrades to the AN/MPQ–64 Sentinel air surveillance radar system. Elsewhere in this title, the budget request also contained $165.4 million for development and procurement of the Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar (G/ATOR) program.

The committee notes that between fiscal years 2014–17, the Army plans to allocate $1.0 billion for the EQ–36 system, and $190.8 million for AN/MPQ–64 Sentinel radar upgrades. During that same time period, the Marine Corps plans to also allocate $1.0 billion for the G/ATOR program, which will perform both counterfire and air surveillance missions.

The committee notes that the Army and Marine Corps have very similar requirements for radars to perform counter-fire and air surveillance missions. The committee is concerned, however, that the Army remains committed to procuring and maintaining two separate radars to perform these tasks, while the Marine Corps is pursuing a single multi-mission radar system. The committee believes that the Marine Corps' approach could yield substantial operations and sustainment savings over the long-term.

The committee notes that the EQ–36 system is currently in low-rate initial production, and the G/ATOR program is just entering low-rate initial production. Therefore, the committee encourages

the Army and the Marine Corps to collaborate and identity overlapping requirements and determine if at some point in the future, the Army could shift to procurement of the G/ATOR multi-mission radar rather than having the each service continue to procure and maintain separate radar systems.

The committee recommends the full amount requested for Army and Marine Corps multi-mission radar development.

Civil Support Team Information Management System

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD CST) currently field an information management system that provides a common operating picture, promotes information sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation, and supports the CST mission of assisting and advising first responders and facilitating communications with other Federal resources. The committee believes that this system should be expanded to follow-on forces, such as the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High Explosive Enhanced Response Force Package and Homeland Defense Response Force units, to ensure the safety of military personnel and first responders, while supporting the interoperability necessary to effectively communicate and operate during large-scale domestic events.

Joint Tactical Radio System Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form Fit Radio Program

The budget request included $482.2 million for procurement of Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form Fit (HMS) radios.

The committee understands that the JTRS HMS program of record includes full and open competition as part of the program's initial full-rate production. The committee believes that in the interest of increased competition, it is imperative that subsequent full-rate production procurements include a strategy for including any non-program of record vendors that meet appropriate qualification standards in accordance with section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee encourages the Army to continue to assess performance requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to ensure that all qualification standards are documented and approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology and available to vendors prior to any additional full-rate procurements. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by July 31, 2012, on the Army's plan for production competition for each element of the JTRS program including potential acquisition strategies for JTRS-tested capabilities that allow JTRS-tested products from non-program of record suppliers to be contracted through full and open competition with the Government in a streamlined manner.

The committee recommends $482.2 million, the full amount of the request, for JTRS HMS radios.

Network Integration Exercises

The committee applauds the Army's effort to encourage commercial solutions and innovation through Network Integration Exercises (NIE). The committee encourages the other military services to leverage the information gained from the Army's efforts and consider participating in future NIEs. The committee also believes that as a result of the lessons learned from NIEs, additional improvements in acquisition policy should be made to couple innovative testing with reduced acquisition time frames. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2013, that considers potential acquisition strategies for NIE-tested capabilities that allow Army NIE-tested products from non-program of record suppliers to be contracted through full and open competition with the Government in a streamlined manner.

Spider Alpha Remote Control Units

The budget request contained $36.4 million for procurement of Spider Alpha Remote Control Units for the Spider Networked Munitions (Spider) program.

The Spider program is the Army's next generation alternative anti-personnel landmine, specifically designed to provide improved flexible force protection capabilities to the warfighter and to minimize and/or eliminate non-combatant injuries or deaths resulting from landmines.

The committee notes the Spider Networked Munitions System program has experienced operational suitability problems during initial testing and operational evaluations conducted by the Office of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation. The committee notes that these problems have been primarily the result of software issues. The committee is aware that the most recent limited user test demonstrated progress toward resolving these deficiencies, but that follow-on operational tests (FOT) are still required. The committee also notes that the Spider program's full-rate production decision shifted from fiscal year 2008 to the third quarter of fiscal year 2012 and could be further delayed due to scheduled FOTs that resulted from recurring demonstrated performance deficiencies.

The committee recommends $21.4 million, a decrease of $15.0 million, for procurement of Spider Alpha Remote Control Units.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $227.4 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The committee recommends a transfer of this funding to title XV of this Act.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $17.1 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $17.2 billion, an increase of $99.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

EA–18G Advance Procurement

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement of EA–18G aircraft.

The EA–18G is an electronic attack aircraft that is replacing the EA–6B aircraft. The committee notes that the budget request included 12 EA–18G aircraft, which would complete the current Department of the Navy requirement for an inventory of 114 EA–18Gs. However, the committee understands that while the 114 EA–18Gs would replace Navy sea-based and shore-based EA–6B squadrons, it would not replace the Marine Corps four shore-based EA–6B squadrons which are planned to be inactivated by fiscal year 2019. Consequently, the committee believes the absence of a replacement for the Marine Corps EA–6B squadrons could result in a shortfall in the Department of Defense's airborne electronic attack capability, and the committee encourages the Department of the Navy to include additional EA–18G aircraft in its budget request for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends $45.0 million for advance procurement of additional EA–18G aircraft.

Reporting of the April 8, 2000, MV–22 Mishap at Marana, Arizona

The committee notes that subsequent to an April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap at Marana Northwest Regional Airport, Arizona, the Marine Corps released information on July 27, 2000, regarding the MV–22 accident investigation report. The statement indicated that a combination of "human factors" had caused the crash of a MV–22 tilt-rotor aircraft, which resulted in the loss of 19 Marines, and that, "Although the report stops short of specifying pilot error as a cause, it notes that the pilot of the ill-fated aircraft significantly exceeded the rate of descent established by regulations for safe flight." The committee understands that subsequent to the release of the July 27, 2000, statement, many media reports did not make a distinction between "human factors" and "pilot error" and reported that the mishap was the result of "pilot error" which, according to the Marine Corps July 27, 2000, public release, does not accurately describe the combination of human factors which caused the mishap. The result is potentially more of the causal factors being attributed to the pilot than "human factors" would warrant.

Consequently, the committee encourages the Commandant of the Marine Corps to continue to work with the committee to further clarify Marine Corps public statements about the April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap at Marana Northwest Regional Airport, Arizona, so

that media reporting of the accident more accurately portrays the causal factors of the accident.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $3.1 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.2 billion, an increase of $55.6 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 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 2013 contained $759.5 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $747.0 million, a decrease of $12.5 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 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 2013 contained $13.6 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $14.5 billion, an increase of $893.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Littoral Combat Ship

The committee is aware of considerable issues that have plagued the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program over recent years. While the Navy has briefed the congressional defense committees on problems involving the LCS program, the committee believes that the Navy has not adequately informed Congress to the full extent possible on program deficiencies, including mechanical and structural failures. The committee is also concerned with the lack of transparency regarding these significant issues as was addressed in the annual report by the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation which stated that its assessment of the program was limited because the "program offices have not released any formal developmental T&E reports." Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a comprehensive briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the LCS program, in a classified or unclassified session.

Mine Warfare

The committee notes that at a recent symposium, the Chief of Naval Operations stated that over the years, the Navy's ability to counter mine warfare threats had "atrophied," and went on to say the testing of the counter-mine warfare module for the Littoral Combat Ship is re-establishing a capability in this area for the Navy.

The committee is pleased this capability is receiving added interest, but is concerned that the ability to conduct offensive mine warfare has atrophied as well. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to review the Navy's offensive mine warfare capabilities and establish an appropriate course of action to re-establish this capability in a cost-effective manner.

Navy Shipbuilding Program

The committee is concerned with the Navy's shipbuilding program. The budget request for fiscal year 2013 Shipbuilding and Conversion (SCN) account contained $13.7 billion, which is significantly lower than the $14.9 billion level appropriated for fiscal year 2012. In fiscal year 2012, it was forecast that the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) would include the start of construction of 57 ships. However, 16 of those ships have fallen out of the FYDP, reducing new construction starts to 41 ships. The Navy has indicated that they will no longer seek to build a 313 ship fleet. Additionally, the Navy has proposed retiring nine additional ships during the FYDP before the end of their service lives. The committee believes the following programs are crucial.

CVN–78 is the lead ship of the Ford class aircraft carrier. It incorporates improved performance and cost saving technologies, decreases the crew size by 1,200 personnel, and saves the Navy over $5.0 billion in total ownership costs for each ship. The Navy intends to start construction of the first three ships of the Ford class on a 5-year basis. The committee encourages the Navy to maintain this schedule with fiscal year 2013 as the first year of incremental funding for CVN–79. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize an extension from the current 5-year period to 6 years for the incremental funding of CVN–79 and CVN–80. The committee also believes it is essential to keep the Nimitz class aircraft carriers on schedule for their mid-life Refueling and Complex Overhauls to ensure these ships reach their planned service life.

The Virginia class submarine program continues to deliver on cost and well ahead of contractual schedule. Having achieved a rate of two submarines a year starting in fiscal year 2011, the committee was concerned to see the rate decrease to one submarine in fiscal year 2014, and believes this would inject instability into a stable program. The committee recommends an increase in fiscal year 2013 advance procurement funds to facilitate restoring the second submarine in fiscal year 2014. To achieve that end, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter a multiyear procurement for up to 10 submarines and authorizes the Secretary to incrementally fund that multi-year contract.

The Marine Corps has a stated requirement of 38 amphibious ships but has made an agreement with the Navy that 33 amphib-

ious ships would be sufficient to provide the lift and forcible entry capabilities they require. There are currently only 29 amphibious ships in the fleet. Two large deck amphibious ships are under contract, LHA–6 and LHA–7. The fiscal year 2013 budget request slid the construction start of the next large deck amphibious ship, LHA–8, from 2016 to 2017. Prior to LHA–6, these ships had well decks, which would flood to launch landing craft. LHA–6 and LHA–7 are designed without well decks, but a well deck is going into LHA–8. The committee is concerned that the internal arrangements to accommodate a well deck are going to change construction significantly, requiring many drawing changes. The committee encourages the Navy to get an early start on LHA–8 design with the contractor. It has been proven that the greater the percentage of a design that is complete at the start of construction, the more successful the construction program. The LPD–27 is the last LPD–17 San Antonio class small deck amphibious ship until the replacement for the LSD starts. In the fiscal year 2013 plan, LSD construction has been delayed until after the FYDP. The committee is concerned that this delay may negatively affect the industrial base.

In the fiscal year 2013 budget request, the Department of the Navy has requested authority to begin a multi-year program for nine DDG–51 Arleigh Burke-class destroyers. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to award a contract for a multiyear procurement of up to 10 destroyers. In fiscal year 2016, the Navy intends to start procuring Block III DDG–51 destroyers. This block will incorporate the advanced Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR), which is currently being competitively evaluated. The committee views AMDR as essential to pacing the air and missile threat. The Navy has stated that the DDG–51 hull is sufficient to accommodate the increased power generation and cooling requirements that AMDR will need, yet the committee still views this as an area of risk.

With the first two Littoral Combat ships (LCS) delivered to the fleet, each of a different design, each has had various problems that are being addressed by the Navy. LCS–1 has had some cracking and shaft seal problems and LCS–2 has had problems with galvanic corrosion within the water jets. The committee is aware that the Navy intends to forward stage up to four LCS to Singapore, and while supporting the budget request for four LCS in fiscal year 2013, it encourages the Navy to ensure the problems discovered to date have technical solutions and that these solutions are incorporated on forthcoming ships.

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of the Navy shipbuilding plan is how it will be able to afford the Ohio class replacement ballistic missile submarine and still have a viable program for other ships. This will have to be addressed in coming years. The budget request delayed the start of construction of the first submarine by 2 years until fiscal year 2021. This delay means that the ballistic missile submarine force dips to 10 submarines for almost 10 years in a couple of decades. To maintain a credible undersea nuclear deterrent, the committee recommends restoring the research and development funding that was reduced in the fiscal year 2013 budget request to allow the Department of Defense time to determine how to keep the program on track. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee

includes a provision that would prevent the Secretary of the Navy from having fewer than 12 ballistic missile submarines at a time.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $6.2 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $6.3 billion, an increase of $102.7 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.6 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.5 billion, a decrease of $140.9 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $11.0 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $11.3 billion, an increase of $313.7 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

F–35 Aircraft Program

The budget request contained $2.7 billion in PEs 64800F, 64800N, and 64800M for development of the F–35 aircraft. The budget request also contained $5.5 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force and Aircraft Procurement, Navy for procurement of 19 F–35As, 6 F–35Bs, and 4 F–35Cs.

The F–35 aircraft program is the largest acquisition program within the Department of Defense (DOD), with a current planned procurement of 2,443 aircraft for the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force to meet fifth generation U.S. fighter requirements. The committee continues to support the requirement for fifth generation fighter aircraft due to projected increases in the effectiveness and quantities of threat anti-aircraft systems. The committee notes that without advanced fifth generation aircraft that the United States may be significantly limited in its ability to project power in the future. In addition, the committee believes that the 187 F–22 Raptors currently planned for may not alone provide enough of this capability.

The F–35 entered engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002 and is currently estimated to complete EMD in 2018. Low-rate initial production of the F–35 began in 2007, with 121 aircraft having been approved by Congress for production through fiscal year 2012. As the program has progressed through the EMD phase, a recurring concern of the committee has been a desire by the Department to begin aircraft production too early in the EMD phase and to significantly increase each subsequent year's production, resulting in a high degree of development and production concurrency, and the production of a significant number of aircraft before sufficient demonstration of required technologies, flight testing and aircraft design stability. The committee notes that for fiscal year 2006, the Department of Defense requested $152.4 million for advance procurement for the first five F–35A aircraft in fiscal year 2007, and that in its report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (H. Rept.109–89), the committee recommended no funds for this purpose, believing that procurement of F–35A aircraft was premature.

Subsequently, the F–35 aircraft program has experienced several changes in the EMD and production schedules due to lagging technology development, design instability, and late delivery of aircraft. The result has been a rebase-lining of the program in 2007 and several cost and schedule changes. The 2012 Government Accountability Office analysis of DOD data indicates that the cumulative number of aircraft projected to be procured through 2017 has been reduced by 1,226 aircraft, or 77 percent since EMD began in fiscal year 2002. Further, the committee notes that the most recent F–35 aircraft program DOD selected acquisition report includes an acquisition program estimate of $395.7 billion. This most recent estimate has increased $13.2 billion since June 2010 and $117.2 billion since March 2007, when the program's estimated cost and schedule was rebase-lined.

The F–35 program is approximately 20 percent through its flight test program. While remaining technology, design stability, and software development issues are of significant concern to the committee, the Department of Defense has made a major reduction in the research and development and production concurrency in the program. As a result, the projected reduction in the number of F–35 aircraft to be produced through 2017 will reduce post-production modifications that could otherwise need to be accomplished on a much larger number of aircraft. The committee supports the most recent actions of the F–35 Joint Program Office leadership to reduce development and production concurrency and focus on EMD issues, but remains concerned about future increases in program acquisition costs, and expects that the Department of Defense will continue to take the necessary measures to curtail future increases in the program's acquisition cost.

Global Hawk Block 30 Aircraft

The budget request contained no funds for Global Hawk Block 30 unmanned aerial intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support for the combatant commanders.

On June 14, 2011, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics provided certification to Congress

that continuation of the Global Hawk Block 30 program was essential to national security, and that there were no alternatives to the program which will provide acceptable capability to meet the joint military requirement at less cost. Further, the certification indicated that the Global Hawk Block 30 costs $220.0 million per year less than the U–2 to operate and sustain. Based on this certification, the committee provided all requested fiscal year 2012 funding for the Global Hawk Block 30 Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS), including $323.9 million for 3 additional systems.

In contrast, the fiscal year 2013 budget would terminate the Global Hawk Block 30 program and cancel the 10 remaining aircraft previously planned for procurement. In addition, the Department of the Air Force has stated its intention to place the current 14 systems in storage, each aircraft having been procured at a cost of approximately $100.0 million. Additional information provided by the Air Force indicates that the 4 additional systems currently in production would be placed into storage upon delivery. The committee notes that the Global Hawk Block 30 achieved initial operability capability in August, 2011. The committee does not believe there is any precedent for the Department of Defense (DOD) placing a system this expensive into storage without being used, and does not support this proposal.

In addition, the committee does not believe that the proposal to suspend Global Hawk Block 30 operations is consistent with the Department's new military strategy. The committee notes that the Department's new strategy is focused on operations in the Middle East and Western Pacific in an anti-access/area-denial environment that places a premium on long-range, long-duration intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability. The Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft currently in service are in high demand by combatant commanders, and are currently flying precisely such missions for U.S. Central Command, U.S. European Command, and U.S. Pacific Command. In addition, most missions being flown are at ranges where the Global Hawk Block 30 is less costly to operate than the U–2, because of the relatively long mission duration of the Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft. The committee believes that the Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft provide a unique capability and should be retained and operated through at least December 31, 2014, in support of current operational requirements of the combatant commanders. Beyond that date, the committee believes the Air Force should continue to fund both the Global Hawk Block 30 and the U–2 if there is sufficient ISR demand from combatant commanders.

The committee recommends $105.2 million, an increase of $105.2 million, in Aircraft Procurement Air Force, for maintaining Global Hawk Block 30 operations. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends $133.0 million, an increase of $133.0 million, in title 3, and recommends $22.2 million, an increase of $22.2 million in title 4, for a total of an additional $260.4 million to fund Global Hawk Block 30 operations for fiscal year 2013. In addition, the committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to fully execute the fiscal year 2012 Global Hawk Block 30 program, including the procurement of 3 additional aircraft, in accordance with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law

112–81) and the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–74).

Inter-Theater Airlift Aircraft

The budget request contains $1.7 billion for C–17 and C–5 inter-theater airlift aircraft programs. The budget request also contains a legislative proposal from the Department of Defense (DOD) to lower the inter-theater airlift aircraft minimum floor from 301 to 275 aircraft.

Air Force officials state that "Case 3" of the Mobility Capability and Requirements Study 2016 (MCRS–16) was the analytical underpinning for the new mobility force structure associated with the new 2012 Defense Strategy and that a strategic airlift fleet of 275 aircraft would support it. Of note, Case 3 is the least demanding scenario that was modeled in MCRS–16. The Case 3 results indicated that the Department would be required to provide 29.1 million-ton-miles per day (MTM/D). Of note, unlike past studies, the Department of Defense also levied an additional 5.0 MTM/D on the Civil Reserve Aircraft Fleet (CRAF) program and increased its requirement of provided airlift to 25.5 MTM/D. Past studies have only assumed that CRAF could provide 20.5 MTM/D because of the number of participants and quantity/type of aircraft in the commercial program. No significant improvements have occurred within the CRAF program that would signify that an increase from 20.5 to 25.5 MTM/D could actually be supported. Furthermore, the largest provider of commercial airlift to DOD as a CRAF participant recently declared bankruptcy.

According to the MCRS–16 summary, the study recognized the reality of long-term U.S. involvement in globally dispersed operations which may include lengthy commitments to major campaigns. MCRS–16 realized important fact-of-life changes that placed new demands on the mobility system since the last mobility study, MCS–05, completed in 2006. The changes included a higher level of engagement around the world, increased reliance on the Reserve Components, increased reliance on airlift to move equipment and supplies that were once moved almost exclusively by surface transport, the introduction of new specialized equipment, the continued growth of Special Operations Forces, and the establishment of U.S. Africa Command. In response to these changes, the Department said that MCRS–16 provided an opportunity to make informed investment decisions designed to maintain the right mix of strategic and intra-theater transportation capabilities. All of which remain valid today, and into the foreseeable future, despite the new 2012 defense strategy.

Officials from the Government Accountability Office noted in testimony on March 7, 2012, before the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces that MCRS–16 did not sufficiently characterize incurred operational risk, nor did MCRS–16 adequately articulate capability gaps or inventory excesses. Additionally, the committee notes that certain assumptions regarding prepositioned stock locations and inter-theater airlift aircraft operational metrics, such as aircraft availability and mission capability, are no longer valid and that actual aircraft performance metrics are notably less than those modeled during MCRS–16 scenario execution.

During the time period between fiscal year 2002 and 2011, there has been a heavy demand on mobility airlift. The C–17 has over flown its planned program of record by 106 percent, or 103,581 hours, and the C–5 fleet has over flown its planned program of record by 134 percent, or 151,570 hours. An Air Force mobility study, completed in September 2010 by the Air Force Office of Lessons Learned when the Air Force program of record was 316 inter-theater airlift aircraft, analyzed Afghanistan mobility operations and found that that "the Air Force does not own enough large and outsize airlift to execute Operation Enduring Freedom surge and sustainment without substantial utilization of contracted and tendered commercial carriers. These aircraft, chartered in their entirety by U.S. Transportation Command at a price tag that sometimes exceeded $1.0 million per mission, deliver unmatched and irreplaceable outsize commodity capability to the warfighter." Between 2006–11, the Department of Defense spent $2.2 billion on foreign contracted strategic airlift.

In its February 2012 Air Force White Paper provided to Congress outlining the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 force structure reorganization, the Air Force stated that "although the U.S. has removed all combat forces from Iraq and the new strategic guidance reduces the steady state requirement for ground forces, we expect Air Force steady state rotational requirements to remain nearly constant, or perhaps increase, under the new strategy." DOD officials also stated to the committee during a briefing on February 23, 2012, that there will need to be further analysis of what the lift requirement, both inter-theater and intra-theater, will be for the new force laydown plan in the Asia-Pacific Area of Responsibility.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, to provide to the congressional defense committees an operational risk assessment for meeting geographical combatant commander airlift requirements with an organic fleet of less than 301 inter-theater airlift aircraft.

Intra-Theater Airlift Aircraft

The budget request contained $234.1 million for C–130 airlift aircraft and no funding for C–27J aircraft. The budget request also includes no funding for the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (C–130 AMP) and reduces the intra-theater aircraft inventory by 65 C–130H and 38 C–27J aircraft.

For the past 6 years, Air Force leadership has vigorously advocated the need for the C–27J program to meet the Army's time-sensitive/mission-critical (TS/MC) airlift requirements, in a cost-effective and efficient manner. On February 27, 2008, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certified to Congress that "there is, within the Department of the Army, Department of the Air Force, Army National Guard, or Air National Guard, a capability gap or shortfall with respect to intra-theater airlift, and validated requirements exist to fill that gap or shortfall through procurement of the Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA)." On the same date, the Chiefs of Staff for both the Air Force and the Army sent a letter to the congressional defense committees that stated "[we] stand together in support of the JCA. Time-sensitive/mission-critical resupply is crucial to our success as warfighters."

On March 30, 2011, the Secretary of the Air Force testified to the Senate Appropriations Committee on Defense that "we continued C–27J procurement as an investment in overall [tactical airlift] fleet viability. Efforts to increase direct support airlift continue, with plans to beddown 38 C–27Js in the Air National Guard." And the 2012 Air Mobility Command Master Plan, published November 2011, states that "the C–27J is intended to provide an efficient means of accomplishing the direct support role for distributed ground forces . . . lessons learned from Southwest Asia operations reveal the need for a smaller than C–130 aircraft. It must provide a responsive, small-scale airlift capability to better support time sensitive, mission critical needs of Joint operations, deployed Special Forces, coalition troops, or host nations. It must also be able to operate on remote, austere airfields or via airdrop. The C–27J fulfills these requirements and will be a superb complement to the C–130 and C–17 fleet capabilities . . . the C–27J's capabilities are tailored for these future scenarios."

Despite the Air Force's unwavering support for C–27J to date, the Air Force decided for fiscal year 2013 that the C–27J was no longer affordable and provided a business-case analysis (BCA) in February 2011 to the congressional defense committees explaining the new Air Force position. In the review of the BCA, the committee notes that the Air Force had to use many assumptions for estimated costs in lieu of historical and fact-based C–27J cost data. Without a sufficient amount of reliable program execution data for C–27J, life-cycle costs per aircraft for personnel, operations, maintenance, and depot activities to support the Air Force position that the C–27J will be more expensive to own and operate than either the C–130H and C–130J may be premature. Furthermore, the committee believes that a prudent, cost-effective basing strategy for 38 C–27J aircraft, and a comparison of the C–27J manning estimate requirement document to actual unit personnel today being used to own and operate the C–27J, may reduce the projected ownership costs of the C–27J below the Air Force estimate. Such a review may assist the Air Force in realizing a tax-payer return on investment by not having to send brand-new C–27J aircraft from the production line directly into long-term storage.

The committee also believes that a large reduction to the intra-theater airlift inventory puts at significant risk the Air Force's ability to meet both title 10 and title 32, United States Code, intra-theater airlift requirements for both steady-state and contingency operations. In its February 2012 Air Force White Paper provided to Congress outlining the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 force structure reorganization, the Air Force stated that "although the U.S. has removed all combat forces from Iraq and the new strategic guidance reduces the steady state requirement for ground forces, we expect Air Force steady state rotational requirements to remain nearly constant, or perhaps increase, under the new strategy." The Chief of Staff of the Air Force stated during a briefing to the committee on January 25, 2012, that his greatest concern with the new defense strategy was not having the capacity in the mobility and combat air forces to support and execute the new strategy. Department of Defense officials also stated to the committee during a briefing on February 23, 2012, that there will need to be further analysis of what the lift requirement, both inter-theater and intra-

theater, will be for the new force lay-down plan in the Asia-Pacific Area of Responsibility. Compounding the issue is that fulfillment of the Army's direct-support/mission-critical airlift requirements could be placed at risk given the Army's plans to divest all of its C–23 Sherpa inventory over the Future Years Defense Program and the aged condition of its rotary-wing fleet of CH–47 rotorcraft.

Specifically pertaining to execution of the C–130J aircraft acquisition program, the committee is discouraged that the Secretary of the Air Force continues to foster procurement instability by annually altering forecasted procurement quantity rates that are significantly different from the preceding year's budget procurement quantity forecasted in future years. A continuous strategy of inconsistent quantity adherence and lack of advance procurement funding preceding the year of full funding for the aircraft induces: program instability; inefficient use of taxpayer's dollars; second and third order effects on subcontractor stability; touch-labor workforce perturbations; and, adverse aircraft pricing fluctuations. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to stabilize C–130J procurement and properly budget for advance procurement funding in future budget submissions.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes provisions that would: preclude divestment of any C–27J aircraft during fiscal year 2013; require the Secretary of the Air Force, after fiscal year 2013, to wait 180 days after submitting the report required by section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) and the Director, Congressional Budget Office submits a detailed life-cycle cost analysis for C–27J, C–130H and C–130J aircraft, before retirement, divestment or transfer of any C–27J aircraft; require the Secretary of the Air Force to continue the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program for the C–130 until the Institute for Defense Analyses conducts a business-case analysis; require an annual report from the Secretary of the Army regarding TS/MC airlift requirements fulfillment by the Air Force; and, require the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the congressional defense committees a report by March 1, 2013, that explains the rationale and planning for any proposed retirement, divestment, or transfer of any C–130 aircraft in fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

Long Range Stand-Off

The committee notes persistent confusion about whether the next generation bomber and next-generation cruise missile (otherwise known as the "Long Range Stand-Off weapon") will be nuclear capable in order to preserve the nuclear triad into the future. The committee addresses the next generation bomber in another section of this bill.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of Nuclear Security, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 4, 2013, concurrent with the delivery of the fiscal year 2014 budget submission, on the Department's plans, including costs and program impact, to ensure that the long-range strike bomber possesses a nuclear warhead equipped air-launched cruise missile capability, and that such system is available to be deployed, upon declaration of initial operating capability of the long-range strike bomber.

Long-Range Strike Bomber Programs

The budget request contained $983.1 million for B–1, B–2, B–52 and the new long-range strike bomber programs.

The budget request is a decrease of $236.7 million below the amount the Air Force had planned for the fiscal year 2013 budget in the Future Years Defense Program. The committee notes significant changes to critical bomber modernization programs, such as B–52 Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT), B–52 Strategic Radar Replacement, and B–52 and B–2 Extremely High Frequency communication upgrades that the Air Force will no longer undertake due to affordability issues. The committee believes that as a result of these cancellations, the ability of the Air Force to meet combatant commander warfighting requirements and maintain reasonable operations and sustainment costs for the legacy bomber fleet is at risk.

The committee is disappointed that despite the successful completion of all engineering, manufacturing, and development (EMD) efforts on the B–52 CONECT program, the Secretary of the Air Force has decided to forfeit the taxpayer's investment in EMD by not continuing the procurement and fielding phases of the program. The committee believes that if the B–52 CONECT procurement program is continued, modernization of the B–52 fleet with B–52 CONECT would increase B–52's combat capability, flexibility, and maintainability; reduce in-flight crew workload; and provide the warfighter with more precise, timely, and effective close-air support.

The committee is also discouraged that the Air Force is unable to clearly articulate when the new long-range strike bomber will become certified for nuclear operations after attaining initial operating capability status. The committee does not believe that test and evaluation master plan affordability should be the limiting factor for certification. However, the committee supports the Air Force's plan to maintain the legacy bomber fleet inventory at current fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 combat-coded levels for each of the bomber fleets.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would support the Air Force's plan to maintain the legacy bomber fleet inventory at current levels. In addition, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Air Force to ensure the new long-range strike bomber is capable of nuclear operations upon declaration of the initial operating capability (IOC) status and certified for nuclear capable operations within two years after declaration of the IOC status. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to obligate fiscal year 2012 appropriations procurement funds for the B–52 CONECT program, and directs the Secretary to conduct a risk-based, mission-effectiveness analysis regarding the advantages and disadvantages of not continuing the B–52 CONECT procurement program and maintaining the B–52 fleet of aircraft in the current configuration and to provide a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by February 5, 2013. The report should include an evaluation of various procurement quantities and pricing options that would enhance the affordability of the B–52 CONECT procurement program in order to garner a sufficient return on investment resulting from the EMD efforts to date.

The committee recommends $983.1 million, the full amount requested, for B–1, B–2, B–52 and the new long-range strike bomber programs.

Reaper Unmanned Aircraft System

The budget request contained $553.5 million for 24 Reaper unmanned aircraft systems (UAS), and also contained $72.3 million for additional spares in Aircraft Procurement Air Force.

Beginning in fiscal year 2011, the Air Force projected an annual procurement of 48 Reaper UAS each year through the completion of procurement in 2016. The committee understands that, as a consequence, this schedule would require the Reaper UAS contractor to produce 48 aircraft for 2 fiscal years, increase its production capacity to meet the higher production rate, and would then request funds for 24 aircraft in the third and subsequent years, through completion of procurement, in approximately 2020. The committee understands that procurement of an additional 12 aircraft in fiscal year 2013 would reduce the unit cost of each vehicle by approximately $1.0 million.

The committee recommends $712.4 million, an increase of $158.9 million, in Aircraft Procurement Air Force, for 12 additional Reaper UAS. The committee also recommends $93.9 million, an increase of $21.6 million, in Aircraft Procurement Air Force, for initial spares to support the procurement of 36 Reaper UAS.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $599.2 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $599.2 million, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 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 2013 contained $5.5 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $5.5 billion, an increase of $15.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $16.7 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $16.7 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $4.2 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $4.6 billion, an increase of $436.2 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Aircraft Survivability Equipment

The committee is aware that in 2009, in an effort to improve rotor aircraft safety and survivability, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics issued an Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) Acquisition Directive Memorandum directing the Department of the Navy, as the lead military service for the program, to develop a modular and open operating system to enable upgrades and platform integration, and thus promote a cost-effective common ASE system and eliminate the need for similar, duplicative systems for each of the military service's rotorcraft inventory.

The committee is encouraged that the military services are coordinating on ASE efforts, but is concerned that duplicate efforts may still exist. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to conduct a review of ongoing and planned rotorcraft threat warning and countermeasure programs, and to brief the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2012, on specific steps the Department will take to ensure that aircraft survivability equipment meets current military service requirements.

Aviation Foreign Internal Defense and Non-Standard Aviation Program

The budget request contained $97.7 million for the Non-Standard Aviation program, and also contained $7.5 million for the U–28 program.

The committee supports and approves of the recent changes to the U.S. Special Operations Command Aviation Foreign Internal Defense (AvFID) program as directed by reporting requirements in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee supports combining the Non-Standard Aviation (NSAv) light program with the AvFID program and the resultant efficiencies in training, maintaining, and supporting of forward deployed combined units. The committee believes that combining these two programs will reduce start-up costs, leverage logistical and operational experiences already gained in the Air Force Special Operations Active and Reserve Components, and field more rapidly a persistent and highly capable

fixed-wing AvFID program. Further, the committee is pleased that the overall program realignment of assets will result in an estimated reduction of Contractor Logistics Support costs by approximately $53.0 million between fiscal years 2013–17.

The committee encourages the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command and the Commander, Air Force Special Operations Command to continually and comprehensively validate geographic combatant commander requirements for AvFID and NSAv, and to prioritize them in a way that will ensure a globally persistent and effective presence that contributes comprehensively to security force assistance and national security objectives. The committee also encourages the Commander, Air Force Special Operations Command to: refine global site selection to optimize operational and logistical support; continue efforts to reduce Contracted Logistics Support across the Future Years Defense Program; and leverage U.S. Air Force Reserve assets to further reduce sustainment costs.

To facilitate the implementation of the proposed changes to the AvFID and NSAv programs the committee supports the proposed modifications required to convert four Non-Standard Aviation (NSAv) light PC–12 aircraft into U–28 aircraft and adjusts authorized funding levels to permit these changes.

The committee recommends $34.9 million, a decrease of $62.8 million, for the AvFID program, and $70.3 million, an increase of $62.8 million, for the U–28 program.

Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund

The budget request contained $99.5 million for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUON) Fund; $100.0 million for the Overseas Contingency Operations JUON Fund; $158.3 million in PE 63648D8Z for Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations; $227.4 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat (JIEDD) Fund; and $1.7 billion for the Overseas Contingency Operations JIEDD Fund.

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

At the request of Congress, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has completed a number of reviews of Department of Defense (DOD) rapid acquisition, quick reaction, and counter-improvised explosive device (C-IED) programs. In each review, GAO con-

cluded that the Department does not have a comprehensive policy or process to oversee the variety of programs and projects established to respond to OEF requested capabilities. The committee notes that GAO has identified 31 entities and over one thousand projects within the Department of Defense, the military services, and U.S. Special Operations Command to respond to urgent operational needs from combat theaters of operation and each have separate budgets used to develop equip and field solutions to the warfighter. The committee believes that significant efficiencies could be achieved by consolidating these accounts and instituting processes and systems that provide visibility of all projects being considered for funding.

Section 804 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's urgent operational needs and rapid acquisition processes and report the findings to the congressional defense committees by January 2012. The committee notes this review is still ongoing and is scheduled to be complete by August 2012. The committee believes that the Department should complete this required comprehensive evaluation of its urgent operational needs processes before requesting approval for a separate funding account such as the JUON Fund. The committee also expects the Secretary of Defense to establish policies and processes to provide comprehensive oversight of these programs as part of this required review. Further, the committee recommends consolidating programs established to rapidly develop and field solutions for units in combat and combatant commanders.

The committee appreciates that the Department must find ways to rapidly fund urgent needs to address near-term and high-risk scenarios. As such, Congress provided the Department with Rapid Acquisition Authority in section 806(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), as amended by section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) and section 803 of Public Law 111–383 which provides the Secretary of Defense $200.0 million in authority, per fiscal year, to waive any statute hindering quick response to immediate warfighter capability requirements in response to combat fatalities. The committee understands the Department has rarely used this authority.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $99.5 million, for the JUON Fund. In title XV of this Act, the committee recommends $50.0 million, a decrease of $50.0 million, for the JUON fund within the budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations. In title II in this Act, the committee recommends $158.3 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63648D8Z for Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations. In title XV of this Act, the committee recommends $1.9 billion, the full amount requested, within the budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations for the JIEDD Fund.

Metrics for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Capabilities for Manned and Unmanned Medium Altitude Systems

The committee notes the significant differences among and within the military services for measuring, evaluating, and describing the level of capability provided by their manned and unmanned system of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) for medium altitude systems. The metric often used is combat air patrol (CAP), but definitions vary for CAP for different aircraft types, even within the military services, and provides limited utility as a metric in describing system capability, utility, or relative capabilities. The committee also notes that the Army has made significant progress in defining its ISR requirements in terms of capability to satisfy its mission by developing the Integrated Sensor Coverage Area construct.

The committee understands the Joint Staff intends to complete a strategic portfolio review of the Department of Defense's current and programmed medium altitude ISR systems portfolio. In completing this strategic portfolio review, the committee recommends the Director of the Joint Staff develop and use a common set of metrics that will provide a common measurement of manned and unmanned system capabilities for each medium altitude platform and differing sensor configurations within platforms, within each of the ISR primary mission areas to include, but not limited to, full motion electro-optical-infrared (EO-IR) video, EO-IR imagery, wide area surveillance, synthetic aperture radar, signals intelligence, hyper-spectral imagery, moving target indicator, dismounted moving target indicator, and foliage penetration.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

The committee is concerned that the budget request results in a reduction of 3 Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) batteries and 66 interceptors across the Future Years Defense Program when compared to the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

The committee is also concerned that their decrease in interceptors and the current production rate, which is below capacity, creates a gap between the time when six fully operational THAAD batteries are delivered to the U.S. Army, and when those batteries will be fully outfitted with interceptors. The committee recommends the full amount requested for procurement of THAAD interceptors. The committee also recommends an increase of $127.0 million, to increase the production in fiscal year 2013 by 12 interceptors to a total of 48 interceptors. The committee also urges the Missile Defense Agency to realign interceptor production to better match the availability of THAAD batteries in its future budget submissions.

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—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Army CH–47 Helicopters

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into one or more multiyear procurement contracts in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, for up to 5 years for CH–47F helicopters.

Section 112—Reports on Airlift Requirements of the Army

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by October 31, 2012, and annually thereafter until 2017, a report that shall include the following information from the preceding fiscal year: (1) the total number of Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo airlift movements that were required for training, steady-state and contingency operations; (2) the total number of Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo airlift sorties executed for training, steady-state, and contingency operations; and (3) the total number of Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo sorties executed for training, steady-state, and contingency operations, aggregated by Department of the Army aircraft, Department of the Air Force aircraft, and contractor-provided airlift aircraft. This section would also require the Secretary of the Army to provide for each Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo airlift sortie not executed by Department of the Air Force aircraft, the reason(s) Department of the Air Force aircraft were not utilized to support the mission.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Retirement of Nuclear-Powered Ballistic Submarines

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to maintain a minimum of 12 ballistic missile submarines in the fleet.

Section 122—Extension of Ford-Class Aircraft Carrier Construction Authority

This section would amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by extending the incremental funding of the Ford class aircraft carriers (CVN–79 and CVN–80) from a 5-year period to a 6–year period.

Section 123—Extension of Multiyear Procurement Authority for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G Aircraft

This section would amend section 128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as amended by the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–238), to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to add a fifth production year to the multiyear procurement contract for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G aircraft.

Section 124—Multiyear Procurement Authority for V–22 Joint Aircraft Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2013 program year, for the procurement of V–22 aircraft for the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and U.S. Special Operations Command. This section would also require that the V–22 multiyear contract provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year, after fiscal year 2013, be subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose for such later fiscal year.

Section 125—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers and Associated Systems

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for up to 10 Arleigh Burke class destroyers (DDG–51). The budget request included $3.0 billion for the procurement of two Arleigh Burke class destroyers. For many years, this class of ships was efficiently procured through multiyear procurement contracts, until the restart of production. The DDG–51 Flight IIA possesses a stable design and the committee supports the budget request to continue DDG–51 production through the Future Years Defense Program.

Section 126—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Virginia-Class Submarine Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract for the procurement of up to 10 Virginia class submarines beginning in fiscal year 2014. This section would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to fund this contract through the use of incremental funding.

Section 127—Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the refueling and complex overhaul of the USS Abraham Lincoln (CVN–72). This section would also set a limit of $1.6 billion for this purpose in fiscal year 2013, since it is the first year of 2-year incremental funding.

Section 128—Report on Littoral Combat Ship Designs

This section would require a report on the two Littoral Combat Ship designs for comparative cost and effectiveness.

Section 129—Comptroller General Reviews of Littoral Combat Ship Program

The section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Littoral Combat Ship program's quality, and a review of the U.S. Navy's operational and sustainment support strategy for the program.

Section 130—Sense of Congress on Importance of Engineering in Early Stages of Shipbuilding

This section would state the sense of Congress encouraging the Navy to prioritize early engineering in large ship construction.

Section 131—Sense of Congress on Marine Corps Amphibious Lift and Presence Requirements

This section would provide the sense of Congress on Amphibious Lift and Presence Requirements.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 141—Retirement of B–1 Bomber Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain 36 combat-coded B–1 bomber aircraft beyond fiscal year 2013.

Section 142—Maintenance of Strategic Airlift Aircraft

This section would also require the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command to submit to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2013, a report assessing the operational risk for meeting the geographical combatant commanders' airlift requirements with a fleet of less than 301 inter-theater airlift aircraft.

Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment or Retirement of C–27J Aircraft

This section would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from divesting or retiring C–27J aircraft from the Air Force's inventory after fiscal year 2013 until 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits the report required by section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) submits to the congressional defense committees a life-cycle cost analysis of C–27J aircraft, C–130H aircraft, and C–130J aircraft. This section would also require the Director to conduct the analysis, which would take into account all upgrades and modifications required to sustain the aircraft through a 40–year service-life. The Director would also provide an assessment of the most cost-effective and mission-effective options for which C–27J aircraft could be affordably fielded by the Air National Guard with regard to the number of basing locations, the number of authorized personnel associated with a unit's manning document, and the maintenance and sustainment strategy. The cost-analysis would also outline any limiting factors regarding the assessment of the C–27J aircraft cost data as it relates to deriving cost ground rules and assumptions, and actual data derived from costs incurred for currently fielded aircraft. The Department of Defense would also be required to provide to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office all requested and all original source documentation needed to conduct the life-cycle cost analyses in a prompt and timely manner.

Section 144—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Termination of C–130 Avionics Modernization Program

This section would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from terminating the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) until 180 days after the Institute for Defense Analyses submits to the congressional defense committees a cost-benefit analysis of modernizing the legacy C–130 airlift fleet with C–130 AMP as compared to only modernizing the legacy C–130 airlift fleet with a reduced scope program for avionics and mission planning systems. The cost-benefit analysis would take into account the impact of lifecycle costs for both C–130s upgraded with C–130 AMP and C–130s not upgraded with C–130 AMP, and for legacy C–130 aircraft that are not upgraded with C–130 AMP, the impacts to future sustainment and maintenance costs associated with certain avionics and mission systems upgrades that may be required in the future for legacy C–130 aircraft to remain relevant and mission effective throughout the full service-life of the aircraft.

Section 145—Review of C–130 Force Structure

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a review of current and future plans for C–130 force structure and provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than the date upon which the President submits the fiscal year 2014 budget request to Congress. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a sufficiency review of the Secretary's report and provide the results of that review to the congressional defense committees no later than 60 days after submission of the Secretary's report to the congressional defense committees.

Section 146—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program

This section would express the sense of Congress that assured access to space remains critical to national security, and that the United States Air Force plan, starting in fiscal year 2013, to commit to an annual production rate of launch vehicle booster cores should maintain mission assurance, stabilize the industrial base, reduce costs, and provide opportunities for competition.

The committee notes that the cost of space launch has increased significantly and it believes that economic order quantity purchases and opportunities for competition will help secure the most cost-effective high mission assurance space launch capability for the taxpayer. The committee notes that the Air Force's detailed acquisition strategy will not be finalized at the time of publication. The committee expects this acquisition strategy will adequately balance mission assurance, cost savings, and opportunities for certified new entrants to compete.

This section would limit 10 percent of the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2013 for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program until the Secretary of the Air Force submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing the details of the acquisition approach. The report should include the anticipated savings, the planned number of launch vehicle booster cores

to be procured, the number of years that the contract will last, an assessment of when new entrants will be certified to compete for evolved expendable launch vehicle class launches, the projected launch manifest with possible opportunities for new entrants to compete, and any other relevant analysis used to inform the acquisition strategy. The Secretary of the Air Force should also provide written certification that the strategy maintains assured access to space, achieves substantial cost savings, and provides opportunities for competition.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the final acquisition plan and submit its findings to the appropriate congressional committees, within 30 days of the Air Force submittal. The findings may be communicated to these committees in the form of a briefing.

In this section, the appropriate congressional committees are defined as the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Section 147—Procurement of Space-Based Infrared Systems

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a fixed price contract to procure two Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) satellites, authorize incremental funding of the two SBIRS satellites over a period not to exceed 6 years, and establish a limitation on the total funds to be obligated and expended for the procurement. This section would also require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on contract details, cost savings, and plans for reinvesting the cost savings into capability improvements for future blocks of SBIRS satellites.

The Air Force proposes to procure two SBIRS satellites over 6 years using advanced appropriations authority as part of its Efficient Space Procurement (ESP), formerly Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency, approach to space acquisition. The Air Force believes a block buy of two satellites can drive down costs, improve stability in the space industrial base, and allow for investments in technology that will lower risk for future programs. However, such an approach, if fully funded in a single fiscal year, would consume a large portion of the overall space budget and negatively impact other mission-critical programs.

While the committee supports the objectives of ESP, it has reservations about its implementation. The committee does not support the request for advanced appropriations authority and notes that such authority has not been provided to the Department in the past and would limit the oversight ability of future Congresses. Therefore, the committee recommends incremental funding authority over a period not to exceed 6 years for the procurement of the two SBIRS satellites.

The committee expects the Air Force to realize substantial savings from the ESP block buy approach, enabled by a fixed-price contract and fixed requirements. The committee also expects the Air Force to reinvest any savings into a spacecraft modernization initiative, where research and development activities are competitively awarded and new technologies are matured for insertion into future blocks of SBIRS satellites or other space-based infrared sen-

sors. Further, the committee believes that the ESP approach must be viewed as a longer-term strategy for space acquisition to fully realize the benefits of the spacecraft modernization initiative and to provide longer-term stability in the industrial base.

The committee discourages the use of advanced appropriations in future budget requests for space programs.

SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 151—Requirement To Set F–35 Aircraft Initial Operational Capability Dates

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to establish the initial operational capability date for the F–35A aircraft and submit a report on the details of such initial operational capability to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2012. This section would also require the Secretary of the Navy to establish initial operational capability dates for the F–35B and F–35C aircraft and submit a report on the details of such initial operational capabilities for both variants not later than December 31, 2012.

Section 152—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of RQ–4 Global Hawk Unmanned Aircraft Systems

This section would limit the use of funds to retire Global Hawk Block 30 Unmanned Aircraft Systems and require the Secretary of the Air Force to take all actions necessary to maintain RQ–4 Block 30 Global Hawk operational capability through December 31, 2014.

Section 153—Common Data Link for Manned and Unmanned Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Systems

This section would amend section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), to require that in carrying out a solicitation for a common data link (CDL), the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that such solicitation complies with the most recently issued CDL specification standard of the Department of Defense, and does not include any proprietary or undocumented interface or waveform as a requirement or evaluation criterion of such solicitation.

The committee is aware that the Department continues to implement a standard specification for CDL for manned and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems. In his March 29, 2012, confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics reiterated the Department's advocacy for open competition in system procurements. The Acting Under Secretary also noted that an assessment was underway to examine CDL procurements over the next 2 years to find ways to improve competition, increase qualified vendors, eliminate the use of proprietary interfaces, and promote open standards, interfaces, and interoperability between vendor products. The committee supports the goals of this assessment, and encourages the Department to implement this policy as expeditiously as possible.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $69.4 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation.

The committee recommends $70.4 billion, an increase of $979.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 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 $8.9 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army. The committee recommends $8.5 billion, a decrease of $472.1 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 research, development, test, and evaluation, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Acute Lung Injury Medical Research

The committee is aware that acute lung injury and acute respiratory distress are significant and growing challenges for combat casualty care caused in large part by the increasing survival rate of combatants surviving the initial blasts from improvised explosive devices. Existing technology such as mechanical ventilators and extracorporeal membrane oxygenation are too complicated for battlefield use. The committee is aware that an artificial lung replacement technology, known as an extracorporeal lung support has been demonstrated as an effective, less expensive, and safer alternative. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to explore the possibility of developing alternative lung support devices rugged, portable, and minimally invasive enough for use in a battlefield environment.

Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle

The budget request contained $74.1 million in PE 23735A for the Combat Vehicle Improvement Program to continue the Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV) program.

The House of Representatives continues to support the AMPV program and notes that in the conference report (H. Rept. 112–329) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the conferees provided numerous options for consideration by the Army to accelerate the program. The committee is disappointed that the Army has elected not to accelerate the program.

The committee understands that the budget request would slip low-rate initial procurement of the AMPV by an additional year to fiscal year 2017. The committee believes that the acceleration of the AMPV program, which would use tracked and/or wheeled variants of systems already fielded, is not a high-risk endeavor and

could also serve to partially mitigate the proposed 3-year break in production of the combat vehicle production base. In addition, the committee is aware that existing manufacturers in the combat vehicle production base have already produced working prototypes of the AMPV. Furthermore, the committee recognizes that the AMPV has many of the attributes of the successful "Interim Armored Vehicle" competitive acquisition, which was fielded 2 years after it was first announced by the Chief of Staff of the Army. The committee encourages the Army to consider modifying its current acquisition strategy and explore the feasibility of beginning low-rate initial procurement of the AMPV in calendar year 2015.

The committee recommends $74.1 million, the full amount requested, in PE 23735A for the AMPV program.

Autonomous Sustainment Cargo Container

The committee recognizes the importance of safely moving containerized supplies from ship-to-shore during contingency operations. The committee has encouraged the development of new robotic concepts for this logistics operation and, in previous years, has supported investments in field-test data for an Autonomous Sustainment Cargo Container (ASCC).

The committee understands, however, that the Army has stated that it does not have a capability gap in its ability to move containerized cargo from ship to shore that the ASCC would address. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to further assess incorporating the ASCC into the Army's current and near-future logistics operations at the off-shore distances in accordance with Army doctrine (including future sea basing). At a minimum, this analysis should review:

(1) The military utility of using an autonomous cargo container across a range of military operations and in various environments including adverse weather/terrain, hostile asymmetrical warfare, and Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief operations;

(2) How ASCC's capabilities would be incorporated into the Army's logistics operations, from point of supply through delivery to point of need;

(3) The cost estimates to procure, operate, and sustain ASCC in comparison to the lifecycle costs of current manned capabilities; and

(4) If applicable, additional operational and logistics impacts to the Army of incorporating ASCC into its processes.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report on the Army's findings to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Body Armor Enhancements and Personnel Protection Equipment for Female Soldiers

The budget request contained $32.0 million in PE 63827A for soldier systems-advanced development. Of this amount, $15.0 million was requested for the development of improved soldier personnel protective equipment efforts. The budget request also contained $96.4 million in PE 64601A for infantry support weapons. Of this

amount, $11.9 million was requested for the development and testing of prototypes for improved personnel protective equipment.

Section 216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense to establish separate research and development program elements for body armor. The committee notes that while science and technology (S&T) funds and projects for body armor activities have been reasonably robust, there has been no significant advanced component development, prototype development, and system development and demonstration (RDT&E) budget activities from which successful S&T projects could be transitioned. The committee is encouraged by the budget request for fiscal year 2013. The committee expects these RDT&E programs to include: female body armor to ensure the warfighter is equipped with the most current individual protection gear; develop ways to reduce weight with current technologies; and increased investment in promising technologies that would eventually achieve reduced weight and increased protection together, as well as maximize flexibility and modularity. The committee also notes that the tradeoff between protection capabilities and weight is a major cost driver in body armor procurements and that this has become a major source of contention related to the measures of protection body armor must provide. The committee further notes available technology has not been able to keep the system within the user's desired weight without sacrificing performance. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to adequately resource these RDT&E efforts in order to improve performance and reduce the weight of systems.

The committee is also aware of concerns expressed by female members of the Armed Forces deployed in support of Operation New Dawn (OND) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) that the current interceptor body armor system's design may not be as ergonomically effective for female soldiers. The committee notes that the current counter-insurgency and dismounted operations in support of OND and OEF place female service members in direct combat action with the enemy. The committee understands the U.S. Army is currently pursuing several S&T and RDT&E programs to improve upon organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE) for soldiers to include programs specifically focused on female soldiers. The committee commends the Army for recognizing this issue and encourages the acceleration of these efforts to help determine the most effective OCIE to include body armor and associated components, for military service members. The committee also encourages the Army to continue to improve upon the partnerships and coordination of efforts between the S&T and acquisition OCIE communities in order to help streamline the transition of technologies into a readily available solution that could be used in the field by the warfighter.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct an assessment as to whether there is an operational need to tailor the interceptor body armor systems fielded to female service members specifically for the physical requirements of women. This assessment should include a comprehensive market survey of commercial body armor system designs specifically tailored for female body types. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within

180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the results of the assessment, as well as to provide an update on all other currently funded programs addressing personnel protection equipment for female soldiers.

The committee recommends $32.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63827A for soldier systems-advanced development, and $96.4 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64601A for infantry weapons program project for development and testing of prototypes for improved personnel protective equipment.

Cellular Networking to the Tactical Edge

The committee recognizes the Department of Defense has successfully deployed a secure third-generation (3G) cellular network in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to provide commanders with enhanced situational awareness and intelligence capabilities as part of its Last Tactical Mile program. By enabling seamless real-time communication between troops in the field and in-theater, this capability has increased operational effectiveness by generating actionable intelligence while enhancing unit mobility.

The committee commends the Army for its effort to deploy a mobile, secure cellular network to facilitate collection of multi-modal biometrics and identity information. Further, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to incorporate the lessons learned from the Last Tactical Mile program and consider wider application of these capabilities as it continues to improve the quality and security of its communications systems.

Efforts to Improve the Sustainment of Body Armor

The committee notes that the domestic body armor industrial base has expanded significantly since 2003 after procurement objectives were increased significantly to outfit all U.S. Armed Forces and Department of Defense (DOD) civilian personnel in the U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility. The committee notes that the total body armor program evolved from a $40.0 million program in 1999, to over $6.0 billion through 2012. This represents a significant investment by the military services for individual personnel protection, and the committee recognizes the importance of this program.

Current overseas contingency operations have demonstrated that body armor has become a critical item on the battlefield. Therefore, maintaining a reliable and cost-effective body armor industrial capability sufficient to meet strategic objectives should continue to be an important consideration when developing current and future acquisition strategies for all body armor components. Currently, the industrial base is approaching an inflection point due to uncertainty of future demand and associated procurement of body armor. The rate of procurements has dramatically slowed. The committee notes that industry has been willing to absorb the cost of non-utilized and underutilized manufacturing capacity in the hope that DOD contracts will continue; however, this cannot be sustained indefinitely. The potential dynamic nature of current and future threats has increased the challenge to forecast requirements and inform industry in advance.

The committee notes that the military services are resourcing ongoing projects and initiatives to understand and improve the life-

span of soft body armor components. The committee understands that current efforts are examining environmental effects, ballistic fiber accelerated aging, and fiber/fabric surface treatment during the weaving process. The committee notes that there is also research into three-dimensional weaving technology, and that modeling and simulation on soft armor architecture is also being investigated for more durable materials. The committee supports these initiatives.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that provides an assessment of the long-term sustainment requirements for the body armor industrial base in the United States, to include supply chains for hard and soft body armor. The briefing should also include an assessment of body armor and related research, development, and acquisition objectives, priorities, and funding profiles for hard and soft body armor components in the following areas: (1) advances in the level of protection; (2) weight reduction; (3) manufacturing productivity and capability; and (4) efforts and new technologies that could currently be used to extend the lifespan of hard and soft body armor components.

Ground Robotic Vehicle Development

The committee is aware that the first generation of robotic ground vehicles helped to counter the threat of improvised explosive devices to both mounted and dismounted forces in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee notes that a key performance requirement for the next generation of robotic ground vehicles is the transportation of infantry equipment and supplies, and to provide the warfighter with increased situational awareness capability. Ground vehicle robots also have the potential to improve the speed and accuracy with which supplies are delivered to warfighters operating in a combat zone. The committee notes that multiple ground robotic development efforts are currently funded by the military services and other Department of Defense agencies and organizations. The committee notes that many of these efforts could potentially overlap and currently appear to lack coordination. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to maintain a coordinated effort in advancing ground robotic research, development, and acquisition in order to improve cost, schedule, and performance of current and future initiatives.

Joint Air-to-Ground Missile Program

The budget request included $10.0 million in PE 65450A for Joint Air-to-Ground Missile (JAGM) research and development.

The committee supports the JAGM program and approves of the decision to continue the program as outlined in the revised Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) issued by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics on March 20, 2012. The committee notes that significant prior-year funding is available to continue the program and encourages expedited contracting actions to ensure that these funds can be obligated in fiscal year 2012. While the committee agrees with the decision in the ADM to explore technical trades to achieve a more affordable solu-

tion, the committee recommends that the Army retain a requirement for an all-weather, moving target-capable missile, with an emphasis on missile solutions capable of being fielded within 3 years of contract award. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2012, on the revised acquisition plan, anticipated requirements, and program schedule and funding needs.

The committee recommends $10.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 65450A for JAGM research and development.

M4 Carbine Product Improvement Program

The budget request contained $96.5 million in PE 64601A for Infantry Support Weapons. Of this amount, $9.6 million was requested for the Individual Carbine competition and $9.2 million was requested for the M4 carbine product improvement program (PIP).

The committee notes that U.S. Army officials have informed the committee that the Army would resource a three-phase acquisition strategy to review potential upgrades to the M4 carbine. Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) required the Secretary of the Army to submit to the congressional defense committees a business case assessment of commercially available upgrade kits and weapon systems before allowing the next generation Individual Carbine to enter full-rate production. The committee is concerned that the budget request does not contain the necessary resources to conduct the evaluation of commercial-off-the-shelf upgrade kits despite the Army's stated intent to do so in phase III of the PIP acquisition strategy.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act that outlines the Army's plan to evaluate commercial-off-the-shelf upgrade kits to the M4 carbine in the product improvement program. This report should include the business case assessment comparing the capabilities and costs of commercial-off-the-shelf upgrade kits to the enhanced M4/A1 carbine.

The committee recommends $9.6 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64601A for the Individual Carbine competition, and $9.2 million, the full amount requested, for the M4 PIP program.

Occupant-Centric Survivability Technology Development Program

The committee understands that the U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC) has established the occupant centric survivability program, with a goal of examining technologies that can significantly protect vehicle occupant casualties. The committee supports this effort. The committee understands that as part of its effort to improve occupant survivability, TARDEC is reviewing industry-derived integrated solutions, such as rapid occupant evacuation systems, modular composite armor and rocket-propelled grenade mitigation, exterior underbody and interior floor improvised explosive device blast mitigation solutions, roof-mounted blast seating and restraint systems, and thermal injury prevention to include fuel containment systems.

The committee notes that the Marine Corps used a similar and innovative "kit" approach that tightly integrated numerous survivability technologies in an effort to significantly upgrade the occupant protection of Marine Corps' Light Armored Vehicles. The committee understands that such an integrated occupant-centric survivability system is potentially applicable to a wide-range of existing and future Army and Marine Corps vehicles and could be installed on current platforms in the near-term during depot reset, or in theater.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2013, on the status of evaluating candidate occupant-centric survivability systems to include: prototyping and testing activities; the potential for integrating candidate technologies on existing vehicles, such as the Stryker vehicle, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, the Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle, and the high mobility, multi-purpose wheeled vehicle; and the status of coordinating findings with the Marine Corps.

Patriot Product Improvement Program

The budget request contained $110.0 million in PE 67865A for the Patriot Product Improvement Program.

The committee is concerned that the Army has not yet presented to Congress a prioritized plan to support the long term requirements of a modification program for a system that will be operational through at least 2035. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report not later than October 31, 2012, that provides a prioritized modernization plan for the Patriot system which addresses replacement of obsolete components and subsystems, development and insertion of technologies that can address evolving threats, including those technologies developed through the Medium Extended Altitude Defense System (MEADS), and introduction of life-cycle costs reduction changes.

The committee notes that a plan to harvest technology from MEADS was a specific requirement of the report mandated in section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), which has not yet been fulfilled. The committee believes such plan should be included in the fiscal year 2014 budget request and beyond.

The committee recommends $110.0 million, the amount requested, in PE 67865A for the Patriot Product Improvement Program.

Pilot Aid for Helicopter Landing and Cargo Handling

The committee is aware of the Army's need to improve mission safety for helicopter air and ground crews involved in landing and cargo handling, particularly in limited visibility conditions. The Army Aviation and Missile Research, Development, and Engineering Center has already demonstrated this capability. In addition, the Navy and Marine Corps have deployed, on unmanned helicopter systems, technology to autonomously deliver cargo on unmanned rotorcraft that could be adapted for use as a cognitive decision aid, freeing pilots to concentrate on flight safety. The committee recommends that the Army evaluate the potential contribu-

tion of autonomous cargo delivery technology as a cognitive pilot aid on its manned rotorcraft, for landing and cargo handling.

Research, Development, and Engineering Command

The committee is aware that the Department of the Army is assessing the role of the Research, Development, and Engineering Command (RDECOM) in an ongoing Material Development and Sustainment study. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee also requested a study by the Army to examine the potential impact of disestablishing RDECOM. The committee strongly supports the RDECOM mission to prevent unnecessary duplication of research and development, while ensuring integration and coordination of various efforts. The committee believes that the level of oversight and discipline that RDECOM brings to the Army acquisition enterprise is vital to the effective stewardship of the taxpayer's investment, and necessary to implement a systematized engineering approach as required by the Weapon Systems and Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23). Therefore, the committee urges the Army to refrain from any effort to disestablish, relocate, or devolve any RDECOM functions, including the reassignment of personnel, until these studies have been completed and thoroughly reviewed by the committee.

Robotics for Surgical Procedures

The committee notes that emerging robotics applications have the potential to improve minimally invasive surgery techniques. The committee supports continued research by the Army's Telemedicine and Advanced Technology Research Center (TATRC) into surgical robotics technologies that could lead to greater remote-surgery capability and surgical capability in non-sterile environments. The committee further believes that such robotics applications for forward-deployed and combat situations, like those used in transluminal endoscopic oral surgery, reduce the risk of life-threatening internal infection associated with accidental injury during surgical procedures.

Rotary-Wing Performance Surface

The committee recognizes the need for the development of a rotary wing performance mission planning tool that improves aviation safety and survivability. Such a system could provide mission planners and air crews with the capability to display specific airframe performance characteristics that take into account terrain and soil features, and other performance factors to provide qualitative assessments of flight routes and landing zones. Such a system could also provide mission planners and aircrews with the capability to rapidly assess an area-of-operation for a forecasted time. This type of capability should be interoperable with existing aviation mission planning decision making tools and have the potential to be integrated with technologies facilitating operations in degraded visual environments.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2013, assessing the current capabilities and capability gaps in Army Aviation mission planning tools that would provide aircrews with

enroute and landing zone assessments. The report should also take into consideration available empirical data derived from aircraft performance attributes, weather and environmental conditions, and known terrain conditions.

Shadow Unmanned Aerial System Alternative Engine

The committee notes that the Army's Shadow unmanned aerial system (UAS) has accumulated over 1 million flight hours in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee understands that a planned upgrade of the Shadow may enable it to perform longer-range and higher-altitude missions. The committee also notes that the Shadow's current engine runs on high-octane gasoline, which creates a significant logistics burden for the Army. The committee is also aware that the Army is pursuing an alternative engine to enhance UAS performance. The committee encourages the Army to continue development of alternative engine solutions and encourages the Army to consider high-efficiency, air-breathing turbine engine technologies. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that details the Army's plans to modernize the Shadow platform's propulsion system.

Smartphone Application Development for the Battlefield

The budget request contained $50.7 million in PE 63008A for electronic warfare advanced technology.

The committee notes that this program matures technologies that address the seamless integrated tactical communications challenge with distributed, secure, mobile, wireless, and self-organizing communications networks that will operate reliably in diverse and complex terrains, in all environments. Within this program element, the committee urges the Army to also focus research and development efforts on smartphone applications that support battle command planning and information interoperability, including those used with coalition partners.

The committee recommends $50.7 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63008A for electronic warfare advanced technology.

Turbo Fuel Cell Advanced Technology Development

The budget request contained $69.0 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology. Of this amount, $24.4 million was requested for ground vehicle technology.

The committee believes the integration of mature, advanced fuel cell technologies into an engine that could effectively meet military logistic requirements should be adequately resourced. The committee is encouraged by the work being done at the Army's Research, Development and Engineering Command-Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (RDECOM–TARDEC), where engineers are developing a turbo fuel cell engine for the Heavy Expanded Mobility Tactical Truck, which is the primary logistics vehicle being used in support of Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee notes that funding at RDECOM–TARDEC has been used to manufacture tubular air electrodes for stable, high-performance solid oxide fuel cells. The committee encourages RDECOM–TARDEC to continue

its work in the development of the turbo fuel cell engine and supports its efforts to increase energy efficiency utilizing renewable and alternative sources of energy.

The committee recommends $69.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $16.9 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy. The committee recommends $17.7 billion, an increase of $835.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Defense University Research Instrumentation Program

The budget request contained $113.7 million in PE 61103N for University Research Initiatives. Of that amount, $19.4 million was requested for the Defense University Research Instrumentation Program (DURIP).

The committee notes that DURIP grants are awarded exclusively on Department of Defense (DOD)-relevant projects that have undergone a rigorous and competitive application process administered by the Office of Naval Research. This process identifies the winning proposals as fulfilling vital and immediate research needs for which investments in instrumentation and infrastructure are critical.

As the Navy protects its investment in basic research, it is vital to ensure that researchers have access to state-of-the-art research instrumentation to carry out transformative oceanographic research in support of Navy programs.

The committee recommends, $123.7 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 61103N for the DURIP.

Development of Unmanned Systems Weapon, Sensor, and Payload Integration and Interoperability Capabilities

The committee recognizes that providing unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) to the warfighters has been a high priority requirement for each of the military services. However, quick reaction programs for the purpose of fielding UAS on an expedited basis has frequently resulted in acquisition of UAS with proprietary software and subsystems, unique to specific UAS, making it costly to update UAS capabilities.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of the Navy are on record citing the importance of the integration and interoperability of UAS sensors and ordnance. The Department of the Navy is therefore encouraged to select an organization within the Department of the Navy best-suited to conduct a review of its UAS to determine appropriate courses of action; including consolidation of integration and interoperability efforts and an investment strategy to achieve further integration and interoperability of UAS

sensors and various types of ordnance. Further, recommendations for consolidation of the integration and interoperability efforts should give site priority to existing scientific research, development, test, and evaluation centers of excellence with experience working with the other military services and with personnel whose intellectual capital and background expertise is hardware-in-the-loop and system-integration of weapons, sensors, and payload systems onto various types of manned and unmanned aircraft systems. Finally, consolidation sites considered should have real-time modeling and simulation weapons laboratories and instrumented weapons-open-air ranges, within military restricted airspace.

The committee recommends that this review be coordinated with the appropriate Department of the Navy weapon system development centers, with participation of personnel from UAS operational units and industry providers of current and planned UAS sensors and ordnance. The committee also recommends that the Department of the Navy provide a briefing on the results of its review to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Electromagnetic Railgun

The budget request included $89.2 million in PE 62114N for power projection applied research, including funds for the Navy's electromagnetic railgun (EMRG) Innovative Naval Prototype (INP).

The committee is aware that the Navy EMRG program has the potential to provide significant benefits over conventional guns by utilizing electricity to create launch projectiles at speeds more than twice of that achievable by conventional guns. In addition, the elimination of the chemical propellant could allow for much deeper magazines due to a smaller round and provides warfighter safety and logistic benefits through the elimination of a large fraction of the energetic material from the magazine. The committee believes that such advances will provide naval vessels with increased strike capability and longer time on-station, as well as provide necessary capabilities to operate effectively in anti-access, area denial environments. The committee is also aware that the electromagnetic railgun has the potential to be useful in a land-based defense mode against missile threats. For both land and sea based options, the committee believes that the Navy should work toward rapidly deploying this technology as soon as practicable.

The committee recommends $89.2 million, the full amount requested, in PE 62114N for power projection applied research.

Marine Corps Early Transition Activities

The committee is aware that the replacement program for Navy's current enterprise intranet, the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN), is expected to be one of the most complex information technology (IT) systems in the Department of Defense. NGEN is expected to supply a secure IT infrastructure for the continental United States and select locations overseas, providing the foundation for a future Naval Networking Environment. The committee recognizes that such a complex system poses management and acquisition challenges unlike those seen by other defense IT systems. Despite these challenges, the committee is aware that the Marine

Corps has made exceptional strides in executing early transition activities to better position the Marine Corps to move to NGEN. The committee applauds the Marine Corps for quickly and efficiently implementing changes to move from contractor-owned-and-controlled to Marine-owned-and-operated infrastructure, and to help implement lessons on behalf of the entire Department of the Navy.

Naval Use of Non-Lethal Systems

The committee is aware that the Navy has explored the use of non-lethal systems to protect naval vessels, such as using laser dazzlers or high-frequency acoustic hailing devices. The committee has approved previous requests by the Navy to reprogram funds to support urgent operational needs for non-lethal systems. The committee also notes that the President's budget requested $177.1 million for Navy physical security equipment procurement, which includes acoustic hailing devices and laser dazzlers. The committee is concerned, though, that satisfying specific needs through urgent operational needs and reprogramming of funds does not indicate a systematic or Navy-wide view of the needs or requirements for non-lethal systems.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the total requirement for non-lethal systems for naval vessels, as well as a plan to meet this requirement.

Navy Directed Energy Programs

The budget request included $89.2 million in PE 62114N for power projection applied research, including funds for the Navy's free electron laser (FEL) Innovative Naval Prototype (INP).

The committee is aware that the Navy is pursuing applied research and development of technologies supporting advanced accelerators with applications to directed energy weapons. This activity also includes the FEL INP, which, if successful, could be utilized for shipboard applications as a defensive weapon against advanced cruise missiles and asymmetric threats. The committee believes that such advances are necessary for the Navy to operate effectively in anti-access, area denial environments.

The committee recommends $89.2 million, the full amount requested, in PE 62114N for power projection applied research.

Shipbuilding Material Comparison

In a recent article published in "Inside the Navy", it was reported that, "superstructure cracking in several classes of surface combatants is being addressed, but in some cases is proving costly". The committee is aware that three materials have been used in the deckhouses of surface combatants: steel, aluminum, and most recently for the deckhouse of the DDG–1000 Zumwalt class, composite material.

The committee is also aware that there is a cost differential in both up-front procurement and production and in lifecycle maintenance cost for these materials. The next opportunity that the Navy will have to influence a design will be with Flight III of the DDG–51 Arleigh-Burke destroyers. The committee directs the Secretary

of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees with delivery of the fiscal year 2014 budget request, comparing the estimated construction costs for a deckhouse made of each of the three materials, or even a possible hybrid of two or all three, and then compares the estimated lifecycle costs for the designed life of the ship.

Surface Combatant Combat System Engineering

The committee continues to support the Navy's continued pursuit of open architecture in its shipboard combat and communications architecture. The committee is also aware that the Navy has tested alternative network systems that reduce size, weight, and power requirements over legacy configurations with the potential to be more affordable as well. The committee encourages the Navy to continue to pursue these types of solutions.

Universal Tactical Controller for Unmanned Systems

The committee is concerned by the large number of proprietary controllers that have been fielded as part of small unmanned systems, including unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV), unattended ground sensors (UGS), and unmanned ground vehicles (UGV). The committee understands the roles of UAVs, UGVs, and UGSs have increased significantly since 2002. The committee notes that the current inventory of unmanned systems, from Class 1 UAVs to UGVs and UGSs, includes many different types of systems, each requiring a proprietary controller unique to those systems. The committee also notes that more than 19,000 systems have been fielded to units across the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, to determine the advisability and feasibility of developing a soldier-wearable, universal controller for the Army and the Marine Corps that could potentially operate Class 1 UAVs, UGSs, and UGVs, and to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the results of the study.

Unmanned Aircraft Programs for Navy Aircraft Carriers

The budget request contained $142.3 million in PE 64402N for the Unmanned Combat Air System (UCAS) and $122.5 million in PE 64404N for the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) system.

The committee notes that the limited fielding operational capability date for the UCLASS has been delayed by two years in the fiscal year 2013 budget, but that the milestone activities associated with technology development for UCLASS and the high-level of concurrency with the UCAS program remain essentially the same. Furthermore, the reporting and certification requirements contained in section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) have not been provided to the congressional defense committees regarding the UCLASS program. The Secretary of the Navy also plans to limit competition early in the UCLASS program by down-selecting to one contractor during the phase of preliminary design review. Additionally, the committee understands that more risk-reduction activities that

would benefit the technology development phase of the UCLASS program are possible within the UCAS program, but that the UCAS program is fiscally under-resourced to perform such activities.

The committee therefore recommends the transfer of $75.0 million from PE 64404N for UCLASS to PE 64402N for UCAS risk-reduction activities. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would assist enhancing competition in the UCLASS program, but limit obligation of fiscal year 2013 UCLASS funds to 25 percent of the total appropriated until the requirements of section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) are provided to the congressional defense committees.

Unmanned Cargo-Carrying-Capable Unmanned Aerial System

The committee notes that the Marine Corps is conducting an evaluation of a rotorcraft unmanned aerial system (UAS) that is being used to carry up to 4,500 pounds of cargo to remote sites in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. To date, the Marine Corps has indicated that the vehicle has flown approximately 250 hours over 192 flights, and carried nearly 600,000 pounds of cargo, with an operationally ready rate of 94 percent. The Marine Corps' use of the cargo-carrying-capable unmanned aerial vehicle has avoided having to resupply remote operating locations by the use of manned vehicle convoys, at significantly reduced cost as compared to manned rotorcraft or manned cargo aircraft; and also avoided exposing manned rotorcraft and cargo aircraft to enemy ground fire. The evaluation was originally planned to span 6 months, however, the Marine Corps plans to extend it another 6 months, through September 2012.

The committee supports the technical demonstration and evaluation of unmanned cargo-carrying-capable UAS. However, if the military services determine that they require cargo-carrying-capable UAS in their respective force structure, the committee believes the services should avoid duplication of their efforts, and encourages them to conduct common development where possible and maintain competition in development and procurement. The committee further notes that section 142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) prohibits the obligation or expenditure of procurement funding for this capability until 15 days after the Department has certified that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has approved a joint and common requirement for such a vehicle.

Utilization of Navy Airship for Airborne Test and Evaluation

The committee is aware that the Navy possesses a manned, lighter-than-air vehicle, designated the MZ–3A, that has been utilized by several agencies in recent years for airborne testing of sensors, communications equipment, and other electronic devices. The committee believes that lighter-than-air systems like the MZ–3A have the potential to provide low-cost, persistent airborne platforms for sensor testing.

The committee is concerned that the Navy has not fully exploited the benefits and availability of the MZ–3A versus other Navy platforms performing airborne sensor testing and evaluation programs

and may be utilizing higher-cost platforms instead. The committee believes that the Navy should maintain a full accounting of its test platforms to ensure that it maximizes its test and evaluation resources.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Director of the Test Resource Management Center of the Department of Defense, to conduct an analysis of the usage of the MZ–3A for test and evaluation purposes and submit a report on the results of the analysis to the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The analysis should examine the following:

(1) An analysis of all of the test platforms used in the past two fiscal years, or planned for use in the upcoming two fiscal years;

(2) Costs for maintaining these platforms, and any limitations requiring the use of specific platforms (such as availability or payload constraints); and

(3) Description of the process for managing the selection of platforms for system testing and evaluation.

Unmanned Undersea Vehicles

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to intensify its efforts to integrate Unmanned Undersea Vehicles (UUVs) more fully into operations where viable and cost effective. The committee recognizes the tremendous advances made by the Navy in development of UUVs, but believes that increased emphasis on UUV programs of record will produce additional capabilities. As Navy standards and requirements solidify, external stakeholders will be incentivized to design and produce more advanced systems reflecting the latest in technology.

The committee is in agreement with the views of the Chief of Naval Operations that unmanned vehicles, particularly UUVs, can complement and augment manned naval systems; increasing their capability while reducing both risk to Navy personnel and cost. As an example, the ability of unmanned vehicles to provide persistent presence could enhance the effectiveness of surveillance missions in priority locations. The ability of one operator to control a number of unmanned vehicles could also expand the coverage potential of these systems without requiring an increase in personnel. The committee urges that the Navy's Roadmap for Information Dominance and other strategic planning documents be reviewed to ensure the potential contributions of unmanned vehicles, particularly UUVs, can be realized fully as soon as possible.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $25.4 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force. The committee recommends $25.5 billion, an increase of $85.0 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Aerial Networking

The committee is aware of Air Force research and development efforts to help address significant and complex problems in aerial internet protocol (IP) networking, to include ensuring that IP-based networks deliver rapid, reliable, real-time tactical information. Such efforts are expected to make it easier for warfighters to dynamically configure and manage these aerial networks during periods of operational use. The committee believes the standardization of this IP-based architecture could provide tangible benefit to our warfighters.

The committee encourages the Air Force to expedite further operational testing of this new capability, including the potential for expanding the automation of the network and its management, addition of higher-capacity airborne backbone network resources, and improved use of satellite and other broadcast network resources which will be assimilated into the fielded capability. Following this testing, the Air Force is further encouraged to expand the scale of live testing and enable testing of different aerial network configurations with the eventual live flight testing in real-world environments to expedite the transition of this capability to fielded military programs.

Aerospace Sensing and Measurement Standards

The committee recognizes the role that standards play in accelerating the development of new and innovative technologies and removing barriers to trade, which increases American global competitiveness and provides technological advantages to the warfighter. The committee encourages the Department of Defense (DOD) to create a consortium of existing organizations to accelerate the development, adoption, and implementation of standards in sensing and measurement for the aerospace sector which will advance defense needs. The committee also encourages DOD to enter into partnerships with other federal agencies where such standards would be mutually beneficial.

Enhanced Weather Data Support

The committee is aware that advanced weather forecasts using Tropospheric Airborne Meteorological Data Reporting (TAMDAR) systems have been used by the Federal Aviation Administration, the U.S. Weather Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for over seven years. The committee is also aware that advanced forecasting employing TAMDAR has the potential to enhance U.S. and allied meteorological forecasting systems, thus providing improved reliability and situational awareness. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to explore the possibility of utilizing TAMDAR in an operational context to determine its utility for defense missions.

Global Positioning System

Since its inception in the 1970s, the space-based architecture of the global positioning system (GPS) has remained generally the same. From the days of the early Block I satellites to the GPS III satellites under development today, the GPS signal from space has

been provided by a dedicated constellation of 24 to 31 satellites in medium earth orbit. The committee believes that the evolution of satellite and user equipment technology combined with today's constrained budget environment make this the right time to look at alternative architectures for the future global positioning system.

The committee directs the Commander of the Space and Missile System Center, U.S. Air Force, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2012, on lower-cost solutions for providing GPS capability following the procurement of the GPS III satellites. The report should identify the system capability, possible implementation approach(es), technical and programmatic risks, and the estimated costs of any solution(s) it recommends.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the report provided by the Commander of the Space and Missile System Center to the congressional defense committees, and to provide its recommendations to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date the report is received.

Hypervelocity Ground Testing With Full-Scale Vehicles

The budget request included $232.6 million in Program Element (PE) 62203F for aerospace propulsion research and development activities, including hypervelocity ground testing activities with full-scale vehicles.

The committee supports maintaining the capability to conduct hypervelocity ground testing with full-scale air vehicles. The committee is aware that the Air Force maintains a number of hypervelocity wind tunnels that it shares with the other military departments, as well as civilian agencies like the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The committee is also aware that as part of the fiscal year 2013 budget certification, the Test Resource Management Center opposed planned Air Force reductions that would have mothballed seven wind tunnels without assessing the impact on other agencies' programs or the cost to recover that mothballed capability in the future.

The committee recognizes the importance that hypersonic technology will play in meeting the defense needs of the future. The committee is concerned that U.S. hypersonics research, including the capability to conduct full-scale ground tests, may not be keeping pace with international efforts in this area. The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) should maintain priority on research, development, test, and evaluation programs that support hypersonics technology. Specifically, the committee urges the DOD to continue utilizing hypervelocity ground testing of advanced systems similar to the X–51 scramjet demonstration system, the Falcon Hypersonic Test Vehicle–2, flyback booster systems, and the stage separation of hypersonic interceptor systems designed to perform launch-phase intercepts. The committee also urges the Air Force to continue to utilize this technology to support the reduction of costs and significantly reduce the risk of flight testing scramjet and rocket-powered short and long range hypervelocity weapon systems.

The committee recommends $232.6 million, the full amount requested, in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion research and development activities.

Industrial Base for Space Surveillance Optics

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has recently completed testing of the Space Surveillance Telescope (SST), and transitioned the program to the Air Force Space Command. The committee also recognizes that the Department of Defense's strategic budget guidance may have unexpected implications for the health and viability of the industrial base required to design, build, and maintain additional SSTs, including the polishing, repair, refurbishment, and availability of spares for the large diameter optics. The committee encourages the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, along with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, to review the U.S. industrial base for large diameter optics to avoid the irreversible loss of the skilled workforce, and to ensure the Air Force and other agencies have future access to an industrial capability to provide precision large diameter optics.

Infrared Search and Track System Development

The budget request contained $84.3 million in PE 24136N for continued development of an infrared search and track (IRST) capability for Navy F/A–18 aircraft, but contained no funding for development of an infrared search and track capability for Air Force F–15 or F–16 aircraft.

The committee supports the Navy's effort to rapidly develop the IRST capability for Navy F/A–18 aircraft and believes that the combination of this new sensor and the deployment of the AIM–9X Block II and AIM–120D air-to-air missile could provide a significant increase in capability in challenging electronic warfare environments. The committee is concerned, however, with the Air Force's lack of research and development investment in this potentially critical technology. The committee notes that even if the F–35 program remains on track, the Air Force will still operate the F–15 and F–16 for many decades. The committee believes that the addition of IRST capability to Air Force F–15 and F–16 aircraft could greatly enhance the value of these fourth generation fighter aircraft in the future. The committee encourages the Air Force to budget for investment and deployment of IRST capability as it develops its future budget requests.

The committee recommends $84.3 million, the full amount requested, in PE 24136N for continued development of an infrared search and track (IRST) capability for Navy F/A–18 aircraft.

Joint Space Operations Center Mission System

The committee believes that (1) improvements to the space situational awareness and space command and control capabilities of the United States are necessary, and (2) the Department should leverage existing investments in government and commercial capabilities to the fullest extent practical.

The committee is aware that the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System (JMS) is a program of critical importance that is being designed to deliver an integrated, net-centric space situational awareness and command and control capability. The committee is also aware that this capability requires timely migration from fragile legacy components.

The committee commends the Air Force for restructuring the JMS program to reduce cost and accelerate transition by enabling competition and leveraging government and commercial applications. Ultimately, the committee expects the Air Force to select and/or develop the solution that best serves the warfighters' needs. The committee encourages the Department to fulfill its requirements by using existing or easily-modified Government and commercial applications, when possible, to achieve efficiency and cost effectiveness. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, to certify and report to the congressional defense committees within 270 days of the date of enactment of this act, that thorough market research and technical evaluation of relevant nondevelopmental items, that could provide a lower cost and earlier transition compared to a developmental solution, is completed during the acquisition process. The report should summarize the findings underpinning the certification. An interim report, in briefing format, should also be provided no later than March 1, 2013.

Materials Affordability Initiative

The budget request contained $47.8 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapons systems. Of that amount, $3.9 million was requested for the Metals Affordability Initiative (MAI) program.

The committee notes that MAI is public-private partnership that includes the entire domestic specialty aerospace metals industrial manufacturing base, which produces the strategic and critical metals aluminum, beryllium, nickel-base superalloys and titanium. MAI projects have involved participants from over 60 additional industrial companies, including over 45 small businesses, 20 universities, and 3 National Laboratories located in 35 states. The committee recognizes that MAI has demonstrated significant improvements in the manufacture of specialty metals for aerospace applications for the government and aerospace industry, and provides the warfighter with metals of improved strength and durability, often at a reduced cost. The committee encourages the Air Force to expand government participation in MAI to include other military departments and defense agencies, and to look at opportunities to expand to areas of metals affordability beyond aerospace applications.

The committee recommends, $57.8 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63112F for the MAI program.

Operationally Responsive Space

The budget request contained $10.0 million in PEs 63430F, 63423F, 63438F, 64441F, 64858F for five different programs to integrate the ORS concept into the entire space architecture. The budget request contained no funds in PE 64857F for the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program.

The committee is aware of the Department's plan to eliminate the Operationally Responsive Space program office and to transfer the remaining efforts to other space programs in order to better integrate the ORS concept into the entire space architecture. The committee is concerned with this plan and is not convinced that it will fully address joint military operational requirements for on-demand space support and reconstitution.

The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) established the ORS office to respond to the needs of the joint force commander and to build an enabling infrastructure to support the rapid deployment of space capabilities. ORS capabilities have the potential to reduce the fragility of the space architecture through rapid reconstitution, provide augmentation or surge capabilities, and offer a pathway for demonstrating new technology or operational concepts.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space to submit to the congressional defense committees a detailed strategic plan by November 30, 2012, that addresses how the Air Force will implement the mission of the ORS program as laid out in section 2273a of title 10, United States Code: (1) to contribute to the development of low-cost, rapid reaction payloads, busses, space lift, and launch control capabilities, in order to fulfill joint military operational requirements for on-demand space support and reconstitution; and (2) to coordinate and execute operationally responsive space efforts across the Department of Defense with respect to planning, acquisition, and operations. The plan should address the required funding for implementing this mission and how it will preserve this program's alternative approach to space acquisition.

Because the committee does not have a detailed understanding of the Department's plan for preserving the ORS mission without the ORS program office, the committee rejects the Department's legislative proposal to repeal the current statute that requires the Secretary of Defense to establish an office to be known as the ORS program office.

The committee recommends a decrease of $10 million, in PEs 63430F, 63423F, 63438F, 64441F, 64858F for the integration of the ORS concept into the entire space architecture. Instead, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 64857F for the Department to continue the ORS program as it develops a strategic plan that addresses the mission of the ORS program office as laid out in section 2273a of title 10.

Realignment of Airbase Technologies Division

The committee notes that the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) maintains an Airbase Technologies Division to research challenges associated with deploying and maintaining expeditionary airfields. The committee is aware that the Air Force is significantly reducing its investment in this area and ultimately plans to divest itself of this research program. The committee is concerned that there are 23 civilian billets associated with the Airbase Technologies Division, but that there is no plan for the disposition of that workforce. The committee recognizes that with the uncertainly over the future status of this workforce, the Air Force risks losing important skills and expertise as civilian scientists and engineers leave AFRL employment to pursue opportunities elsewhere. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the date of enactment of this Act on the disposition plans for that workforce. The report should address the Air Force's plan for reassigning, realigning, or eliminating the residual workforce from the Airbase Technologies Division. It should also

address how the Air Force will meet future civil engineering resourcing and research and development requirements to ensure a viable, long term program.

Space-Based Nuclear Detection

The committee reaffirms the importance of a space-based nuclear detection capability. The committee has not yet received the plan required in section 419 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) which required the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to develop a way forward for space-based nuclear detection sensors. The committee notes that such a plan remains necessary to understand the way ahead to ensure that this capability is available, especially in the geosynchronous orbit, following the decision not to integrate the Space and Atmospheric Burst Reporting System into the Space Based Infrared System satellites. The committee expects that the requirement for maintaining nuclear detection capability will be addressed.

Space Situational Awareness Fence Program

The budget request contained $267.3 million, in PE 64425F for continued development of the Space Fence system. The United States' reliance on space-based capabilities is growing exponentially; and, as summarized recently in the National Security Space Strategy, space is increasingly congested, contested, and competitive. Space debris is growing, increasing the potential for collisions with operational satellites and threatening our national security space assets. The Air Force Space Fence program will replace the existing surveillance system, over fifty years old, which does not have the capability to detect smaller objects and has significant coverage gaps in the southern hemisphere. The Space Fence is a major component of the nation's space situational awareness architecture.

The committee urges the Air Force to keep the program on schedule to provide the first S band radar surveillance site with initial operational capability for low and medium orbits by fiscal year 2017.

Space Test Program

The budget request contained $10.1 million in PE 65864F for the Space Test Program (STP), a decrease of $36.89 million.

The committee is concerned about the proposed cancellation of STP and its impact on long-term investment in space assets. Since 1965, STP has conducted space test missions for the purpose of accelerating the Department of Defense's (DOD) space technology transformation while lowering developmental risk. The cost-effective program flies an optimally selected number of DOD sponsored experiments consistent with priority, opportunity, and funding. The program serves a unique role in advancing technology that has become the foundation of core space capabilities.

The committee notes the statement in the President's budget justification that STP missions are the most cost-effective way to flight test new space system technologies, concepts, and designs.

The committee shares this assessment, but it is concerned by the STP proposed cancellation.

The committee recommends $45.0 million, an increase of $34.9 million, in PE 65864F for the Space Test Program.

Specialized Undergraduate Flight Training Advanced Trainer Replacement

The budget request contained $1.6 million in PE 64233F for the advanced trainer replacement (T–X) program development. The T–X program is planned to replace the aging T–38C aircraft and its ground-based training system for advanced pilot training. The committee notes that the T–38C has been in service since 1962, and is now in its third service life with an average of more than 14,000 hours per aircraft.

The committee recognizes the importance of the T–X program and supports the Department of the Air Force's efforts to move forward with this critical initiative. The committee notes that, compared to the budget request for fiscal year 2012, the budget request for fiscal year 2013 would delay the T–X initial operational capability (IOC) from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2020, and believes that any further delay in the program schedule may create safety and operational risks to future pilots through the operation of an aging T–38 fleet, while it may also increase fifth generation pilot training shortfalls for the F–22, F–35 and future long range strike aircraft. The committee is concerned that the budget request of $1.6 million for fiscal year 2013, and $6.0 million planned for fiscal year 2014, may not support the current acquisition schedule which would begin the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program phase in fiscal year 2014.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to review, and if necessary, revise its T–X program budget plans for the fiscal year 2014 budget request to support T–X program entry into the EMD phase not later than fiscal year 2014 so that the T–X IOC can be achieved in fiscal year 2020. Additionally, the committee understands that the Department plans to conduct its industry day, and other activities prior to its submission of a T–X request for proposal, in calendar year 2012, and urges the Department to adhere to this plan.

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

Overview

The budget request contained $18.0 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends $18.5 billion, an increase of $496.1 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Active Denial Technology and Roadmap

The committee is aware that more than $120 million has been invested over more than a decade in the development of non-lethal,

directed energy active denial technology, yet the Department of Defense has not established a program of record, or fielded systems to our service members, despite a number of Urgent Operational Needs requests from field commanders. The committee strongly supports this non-lethal capability and has authorized continued funding for next generation solid state active denial technology to support the Army's Ground Combat Vehicle non-lethal requirements.

In 2006, the Department issued the only policy statement to date on active denial technology, noting "support for the development" of the technology, which "offers the possibility for wide-ranging application in multiple scenarios where we lack suitable means of anti-personnel action." The committee is concerned that a lack of further policy guidance for the continued development, deployment and export of active denial technology is inhibiting the utilization of this capability, even as other nations such as Russia has recently announced an intention to also begin development of this technology. The committee is equally concerned by recent inconsistent export licensing decisions related to the marketing and sale of this capability to international partners.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a policy update and roadmap for active denial technology, including the Active Denial System, to the congressional defense committees by July 16, 2012. The policy shall clarify the Department's position on the further development, deployment and export of the capability and the roadmap shall provide a detailed consideration of future funding, development and deployment plans; potential opportunities for leveraging U.S. investment by fielding the capability domestically and internationally; the Department's position, including specific criteria used to evaluate marketing and sales licenses (in coordination with the Department of State), for coalition partners to procure U.S. active denial technology.

Aegis Ashore Program

The budget request contained $276.3 million in PE 64880C for the Land Based SM–3 or "Aegis Ashore" concept.

The committee notes that the 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review (BMDR) generated a requirement by the Administration to provide an Aegis capability ashore as a key component of the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA). The committee further notes that two stalwart allies, Romania and Poland, have enthusiastically responded to United States plans to host an Aegis Ashore site in their countries.

The committee notes, in another section of this report, concerns expressed by the Government Accountability Office on the high concurrency and technological risk forced by the timeline for deployment of the Aegis Ashore system.

The committee recommends $276.3 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64880C for the Land Based SM–3 or "Aegis Ashore" concept.

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Combat System

The budget request contained $260.60 million in PE 64307N for the Surface Combatant Combat Systems Engineering for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Weapons System.

The committee notes that the Aegis BMD Weapons System is the world's premier proven naval defense system and the sea-based element of the U.S. Ballistic Missile Defense System. Aegis BMD plays an active role in protecting U.S. deployed forces and allies from enemy ballistic missile attack. The committee further notes that the Aegis BMD system has been included in the Administration's European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense and has undergone extensive and successful missile defense testing.

The committee recommends $260.6 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64307N for the Surface Combatant Combat Systems Engineering for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Weapons System.

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense

The budget request contained $992.2 million in PE 63892C for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system.

The committee also supports the initiation of a Service Life Extension Program (SLEP) by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, which could result in a significant increase in the service life of the SM–3 IA interceptor and the retention of as many as 41 IA interceptors in the inventory by the end of 2017 that would have otherwise been transitioned out of the fleet. The committee is aware combatant commander interest in ensuring the largest possible inventory of Aegis BMD interceptors.

The committee recommends $992.2. million, the full amount requested, in PE 63892C for the BMD system.

Airborne Infrared and Advanced Remote Sensor Technology

The budget request contained $58.7 million in PE 64886C for the Advanced Remote Sensor Technology (ARST).

The committee believes that early tracking and discrimination of ballistic missiles is critical in providing notification and essential cueing information to other Ballistic Missile Defense Systems (BMDS). The committee supported the Airborne Infrared system for this reason. The committee understands ARST is the Missile Defense Agency's (MDA) revised concept for this system. The committee believes that a forward-deployed ARST would enable existing BMDS radar assets to search a smaller volume with less radar energy required to detect threats. This translates to an increased raid threat handling capability.

While MDA's ultimate goal with the ARST program may be space-based sensors, the committee believes that the program could produce technologies and resulting capabilities with near-term applications beyond space. With continued development, these Airborne Infrared sensors could be used as a flexible, rapidly deployable missile defense system component to provide the earliest possible fine track and discrimination of boosting threat missiles. Moreover, advanced sensor technologies developed for missile defense also can provide benefits to other defense and intelligence missions, such as air-to-air engagements in difficult environments; airborne weapons layer surveillance, acquisition, cueing, and fire control; maritime domain awareness; and ballistic missile defense technical collection.

To prevent wasteful duplication of effort, the committee believes MDA should coordinate with the Services and the Intelligence

Community to ensure that all potential applications for ARST investments are considered fully and adequately. In particular, the MDA should ensure that advanced sensor development takes into consideration any near-term, non-space missile defense capabilities. Exploiting these technologies in multiple mission areas may also enable future cost sharing and technology transfer opportunities. The committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the results of coordination with the military services and the intelligence community.

The committee recommends $58.7 million, the amount of the request, in PE 64886C for ARST.

AN/TPY–2 Radar

The committee notes the exceptional capability of the TPY–2 radar, and believes such capability should be fully explored by the Defense Department. The committee is aware that there have been recent reports that provide recommendations for how to further the capability of this system.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by November 30, 2012, on the stacked TPY–2 array concept described in the National Academies "Assessment of Concepts and Systems for U.S. Boost-Phase Missile Defense in Comparison to Other Alternatives," conducted pursuant to section 232 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

Assessment on Inner-Aural Communications Hearing Protection Capabilities

The committee is concerned that hearing loss continues to remain one of the most prevalent long-term injuries for military personnel. The committee is concerned that many military personnel may not wear their issued earplugs because current earplugs could potentially limit situational awareness as well as reduce the warfighter's ability to communicate over handheld and man-portable radios. The committee understands that U.S. Special Operations Command has developed and fielded communications technology that both increases situational awareness and mitigates the risk of permanent hearing loss through the use of enhanced inner-aural hearing protection and hearing enhancement protective technology.

The committee believes that the military services should consider additional investment in such technology and directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the status of the Department's efforts in developing technology to reduce service-related hearing loss, as well as the advisability and feasibility of equipping military personnel with inner-aural communications hearing protection and enhancement systems that could potentially reduce the risk of hearing loss.

Basic Research

The committee is aware that funding for basic research is a critical component of the Department of Defense's strategy for maintaining technological superiority over future adversaries. While much of the recent focus on supporting the warfighter has been on satisfying requests for urgent operational needs, the committee recognizes that long-term modernization needs also require investment and attention. Not only do these basic research initiatives support cutting-edge scientific research, they also contribute significantly to undergraduate scholarships and graduate research fellowships that strengthen the U.S. scientific and technical workforce.

The committee notes that a recent Defense Science Board study has also determined that the Department's basic research program is valuable, comparable to other basic research programs in the government and well-suited to the needs of the Department. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to continue to prioritize and protect these investments vital to the sustained health and future modernization of the military.

Blast Gauges

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) recently completed a rapid development effort to field sensors to measure blast effects and provide gross measures indicating the potential for traumatic brain injury (TBI). DARPA developed a simple sensor, easily integrated into a soldier's ensemble, for a cost of less than $50 per sensor. The committee understands that these sensors are now available through the Rapid Equipping Force to any unit that requests them. The committee encourages the military services to begin using these devices, and also to develop the necessary tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) to ensure proper employment, effective systematic data collection, and integration of that data into ongoing TBI research. To enhance the development of TTPs and data collection processes, the committee recommends that the Secretary of the Army and the Commandant of the Marine Corps identify and assign blast gauges to specific route clearance units to be deployed in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, or undergoing training in simulated blast environments, where these blast gauges can be utilized in a realistic operational setting.

Chemical Demilitarization and Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program

The committee notes that the Department of Defense recently approved and announced revised cost and schedule estimates for the final two U.S. chemical weapons destruction plants. The committee understands that the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program's life-cycle costs are now estimated at $10.6 billion, with destruction completion estimates for the chemical weapons stockpiles located at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, adjusted to 2019 and at the Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, to 2023. The committee further understands that this adds about $2 billion and 2 years to a previous program estimate to allow additional time and resources if necessary.

The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense is considering a legislative proposal that would authorize ACWA to consider use of Explosive Destruction Technologies, and other technologies for the treatment and disposal of agent or energetic hydrolysates, if problems with the current on-site treatment of hydrolysates are encountered.

The committee is concerned that these proposals have not been properly coordinated with the congressional defense committees and that this issue warrants further review. Additionally, the committee is concerned that the revised cost and schedule estimates for the final two U.S. chemical weapons destruction plants may not accurately reflect potential costs out to the adjusted timelines of 2019 and 2023.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the recently approved revised cost and schedule estimates for the ACWA program and any legislative proposals or changes being considered by the Department of Defense in support of the Chemical Demilitarization and ACWA programs.

Combating Terrorism and Emergency Response Technology Innovation

The committee supports the research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E) of certain technologies that combat terrorism, enhance emergency response capabilities, and enable U.S. Special Operations Forces (SOF). This includes technologies that facilitate worldwide communications, improve situational awareness, and enable command and control. The committee also supports the development of certain technologies that would utilize mobile training content and distance learning capabilities to realize efficiencies and improve SOF and first responder proficiency in these critical areas. The committee therefore encourages the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict to continue RDT&E of certain technologies that support combating terrorism, emergency response, and U.S. SOF through offices and organizations such as the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office and the Technical Support Working Group.

Comparative Effectiveness Research for Orthotics and Prosthetics

The committee is aware that the use of improvised explosive devices (IED) in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan has resulted in amputations becoming signature injuries for this generation of service members. The committee also recognizes that as IED threats continue to challenge U.S. forces in the future, so will the threat of amputation injuries. As a result, growing numbers of service members require sophisticated orthotic and prosthetic care to respond to these and other related injuries. The committee notes that there is little comparative effectiveness and outcomes-based research to establish the most appropriate services, supports, and devices for different types of orthotic and prosthetic patients. To deal with the long-term challenges posed by these kinds of injuries, the committee believes the Department of Defense should initiate a comparative effectiveness research program for orthotics and prosthetics.

Concerns Related to High Concurrency and Technical Risk Associated with the EPAA

The committee is aware that each year, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) prepares a report for the congressional defense committees on the missile defense programs of the United States pursuant to a mandate in the national defense authorization acts since 2002.

The committee was pleased to see in the report prepared for fiscal year 2011 that the GAO found that MDA has achieved successes in areas like the delivery and performance of its targets, which has been a concern in the past.

The committee is, however, concerned by GAO's findings in its draft fiscal year 2012 report that "during 2011, the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system, the Aegis Standard Missile 3 Block IB, and the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense experienced significant ill effects from concurrency."

For nearly every missile defense program the GAO found high levels of concurrency, which is defined as "the overlap between technology development or between product development and production." GAO found that the discovery of a design problem in the ground-based midcourse defense (GMD) interceptors, mod CE2, while production was under way increased costs, may require retrofit of fielded equipment, and delayed delivery of those interceptors. As a result, flight and other test-related costs to confirm capability have increased from $236 million to about $1 billion; the committee notes these costs involve four flight tests of the CE2 equipped interceptor.

GAO also noted concurrency problems with regard to the many systems and programs that relate to the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) to deploy missile defense in Europe: specifically the Aegis Ashore system, and potential implications for the Romania Aegis Ashore deployment to Romanian civil systems; the Precision Tracking Space System; and the SM–3 IB, IIA, and IIB missiles.

The committee notes that concurrency has affected many areas of the missile defense system and no system appears to have been spared that concurrency, including the GMD system. Regarding GMD, the committee is aware of the compressed timelines to deploy missile defenses when the United States withdrew from the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty in 2002. In that circumstance, the United States had no homeland missile defense and raced to deploy it to defend the homeland.

In the case of other systems, such as the EPAA's SM–3 IIB, the committee notes that the GAO has stated that "the need to meet the presidential directive to field the SM–3 Block IIB by the 2020 timeframe for European PAA Phase IV is a key driver for the high levels of concurrency." The committee encourages MDA to learn from these past mistakes.

The committee directs the Missile Defense Executive Board (MDEB) to report to the congressional defense committees not later than September 15, 2012, on its plans to address the risks noted by the GAO in its April 2012 draft report; this report should include an evaluation of mitigations and their costs that may be necessary if the risks highlighted by GAO are not resolved on a schedule consistent with the timelines articulated in the Ballistic Missile

Defense Review of 2010 concerning the EPAA's four-phased deployment and consistent with the plan to update and field additional GMD systems.

The committee further notes that the OSD Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office is currently working to develop a comprehensive cost of the EPAA. The Committee expects the final cost projection to be provided not later than the MDEB report required by this section.

Conventional Prompt Global Strike

The budget request contained $110.4 million in PE 64165D8Z for conventional prompt global strike (CPGS) capability development.

The budget request would fund the design, development, and experimentation of boosters, payload delivery vehicles, non-nuclear warheads, guidance systems, and mission planning and enabling capabilities with the goal of competitive acquisition beginning in fiscal year 2013 or fiscal year 2014. The committee understands that timing will be driven by the outcome of flight events and the budget.

The committee notes that while the first two HTV–2 tests were unsuccessful (though it provided meaningful data for review and concept development), the Army's Advanced Hypersonic Weapon (AHW) concept, developed in concert with the Sandia National Laboratory, was a success. The committee encourages the Department to continue cost-effective technology development and demonstration by leveraging the successful flight test of the AHW FT–1A glide body and by utilizing this ongoing program that can support prompt global strike acquisition programs across the Department.

The committee encourages a broader examination of the trade space of CPGS capabilities and concepts to meet warfighter requirements. The committee is mindful of the letter received by the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on May 20, 2011, from the Under Secretary of Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics that stated: "The Department remains committed to using industry competition for driving productivity and managing program risks and costs. It is my intent to promote competition in all areas of CPGS acquisition at the system, subsystem, and component levels." The committee understands that this continues to be the Department's approach and commends the Department for it.

The committee also encourages the Department to draw on the lessons of the 2008 National Academy of Sciences review and final report "U.S. Conventional Prompt Global Strike: Issues for 2008 and Beyond," completed pursuant to the conference report (H. Rept. 109–707) accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007 in which the conferees recommended a series of verification and transparency measures, in the context of their recommendation for development of CPGS, that could address concerns related to verification, transparency, and nuclear versus non-nuclear discrimination.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2012, detailing how the Department plans to use competition and integrate verification and transparency measures as it develops and deploys CPGS capabilities.

The committee recommends $110.4 million, the amount of the request, in PE 64165D8Z for conventional prompt global strike (CPGS) capability development.

Counterterrorism and Irregular Warfare Capabilities

The budget request contained $77.1 million in PE 63122D for activities in the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office (CTTSO). The budget request also contained $26.3 million in PE 63121D for activities in Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict Advanced Development. Of the amount, $7.5 million was requested for the Explosive Ordnance Disposal/Low-Intensity Conflict (EOD/LIC) program, $13.0 million was for the Irregular Warfare Support (IWS) program, and $1.9 million was for Information Dissemination Concepts.

The committee notes that according to the Department of Defense (DOD) new strategic guidance released in January 2012, "counter terrorism and irregular warfare" will remain primary DOD missions and, furthermore, that the Department "will continue to build and sustain tailored capabilities appropriate for counter terrorism and irregular warfare." The committee believes that irregular warfare (IW) will be the likely form of warfare confronting the United States, and that developing and institutionalizing IW capability across the military services is critical to military success.

The committee notes that CTTSO plays a unique role in front-end research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) to help warfighters rapidly acquire "tailored capabilities" for counterterrorism and IW. Under the authority of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict (ASD SO/LIC), CTTSO works with interagency and international partners to identify combating terrorism capability requirements; select promising proposals for advanced technology development; and rapidly deliver capability to the warfighter through RDT&E support. The committee has consistently recognized the value CTTSO adds to rapid acquisition of IW capabilities through its business process for evaluating proposals; experience interacting with numerous interagency and international partners; and expertise in advanced development prototyping. Specifically, the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2011, praised the Irregular Warfare Support (IWS) Legacy program for being "immediately effective in disrupting terrorist network activities, saving lives, and building a leave-behind indigenous capability." The committee noted that the Legacy program is one of many CTTSO programs that develop innovative, non-materiel, and multi-disciplinary methodologies and strategies for disrupting irregular and asymmetric threats and also directed the Secretary of Defense to assess the program's applicability against other network-based threats.

The committee has expressed concerns regarding CTTSO's location under ASD SO/LIC and the limited funding it receives compared to the emphasis on IW within DOD strategies. In the conference report (H. Rept. 111–288) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the conferees expressed concern that, "(1) this small program office in the Office of the Secretary of Defense appears to be the only entity in the De-

partment, and perhaps in the executive branch, engaged in these types of activities; and (2) that so little funding is requested each year to sustain such activities and to scale up those that prove to be successful."

The committee notes that CTTSO has program management authority for three sub-organizations: the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG), the EOD/LIC program, and the IWS program. The committee is concerned that projected funding for IWS, EOD/LIC, and Information Dissemination Concepts (IDC) are reduced across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) before being eliminated in fiscal year 2016.

Given the Department's guidance to "build and sustain tailored capabilities" for IW missions, the likelihood that future challenges will be irregular in nature, and the enduring need to maintain a robust RDT&E and flexible procurement and acquisition capabilities to support IW requirements, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to reexamine the funding reductions to IWS, EOD/LIC, and IDC through fiscal year 2016.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, the Director of the Office of Secretary of Defense for Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation and other relevant offices, to include those within the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to brief the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on CTTSO funding changes over the FYDP and present options for fulfilling IW rapid capability development gaps if funding is eliminated for the IWS program, EOD/LIC, and IDC.

The committee recommends $102.1 million, an increase of $25.0 million, in PE 63122D for activities in the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office (CTTSO).

Critical Gaps in Undersea Mobility Capabilities

The budget request contained $26.4 million in Program Element (PE)1160483BB for Special Operations Forces Underwater Systems.

The committee is aware that U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has realigned the Undersea Mobility Program to comply with the additional oversight requirements pursuant to Section 144 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee is also aware that the proposed program structure for fiscal year 2013 includes scaled-down requirements for dry combat submersibles to operate via host surface ship only with moderate capacity and varying endurance. The committee is concerned that frequent program and strategy changes to the Undersea Mobility Program and a lack of funding priority in critical research, development, testing and evaluation, have delayed the introduction of advanced capabilities for both wet combat submersible replacement and dry combat submersible development.

The committee is concerned that the current program schedule for dry combat submersibles, in particular, will not field an operational evaluation platform until early 2015 with extended integrated testing not taking place until 2016. Given current dry combat submersible capability gaps and a potential shift in strategic

emphasis to the Asia-Pacific and other regions that present anti-access and area-denial challenges, the committee is concerned that USSOCOM's Undersea Mobility Program will be unable to meet potential geographic combatant command requirements to operate in denied maritime areas from strategic distances. Additionally, the committee is concerned that the highly perishable and technical skill sets required to operate wet and dry combat submersibles resident within the Naval Special Warfare community have not been fully exercised and utilized in recent years, thereby increasing capability gaps and risks to the overall program.

The committee has previously expressed concern with these current capability gaps and recognized the operational importance of the Undersea Mobility Program to provide technologically-advanced undersea mobility platforms for U.S. Naval Special Warfare Command and USSOCOM. The committee therefore encourages the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command to review the current Undersea Mobility Program to mitigate risk, potentially accelerate the fielding of safe, efficient, and financially sound operational wet and dry systems, and to continually communicate with the congressional defense committees to ensure programmatic success and prevent previous program shortfalls.

The committee recommends $61.4 million, an increase of $35 million, Special Operations Forces Underwater Systems.

Cyber Research of Embedded Systems

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) has increased focus and resources on dealing with cyber security threats to DOD networks and systems. The committee also notes that the decreasing size and increasing computational power of many microelectronics has helped embed computers into practically every weapons system within the Department, leading to an exponential increase in the complexity of protecting those systems. A 2010 report by the JASON Program Office noted that, "while the level of effort expended in securing networks and computers is significant, current approaches in this area overly rely on empiricism and are viewed to have had only limited success."

The committee supports the Department's strategy for securing its computer networks and systems, but also urges the Department to embrace a broader research agenda to protect all computing resources, including embedded systems. The committee believes that Centers of Excellence exist within military organizations, and should be resourced to carry out the research, in addition to the development, of suitable defensive capabilities. As necessary, the committee also encourages the Department to look at fostering cybersecurity capabilities in organizations that traditionally may not have been involved in information systems protection, in order to explore new approaches and expand the overall capability base.

Defense Microelectronics

The committee is concerned about the state of defense microelectronics, with regard to both the availability of a trusted supply chain, as well as the long-term health and vitality of the industrial base. The committee fully recognizes the critical importance to the Department of Defense of sustaining and improving the supply of trusted semiconductors, supply chain components and inspection

tools manufactured in the U.S. The committee is also concerned that the Department's lack of a comprehensive microelectronics strategy, as called for by the Senate committee report (S. Rept. 112–26) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, poses a challenge in supporting decisions regarding what course of action may be most beneficial to that industrial base.

The committee recognizes the changing nature of the microelectronics industrial base, as well as the significant cost pressures associated with recapitalization and retooling to accommodate these changes. The committee is aware that industry is potentially facing a major transition to larger sized, 450mm wafers that will allow the manufacture of more advanced semiconductor devices at a lower cost. The committee believes that to get there will likely require the development of the next generation of manufacturing tools. The committee recognizes the value of pursuing technology research for other technologies that support fabless and maskless semiconductor development as a way to change the paradigm for the microelectronics industrial sector. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to complete the requested defense microelectronics study, which should examine ways of supporting further technology development for fabless and maskless semiconductor production, as well as manufacturing tools for 450 mm wafers. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy to examine the challenges to the microelectronics industrial base during its Sector-by-Sector, Tier-by-Tier analyses.

Finally, the committee recognizes the need to maintain and sustain an in-house capability to design and manufacture obsolete and hard-to-find microelectronics that complements but does not compete with industry. The committee is aware that the Department relies upon some types of microelectronics for decades, during which time commercial sources may no longer be available. Commercial pressures and incentives typically do not align with Department needs for low production quantity and long sustainment periods, driving the need for in-house solutions. The committee is also aware that the threat to U.S. microelectronics is complex, ranging from counterfeit parts to sophisticated manipulation of commercially available products. The committee notes that the Defense Microelectronics Activity (DMEA) is focused on the unique and trusted strategic semiconductor supply chain requirements of the U.S. government in the short and long term. The committee supports the mission of DMEA, provided it continues to maintain processes and capabilities that leverage industry without inadvertently competing with it.

Department of Defense Unmanned Aircraft System Operations in the National Airspace System

The budget request contained $7.7 million in PE 35219A, $18.0 million in PE 35220F, $0.7 million in PE 63211F, and $8.9 million in PE 64400D8Z for sense and avoid technology development to further unmanned aircraft system (UAS) operations in the National Airspace System (NAS). The budget request also included $37.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, for procurement of Ground Based Sense and Avoid (GBSAA) systems for the Grey

Eagle UAS program to comply with Federal Aviation Administration requirements to "sense and avoid" and permit expanded training opportunities and operation of the Grey Eagle unmanned aerial vehicle in the national airspace.

The committee supports these projects. UAS have become a significant component of the Nation's defense capability, as well as having the potential to provide support during a crisis and disaster response. The committee also recognizes the contribution that the Joint Planning and Development Office's (JPDO) report, "NextGen Unmanned Aircraft Systems Research, Development and Demonstration Roadmap," dated March 15, 2012, has made by providing a multi-agency perspective of the technology required to enable UAS operations and integration in the next generation NAS. The report is a joint publication of the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Homeland Security. The committee supports and encourages a collaborative relationship between the Department of Defense and other JPDO partners in order to expedite development of the necessary technologies to solve the challenges of UAS–NAS integration.

While supporting the Department of Defense's investment in "sense and avoid" technologies and system development, the committee is concerned about the overall plan for development and system fielding. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on current DOD capabilities and the program for GBSAA and airborne sense and avoid (ABSAA) development and fielding in support of UAS operations in the NAS. The report should include: the technology development and procurement roadmap for the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services, and include the required capabilities and systems for each, as applicable; the fiscal year 2013 Future Years Defense Program research and development and procurement budgets for each; a description of the technology development progress made and procurement actions taken to date; and the current GBSAA and ABSAA fielded capabilities. Finally, the report should include the projects the Department of Defense intends to address that are included in the multi-agency JPDO report, "NextGen UAS Research, Development, and Demonstration Roadmap."

Design Research to Improve Safety of Health Information Technology

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has made substantial investments in sustaining the current generation of health information technology (IT) systems, and working with the Department of Veterans Affairs to develop the next generation of electronic health records. However, the committee is concerned that the Department has not focused sufficient resources on research to improve design usability of the human-machine interface for these systems prior to entering system development. The com-

mittee notes that a recent study by the National Academies Institute of Medicine titled, "Health IT and Patient Safety: Building Safer Systems for Better Care" linked patient safety to sound design and development. As the report stated, research is needed to identify characteristics of safe systems and additional research is needed specifically about the impact of design deficiencies on patient impact.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and the Deputy Chief Management Officer, to brief the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on research being conducted within the Department of Defense related to human-machine interfaces for design usability of health IT systems. Areas of supporting research may include:

(1) User-centered design and human factors applied to health IT;

(2) Safe implementation and use of health IT by all users;

(3) Socio-technical systems associated with health IT; and

(4) Impact of policy decisions on health IT use in clinical practice.

The briefing should also address how the research is being integrated into current health IT programs, as well as identify any gaps where additional research should be initiated.

Detection of Non-Signature Based Cyber Threats

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not providing sufficient resources to acquire capabilities to detect and protect against cyber threats for which a signature has not yet been developed. The need persists for real-time detection and mitigation of non-signature-based threats that can operate in high-bandwidth networks and can also evaluate network traffic for malicious activity. The committee is aware that there are technologies that might address the need, but they require additional development, testing, and operational evaluation. The committee recommends that the Department establish a process for rapidly identifying, testing and evaluating potential solutions and accelerate adoption and implementation of those technologies to meet this pressing need.

Diluted Nerve Agent Laboratory Decertification

The committee commends the US Army Medical Research Institute for Chemical Defense (USAMRICD) for its critical research in the area of medical chemical countermeasures research and development. However, the committee is aware that USAMRICD is decertifying all laboratories in the handling and administration of dilute agent with the exception of the Battelle Memorial Institute's Biomedical Research Center and the USAMRICD Collaborative Research Facility at Aberdeen Proving Ground. Decertified laboratories will be required to transfer their research to these approved facilities in order to continue working with diluted agents.

While the committee is aware of the budget and safety concerns that influenced this decision, the committee remains concerned about the potential negative consequences that will result from the transfer of research to these two facilities. The committee is par-

ticularly concerned about the effects that this move will have on research that advances of treatments for nerve agent-induced neurotoxicity.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act on the potential impact on diluted agent research due to this change, and the plans to mitigate that impact.

Directed Energy Missile Defense Program

The budget request contained $46.9 million in PE 63901C for Directed Energy Research.

The committee notes that this year's budget request terminates the Airborne Laser Test Bed program. This program demonstrated the world's first megawatt class airborne laser, tracked 11 boosting missiles, and destroyed a foreign material asset ballistic missile. The committee notes, however, that the Government Accountability Office in 2011 had expressed concern about continuing technical issues affecting the test bed's experiments and about flight test failures.

The committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committee by July 31, 2012, on the costs involved with returning the Airborne Laser aircraft to an operational readiness status to continue technology development and testing, and to be ready to deploy in an operational contingency, if needed, to respond to rapidly developing threats from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The committee recommends $76.9 million, an increase of $30.0 million, in PE 63901C to enable MDA to preserve the skilled workforce that was involved in the Airborne Laser Test Bed program and to accelerate experimentation with next generation directed energy system development, including the planned testing of the Phantom Eye system. The committee believes these funds can also support and accelerate the directed energy research applicable to missile defense that is occurring at the nuclear weapons laboratories.

Early Development Activities to Improve Acquisition Outcomes

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has made a number of improvements to respond to the concerns raised by the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) related to the inadequacy pre-developmental planning and systems engineering. The committee is encouraged that the Department has placed greater emphasis on making improvements earlier in the pre-acquisition stages of the developmental cycle. In addition, the committee notes that each of the military departments has implemented, or is proposing to implement, improvements that are intended to pay dividends in the near future. For example, the Air Force has implemented funding for requirements analysis and maturation in order to do more rigorous developmental planning before programs are proposed. The Army has initiated a technology maturation program element that should improve the transition of promising science and technology research into programs of record. In compliance with Public Law 111–23, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and

Engineering (OASD (R&E)) is growing a cadre within its organization to improve systems engineering and developmental testing. The committee notes that the budget request contained an additional request for OASD (R&E) to have the authority to initiate a new project called "The Effects Chain Analysis Cell" which is intended to provide modeling and simulation tools for planners to do more quantitative trade space analysis as part of the analysis of alternatives. The committee supports this request.

Foreign Materiel Exploitation

The committee is concerned that the level of sophistication in foreign systems has increased exponentially over the past decade, primarily due to widespread use of complex digital devices, such as digital radio frequency memory (DRFM) and field-programmable gate arrays (FPGA). These systems are proliferating at an alarming rate and pose a serious threat to the national security and critical domestic infrastructure.

The committee is further concerned that there are insufficient facilities for classified lab space to conduct integrated weapon system analysis, which limits the quality and quantity of foreign threat data provided to the warfighter, acquisition community, and policymakers. This deprives the intelligence community of an opportunity to generate scientific and technical intelligence (S&TI) that has historically proven a key driver for the development of tactics, techniques, and procedures, and force modernization requirements. Lower volume and quality of S&TI increases the risk of technological surprise encountered on the battlefield, ultimately increasing the vulnerability of U.S. forces in future conflicts.

Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to take all steps necessary to ensure the military departments and defense agencies have the facilities and resources necessary to exploit and counter current foreign military systems.

Ground-Based Midcourse Defense

The budget request contained $903.1 million in PE 63882C for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system. The committee recommends fully funding the President's request of $903.1 million, and the committee recommends an additional $356.284 million for PE 63882C for fiscal year 2013, which this section would authorize.

The committee is aware that the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system is the only system that presently provides missile defense protection to the United States, and it will remain the only system able to provide that defense until at least 2020, assuming the SM–3 IIB missile is able to provide protection for the homeland in that year. The committee has noted elsewhere in this report the concerns about the acquisition strategy and other concerns about the IIB raised by the Government Accountability Office, the Defense Science Board, and the National Academies.

The last two intercept flight tests of the GMD system, FTG–06 in January 2010 and FTG–06a in December 2010, failed to achieve intercept. The committee is aware that these two tests involved the CE2 interceptor, as opposed to the CE1 interceptor, which is three for three in successful tests. The committee notes these three tests were not threat representative against an intercontinental ballistic

missile, which the committee addresses in another section of this report.

The committee understands that the FTG–06 failure was principally due to a quality control issue associated with a component in the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle (EKV). The FTG–06a failure is still under investigation but is also centered on technical issues involving the EKV. The committee does not believe the appropriate reaction to these difficulties is to cut the GMD budget.

The committee fully supports the request for an additional five ground-based interceptors (GBI) to provide additional flight test and reliability assets, though the committee is concerned that even with these assets, there will not be sufficient resources for GBI acquisition to support a more robust GMD test program, which it recommends elsewhere in this section.

The committee notes that improvement of the EKV was intended from the very outset of the original GBI program. The decision by the administration to cancel the Multiple Kill Vehicle program and curtail further GBI development means there is now no program to substantially improve or upgrade the current EKV through its intended life until 2030. The committee is concerned that without significant improvement, such as a next-generation kill vehicle for the GBI, the GMD system may not be able to keep pace with future threats. The committee includes a recommendation to address this concern in another provision of this report.

The committee recommends $1.3 billion, an increase of $357.0 million, in PE 23735A for the AMPV program.

Information Technology Discharge Solutions

The committee is aware that some non-Department of Defense acute care medical facilities utilize automated referral and discharge processes known as Information Technology Discharge Solutions (ITDS). These systems have the potential to provide cost-avoidance and expeditious and seamless discharges from acute care facilities. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to explore the feasibility of utilizing an ITDS in military treatment medical facilities in order to determine how such systems could integrate into the existing information technology architecture and potentially save costs, improve throughput, minimize safety risks, and improve the efficiency of military medical facilities.

Innovation Program at the Defense Information Systems Agency

The committee is aware that the ability to innovate is important for any agency within the Department of Defense, and is especially important for any information technology (IT) investments. For this reason, the committee recognizes the need for the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to have stable and robust funding to support its ability to develop, assess, and integrate emerging IT solutions that have the potential to add great value to the Global Information Grid. The committee believes that DISA's Chief Technology Officer has crafted an effective vision for leveraging these funds to field critical new warfighting capabilities and concepts through such vehicles as Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations. The committee encourages DISA to continue to pursue opportunities to broaden and deepen its innovation capacity, and encour-

ages DISA to pursue new funding sources like the Rapid Innovation Fund to do so.

Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense

The budget request contained $99.9 million in PE 63913C for Israeli cooperative programs for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA). Of this amount, $10.7 million is requested for the Arrow Weapon System (AWS) improvement program, $50.9 million is requested for the Arrow–3 upper tier system, and $38.3 million is requested for the David's Sling Weapons System (DSWS).

The fiscal year 2013 request represents a decrease of $136 million from the fiscal year 2012 appropriated level.

The committee supports and recommends this request and recommends an increase of $168 million as requested by Government of Israel to meet its security requirements, of which $23.8 million is to be provided to the Arrow–3 upper tier system, $33.7 million is to be provided to accelerate improvements to the AWS improvement program, $72.2 million is to be provided to the joint development of the DSWS, and $39.3 million is to be provided for DSWS co-production activities.

The committee notes that the threats from ballistic missiles are a direct and increasing danger to the state of Israel. The committee believes that cooperation with Israel, one of America's closest allies, remains one of the most important defense relationships.

The committee also notes that the increase it is recommending above the President's request is significant. The committee believes that the Director, MDA should, when working with Israel on the expenditure of these funds, ensure that there is minimal program risk posed by any acceleration of program knowledge points through this recommended funding increase.

The committee also recommends a provision elsewhere in this section that would provide a significant authorization of funds for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

Medical Countermeasures Advanced Development and Manufacturing

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is pursuing a medical countermeasure capability to rapidly counter known and unknown chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats, including novel and previously unrecognized, naturally occurring infectious diseases. The committee understands that this program will provide a dedicated, flexible, adaptive, and scalable advanced development manufacturing Center of Excellence to meet DOD requirements in this critical area.

While aware of the unique requirements for the Department and the need to have a program serving those distinct requirements, the committee remains concerned that costly duplication and inefficiencies exist in the area of bio-defense across Federal agencies, as detailed in the recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report (GAO–11–318SP) "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue," which noted that Federal agencies are unable to account for bio-defense spending across the entire Federal Government.

The committee encourages continual and effective interagency coordination, in particular between the Department of Defense and

the Department of Health and Human Services, and the continued utilization of the "Integrated Portfolio for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Medical Countermeasures" as a forum to reduce duplication, realize efficiencies, and save tax dollars. The committee also encourages close integration and coordination between the medical countermeasure enterprise and the broader Joint Program Office for Chemical-Biological Defense to ensure efficiencies are realized, requirements are properly identified, and capabilities are rapidly fielded in the area of medical countermeasures, including the potential merging of Joint Program Management offices dealing with Transformational Medical Technologies, and Chemical, Biological Medical Systems.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, outlining efforts to implement a strategic plan for all Departmental medical countermeasures activities, including Advanced Development and Manufacturing, Transformational Medical Technologies Initiative, the Medical Countermeasure Initiative, and similar activities designed to produce a medical countermeasure capability that will rapidly counter known and unknown chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear threats. The briefing should also include an overview of how these medical efforts and initiatives will be managed and balanced within the broader Chemical-Biological Defense Program to ensure that all Joint Service requirements are met including chemical and other non-medical programs.

Medium Extended Altitude Defense System

The budget request contained $400.9 million in PE 64869A for the Medium Extended Altitude Defense System (MEADS).

The committee is concerned that it does not have a complete picture of all MEADS-related expenses. The committee is aware that the MEADS agreement committed the United States to a total cost of $2.4 billion, but budget documents suggest the United States may have expended, or be planning to expend, in excess of $3.0 billion. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by May 31, 2012, on all MEADS and MEADS-related expenses incurred, or planned, by the United States.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $400.9 million, in PE 64869A for MEADS. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision in which the committee details its concerns with MEADS and its rationale for authorizing no funds for the program in fiscal year 2013.

Mitochondrial Research

The committee recognizes that many service members returning from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan potentially have some form of Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), and that they may represent a larger proportion of U.S. casualties than those sustained in other recent conflicts. The committee notes that there is a growing body of research indicating that TBI-related impairments may be the result of damage to human cell mitochondria sustained during and following a blast event. The committee notes that researchers believe that an enhanced understanding of post-injury mitochondria

may help target therapeutic interventions, potentially delaying or preventing additional impairment or disability. In order to support and potentially enhance the treatment of TBI-related injuries, including the long-term impact on veteran's physical and mental health, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to explore further medical research into the mitochondrial linkages to TBI effects through its various medical research entities across the services.

Modeling and Simulation for Cyber

The committee is aware that poor software programming is a major contributor to critical vulnerabilities in many software-intensive systems. The committee is also aware that efforts exist to improve software coding best practices, including through the adoption of best practices in the curricula of major computer science programs. The committee urges the Department of Defense to accelerate efforts under way to conduct secure software coding experiments and data analysis to determine which secure coding guidelines are practiced and effective, and to develop a template for scalable cyber modeling and simulation. The committee believes such templates are necessary to improve understanding of the cyber threat, improve mitigation efforts, increase the military's ability to fight and survive during cyberattacks, measure the state of cybersecurity, and explore and exploit new ideas in cyber warfare.

Modeling and Simulation Grand Challenges

The committee recognizes the value of modeling and simulation (M&S) to a wide range of activities within the Department of Defense. The committee believes that the Department could do more to harness the entrepreneurial and innovative spirit of industry, academia and the organic research and engineering resources of the Department to facilitate progress in the state of the art for M&S. The committee recognizes that the issuance of grand challenges have been effective in other areas, such as the Grand, Urban and Balloon Challenges of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. The committee encourages the Department to develop and promulgate a set of M&S Grand Challenges for the research community that would support increased interagency coordination; improved efficiency and interoperability of specific M&S tools, as well as to replace, improve, or provide efficiencies to existing activities of the Department; reinvigorated use of simulation-based acquisition as an enterprise-wide strategy, including the use of modeling and simulation for performing analyses of alternatives for major defense acquisition programs; lowering the operations and support costs of the Department; and supporting risk mitigation activities.

National Defense Education Program

The budget request contained $90.0 million in Program Element (PE) 61120D8Z for the national defense education program (NDEP).

The committee is aware that the Office of the Secretary of Defense supports some K–12 science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) educational activities through NDEP, as well as other programs to support undergraduate and postgraduate fel-

lowships. The committee recognizes STEM as a critical capability for the Department, not just in providing a pipeline of scientists and engineers for developing new capabilities, but also for acquisition professionals and policy-makers that should educate consumers when they make decisions about funding or pursuing new technologies. The committee further emphasizes the Department's growing need for a technically skilled workforce in all positions, particularly its enlisted personnel. A recent Council on Foreign Relations titled U.S. Education Reform and National Security, stated the U.S. "shortage of skilled human capital both inflates personnel costs and strains the military's ability to develop and deploy technologies that can deter sophisticated adversaries." It further states "Many U.S. generals caution that too many new enlistees cannot read training manuals for technologically sophisticated equipment. A former head of the Army's Training and Doctrine Command said that the lack of fully qualified young people was 'an imminent and menacing threat to our national security.'"

The committee notes that some research indicates that achieving certain math skills by the eighth grade is a critical determinant for success in STEM fields. For that reason, the committee believes that it is important for the Department to support K–12 STEM programs, as that supports an increased pipeline of qualified individuals that may pursue university degrees in STEM fields. The committee believes that K–12 STEM programs are a long-term investment for the Department, and should protect these investments even in a time of increased pressure on the Department's budget. The committee also believes that as the Department considers investments in K–12 STEM, it should ensure that these programs are tied to a comprehensive Department-wide strategy, and are thoroughly coordinated with other similar federal programs to avoid duplicative and conflicting efforts.

The committee recommends $90.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 61120D8Z for the national defense education program.

National Defense University Research Program

The committee is aware that the fundamental purpose of the National Defense University (NDU) is to provide rigorous joint professional military education to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, selected United States civilians, and international partners. NDU performs research in support of the national security strategy and national military strategy development needs of the Department, which the committee believes are key ingredients in preparing military and civilian leaders from the United States and other countries to evaluate national and international security challenges.

The committee notes that during the past two years NDU has undertaken a major realignment of its research activities to create opportunities for stronger leadership, new efficiencies, a more coherent research organization, a surge in world-class researchers, better cooperation between educators and researchers, and more effective outreach. The committee believes the alignment of research and education with practice is critical to developing the necessary leaders of the future. The committee encourages continuing support and stable funding for NDU's research activities to attract the world-class researchers and support the fundamental strategic and

technology policy research necessary to create the national security leaders of the future.

Non-Lethal Weapons and Irregular Warfare

The committee reaffirms its long-standing support for the rapid development and fielding of non-lethal weapons technologies and capabilities, which have broad applicability across a wide range of military operations. As an important adjunct to lethal force, these capabilities can be useful in implementing the military strategy highlighted in the Department of Defense's strategic guidance document most notably within the area of irregular warfare. The committee reiterates its belief that non-lethal directed energy technologies and systems show great promise and encourages the Department to more actively pursue these capabilities. The committee also believes the transition to the military services for deployment of technologically-mature non-lethal weapons programs must be accelerated. The committee encourages the Commandant of the Marine Corps, as Executive Agent for the Department's Non-Lethal Weapons Program, to facilitate military service integration of non-lethal weapons capabilities into the total force when appropriate and to ensure their effective use as appropriate in future contingency operations and irregular warfare.

Phoenix Program

The budget request included $159.7 million in PE 63287E for space programs and technology. Of this amount, $28.0 million was requested for the Phoenix program.

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is developing a program allowing the Department of Defense to work with existing satellite owners to leverage high-value, long-life components on existing satellites in geosynchronous orbit once they are no longer operational. Utilizing commercial capability to send small packaged systems into geosynchronous orbit, this program would allow for upgrading, fixing, repairing, and enhancing serviceable components. The committee is aware that there are a number of technical challenges, such as transportation and orbital maneuvering, robotic systems and integration, and extravehicular tool requirements. However, the committee believes that this program could revolutionize the utilization of space assets, if successful.

The committee recommends $159.7 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63287E for space programs and technology, including $28.0 million for the Phoenix program.

Physical Barrier Protection

The committee is aware that the expeditionary nature of military forces requires the capability to provide rapidly deployable physical security barriers that can provide ballistic and blast protection in austere environments. The committee recognizes that there are a number of commercially available products that provide some capability, but that the Department of Defense has also invested in developing and testing new physical security barrier systems with improved capability. The committee is concerned that the Department has not made adequate use of these improved systems, particularly in austere and restricted environments. The committee urges the

Department to take all practical measures to ensure that the most suitable physical protection systems are made available to the warfighter.

Plan for Testing of the Missile Defense Systems Against Accidental or Unauthorized Launches Originating from the Russian Federation or the People's Republic of China

The committee is aware that it is the current policy of the United States, as enacted in the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–38), that the United States "deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate."

The committee applauds the Commander, U.S. Northern Command for the diligence with which his command exercises against the many ballistic missile threats to the United States. The committee is, however, concerned that the threat of accidental or unauthorized launches has not received adequate attention.

The committee therefore directs the Commander, U.S. Northern Command to prepare and submit a plan to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for testing the national missile defense system against the unauthorized or accidental launch of a ballistic missile against the United States by states other than rogue regimes, specifically, the Islamic Republic of Iran or People's Democratic Republic of Korea, including an accidental or unauthorized launch of a missile by the Russian Federation or the People's Republic of China. The committee further directs the Commander to brief the congressional defense committees on the results of the plan.

Potential Threats Posed by Open Source Publication of Medical Research

The committee believes that advanced scientific research on extremely dangerous pathogens and toxins, such as Avian influenza virus, anthrax, and Ebola virus, is vital to the ongoing study of these agents' nature and how to safeguard military and civilian populations from them. The committee also understands that the complex nature of this research requires the scientific community to share its findings and research as widely as possible in a collaborative environment that includes public and private entities in order to maximize the potential for scientific advancements. However, the committee is concerned that in the hands of malignant actors, this research combined with readily available commercial, scientific, and medical technology, could be used to produce biological weapons for use against the very populations the research was intended to protect.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that describes the potential threats posed by the open publication of this advanced research, and steps that the Department could take to assist the interagency effort to mitigate these threats.

Precision Tracking Space System

The budget request contained $297.4 million in PE 64883C for the Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS); the future years defense plans for fiscal year 2013 to 2017 includes $1.530 billion.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has articulated concerns in its annual report on missile defense acquisition specifically about PTSS. The committee also notes that the GAO highlighted that the projected cost and size of the PTSS constellation is not yet known, making it impossible to conduct a true analysis of alternatives. Further, GAO noted that the acquisition strategy and timelines for the first PTSS satellites reaching orbit adds risk to the system, as do many of the technologies involved, many of which have never been integrated together. Additionally, the Strategic Forces Subcommittee was briefed recently by the National Academies on the final report of its study, mandated by section 232 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, which recommended cancelling the PTSS altogether.

The committee is concerned that PTSS, which was intended to have most of the capabilities but much less of the cost than the Space Tracking and Surveillance System (STSS), may wind up having almost all of the cost of that system but much less of the capability. Further, the committee notes that there is no consensus as to what, exactly, PTSS would contribute to the defense of the United States, with some believing that PTSS offers great capability including tracking and the potential for discrimination capability, and others stating it is not-optimally designed for that mission and recommending other options for sensor coverage that may be more cost-effective. Lastly, the committee notes that systems with discrimination capability are the most useful to the defense of the United States.

The committee believes that an independent analysis of alternatives may conclude that there are less expensive and just as effective, if not more effective, means of providing added sensor coverage to the defense of the United States. Elsewhere in this title the committee has directed actions which could further inform that judgment.

The committee recommends $50.0 million in PE 64883C, a decrease of $247.4 million, for the Precision Tracking Space System.

Production of Critical Materials for Protection Against Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Agents

The committee recognizes the need for an adequate supply of materials to protect warfighters, first responders, and citizens from exposure to chemical, biological, and radiological agents. These materials are critical to assuring the mission effectiveness of U.S. forces to respond to domestic and international crises. Therefore, the committee encourages the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, through the Defense Production Act—Title III program, to examine the industrial base capacity in this area and determine if additional sourcing is needed to ensure sufficient supply to meet current and projected needs.

Rapid Innovation Fund

The budget request contained no funding in PE 64775D8Z for the defense rapid innovation program, known as the Rapid Innovation Fund (RIF) program.

The Rapid Innovation Fund was created by Congress in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) in order to stimulate innovative technologies, reduce acquisition and lifecycle costs, address technical risks, improve the timeliness and thoroughness of test and evaluation outcomes, and rapidly insert such products directly in support of primarily major defense acquisition programs. The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has had some delays in receiving the funding, in part due to an extended continuing budget resolution at the beginning of fiscal year 2011. Despite those issues, the committee is aware that the DOD has made great progress in implementing a competitive process that has received over 3,500 proposals, and has been successful at attracting many new, non-traditional businesses to Department of Defense research. The committee continues to support the goals of this program, and encourages the Department to increase the reach and effectiveness of RIF. For example, the committee believes the Department should engage a broader spectrum of stakeholders in the requirements generation and evaluation process, such as the geographic and functional combatant commands, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and the Test Resource Management Center. The committee also recommends that future broad area announcements, and subsequent proposal evaluation, should assess business readiness, test and evaluation needs, and DOD technology insertion support to ensure best value proposals and successful project outcomes.

The committee recommends $200.0 million, an increase of $200.0 million, in PE 64775D8Z for the RIF program.

Report by Secretary of Defense on SM–3 IIB Missile

The committee believes the SM–3 IIB interceptor that is being developed by the Missile Defense Agency, should be capable of providing missile defense coverage to the continental United States from locations in Europe.

The Committee directs the Secretary to report within 90 days on how the SM–3 IIB interceptor in design and development will provide missile defense coverage to the continental United States from locations in Europe. Such report shall be unclassified, with a classified annex as necessary.

Report on Fragility in the Missile Defense Industrial Base

The committee is concerned about the impact of budget cuts on the missile defense industrial base, as it is concerned about the overall defense industrial base. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on the fiscal year 2013 budget request for missile defense, the Director, Missile Defense Agency (MDA) stated: "If we have sequestration and the dramatic reduction in our programs, it will be most—hardest-felt in the supplier base. And it's not only the availability of the supplies, as we were discussing before, it's the manufacturing processes. And, a lot of these components that we use, and we use over 2,000, for example,

on a ground-based interceptor, those components themselves are built in a certain way that give it its reliability. And, the loss of the workforce in many of these cases I would say would be close to non-recoverable. Or, if it is recoverable, it's going to be a very painful process."

The committee is also aware that there are certain components with only one or two suppliers remaining in that area of design and production. This is especially true for the producers of the Standard Missile 3 interceptor's Divert and Attitude Control System which guides the kill vehicle during the final phase of its intercept operations. The committee is deeply concerned about the absence of competition in the design and production of key missile defense technologies.

The committee therefore directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days that details the key components in major MDA missile defense systems and the extent to which there is a risk of relying on only a single supplier for those components. The report should include any specific efforts MDA has undertaken in the past 2 years to ensure competition in the industry supplier base for those components and any efforts the MDA plans to inform a strategy to deal with the risks of reliance on a single supplier for critical missile defense technologies in the years ahead. In addition, the committee urges the Missile Defense Agency to provide as part of the fiscal year 2014 budget request a plan on how it intends to implement the strategy.

Report on Space-Based Interceptors

The committee remains concerned that the full potential of ballistic missile technology is not being realized, particularly in space-based interceptor technology. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should pursue effective space-based interceptor technology to defend against long-range ballistic missile threats.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the defense committees of Congress examining the technical and operational considerations associated with developing and operating a limited space-based interceptor capability. Within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the report should include the following:

(A) the identification of the technical risks, gaps, and constraints associated with the development and operational of such a capability;

(B) an assessment of the maturity levels of various technologies needed to develop and operate such a capability;

(C) the key knowledge, research, and testing that would be needed for any nation to develop and operate an effective space-based interceptor capability; and

(D) the estimated effectiveness and cost of potential options for developing and operating such a capability, including their effectiveness in conjunction with existing and planned terrestrially-based missile defense systems

Furthermore, the committee believes that the Director of the Missile Defense Agency should establish a space-based interceptor program office to begin technology and engineering development activities. This program office should serve as the single-point of con-

tact vis-à-vis space-based interceptor technology. The committee directs the Director to seek funding for such an office in the fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Missile Defense Agency.

Report on U.S. European Phased Adaptive Approach Spending and U.S. Export Controls

The committee is concerned that U.S. funds may have been expended in a contract with a firm currently under investigation for violation of the U.S. International Trafficking in Arms Regulations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2012, on whether any U.S. Department of Defense funds have been used, directly or indirectly, to obtain missile defense command and control systems from a contractor that is under investigation, per the most recent Blue Lantern report, for violation of U.S. International Trafficking in Arms Regulations. If U.S. funds were expended in a contract involving an entity currently under investigation for violating U.S. export control laws, the Secretary is directed to include in the report an explanation of why that company was allowed to receive such U.S. funds and when the U.S. funds were provided to the contractor that is under investigation.

Risk Mitigation for Enterprise Resource Planning Systems

The committee is aware of the challenges associated with implementing enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems. The committee is concerned that delays in implementing ERP systems places a significant financial burden on the Department of Defense and could jeopardize achievement of financial auditability goals. The Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform also expressed concern that some ERPs do not function as intended, forcing the Department and the military services to rely on sustaining costly legacy systems and manual processes. Consequently, the committee believes that the Department should establish risk mitigation plans to address actual and potential deficiencies associated with the development, implementation, or utilization of its ERP systems that could affect the achievement of Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) goals.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that includes a risk mitigation plan for each ERP being developed by the Department of Defense and the military services, including how best to integrate the experience and expertise of the industry product provider at each stage of implementation and mitigation. At a minimum, each risk mitigation plan should:

(1) Identify measures for resolving any such weaknesses or deficiencies;

(2) Assign responsibilities within the Department to implement such measures;

(3) Specify implementation steps for such measures;

(4) Provide timeframes for implementing such measures; and

(5) Identify any alternative arrangements outside of the ERP environment that may be necessary for meeting FIAR objectives.

Sea-Based X-Band Radar

The budget request contained $9.7 million in PE 63907C for the sea-based X-band (SBX) radar.

However, the committee is concerned that this request is not sufficient to maintain the deployment of the SBX to add sensor coverage to the defense of the United States for an extended period of time. For example, the committee is aware that the SBX radar has recently been deployed to support U.S. missile defense against People's Democratic Republic of Korea's pledged ballistic missile test, yet there is no funding source to support such a deployment. The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency is planning to pay for these and other SBX expenses by taking fiscal year 2012 appropriated funds and the request for fiscal year 2013.

The committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by June 15, 2012, on the costs of the deployment of the SBX radar to support U.S. operations vis-à-vis North Korea's April 2012 ballistic missile launch, and to provide an annual budget estimate for maintaining the SBX radar in a status such that it can be deployed in less than 14 days notice and for a period of at least 60 days per year. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to ensure a deployment capability for the SBX.

The committee recommends $9.7 million, the full amount of requested, in PE 63907C for the SBX radar.

SM–3 IB Missile

The committee is concerned by the recent failure of the SM–3 IB missile's first test, which the committee approved $565 million in procurement funding last year to procure 42 interceptors. The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has planned three more flight tests in fiscal year 2012 to prove out the SM–3 IB missile, along with two additional flight tests in fiscal year 2013 prior to authorization to begin procurement activities.

The committee is very supportive of the more capable IB interceptor being available for the ballistic missile defense system upon the completion of appropriate testing. The committee is aware that the IB missile is a necessary component of the European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense, specifically phase II, and that other combatant commanders are planning to have this interceptor available for their missile defense requirements.

The committee is also aware that as the MDA is attempting to resolve problems with the IB, it is also attempting to complete development of the IIA missile and review design proposals of the IIB missile. The committee urges MDA to ensure adequate focus to the sequence of these development efforts, especially in a time of constrained budgets.

SM–3 IIA Development

The budget request contained $399.3 million in PE 64881C for the SM–3 Block IIA co-development program.

The committee notes that the President's budget request is intended to maintain the U.S. commitment with Japan to meet the planned 2018 Initial Operating Capability (IOC) and the deployment of Phase III of the European Phased Adaptive Approach to

missile defense. The committee understands that procurement will commence in fiscal year 2017 with 12 rounds.

The committee recommends $399.3 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64881 for the SM–3 Block IIA co-development program.

SM–3 IIB Missile

The budget request contained $212.7 million in PE 63902C for the Standard Missile 3 (SM–3) IIB missile defense interceptor, and $1913.3 million over the course of the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) for fiscal years 2013–2017. The committee supports the request for fiscal year 2013.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office expressed several concerns about the SM–3 IIB missile development path in its annual report on missile defense acquisition; the committee addresses these concerns in another section of this report.

The committee is aware that the Defense Science Board and the National Academies have all noted the technical challenges with the IIB missile in terms of how it will, or will not, be able to perform the mission for which it is intended. The committee is aware that one recent report has recommended the termination of Phase IV of the European Phased Adaptive Approach, which would include the deployment of the SM–3 IIB and the Precision Tracking Space System. The committee is not ready to support that recommendation at this time. The committee is however deeply concerned about the $1.9 billion dollars programmed for the IIB missile in the FYDP. The committee considers that such investment may not be justified if the interceptor concept ultimately selected in fiscal year 2012 is only modestly more capable than the IIA missile.

U.S. Missile Defense Data Sharing with Israel

The committee supports the close ties between the missile defense programs of the State of Israel and the United States. The committee strongly believes such cooperation should continue. This cooperation should continue to include the sharing of missile defense data as is appropriate, to further U.S. national security goals, such as exists with the U.S. AN/TPY–2 radar currently deployed in Israel. Such data sharing, when appropriate, should also include data derived from the U.S. European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense and the North American Treaty Organization theater missile defense system, of which the EPAA is a U.S. contribution.

The committee is therefore concerned that senior NATO leadership had suggested data will not be shared with Israel, a key U.S. ally. The committee directs the Secretary to provide verification to the congressional defense committees and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that there are no international barriers to sharing with Israel any missile defense data derived from U.S. systems when the United States determines that the sharing of such data would further U.S. national security goals.

U.S. Northern Command Report on Plan to Enhance Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Reliability and Discrimination and Change Shot Doctrine

The committee has received testimony by the Director, Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and a classified briefing by the Institute for Defense Analyses on the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system shot doctrine. The committee understands that MDA and the Department of Defense are planning for significant changes to the shot doctrine of the GMD system.

The committee is aware that the Commander, U.S. Northern Command is responsible for the GMD shot doctrine. The committee directs that the Commander, U.S. Northern Command to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by November 1, 2012, on the MDA shot doctrine strategy for the GMD, including the plan submitted in MDA's budget documents for fiscal year 2013 that details the Commander's views on the strategy. The report should also include the metrics concerning GMD reliability and discrimination that will be used when deciding whether and how to revise the shot doctrine for the GMD system.

Use of Bone Samples in Research

The committee is aware that the military depends on the research and study of collections of human bones to develop novel military body armor and helmets, amputation therapies, joint replacements, and remains-identification techniques, among other uses. The current collection most often utilized by the Department of Defense (DOD) often has a significant delay to conduct the necessary research. The collection also lacks sufficient diversity in size, age, ethnicity and other characteristics to reflect today's warfighters. Therefore, the committee encourages DOD to utilize additional publicly available, larger, and more demographically diverse bone collections when conducting its research and study.

Vertical Lift Platform Technologies

Two and a half years ago the Department of Defense Acquisition, Technology & Logistics leadership asked Industry to self-form into the "Vertical Lift Consortium" (VLC). The Department established an Other Transaction Agreement (OTA) with the VLC to more effectively define requirements, streamline development, flight demonstrate innovative Vertical Lift technologies and accelerate transition to the Warfighter at lower risk and cost. The VLC is an open and competitive forum that leverages all sectors of the Vertical Lift Community to encourage teaming of innovative small business and non-traditional contractors with major defense firms and academia.

The Committee supports the Department's engagement with the VLC to obtain input on future vertical lift technology requirements, methods and development strategies for next-generation vertical lift aircraft. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to submit a report to the Congressional Defense Committees not later than March 15, 2013 providing the status of this initiative and, taking into consideration input from the VLC, recommend acquisition approaches for rapid and affordable flight demonstration of innovative Vertical Lift X-planes, including novel acquisition methods such as competitive prize awards that have been successfully applied in other fields.

Weapons of Mass Destruction Defeat Technologies

The committee notes that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) continues a strong partnership with each of the services and U.S. Special Operations Command to develop and field innovative weapons of mass destruction (WMD) defeat technologies and solutions that reduce, eliminate, and counter WMD threats. The committee supports the development of personnel protection equipment to include digital dosimeter radiation technologies and other lightweight portable detectors capable of identifying discrete quantities across the widest-spectrum of WMD threats for U.S. Special Operations Forces and general purpose forces. The committee is particularly interested in these technical and operational capabilities because the national intelligence community continues to assess credible threats posed by terrorist groups, states, and state-sponsored entities to acquire and weaponize WMD material for use against the United States and its allies. The committee therefore encourages DTRA to continue development of innovative and emerging detection and threat identification technologies and to ensure prompt transition of validated capabilities to address national security requirements.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained $185.3 million for operational test and evaluation, Defense. The committee recommends $220.3 million, an increase of $35.0 million, in the requested amount for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 operational test and evaluation, Defense program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Testing of Information System Controls

The committee is aware of the problems challenging many enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems. The committee's Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform noted that a common problem for these programs was that testing for logical security controls, which should occur early in the developmental process, was typically prioritized after functionality testing, and tended only to occur at the end of the developmental process. The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) should continue to subject its systems, whether legacy systems or ERPs, to information system controls testing. The committee also believes that the Department should place priority on this testing and ensure that sufficient numbers of appropriately skilled personnel exist within the test and evaluation community.

Therefore, the committee directs the Deputy Chief Management Officer for the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Director for Operational Test and Evaluation and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation, to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that assesses the information

system control testing needs for all ERPs being developed by the Department of Defense. The briefing should also determine whether appropriate workforce levels and corresponding skill sets exist within the Department's developmental and operational test communities, and how best to integrate the experience and expertise of the industry product provider during testing and implementation. The briefing should also describe what actions the Department is taking to address any identified shortfalls.

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—Next-Generation Long-Range Strike Bomber Aircraft Nuclear Certification Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain that the new long-range strike bomber will be capable of using strategic weapons by the date it receives declaration of initial operational capability (IOC), and nuclear certified to use strategic weapons no later than two years after declaration of IOC.

Section 212—Unmanned Combat Air System

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to conduct additional risk reduction activities related to the technology development of the follow-on Unmanned Carrier-launched Surveillance and Strike system.

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

This section would amend section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) and would preclude the Secretary of the Navy from obligating 25 percent of appropriated funds until the reporting and certification requirements of section 213 are met. This section would also prevent the Secretary of the Navy from "down-selecting" to less than two prime contract competitors prior to the critical design review milestone for the program.

Section 214—Limitation on availability of funds for future manned ground moving target indicator capability of the Air Force

This section would restrict the obligation and expenditure of Air Force research, development, test and evaluation funds for any activity, including pre-milestone A activities, to initiate a new start acquisition program to provide the Air Force with a manned ground moving target capability or manned dismount moving tar-

get capability until a period of 90 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits a report on the plan for manned future ground moving target and manned dismount moving target indicator capabilities of the Air Force. The report required in this section would include: the plan to maintain onboard command and control capability that is equal or better than such capability provided by the E–8C joint surveillance target attack radar program; each analysis of alternatives completed during fiscal year 2012 regarding future manned ground moving target indicator capability or manned dismount moving target indicator capability; an analysis of each alternative considered, including cost and a description of how such programs would affect the potential growth of future manned ground moving target indicator capability or manned dismount moving target indicator capability; a description of potential operational and sustainment cost savings realized by the Air Force using a platform that is derived from a commercial aircraft and in operation by the Department of Defense as of the date of the report; the plan by the Secretary of Defense to retire or replace E–8C joint surveillance target attack radar aircraft; and any other matter the Secretary considers appropriate. This section would permit the Secretary to waive the restriction on the obligation and expenditure of funds for this purpose if the Secretary determines such a waiver is required to meet an urgent operational need or other emergency contingency requirement directly related to ongoing combat operations, and notifies the congressional defense committees of such determination.

Section 215—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Milestone A Activities for the MQ–18 Unmanned Aircraft System

This section would limit the use of funds for milestone A activities for the MQ–18 Medium Range Multi-Purpose Vertical Take-off and Landing Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) until the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council certifies that the MQ–18 UAS is required to meet a capability in the Department of Defense manned and unmanned medium-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance force structure and that an existing UAS cannot meet the required capability or be modified to meet the required capability. This section would also define milestone A as the distribution of request for proposals, selection of technology demonstration contractors, and/or technology development.

Section 216—Vertical Lift Platform Technology Demonstrations

This section would authorize a program to develop and flight-demonstrate vertical lift technologies.

SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Section 221—Procurement of AN/TPY–2 Radars

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense acquire two additional AN/TPY–2 radar radars, one of which is requested in the fiscal year 2013 budget request and one additional radar in fiscal year 2013. The committee is aware there are significant budget efficiencies to procuring two radars as opposed to one. Therefore, the committee recommend the full amount of the budget

request of $217.2 million in fiscal year 2013 for PE 28866C, Procurement, Defense Wide, Missile Defense Agency, and it recommends an additional $170.0 million for the procurement of the second radar in fiscal year 2013. The committee is concerned that the fiscal year 2013 budget submission and the associated Future Years Defense Program recommend reducing the acquisition of the AN/TPY–2 radar by 6 units to only 12 radar units.

The committee is not aware of any decrease in combatant commander requirements for these radars, and, in fact, it is concerned that this reduction in acquisition may force combatant commanders to take undesirable risks in trading off deployments of these radars, which are key to regional and homeland missile defense. The committee is concerned that the Department and the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) is relying too heavily on the MDA's Precision Tracking Space System concept, a concept which the committee expresses its concerns elsewhere in this report.

The committee also believes that it may be possible to better utilize the current TPY–2 system. To that end, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study the utility, costs, and risks of mounting the TPY–2 radar on a rotational table allowing for it to rapidly change direction of the radar array.

Section 222—Development of Advanced Kill Vehicle

The section would require that the Director, Missile Defense Agency submit a plan within 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Act to ensure that the kill vehicle for the Next Generation Aegis Missile can be adapted to also serve as an improved kill vehicle for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System. The committee also believes that for this purpose, the Director should provide a description of the technology of and concept behind applying the former Multiple Kill Vehicle proposal to the Next Generation Kill Vehicle, which was terminated in the budget request for fiscal year 2010.

The committee believes this plan is consistent with the recommendation of the National Academies' Assessment of Concepts and Systems for U.S. Boost-Phase Missile Defense in Comparison to Other Alternatives, which was conducted pursuant to the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

Section 223—Missile Defense Site on the East Coast

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an environmental impact statement by December 31, 2013, on possible locations on the East Coast of the United States for the deployment of a missile defense site.

This section would also require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to develop a plan for the deployment of an East Coast site to be operational not later than the end of 2015; the plan would evaluate the use of two-stage and three-stage ground-based interceptors, as well as the SM–3 block IA, block IB, and later blocks of the SM–3 missile. This section would require the plan to be included in the fiscal year 2014 budget submission, but it would also authorize $100.0 million in PE 63882C in fiscal year 2013 to be

available 30 days after the plan is presented to the congressional defense committees.

The section would also add criteria for the selection of the location of the missile defense site on the East Coast of the United States.

The committee is aware that a cost effective missile defense site located on the East Coast of the United States could have advantages for the defense of the United States from ballistic missiles launched from the Middle East. The committee is also aware that several reviews, including studies by the Commander, U.S. Northern Command in 2007–08 (which do not reflect current command recommendations in view of the 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review), the Institute for Defense Analyses, and the National Academies have all examined the potential contribution of an East Coast missile defense site, and certain of these studies have recommended that work begin on the development and deployment of such a site. The committee encourages the Department to provide to the defense committees an interim analysis on feasibility and cost no later than February 1, 2013.

Section 224—Ground-based Midcourse Defense System

The section would authorize a total of $1.26 billion for PE 63882C for fiscal year 2013.

This section would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to begin the upgrade of the six silos in Missile Field 1, which the fiscal year 2013 budget request recommends be shut down and moved to a near-mothball status, and complete it so that it is in operationally ready status within 3 years; this recommendation is consistent with the Administration's policy to be "well hedged" against the possibility that new threats may emerge. This section would also require the funds provided in this section be spent to complete the refurbishment of the CE1 GMD interceptor fleet to improve reliability.

Section 225—Ground-based Midcourse Defense Interceptor Test

The section would require the Director, Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to undertake an intercept test, using an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) class target, of the ground-based midcourse defense system (GMD) using a CE1 interceptor, which has been successfully tested three out of three times, though not against an intercontinental ballistic missile target, by the end of calendar year 2013. The committee is concerned that under current MDA plans, the GMD system won't be tested against an ICBM until the fourth quarter of 2015. The committee believes that the pace of the growth of ICBM threats to the United States requires the GMD system be tested sooner than current MDA plans.

Section 226—Deployment of SM–3 IIB Interceptors on Land and Sea

This section would express the sense of the Congress that the Standard Missile 3 (SM–3) IIB missile defense interceptors should be deployed at initial deployment, currently planned for 2020, in a land-based and sea-based mode. This provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report within 180 days after

the date of the enactment of this Act on the implications for the force structure of the Navy if the SM–3 IIB cannot fit in the standard Vertical Launching System configuration for the Aegis BMD system, including the effect on Navy ship deployments, cost, and overall magazine depth to respond to missile raids. This section would also require that the report include an explanation if the interceptors cannot be deployed in a sea-based mode at initial deployment, including cost and force structure requirements, related to the use of the IIB missile for the defense of the United States from threats originating in the Pacific region.

Section 227—Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense Program

This section would authorize $680.0 million for the Iron Dome system in fiscal years 2012–15 in PE 63913C for procurement of additional batteries and interceptors, and for operations and sustainment expenses. This section would also require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to establish within MDA a program office for cooperative missile defense efforts on the Iron Dome system to ensure long-term cooperation on this program.

The committee is aware that National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) included $205.0 million for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system for the State of Israel. The committee notes that the Iron Dome system has proven very effective at defeating threat rockets launched at protected targets. The committee also notes that if the full $680.0 million is used on the program, the total U.S. taxpayer investment in this system will amount to nearly $900.0 million since fiscal year 2011, yet the United States has no rights to the technology involved. The committee believes the Director should ensure, prior to disbursing the authorized $680 million for Iron Dome, that the United States has appropriate rights to this technology for United States defense purposes, subject to an agreement with the Israeli Missile Defense Organization, and in a manner consistent with prior U.S.-Israeli missile defense cooperation on the Arrow and David's Sling suite of systems. The committee also believes that the Director should explore any opportunity to enter into co-production of the Iron Dome system with Israel, in light of the significant U.S. investment in this system.

Section 228—Sea-Based X-Band Radar

This section would require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to ensure that the sea-based X-band (SBX) radar is maintained in a status such that the radar may be deployed in less than 14 days and for at least 60 days each year.

Section 229—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the MEADS Program

This section would prohibit the Department from obligating any funding on the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) program.

The committee notes the that in the conference report (H. Rept. 112–329) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the conferees limited the availability of more than 25 percent of fiscal year 2012 funds for MEADS until the Sec-

retary of Defense submits a plan to use such funds as final obligations under the MEADS program for either: (1) implementing a restructured MEADS program of reduced scope; or (2) contract termination liability costs with respect to the contracts covering the program. The committee believes there should have been no confusion regarding the meaning of "final obligations."

The committee further finds that the Department of Defense has not yet submitted the reports required by section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee believes this report, when submitted, will offer useful direction for the Patriot Improvement Program, which is referenced elsewhere in this report.

Additionally, the Government Accountability Office has reported to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services in its recent selected acquisition report that there may in fact be continuing MEADS expenses for the United States for several years beyond fiscal year 2013, which would be inconsistent with budget briefings provided to the committee by the Department.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is now engaging, at the senior most levels, with representatives of Germany and Italy concerning this program. The committee believes such senior level attention earlier in the course of this program might have saved the taxpayers significant expenditure of dollars.

The committee further understands from the Department that the Federal Republic of Germany and the Italian Republic have made clear they will not work with the United States to further adjust the terms of the MEADS program, believing they have a deal with the United States and having made their required contributions to the program. The committee urges the Department to remind the representatives of Germany and Italy that only Congress can commit the United States to the expenditure of taxpayer funds.

Section 230—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Phased, Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense in Europe

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to jointly submit a plan to the congressional defense committees on cost-sharing with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) the expenses of the fixed European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) assets, including the Aegis Ashore sites and the forward-deployed AN/TPY–2 radar. The committee believes other expenses should also be included, though it notes it has not received a complete explanation from the Department of all of the U.S. capabilities that will be available to support the EPAA. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a NATO pre-financing request for the expenses of this missile defense equipment, as is required for EPAA military construction expenses elsewhere in this bill. This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the costs of the specified EPAA expenses for missile defense equipment until NATO responds to the U.S. pre-financing request. Mindful of the highly ambitious timelines for deployment of the EPAA and the rising long-range missile threat from the Islamic Republic of Iran, this section would

provide the President a waiver if he determines the use of that authority is vital to the national security of the United States.

The committee is aware that the Administration decided that the European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense should be a U.S. contribution to NATO as announced at the Lisbon Summit in November 2010. The committee is concerned that when this commitment was made, there was no clear understanding of the cost of the EPAA deployment; the committee notes that there has not yet been a detailed assessment of the cost of the deployment. The committee understands that the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office in the Office of the Secretary of Defense is now attempting to provide a comprehensive and detailed cost estimate for the EPAA. The committee notes that in a letter in February of this year, Acting Under Secretary of Defense, stated that a briefing on the interim findings of the cost estimate would be provided in March of this year to support the committee's oversight activities; that briefing was not provided.

The committee is aware that some of the command and control arrangements are being sorted out now in anticipation of the NATO summit in May of 2012 in Chicago. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee expects to be briefed on these arrangements, which should assist the committee in better understanding the extent to which the EPAA is providing for the missile defense of Europe and the missile defense of the United States and its interests, including its deployed forces. Such understanding is key to the appropriate cost-sharing of the EPAA.

The committee also notes significant budget challenges to the United States missile defense program in view of the budget cuts under the Budget Control Act (Public Law 112–25) and the President's budget requests since his fiscal year 2010 budget request. The committee is aware that the budget request for the Missile Defense Agency for fiscal year 2013 is approximately $400.0 million less than the request for fiscal year 2012, and the projected requests between fiscal year 2013–16 are approximately $3.6 billion less in the fiscal year 2013 Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) than they were in the fiscal year 2012 FYDP.

The committee notes that such reductions have had an impact on the budgets for the national missile defense programs, including the ground-based midcourse defense program, the sea-based X-band radar system, and forward deployed AN/TPY–2 radars, which can have significant capability for homeland and regional missile defense. The committee also notes significant reductions in systems like the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system. The committee notes, however, that plans for the EPAA remain unchanged and, in many cases, the budget requests have been increased by the fiscal year 2013 budget request and FYDP. The committee recommends NATO provide financial support for the U.S. contribution to Europe's missile defense given the budget environment.

Section 231—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Precision Tracking Space System

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS) until a contract is signed for an analysis of alternatives by a Federally Funded Research and

Development Corporation (FFRDC), which has not been involved with the PTSS program to date, and which appoints a panel of independent study leaders. This provision would also require that the terms of reference for the study should be shared with the congressional defense committees when the AOA is commenced. This section would also limit the use of funds only to PTSS technology development activities until the FFRDC completes the analysis and 60 days have lapsed since the report has been provided to the congressional defense committees.

This section would require that the analysis of alternatives examine the possible lowest cost sensor option, i.e., land-, air-, space-based, or some combination of them, with respect to acquisition and operations and sustainment costs over the next 10 years, and for improving homeland missile defense, including adding discrimination capability for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System. This section would also require the FFRDC to examine what overhead persistent imagery data or other data is already available that is not being used for missile defense and how the exploitation of that data could aid the missile defense mission. The FFRDC would also be required to study the plans for integrating PTSS into the ballistic missile defense system and evaluate the concept of operations for its use in the system.

The committee expects the analysis conducted by the FFRDC will be based on a clear articulation by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) of the following: the ground-based sensors that will be required to be maintained to aid the PTSS constellation; the number of satellites planned to be procured for a first constellation (including projected lifetime of satellites in the first constellation) and a replenishment constellation; technological and acquisition risks of the PTSS, and an evaluation of technological capability differences between PTSS and the STSS; and, the costs of the system including the projected acquisition, integration, operations, and sustainment costs, including for launch services. The committee expects all cost data used by the FFRDC will be fully validated by the Department of Defense Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office, and will be compared with other missile defense sensor systems. This section would also require that the AOA include an examination of the space situational awareness capabilities of the PTSS, including requirements and cost-sharing between MDA and the Air Force based on a memorandum to be negotiated between the two agencies, which should be shared with the congressional defense committees.

The committee recommends this provision based on concerns raised by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that a true analysis of alternatives (AOA) for PTSS was never conducted. In addition, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces in March 2012 on the missile defense budget request for fiscal year 2013, the Director, Missile Defense Agency stated that "the capability for a missile defense system like this will spend most of its time doing functions other than missile defense." The committee believes that a system that will spend most of its time doing a mission other than homeland missile defense, in this case, the space situational awareness mission, should be more directly designed for its primary mission, and that the MDA should not be entirely responsible for the cost of this system. In the event that the analysis

of alternatives the committee has recommended concurs with the PTSS as the optimal way ahead for the homeland missile defense mission, the committee believes this provision is vital to ensure the responsible expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

Lastly, the committee is aware that the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense is still conducting a review of the cost of the PTSS. The committee believes that it should have a more fulsome understanding of the costs and tradeoffs of this system before it too heavily invests scarce missile defense dollars in this system.

Section 232—Plan to Improve Discrimination and Kill Assessment Capability of Ballistic Missile Defense Systems

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to develop a plan, to be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2012, and include the funding for such plan in his fiscal year 2014 budget request, for an improved discrimination and kill assessment capability of the Ballistic Missile Defense Systems, including, specifically, the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system.

Section 233—Plan to Increase Rate of Flight Tests of Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System

This section would require the Director, Missile Defense Agency to develop a plan to increase the rate of flight tests and ground tests of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system. The plan shall ensure that there are at least three flight tests every 2 years, unless the Director, Missile Defense Agency provides written certification and an analysis to the congressional defense committees that it is not feasible or cost-effective. This section would require the Director include funding for such plan in the fiscal year 2014 budget request.

Section 234—Report on Regional Missile Defense Architectures

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, describing: (1) the planned regional missile defense architectures, including the force structure and inventory requirements derived from these planned architectures, and their purpose and cost; and, (2) the comprehensive force management process, and the capability, deployment, and resource outcomes that have been determined by this process.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the preparation of a report on regional missile defense plans in order to better understand the force structure and budgetary implications of the plan articulated in the Ballistic Missile Defense Review of 2010 to create regional missile defense architectures beyond the European Phased Adaptive Approach in East Asia and the Middle East. However, the committee can find no record of the receipt of this required report.

Section 235—Use of Funds for Conventional Prompt Global Strike Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that out of funds authorized to be appropriated for ground-testing activities of the conventional prompt global strike program, they only be expended using competitive solicitation procedures to involve industry as well as government partners.

Section 236—Transfer of Aegis Weapon System Equipment to Missile Defense Agency

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy, in accordance with section 230 of this Act, to transfer to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Aegis weapon system equipment for use in the Aegis Ashore Site in Romania, with certain authorities to preserve shipbuilding schedules. The Director of the Missile Defense Agency would be authorized to transfer Aegis weapon system equipment for installation in a shore-based Aegis weapon system to the Secretary of the Navy for use in the DDG–51 Destroyer program.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Section 241—Study on Electronic Warfare Capabilities of the Marine Corps

This section would require that the Commandant of the Marine Corps to conduct a study on the future capabilities of the Marine Corps with respect to electronic warfare, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act which would include: a detailed plan for EA–6B Prowler aircraft squadrons; a solution for the replacement of the EA–6B aircraft; concepts of operation for future air-ground task force electronic warfare capabilities of the Marine Corps; and any other issues that the Commandant determines to be appropriate.

Section 242—National Research Council Review of Defense Science and Technical Graduate Education Needs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council to review Department of Defense specialized degree-granting graduate programs in engineering, applied sciences, and management.

Section 243—Report on Three-Dimensional Integrated Circuit Manufacturing Capabilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a comprehensive assessment regarding three-dimensional integrated circuits manufacturing capacity to serve the U.S. military and other national security interests, and to provide a report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 244—Report on Efforts to Field New Directed Energy Weapons

This section would require 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 summarizing efforts within the Department of Defense to transition mature and maturing directed energy technologies to new operational weapon systems.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 251—Eligibility for Department of Defense Laboratories To Enter into Educational Partnerships with Educational Institutions in Territories and Possessions of the United States

This section would amend section 2194f of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the directors of the Department of Defense laboratories to enter into education partnership agreements with educational institutions in U.S. territories and possessions.

Section 252—Regional Advanced Technology Clusters

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use the research and engineering network of the Department of Defense to support regional advanced technology clusters established by the Secretary of Commerce to encourage the development of innovative advanced technologies. This section would also designate an office within the Department of Defense with the lead responsibility for enhancing the Department's use of regional advanced technology clusters.

Section 253—Briefing on Power and Energy Research Conducted at University Affiliated Research Center

This section would direct the Department of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 28, 2013, on power and energy research conducted at University Affiliated Research Centers.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

The budget request totaled $273.3 billion in operation and maintenance (O&M) funds to ensure the Department of Defense can train, deploy, and sustain U.S. military forces. The fiscal year 2013 O&M request included $209.3 billion in the base budget and $64.0 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). Some 23 percent of the total request is for OCO. This fiscal year 2013 total request represents an 8 percent decrease from fiscal year 2012 appropriations of $284.8 billion.

The committee notes that overall readiness trends saw improvements in non-deployed unit readiness, including equipment availability and condition, personnel, and training in fiscal year 2012. However, concerns about the overall readiness of the total force remain. These shortfalls continue to present an increased risk to na-

tional security if the military had to respond quickly to emergent contingencies. With the conclusion of operations in the Republic of Iraq and the ongoing drawdown of operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee anticipates a continuing realignment of funding from the Department's OCO request to the services' O&M base budgets to better represent normalized budget requirements, to accommodate training across the full spectrum of conflict, and to reset war-torn equipment. However, the committee remains concerned about the risk associated with the continued funding of enduring requirements outside of the base budget.

The Army budget's top-line reduction is driven largely by the end of U.S. military operations in the Republic of Iraq, reductions in the U.S. footprint in Afghanistan, and the Army's decision to shed at least eight brigade combat teams by 2017. While the OCO budget decreased, the base budget increased to support the reset of equipment that has been damaged or worn out through 10 years of demand, and also to support increased home-station training for full spectrum operations as the Army commits fewer units to combat operations. While deployed Army forces have, in most cases, the equipment, personnel, and training they require for their missions, this deployed readiness has, for the past 10 years, come largely at the expense of non-deployed Army units. Fiscal year 2012 saw improvements in non-deployed unit readiness, including equipment availability and condition, personnel, and training. However, there are still shortfalls in several areas, especially within the Guard and Reserve components. These shortfalls are expected to begin seeing improvement now that combat forces have withdrawn from Iraq and with initial reductions in the number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan. The fiscal year 2013 budget seeks to accelerate this trend by addressing some of the most serious shortfalls and by increasing funds for both the Guard and Reserve. To address key training shortfalls in one specific area, the committee recommends requiring Army medical evacuation crews be certified as paramedics within the next two years and to improve the management of Army simulated training. To address equipment shortfall concerns, the committee recommends clarification in guidance for the sustainment of key weapon systems and equipment reset and retrograde. Additionally, to assess the readiness of the force, the committee recommends the Comptroller General examine key readiness trends and indicators to help the committee understand the current state of the force. To address another readiness trend, the committee also directed the Secretary of Defense to examine key factors driving increased levels of depot maintenance carryover to ensure that this key function remains appropriately resourced.

The Air Force proposed to reduce its overall force structure but retain the current readiness of remaining assets. This includes an Air Force proposal to eliminate seven fighter squadrons (two active and five reserve squadrons) including five A–10 squadrons, one F–15C squadron, and one F–16 squadron. Overall, the Air Force proposed reducing 303 aircraft, including 123 combat aircraft, 150 mobility and tanker aircraft, and 30 intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance aircraft. At the same time, the Air Force indicates that overall accounts for training, maintenance, and operations are fully funded to meet existing requirements. From a facilities perspective, the Air Force proposed to take risk in the sustainment,

restoration and modernization of facilities. After assessing the proposed force structure of the Air Force, the committee restored the entirety of the force structure reductions proposed by the Air Force in fiscal year 2013. The committee also restored funding to support 24-hour operation of the Aerospace Control Alert function which provides defense of the homeland through Operation Noble Eagle. Finally, the committee recommended full funding of the Air Force's baseline training requirements, full funding for the flying-hour program, and a substantial increase to facility restoration and modernization.

With the fiscal year 2013 budget request, the Navy attempts a course correction to restore depot maintenance funding in order to fully fund maintenance requirements. Despite the drawdown in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, operational tempo is expected to remain high, particularly in light of the Department's intended strategic pivot to the Pacific which will predominantly demand maritime assets. Beyond this, the demand for the Navy's services is increasing, particularly due to increased tensions with the Islamic Republic of Iran, anti-piracy missions, missile defense operations, and additional support of U.S. Africa Command and the Arctic. Like the Army, the Navy's next-to-deploy forces are reporting high levels of readiness, but this also comes at the expense of the non-deployed forces that experience fewer training opportunities as resources are prioritized toward meeting Global Force Management demands. To reduce the risk to Navy readiness, the committee recommends funding the operation and maintenance costs for fiscal year 2013 to retain three of four guided missile cruisers that the Navy proposed for early retirement. In addition to this, the committee authorizes full funding for the inactivation execution of the nuclear aircraft carrier USS Enterprise and begins incremental funding of that work in the first of the three fiscal years anticipated for execution.

The Marine Corps is undertaking a massive reset operation to replace and refurbish equipment and vehicles damaged in wartime operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The fiscal year 2013 budget request included increases for the Marine Corps' reset efforts for combat vehicles, the Armored Amphibious Vehicle (AAV), rotary wing aircraft, and the repair and refurbishment of communications equipment and crew-served weapons. The Marine Corps also faces reductions in its training accounts in light of the service's decision to "rebalance" the Corps to a "middle-weight" force of 182,100 personnel, down from 202,000. In light of a smaller force, the Marine Corps has made some initial investments in specialized skill sets and enablers that help the Corps adapt to its smaller, more amphibious-centric role such as cyber, intelligence, and Marine Corps Special Operations.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

Office of Net Assessment

The committee notes that the Director of the Office of Net Assessment, within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, is responsible for developing and coordinating net assessments of the stand-

ing, trends, and future prospects of U.S. military capabilities and military potential in comparison with those of other countries or groups of countries so as to identify emerging or future threats or opportunities for the United States. The committee believes that as fiscal resources become increasingly constrained and the security challenges faced by the United States grow, the unique function performed by the Director is more important than ever. As Secretary Panetta stated in testimony before the House Budget Committee in March, 2012, ". . . unlike past drawdowns when threats have receded, the United States still faces a complex array of security challenges across the globe: We are still a nation at war in Afghanistan; we still face threats from terrorism; there is dangerous proliferation of lethal weapons and materials; the behavior of Iran and North Korea threaten global stability; there is continuing turmoil and unrest in the Middle East; rising powers in Asia are testing international relationships; and there are growing concerns about cyber intrusions and attacks." Moreover, a key tenet of the President's new defense strategic guidance released in January, 2012 is reversibility. The guidance states . . . [the Department of Defense] sought to differentiate between those investments that should be made today and those that can be deferred. This includes an accounting of our ability to make a course change that could be driven by many factors, including shocks or evolutions in the strategic, operational, economic, and technological spheres." The committee notes that the concept of reversibility relies upon several factors, including advance warning of emerging threats. Therefore, it is critical that the Department maintain a robust capability to identify disruptive shifts in the security environment, in order to anticipate and respond to such challenges.

Nevertheless, the budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $10.0 million for the Office of Net Assessment, within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide. This request represents the second consecutive year the budget request has included a decrement in the proposed funding for the Office. The committee notes that these cuts have been justified on the basis of efficiencies. While the committee supports efficiencies in the operations of the Department, it observes that this budget request is a significant reduction. In fact, the budget request for fiscal year 2013 is slightly less than half the budget requested for fiscal year 2011. The committee is concerned that such reductions do not simply cut waste, but disrupt the ability of the Department to effectively prognosticate and challenge conventional assumptions. As a result, elsewhere in this bill, the committee recommends an authorization of $20.0 million for the Office of Net Assessment, an increase of $10.0 million, for fiscal year 2013. The committee encourages the Director of the Office of Net Assessment to exploit efficiencies within the Director's office in order to maximize the use of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2013 for research, exploration, location of talent, and identification of emerging trends, rather than administration and overhead.

Reduction in Army Depot Maintenance due to Carryover

The committee found that the Army had more than $5.7 billion in total carryover workload at of the end of fiscal year 2011, representing some 12.7 months of unexecuted workload. Additionally,

the committee has learned that the Army will be unable to fully execute all programmed reset funding for depot-level maintenance through fiscal year 2013. With the magnitude of work to be done on equipment returning from Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom, and the likelihood that the Army will not execute it in such a short period of time, the committee finds that funds requested for fiscal year 2013 depot-level maintenance, Operation and Maintenance, are early to need, as this workload will most likely be performed in fiscal year 2014 or later. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $250.0 million.

ENERGY ISSUES

Energy and Fuel Budget Justification

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its emphasis on energy reductions, investments in renewable projects that result in long-term savings, and more efficient processes that reduce demand for fuel consumption. The committee is, however, concerned by the lack of visibility into the annual investments in energy and expenditures on fuel. The committee notes that the Department of Defense spent $19.4 billion in fiscal year 2011 on energy, an increase from the total expenditure of $15.2 billion in fiscal year 2010. The committee is concerned about fluctuating fuel prices, and the resulting shortfalls and impacts on the operation and maintenance accounts.

Therefore the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees in conjunction with the annual President's Budget request, a separate budget justification material on energy and fuel budget justification. The material should include details of energy costs by account, energy investments by account, and details of fuel expenditures. The committee recognizes that there are a variety of funding accounts and mechanisms being leveraged for energy investments that result in reductions in long-term sustainment costs. Therefore, the energy and fuel justification should include the details regarding the total energy expenditures by account and investments being made for energy by account and type of funds across the Future Years Defense Program to ensure that the committee can exercise the necessary oversight for the investment in funds.

Regarding fuel expenditures, the committee seeks information regarding budgeted fuel prices, adjustments to the account, resulting shortfalls or excesses, and details regarding the accounts that funded any such shortfalls and the impact to those accounts. The committee notes that in the fiscal year 2013 budget request, the projected price for fuel is $157 per barrel, whereas the average price in fiscal year 2012 is $162 per barrel. The committee also notes that the price for fuel projected across the FYDP is $137 per barrel. Recognizing the volatility in the fuel market, the committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to more accurately project fuel prices and to seek opportunities to enter into longer-term bulk fuel contracts or identify other options that would stabilize the fuel accounts for the military services.

Marine Energy Technologies

The committee is aware of the Navy's efforts to develop and test wave marine and hydrokinetic energy technologies as one of many technology solutions helping the Navy meet its shore energy goals and mandates, as well as to potentially power maritime security systems, and support at-sea surveillance and communications systems. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 31, 2012, on the current and future investments in test wave marine and hydrokinetic energy technologies, the payback associated with this investment, the future of the program, and a map of possible locations in proximity to military installations for employing this technology.

Navy Hybrid Electric Technology

The committee is aware of the Navy's efforts to incorporate hybrid electric engines into its fleet to reduce fuel consumption, and to help meet its energy goals. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 31, 2012, on the current and long-term employment of hybrid electric engine technology. The briefing should include details on the potential long-term savings that may be achieved, the projected cost for incorporating such technology in the initial design of engines, the cost to retrofit a platform with the technology, and future plans to incorporate this technology into additional classes of ships in the fleet.

Procurement Procedures to Incorporate the Use of Fuel Cells

The Defense Logistics Agency sponsored report, "Beyond Demonstration: The Role of Fuel Cells in DOD's Energy Strategy," published on October 19, 2011, offers recommendations with respect to the Department of Defense's use of fuel cell technology for distributed generation, backup power, unmanned vehicles, and non-tactical material handling equipment. The committee is very interested in the Department's use of fuel cells in defense energy applications.

The committee directs the Department to Defense to brief the congressional defense committees no later than June 1, 2013, on the implementation of the report's recommendations. This brief should address how the Department is addressing the following report recommendations:

(1) Develop and implement procurement models, which enable more efficient acquisition of fuel cell systems, including through third-party financing mechanisms, such as power purchase agreements;

(2) Require consideration of natural gas as well as renewable-fueled fuel cells for meeting electric power, heating, cooling and back-up power requirements for new and major renovations of DOD facilities and include evaluation of fuel cell options in all A/E design contracts;

(3) Require that solicitations for energy services/electric power include consideration of natural gas and renewable fueled stationary fuel cells and fuel cells for back-up power;

(4) Require that designers of unmanned vehicles evaluate fuel cells as an option for providing power; and

(5) Encourage the incorporation of fuel cell power in material handling applications.

LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT ISSUES

Army Management of the Organic Industrial Base

The committee is aware that the Army is currently evaluating the potential benefits of having U.S. Army Installation Management Command (IMCOM) assume responsibility from U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) of the day-to-day management of the service's organic industrial base installations.

While the committee commends the Army for exploring ways to become more efficient in its management of these facilities and recognizes that other military departments manage their portions of the organic industrial base in a similar manner, it is concerned about the possible unintended consequences of having IMCOM assume responsibility over the depots and arsenals. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Army Installation Management Command in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Army Materiel Command to establish policies to ensure that in any future transition that:

(1) Depot and arsenal production remain under the purview of the depot and arsenal commanders;

(2) IMCOM establishes a formal process for the proper prioritization of resourcing of depots and arsenals within the IMCOM budget, including statutory requirements for capital improvements;

(3) Duplicative management structures are not created; and

(4) The organic industrial base retains the necessary flexibility to allocate its allotted funding, such as the Critical Infrastructure Program, to best meet customer needs.

To enable the proper oversight of implementation, the committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of any formal approval by the Secretary of the Army to shift management of the Army's organic industrial base from AMC to IMCOM.

Consolidated Guidance for Mine-Resistant Ambush-Protected Vehicle Sustainment

The committee commends the Department of Defense for rapidly acquiring and fielding mine-resistant ambush-protected (MRAP) vehicles in support of Operations Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom, and New Dawn. The committee also recognizes the progress the military departments have made in planning for the disposition of their respective MRAP fleets. However, the committee is concerned about the lack of a long-term joint guidance for the integration of MRAP vehicles within the military departments' existing fleets and the sustainment of the enduring fleet. The committee notes the significant investment made in the development and fielding of the MRAP fleet and the costs associated with its sustainment in a reduced budgetary environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with Secretaries of the military departments and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop Department-wide guidance for the sustainment of the MRAP vehicle fleet and to submit the guidance to the congressional defense committees in conjunction with the submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014. At a minimum, the guidance should address:

(1) The enduring nature of the IED (improvised explosive device) threat and any needed MRAP capability;

(2) MRAP variants that will be deemed enduring;

(3) Fulfilling outstanding combatant commander requirements for MRAPs;

(4) An operations and sustainment plan for the MRAP fleet;

(5) The MRAP fleet's integration into training programs, centers, and curricula;

(6) The MRAP fleet's integration into prepositioned stocks; and

(7) The MRAP guidance's congruence with other acquisition strategies, operations plans, and combatant commander requirements.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the guidance within 30 days of the budget's submission to Congress.

Corrosion Mitigation Information Sharing

The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Department of Defense to leverage the work of universities, and private and nonprofit organizations, to improve the sharing of comprehensive corrosion information and expertise with the military services and defense agencies by streamlining data and making it available through improved software and other information sharing tools. The committee believes that this will complement the efforts of the Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to control, prevent, predict, and solve corrosion-related problems to minimize the impact of corrosion on Department of Defense platforms and assets.

Department of Defense Counterfeit Parts

In addition to the committee's concerns about strategic materials and supply chain security cited in title IX and title XVI of this Act, the committee is concerned about the readiness and sustainment impacts associated with the growing number of counterfeit parts entering the Department of Defense's supply stream. The committee is particularly concerned about critical components and spare parts that have been re-marked to display the part numbers and manufacturer logos of authentic parts; are deficient from military standards; have altered date markings to represent the parts as newer than when they were last manufactured; and bogus parts using invalid part numbers or dates beyond the last known legitimate production. The committee urges the Department to leverage existing initiatives to establish anti-counterfeiting guidance and disseminate this guidance to all departmental components and defense contractors. The committee also urges the Department, as it

develops its anti-counterfeit program, to analyze collected data to best target and refine counterfeit-part risk-mitigation strategies.

Depot Maintenance Carryover Definition

The committee notes that carryover is a portion of maintenance work not completed during the year of obligation and carried into the next fiscal year. Under Department of Defense (DOD) policy, the allowable amount of carryover is based on the outlay rate of the customers' appropriations financing work. According to the Government Accountability Office, when working capital fund activities accept orders late in the year that generally cannot be completed, or in some cases started, by the end of the fiscal year, the amount of carryover greatly increases. The committee also recognizes that greater workload requirements generated by operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan led to additional carryover for DOD depots, particularly at Army and Marine Corps depots. The committee encourages the Department to manage depot workload so that established carryover rules do not become a detriment to the organic depots and their ability to continue cost-effective operations.

The committee further encourages the Department to exclude depot maintenance workloads funded through procurement appropriations from the Department's current methodology for calculating carryover ceiling targets. The committee notes that procurement funding is multi-year in nature, and the depot maintenance requirements funded with procurement appropriations are not normally programmed to be completed in the first year in which procurement funds are obligated. The committee believes that it is unnecessary to include depot maintenance workloads funded by procurement appropriations in carryover ceiling targets.

Operating and Support Cost Estimation Reporting

The committee is aware that, in February 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) released the report, "Defense Logistics: Improvements Needed to Enhance Oversight of Estimated Long-term Costs for Operating and Supporting Major Weapon Systems" (GAO–12–340). The committee notes that among the report's findings is that the Department of Defense's selected acquisition "reports to Congress on estimated weapon system operating and support (O&S) costs are often inconsistent and sometimes unreliable, limiting visibility needed for effective oversight of these costs." The committee is concerned about the lack of reliable, objective O&S cost data provided to Congress. Further, the committee is concerned that this lack of reliable data could limit its visibility into these costs and hamper its ability to provide effective oversight and make sound funding decisions. However, the committee understands that the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation is assessing the systems and methods through which the Department tracks O&S costs on major defense acquisition programs as required by the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23). The committee urges the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to address the Comptroller General's findings in GAO–12–340 as part of its ongoing assessment, and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by

March 1, 2013, on the steps being taken to implement the recommendations included in GAO–12–340.

Testing and Evaluation of Materials Degradation

The committee encourages the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to consider the impacts of corrosion and exposure of equipment to corrosive environments when considering its evaluation of individual program test and evaluation master plans and conducting operational tests and evaluations across platforms and weapon systems. The committee believes that this will more accurately depict the environments in which the equipment will be operated and will help ensure material degradation due to corrosion does not become a limiting factor during the useful service life of a weapon.

The committee recognizes the issues that were highlighted by the Government Accountability Office regarding the F–22 Raptor and believes such issues could be more effectively mitigated or addressed if given consideration throughout the initial acquisition and testing process, as Congress intended in the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23). Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 31, 2012, on how corrosion prevention, mitigation, and control are incorporated into the test and evaluation plans for weapon systems, and actions taken in the test and evaluation community to consider material degradation due to corrosion and the impacts to long-term sustainment costs.

Safety and Security Standards for Transportation Protective Service Commercial Carriers

The committee is concerned that DOD has not implemented stringent enough safety standards for potentially dangerous cargo that is routinely transported by Transportation Protective Service (TPS) commercial carriers through our nation's highways and communities. These shipments are often not only potentially hazardous to the public but involve sensitive and classified defense material that require heightened levels of security, improved incident response capabilities and continuous monitoring while in transit.

The committee was disappointed to learn that a number of reasonable recommendations to improve safety performance standards submitted by the Security and Safety Subcommittee of the National Defense Transportation Association's (NDTA) Surface Committee, were later rejected by DOD's Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) even though SDDC was an active participant in the subcommittee's deliberations. These standards included the following: adopting minimum DOT safety performance at 50th percentile; mandating proven safety technologies in trucks; requiring carrier operations center be continually staffed; outlining specific carrier responsibilities for incident; and incentivizing carriers with strong safety records.

The decision by SDDC to instead follow less stringent criteria is found by the committee to be insufficient. It is the view of the committee that material transported by TPS is largely unique to DOD

and requires appropriate safety and security measures beyond that required for non-defense commercial carriers.

Accordingly, the committee directs DOD to adopt increased mandatory minimum standards to ensure the safety of the public and require DOD-approved TPS carriers possess adequate procedures and safety standards for both drivers and vehicles. The committee is encouraged that SDDC has undertaken efforts to develop a process and metrics for evaluating driver and carrier performance. The committee therefore directs DOD to provide the defense committees a report on its proposed carrier evaluation and safety standards plan within 45 days after enactment of this Act.

Surveying and Mapping

The committee is aware that the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) has issued a draft request for proposals (RFP) for its newest omnibus contract. The committee is also aware that this draft RFP takes a different contracting approach than similar past solicitations. The committee recognizes that contracting means have evolved for the better, but also notes that the current process has been successfully utilized for more than 15 years. To better understand the rationale for the current contracting approach, the committee directs the Director of the NGA to provide a briefing on the acquisition strategy for the GEOINT Data Services contract not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act.

Readiness Issues

Analysis of Readiness Trends

In the January 2012 strategic guidance and the fiscal year 2013 budget request, the Department of Defense presented a new defense strategy and related budget decisions that the committee believes have significant implications for the sizing, use, and readiness of U.S. forces. Specifically, the Department is calling for what it describes as a smaller, lighter, flexible joint force able to conduct a full range of activities, and has proposed reductions in either end strength and/or force structure in each of the military departments. Since the turn of the century, the Department has been heavily engaged in ongoing operations which, among other things, have required personnel to deploy frequently and have left little time to train for anything other than counterinsurgency missions. These ongoing operations and repeated use of equipment have accelerated the degradation of equipment readiness which has begun to show signs of improvement only since the cessation of operations in the Republic of Iraq. In addition, units that are not deployed have had to transfer equipment and personnel to deploying units, causing shortfalls.

Notwithstanding steps the Department has taken in the past several years intended to enhance its ability to better manage deployments and address readiness concerns, including implementing programmatic actions and increasing investments, reported readiness rates have declined over the past 12 years and are improving only as operations in Iraq have ceased and units' dwell time at home station has increased along with opportunities for expanded training. During this time period, the Department of Defense has

also made various changes in its readiness reporting policies and supporting information systems which have resulted in adjustments to the scope of readiness data that is reported to internal and external decision-makers.

To help inform the committee's oversight of the Department's efforts to improve readiness and its consideration of the budget request, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, on the readiness of U.S. forces. The report should include, at a minimum, an analysis of:

(1) Key changes in the type of readiness information available to Congress and Department of Defense decision-makers, such as those resulting from changes in readiness reporting policies;

(2) The current and historical readiness status of each of the military departments including any trends in reported readiness and any major areas of deficiencies;

(3) Actions taken by the Department to address the above identified deficiencies and the nature and results of any assessments undertaken by the Department of Defense to measure the contribution of these actions towards improving readiness;

(4) The extent to which the Department has developed any further action plans and identified associated resource needs to assess the aforementioned deficiencies; and

(5) The impact of the cessation of operations in Iraq on readiness, including training, equipment, and personnel availability.

Army Immersive Gaming and Simulation Training Architecture

The committee understands that the Army continues to incorporate a growing number of immersive gaming and simulation systems into its "Army Force Generation" training model. The committee understands that as this integration has progressed, several technical challenges concerning interoperability and technology refreshment have emerged. Specifically, the committee is aware of conflicting hardware requirements, software compatibility issues, and training tool integration challenges. The committee is concerned that efforts to grow this medium of training further in a constrained budgetary environment without standardization of the supporting architecture could lead to unsustainable and unnecessary growth in the civilian manpower or contractor support required to effectively operate and maintain the architecture.

Therefore the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) to institute Army-wide standards for immersive gaming and simulation architecture. As part of these standards, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. TRADOC to require a common hardware standard to the maximum extent possible to reduce life-cycle costs of buying, maintaining, and upgrading equipment. Further, the commander, in his guidance, should ensure that future system development uses a common operating system or, at a minimum, a compatible operating system, to an established standard. The committee also directs the Commander, U.S. TRADOC to utilize, to the extent possible, an open architecture for software products to ensure the max-

imum level of interoperability between various training tools in order to provide the best possible training environment.

Army Rotary Wing Aviation Water Egress Training

The committee recognizes the need to ensure the Army provides its rotary-wing aviation community with the best survivability training available. The committee is aware that the Army's capability to train a key component of survivability, water egress, may be degraded. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to formally assess the Army's current rotary-wing water egress training capability and submit written notification to the congressional defense committees outlining the findings by December 1, 2012, and ensure that any deficiencies are addressed in the fiscal year 2014 budget submission.

Chemical Protective Over-Garment Stockpile

The committee believes that protecting troops from dangerous conditions in the battlefield is a top priority, and the Chemical Protective Over-Garment (CPOG) is the primary means by which individual military members are protected against contact with chemical, biological, and other threats. The production of CPOG suits is a complex process that includes the acquisition of special fabric and bonding of the material in addition to sewing and packaging. The committee is concerned about the impact of an extended break in CPOG production and, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees written notification of the number of CPOG suits in the current Department of Defense inventory within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The notification should include: the number of suits in each camouflage pattern; the number of suits in each size; and the locations where suits are being stored. The notification should also include a detailed summary of the age of the suits in the current stockpile along with testing data which was used to validate extending the shelf-life of CPOG suits currently in the inventory.

Civil Reserve Air Fleet Program

The committee recognizes that commercial air carriers participating in the Department of Defense's Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) program commit their aircraft to be called upon, or activated, to support a range of military operations. As an incentive to encourage participation in CRAF, the Department of Defense contracts with CRAF participants to fly its daily peacetime passenger and cargo airlift business. CRAF participants are used to directly augment an increasingly overburdened organic fleet which has been significantly overflown in the last 10 years (C–5s average overfly 30 percent per year, and C–17s average overfly 7 percent per year). Based on reports indicating recent consolidations among CRAF participants, a decreased use of CRAF aircraft for military missions, and an historical overuse of the Department of Defense's organic air mobility fleet, the committee is concerned with the long-term ability of CRAF and the organic mobility fleet to meet the Department of Defense's needs. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the

congressional defense committees by March 31, 2013, on the following:

(1) The relevant statutes, regulations, and Department of Defense guidance and policies pertaining to the use of commercial airlift to support military operations under the CRAF program;

(2) The Department of Defense's usage rates for CRAF and how those rates compare to those of its military air fleet, for fiscal years 2011 and 2012, as well as a historical perspective of usage rates as appropriate. Additionally, this analysis should include the identification of statutes, regulations, guidance, or policies in place to address usage rates in the CRAF program;

(3) An analysis of any justification to support unclassified restricted routes that prohibit civilian aircraft from participating;

(4) The extent to which the Department of Defense has established future requirements for CRAF and how the planned size of CRAF compares to those requirements; and

(5) Any additional information that the Comptroller General determines will further inform the committees on issues related to the CRAF program.

Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Training

The committee is aware that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) obligates more than $150.0 million annually to support counter-IED (C–IED) training. The committee notes JIEDDO's evolving efforts to ensure all warfighters receive the necessary training for effective operational employment for rapidly fielded C–IED systems. In addition, the committee understands that it is the collective assessment of the Department of Defense that the IED threat is enduring and will require adequate resourcing in order to sustain certain capabilities and related training requirements.

The committee believes that the best asset on the battlefield is a well-led, trained, situationally aware soldier, sailor, airman or marine. For this particular purpose, the committee understands training as the ability to develop, define, and set C–IED and Attack the Network training standards for joint forces in response to combatant commanders' requirements and integrate those standards into appropriate joint and DOD concepts and doctrine. The committee commends JIEDDO's training efforts and understands the difficulties in managing training efforts that are inherent in an intense, fluid IED environment. However, the committee also believes that training is inherently the responsibility of the respective military departments. The committee is concerned that JIEDDO appears to lack a comprehensive plan for the transition of current training initiatives to the military services for long-term sustainment. The committee expects the military departments to actively participate in the planning, programming, and budgeting process for C–IED training and encourages their participation in defining enduring requirements. The committee also notes that a large portion of JIEDDO funding is contained in the Overseas Contingency Operations budget and that there is risk associated with resourcing enduring training requirements outside of the base budget. The committee expects that enduring training capabilities

managed by the military services should be resourced in the base budget.

The committee directs the Director, Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, to develop a transition plan within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act to guide the transfer of all enduring C–IED training to the military departments by January 1, 2015. The Director should provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the transition plan within 30 days of the plan's completion.

Defense Cultural Training

The committee understands that, in August 2011, the Secretary of Defense officially recognized language, regional, and cultural skills as enduring war-fighting competencies with the issuance of a service-wide memo. The committee believes these competencies are critical to mission readiness and supports the Secretary's position that more needs to be done to provide individual service members and Department of Defense civilians with the ability to effectively understand the cultures of coalition forces, international partners, and local populations. The committee believes that the most cost-effective manner in which to deliver this training to the Department is to collaborate with regionally accredited institutions of higher education which have standing cultural studies programs. The committee strongly urges the Department to fully leverage these institutions and their capabilities.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to provide the congressional defense committees with a report on the current status and future plans for the Department's collaboration with institutions of higher education for cultural training to include curriculum, course requirements, and program accreditation by September 1, 2013.

Maintenance and Sustainment Readiness

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's new strategic guidance, and Future Years Defense Program, places increased demand on legacy Air Force platforms to counter contemporary threats and meet global mission requirements. These aging aircraft fleets, many of which were procured decades ago, are expensive to maintain and lack dedicated technology insertion programs to replace outdated materials, product forms, and so-called "problem parts" that dramatically increase operations and maintenance (O&M) costs and limit mission availability. The committee is aware that commercial aircraft fleets, working with an active subcontractor base, have employed multiple generations of new structural aluminum alloys, advanced manufacturing processes, and joined technologies since the aging Air Force fleet was designed. The committee also believes that the low-risk transition of these proven commercial technologies, products, and best practices could help the Air Force to increase mission availability and reduce O&M costs for the aging fleet.

Through the expanded authority provided in section 333 of this Act, the committee encourages the Air Force to leverage commercially developed and proven technologies and products within its

modernization and sustainment activities in order to increase mission availability, reduce total ownership costs, and resolve supply chain issues. Section 333 would give the Department of the Air Force the authority to use working-capital funds for expenses directly related to conducting a pilot program for a product or process improvement.

MC–12W Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Aircraft Program

The Air Force MC–12W Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Aircraft Program is currently assigned to the Active Component. The Air Force has indicated it plans to transfer the MC–12W program to a program of record in the Air National Guard in fiscal year 2014. The committee is concerned that the Air Force has not fully considered the life-cycle costs and potential long-term operational impact of transferring the MC–12W program from a quick reaction capability to a program of record. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on all life-cycle costs of basing, training personnel, and operating and maintaining the MC–12W program as a program of record in the Air National Guard.

Operation and Maintenance Budget Transparency Requirements

The committee has been increasingly concerned about its lack of visibility into the military departments' operation and maintenance accounts. It is concerned that these large accounts represent a wide array of activities that are not clearly defined in the Department of Defense's annual budget submission. The committee is also concerned that the administrative and indirect costs imbedded within the operation and maintenance accounts seem to be growing at a disproportional rate to that of funding directly supporting training and operations. This lack of budget visibility has degraded the committee's ability to provide the necessary and proper oversight to a large portion of the military departments' budgets. However, the committee wishes to commend the Marine Corps for providing much of this information in its annual budget submission through the deployable day metric and direct and indirect cost ratio metrics.

In addition, the committee has grown increasingly concerned with the frequency and size of the military departments' intra-budget activity transfers. While the committee has established clear guidelines for congressional notification and approval of above-threshold reprogramming requests, it has not provided similar notification requirements for intra-budget activity transfers. The committee believes that this, too, has degraded the committee's ability to provide oversight and to ensure authorized expenditures are being made in accordance with congressional intent.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, to establish a new consolidated budget justification display to be delivered in conjunction with the military departments' annual budget submissions that, at a minimum:

(1) Fully identifies the military departments' baseline operational tempo budget;

(2) Delineates direct and indirect costs including resources and personnel;

(3) Defines the operational tempo budgetary requirement;

(4) Defines the percentage of the requirement met by the budget request;

(5) Displays a percentage of growth or decline for both direct and indirect costs; and

(6) Clearly defines items included in both direct and indirect costs.

In order to help the committee more fully understand departmental priorities and future requirements within these accounts, the committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit written notification to the congressional defense committees whenever an intra-budget activity transfer within an operation and maintenance account exceeds $25.0 million.

Operational Clothing and Individual Equipment

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Defense did not submit a budget justification display that covers programs and activities for the procurement of organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE) as required by the House Report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. The committee continues to be concerned that the military services are reliant on overseas contingency operation requests to fund OCIE requirements and strongly urges the Secretary to include this information with the submission of the Fiscal Year 2014 budget request. Further, the committee is concerned about the long-term sustainment of OCIE and believes that greater transparency in annual budget justification materials would enhance oversight.

In addition to the aforementioned budget display and the report required by the House Report (H. Rept. No. 111–491) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to include performance and evaluation criteria on OCIE as part of the Army's annual budget submission for Force Readiness Operations Support beginning in Fiscal Year 2014. This performance and evaluation criteria shall include budget information for the previous two fiscal years and the current year's request. The information shall be provided on a line-item basis.

Paramedic Training and Certification for Army Medical Evacuation Aircrews

The committee is aware that, in 2009, the Secretary of Defense directed that the new U.S. Army standard for aeromedical evacuation (MEDEVAC) is to evacuate urgent point-of-injury patients to the appropriate level of care within one hour of receiving a MEDEVAC mission request. The committee commends the Department for meeting this important challenge and its continued efforts to improve MEDEVAC operations. The committee is aware that these efforts have contributed to a 92 percent survival rate for

wounded service members in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the highest in U.S. history.

However, the committee is also aware that the Defense Health Board (DHB), in June 2011, noted opportunities to improve the care provided to casualties during tactical evacuation, or the transit from point-of-injury to the first medical treatment facility. The committee supports the DHB's effort to enhance the quality of care provided to the warfighter and supports its recommendations for improvement. The committee understands that among the DHB's recommendations were a need to institutionalize best practices, optimize evacuation time for all likely tactical contingencies, enhance in-flight care documentation procedures, and, notably, improve the level of training and certification for in-flight care providers. The committee was most interested in the DHB's assessment regarding the linkages between mortality rates and the level of in-flight care provider medical training, specifically noting that flights with critical care flight paramedic (CCFP) certified crews demonstrated increased patient survivability rates.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to promulgate the rules and regulations necessary to implement the recommendations of the Committee on Tactical Combat Casualty Care, as approved by the Defense Health Board, entitled "Tactical Evacuation Care Improvements within the Department of Defense 2011–03," dated June 14, 2011. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to establish by September 1, 2012, a Department-wide standard that requires all in-flight medical care providers to be CCFP certified within the next three years.

Simulated Tactical Flight Training

The cost of operating high-performance fighter aircraft continues to increase the overall costs of the flying hour program. While the committee supports the current level of funding of the flying hour program and the invaluable experience provided, the committee believes that alternative methods to train and prepare pilots for combat should be assessed. One such alternative has been an increased reliance on simulator-based training platforms. Among the emerging technologies available to simulate the dynamic forces experienced during flight is a new class of centrifuge-based flight simulators known as "sustained-G tactical flight trainers." These simulators combine long-arm centrifugation with high fidelity, flyable cockpit modules to mimic the physiological stresses and G-forces experienced during actual tactical flight.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the effectiveness of simulated tactical flight training in a sustained G environment and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2013. The study should assess the training effectiveness, cost efficiencies, increased readiness, and life-cycle efficiencies from simulator based training platforms on the modeled aircraft.

Space Training

The committee notes the progress in the implementation of the Ballistic Missile Defense Individual Training and Education Needs Assessment recommendations. The committee continues to support

improving the integration of ballistic missile defense training across and between combatant commands and military services, and encourages the identification of capabilities and funding necessary to effectively and adequately integrate this training.

The committee recognizes that a similar study for space training could improve integration, find efficiencies, and identify opportunities to better meet Joint Requirements across the services and combatant commands. The committee therefore directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, that contains the following:

(1) A description of existing space training and education;

(2) An assessment of the synchronization and standardization across existing training programs, including best practices; and

(3) Recommendations that are warranted for training improvements, including recommended roles and responsibilities, organizational models, resources, and facilities required for joint space training.

Strategic Mobility Study Plan

In the conference report (H. Rept. 112–329) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the conferees expressed concern about the Department of the Navy's plans to place Maritime Prepositioning Ship Squadron-One (MPRSON–1) in a reduced operating status. The committee understands that in fiscal year 2013, the Navy has proposed to further reduce the readiness of MPRSON–1 by placing it into the Ready Reserve Fleet (RRF). The committee is concerned that the decision to place MPRSON–1 into RRF status was done without due consideration of other strategic lift reductions being made by the other military departments. Furthermore, the committee understands that U.S. Transportation Command intends to perform a Strategic Mobility Capabilities Study in the coming calendar year.

Therefore, to help ensure the conferees' concerns are properly addressed, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, to provide a plan to congressional defense committees for the forthcoming Strategic Mobility Capabilities Study by August 1, 2012.

Training Range Encroachment

The committee believes that it should be a priority of the Department of Defense to ensure military personnel continue to have reliable access to military training ranges. Unimpeded access to training ranges, such as the Pacific Missile Range Facility, is essential to ensure military readiness. The committee is aware that a number of training ranges are threatened by encroachment due to the economic development of surrounding lands. The committee is also aware of situations where agreements, either formal or informal, exist with private land owners who have been supportive of the military's training activities and have allowed military operations to take place on their property for a number of years. However, the committee is concerned that military training could be impeded should future private land owners be less supportive of such oper-

ations. As such, the committee encourages the Department to take appropriate action to leverage existing authorities and programs, as well as work with states and municipalities to leverage their authorities, to mitigate encroachment or other challenges that have the potential to impede future access or operations on military training ranges.

Unmanned Aircraft Training Strategic Plan

The committee notes that Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) training requirements will increase in the coming years due to expanding inventories and the sustained high demand for UAS-provided capabilities. If UAS pilots and sensor operators are to maintain proficiency and mission readiness at their home stations, the Department of Defense will need to address the current constraints on training in the national airspace. The development of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) safety standards for UAS by 2016, as required by the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–95) will allow the Department of Defense to access the national airspace for routine training.

However, the committee believes that the Department needs to have a strategic plan in place to absorb UAS into bases, airspace, and training programs in the continental United States, as the inventory grows and some assets return from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, which will likely be before the establishment of safety standards.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on an unmanned aircraft training strategic plan that addresses the following:

(1) Identification and description of clearly defined training requirements (including live versus simulated) of all groups of UAS, and identify remaining UAS training shortfalls, and provide UAS training recommendations;

(2) An investment strategy for significantly enhancing the quality and interoperability of UAS training simulators;

(3) A plan for integrating live and simulated UAS training into other programs of instruction, mission rehearsal exercises, and combatant commander exercises;

(4) Department-wide UAS training standards that seek an informed balance between live training and simulated training; and

(5) An integration plan for simulation systems that enables interoperability and distributed training involving a mix of manned and unmanned assets.

The committee notes that a report on this topic normally would not be delivered to the congressional intelligence committees; however, as this section results, in part, from a broader review of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms initiated by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and as the matters covered by the report relate to the fielding and use of platforms over which the congressional intelligence committees also exercise jurisdiction, the report should be provided to both the con-

gressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees.

OTHER MATTERS

Alternatives for Hexavalent Chromium

The committee commends the efforts by the Department of Defense to reduce, manage and, ultimately eliminate the use of toxic materials and notes in particular the Department's efforts to transition to the use of alternatives for hexavalent chromium for coatings and surface treatments. The committee is encouraged by recent successful transitions, and supports continued research and development efforts to identify acceptable alternatives.

Capital Investment Program

The committee is aware that statutory and regulatory dollar-value limitations placed on the discretionary authority of depot and arsenal commanders to carry out renovation and minor construction capital investment program projects funded through the Defense Working Capital Fund (DWCF) have not been adjusted for inflation. The committee is concerned that these limitations have degraded the purchasing power of depot and arsenal installation commanders and may lead to ineffective utilization of statutorily prescribed capital investments associated with improvements in depot and arsenal production. The committee is aware that in fiscal year 2002, section 2805 of title 10, United States Code was amended to increase the threshold for unspecified military construction projects funded by the WCF intended solely to correct a deficiency that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening to $1.5 million. However, the committee believes that an adjustment for non-safety related projects is warranted.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to review renovation and minor construction project limitations in statute and regulation and provide formal recommendations on needed inflation-related adjustments to ensure efficient operation of Department of Defense maintenance depots, shipyards, and arsenals. If disparities regarding the exercise of a depot or arsenal commander's discretionary authority to carry out renovations or minor new construction exist in practice between military departments or defense agencies, or major commands within a military department, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense to identify and highlight those disparities for the committee. The Under Secretary of Defense should transmit this information by letter to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Congressional Budget Office and Government Accountability Office Information Access

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its efforts to begin securing its various online databases and informational portals, such as Army Knowledge Online. The committee believes that these steps are a necessary precaution that will enhance the Department's information security. However, the committee is

also aware that in securing these resources, the Department has made it more difficult for the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to access the information necessary to assist Congress in carrying out its oversight responsibilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, to update the necessary rules and regulations and issue any credentials required for staff members of CBO and GAO to access departmental information in support of congressionally directed tasks by September 1, 2012. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit written notification to the congressional defense committees certifying the Department's compliance.

Consolidated Guidance for Equipment Retrograde and Disposition

The committee commends the Department of Defense and the military departments on the progress made toward successful retrograde of equipment used in support of Operations Iraqi Freedom and New Dawn. The committee recognizes the significant challenges associated with the inventory, assessment, and subsequent transportation of the large amount of equipment used to support these operations.

However, the committee remains concerned about the overall level of coordination, oversight, and the processes in place to guide the remaining retrograde and disposition. In particular, the committee believes that the military departments may be unnecessarily retrograding non-enduring mission equipment or may be disposing of equipment prior to enduring requirements being fully established. Further, the committee recognizes the logistical and political challenges associated with the retrograde of equipment used in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with Secretaries of the military departments and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop department-wide guidance for the retrograde and disposition of equipment used in support of operations in the Central Command area of responsibility. At a minimum, the strategy shall:

(1) Prescribe standard prioritization and disposition criteria that focus on filling unmet combatant commander and home-station training requirements with retrograded equipment;

(2) Provide guidance on the nomination, evaluation, and acceptance process for non-standard equipment additions to the military services' equipment authorization documents and prepositioned stocks; and

(3) Provide disposition guidance to the military departments for the donation, transfer, or sale of non-enduring excess equipment only after it is deemed excess by the Department's process for donation, transfer and sale of excess equipment.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to deliver this guidance to the congressional defense committees in conjunction with the annual budget submission for fiscal year 2014. Further, to enable the committee to provide the necessary oversight, the committee directs the Department to brief the congressional defense committees on the guidance within 90 days after its delivery to Congress.

Contracted Hospitality and Food Services

The committee is concerned about the quality assurance of contracted food and hospitality services in support of the military departments. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military departments to ensure that contracted culinary or hospitality services are procured from vendors utilizing personnel that are professionally trained through an accredited program in a relevant field by May 1, 2013.

Defense Biometrics

The committee is aware that United States military forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and elsewhere rely on biometrics data, such as fingerprints and iris scans, to identify enemy combatants and link individuals to events such as improvised explosive device detonations. A recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report entitled "Defense Biometrics: Additional Training for Leaders and More Timely Transmission of Data Could Enhance the Use of Biometrics in Afghanistan" (GAO–12–442) recommended that the Department take several actions to enhance the effectiveness of its biometrics activities in ongoing operations, such as:

(1) Expanding leadership training to improve employment of biometrics collection;

(2) Helping ensure the completeness and accuracy of transmitted biometrics data;

(3) Determining the viability and cost-effectiveness of reducing transmission times; and

(4) Evaluating the merits of disseminating biometrics lessons learned across the Department for the purposes of informing relevant policies and practices.

The committee believes that biometrics will be an enduring capability to support future military operations. GAO's recommendations should be relevant to informing the future of biometrics development and employment. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on any actions, taken or proposed, to implement the recommendations made in GAO–12–442.

Digitization of Defense Media Activity Material

The committee is aware that the Defense Media Activity (DMA) was established to provide an internal news and media production organization for Department of Defense (DOD), as well as to support internal communications operations by gathering information on DOD policies, programs and priorities. An important component of DMA is the Defense Imagery Management Operations Center, which centrally manages current and historical visual information to support worldwide DOD communication and operational missions.

The committee is also aware that DMA planned an initiative in 2011 to digitize its entire inventory of records, along with the capability to store, process, and disseminate these records electronically. The committee understands that due to recent budget constraints, DMA eliminated this requirement. The committee believes that

this digitization effort has the potential to reduce operating costs and increase the efficiency for DMA in the long run. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate the priority for this initiative and provide adequate funding for completion.

Disposal of Department of Defense Computers

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has a vast inventory of computers that must be demobilized and disposed of on an annual basis as they become technologically obsolete. To the maximum extent practicable, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to dispose of those computers in the most environmentally responsible manner possible. This disposal should occur only after ensuring all sensitive information and components have been removed in an appropriate manner.

Joint Airborne Hazards Action Plan

The committee continues to be concerned about the long-term health impact of burn pits on military service members in the Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and the Republic of Djibouti. In October 2011, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) released a report regarding Long-Term Health Consequences of Exposure to Burn Pits in Iraq and Afghanistan. IOM concluded that the inability to capture individual exposure data during a conflict with existing technologies creates a need for long-term monitoring due to health effects evolving years after exposure. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has moved forward on a Joint Airborne Hazards Action Plan to improve the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of post-deployment health services to those military members with health concerns related to airborne hazards, and encourages the Department of Defense to proceed with their components of the joint action plan as expeditiously as possible.

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.

Section 302—Authorization of Appropriations of Funds for Inactivation Execution of U.S.S. Enterprise

This section would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for inactivation execution of the U.S.S. *Enterprise* (CVN 65) at the levels identified in section 4301 of division D of this Act. The committee notes that inactivation execution is planned for work in 3 fiscal years, and this section would provide the contract authority to the Secretary of the Navy to perform that work. The committee also notes that there is an additional $203.0 million available in fiscal year 2013 to support the inactivation of the U.S.S. *Enterprise*, to include equipment and material, advance planning, disposal and recycling, and the terminal offload program.

SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 311—Training Range Sustainment Plan and Training Range Inventory

This section would extend the annual reporting requirement regarding training range sustainment plans and training range inventory from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018.

Section 312—Modification of Definition of Chemical Substance

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 and primers.

Section 313—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement

This section would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (42 U.S.C. 17142) to exempt the Department of Defense from the requirements related to contracts for alternative or synthetic fuel in that section.

Section 314—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Procurement of Alternative Fuel

This section would prohibit the use of funds for the production or purchase of any alternative fuel if the cost of producing or purchasing the alternative fuel exceeds the cost of producing or purchasing a traditional fossil fuel. This section would also provide an exception for the Secretary of Defense to purchase limited quantities of alternative fuels to complete fleet certification of 50/50 alternative fuel blends.

Section 315—Plan on Environmental Exposures to Members of the Armed Forces

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for identifying a material solution to measure environmental exposures to members of the Armed Forces both in the continental United States and outside of the continental United States. This section would also direct the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees regarding this plan.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

Section 321—Expansion and Reauthorization of Multi-Trades Demonstration Project

This section would reauthorize the Multi-Trades Demonstration Project, a project that increases the pay grade of an employee who achieves certain skill proficiencies in more than one field by one grade, and expands its participation to civilian workers in all military departments.

Section 322—Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair

This section would amend section 2460 of title 10, United States Code, to refine the definition of depot maintenance. This section would also exclude nuclear aircraft carrier refueling, defueling, and concurrent complex overhaul and the procurement major modifications designed to improve the performance or safety of a weapons system from the definition of depot-level maintenance and repair. Further, this section would amend section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, by inserting "in direct support of depot-level maintenance and repair" to describe the type of "associated logistics capabilities" covered under section 2464 and would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from delegating the waiver authority granted under section 2464. This section would also exclude special access programs from the requirements in section 2464, and would establish a biennial special access core capability review and report.

SUBTITLE D—READINESS

Section 331—Intergovernmental Support Agreements with State and Local Governments

This section would authorize the Secretary concerned to enter into intergovernmental support agreements with State or local governments for the procurement of installation support services. Procurement of police and fire protection services are specifically exempt from this authority.

Section 332—Extension and Expansion of Authority To Provide Assured Business Guarantees to Carriers Participating in Civil Reserve Air Fleet

This section would amend section 9515 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to provide increased minimum assured business guarantees to Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers providing airlift services to the Department of Defense. The current authority will expire on December 31, 2015.

Section 333—Expansion and Reauthorization of Pilot Program for Availability of Working-Capital Funds for Product and Process Improvements

This section would expand the authorization to use working-capital funds for expenses directly related to conducting a pilot program for a product or process improvement to the Secretaries of the military departments.

Section 334—Center of Excellence for the National Guard State Partnership Program

This section would amend chapter 5 of title 32, United States Code, by authorizing the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to maintain a Center of Excellence for the National Guard State Partnership Program to provide training opportunities for units and members of the regular and reserve components for the purpose of improving the skills for such units and members when deployed to complete the mission of the State Partnership Program.

SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

Section 341—Report on Joint Strategy for Readiness and Training in a C4ISR-Denied Environment

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the readiness of the joint force to conduct operations in environments where there is no access to Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems. This section also would require the development of a C4ISR-denied environment roadmap and exercise plan.

Section 342—Comptroller General Review of Annual Department of Defense Report on Prepositioned Materiel and Equipment

This section would modify the frequency in which the Comptroller General of the United States submits its report on the Department of Defense's prepositioned stocks from 120 days after the Department submits its annual report on prepositioned stocks to a rate that the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

Section 343—Modification of Report on Maintenance and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards

This section would modify section 7310(c) of title 10, United States Code, to include vessels that are operated pursuant to a contract entered into by the Military Sealift Command, the Maritime Administration, or the U.S. Transportation Command.

Section 344—Extension of Deadline for Comptroller General Report on Department of Defense Service Contract Inventory

This section would amend section 803 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to extend from 180 to 270 days the requirement for the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report regarding the Department of Defense contract inventory.

Section 345—GAO Report Reviewing Methodology of Department of Defense Relating to Costs of Performance by Civilian Employees, Military Personnel, and Contractors

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare a report to assess the Department of Defense Directive-Type Memorandum 09–007 entitled "Estimating and Comparing the Full Costs of Civilian and Military Manpower and Contractor Support" and determine whether the methodology employed is accurate. The report shall be submitted no later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Section 346—Report on Medical Evacuation Policies

This section would require a report from the Secretary of Defense on the policies, procedures, and guidelines of the Department of Defense for helicopter evacuation of injured members of the Armed Forces.

SUBTITLE F—LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY

Section 351—Repeal of Authority To Provide Certain Military Equipment and Facilities To Support Civilian Law Enforcement and Emergency Response

This section would amend section 372 of title 10, United States Code, to ensure Department of Defense support to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement or emergency response agency to prepare for or respond to an emergency involving chemical or biological agents, is consistent with the national preparedness system and other statutory changes made since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security.

Section 352—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Disestablishment of Aerospace Control Alert Locations

This section would limit the funds authorized to be appropriated to disestablish 2 of the 18 Aerospace Control Alert locations. This section would also establish a consolidated budget exhibit for the Aerospace Control Alert mission. Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees that provides a cost-benefit analysis and a risk-based assessment of Aerospace Control Alert mission; and then have the Comptroller General of the United States assess the Secretary's report.

Section 353—Limitation on Authorization of Appropriations for the National Museum of the United States Army

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds for the National Museum of the United States Army until the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees written certification that sufficient private funding has been raised to fund construction of the "baseline museum" and that at least 50 percent of the baseline museum has been completed.

Section 354—Limitation on 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 2013 for the retirement, inactivation, or storage of a cruiser or dock landing ship. This section would provide an exception for the retirement of the U.S.S. *Port Royal* (CG 73). Finally, this section would require the Secretary of the Navy to maintain the operational capability and perform the necessary maintenance of the cruisers and dock landing ships in support of operational requirements of the combatant commands.

Section 355—Renewal of Expired Prohibition on Return of Veterans Memorial Objects without Specific Authorization in Law

This section would amend section 2572 of title 10, United States Code, and prohibit the President from transferring a veterans memorial object to a foreign country unless the transfer is specifically authorized by law or the transfer is made after September 30, 2017.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 361—Retirement, Adoption, Care, and Recognition of Military Working Dogs

This section would amend section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, to change the classification of military working dogs from equipment to canine members of the Armed Forces. This section would also require non-profit provided veterinary care for retired working dogs and establish policies to ease the cost of transporting retired working dogs for the purposes of adoption.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense has determined that the current force structure and size of the Armed Forces can be reduced to meet the defense strategic guidance, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," published in January 2012. This guidance, coupled with the proposed cuts in the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), has led the military services to alter their force structure and reduce end strengths.

The budget request reduces the end strengths of the Active and Reserve Components by 31,300 service members, with an additional reduction of 92,600 service members over an additional 4 years. The committee is concerned with the pace of the proposed reductions and the impact it will have on national security, while the United States is engaged in ongoing contingency operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and also required to maintain a robust global security posture.

The Army and the Marine Corps will make the largest reductions over the next 5 years of 72,000 and 20,000 respectively from their fiscal year 2012 authorization levels. The end strength reductions proposed in the fiscal year 2012 budget request, which had no reductions in the Army or Marine Corps until 2015, have been discarded to begin reductions in fiscal year 2013 in order to comply with required funding levels in the Budget Control Act. A particular concern is the Administration's plan to fund additional end strength (above the fiscal year 2017 end state levels) for the Army (49,700) and Marine Corps (15,200) in the overseas contingency operations funding beginning in fiscal year 2013. If the Administration subsequently decides to accelerate troop withdrawals in Afghanistan, the overseas contingency operations funding could be dramatically reduced. This would force the Army and Marine Corps to accelerate manpower reductions or fund the personnel from other accounts.

The committee is also concerned with the reductions in the Reserve Components. The services have relied heavily on their respective Reserve Components over the past 10 years of conflict and have embraced the operational reserve as a practice versus a concept. It is imperative the Active and Reserve Components work together as a total force to maintain the All-Volunteer Force. The committee believes that the Reserve Components must be an operational reserve, mobilized periodically for real-world operational

missions to maintain and sustain the level of skills and competence so that they are capable of responding to crises or combat requirements. To achieve this objective, the committee supports sustaining a robust and viable force structure mix between the Active and Reserves to ensure the dwell time goals of 1 to 3 for Active and 1 to 5 for Reserves are met during peace and war.

Notwithstanding the fiscal pressures on the Department of Defense, the committee strongly encourages the services, in conjunction with their Reserve Components, to conduct a rigorous analysis of the Reserve force structure and end strengths to ensure the appropriate capabilities are nested in both the Active and Reserve force structure. The goal is to ensure the Total Force will be able to execute the requirements of the Combatant Commands, as well as meet the Federal and State homeland security and natural disaster requirements as part of our National Security Strategy. The Reserve Component has become an integral partner in maintaining a robust global security posture. Without the operational reserve, the Nation would have faced extreme challenges maintaining the All-Volunteer Force during 10 years of war. The committee believes it is critical the experienced gained in the Reserve Component is maintained and not lost due to fiscal constraints.

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, 2013:

Service	FY 2012 Authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Commmitte Recom-mendation	FY 2013 Request	FY 2012 Authorized
Army	562,000	552,100	552,100	0	–9,900
Navy	325,700	322,700	322,700	0	–3,000
USMC	202,100	197,300	197,300	0	–4,800
Air Force	332,800	328,900	330,383	1,483	–3,340
DOD	1,422,600	1,401,000	1,401,560	1,483	–21,040

The committee recommends an increase in end strengths to reflect the corresponding manpower requirements to maintain 18 Air Force Block 30 RQ–4 Global Hawks and the committee's limitation on retiring, divesting or transferring any aircraft assigned to the Air Force. The committee also notes the Navy end strength is approximately 5,000 less than the fiscal year 2012 authorized end strength of 325,700 and is projected to end the year at the current level. This is a drastic change from the fiscal year 2012 budget plan and what was submitted and briefed to Congress for the fiscal year 2013 budget. The committee is concerned about the Navy's ability to properly manage its manpower requirements. Over the past several years, the Navy has been over its authorized end strength levels, particularly within its officer corps, by several thousand and executed drastic force shaping measures in fiscal year 2012 to ensure that they were in compliance. As a result, the

Navy took more reductions than were necessary for budget saving measures, involuntarily forcing enlisted sailors out of the Navy. Although the committee authorizes the President's request for the Navy's end strength for fiscal year 2013, the committee is doubtful of the Navy's ability to reverse course and meet this increased authorization level. As such, the committee believes an additional 1,008 sailors to maintain 3 Cruisers in fiscal year 2013 is not needed based on current manning levels.

Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum Active Duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2013. The committee recommends 552,100 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Army, 322,700 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Navy, 197,300 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 330,383 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Air Force.

Section 403—Limitations on End Strength Reductions for Regular Component of the Army and Marine Corps

This section would limit the end strength reductions for the Regular Component of the Army to no more than 15,000 members per year, and for the Regular Component of the Marine Corps to no more than 5,000 members per year between fiscal years 2014–17. In addition, if the President determines a reduction in end strength of the Regular Component of the Army or Marine Corps (or both) is necessary, this section would require the President to submit an annual certification with the budget request that the reduction will not: undermine the ability of the Armed Forces to meet the requirements of the National Security Strategy; increase security risks for the United States; or compel members of the Armed Forces to endure diminished dwell time and repeated deployments. This section also would require that the Department of Defense budget request include amounts for the end strength of the regular component of the Army and the Marine Corps in the base budget and not through emergency, supplemental, or overseas contingency operations funds.

Section 404—Exclusion of Members within the Integrated Disability Evaluation System from End Strength Levels for Active Forces

This section would exclude a member of the Armed Forces who is within the Integrated Disability Evaluation System as of the last day of any fiscal year from 2013 through 2018 from counting toward the end strength levels for Active Duty members of the Armed Forces prescribed for that fiscal year. This section would require that the funding for this population be paid from the overseas contingency operations account.

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, 2013:

Service	FY 2012 Authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Commmitte Recom-mendation	FY 2013 Request	FY 2012 Authorized
Army National Guard	358,200	358,200	358,200	0	0
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	66,200	62,500	62,500	0	–3,700
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	106,700	101,600	106,005	4,405	–5,100
Air Force Reserve	71,400	70,500	72,428	1,928	–900
DOD Total	847,100	837,400	843,733	6,333	–9,700
Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	9,000	9,000	0	–1,000

The committee's increase to the President's FY13 budget request reflects the corresponding manpower requirements for the committee's limitation on retiring, divesting or transferring any aircraft assigned to the Air Force.

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, 2013:

Service	FY 2012 Authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Commmitte Recom-mendation	FY 2013 Request	FY 2012 Authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	32,060	32,060	0	0
Army Reserve	16,261	16,277	16, 277	0	16
Naval Reserve	10,337	10,114	10,114	0	–223
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,833	14,305	14,952	647	–528
Air Force Reserve	2,662	2,888	2,888	0	226
DOD Total	78,414	77,905	78,552	647	–509

The committee's increase to the President's FY13 budget request reflects the corresponding manpower requirements for the committee's limitation on retiring, divesting or transferring any aircraft assigned to the Air Force.

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, 2013:

Service	FY 2012 Authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Commmitte Recom-mendation	FY 2013 Request	FY 2012 Authorized
Army National Guard	27,210	28,380	27,210	–1,170	0
Army Reserve	8,395	8,445	8,395	–50	0
Air National Guard	22,509	21,101	22,272	1,171	–1,408
Air Force Reserve	10,777	10,283	10,946	663	–494
DOD Total	68,891	68,209	68,823	614	–1,902

This section would establish limits for fiscal year 2013 on the number of dual status technicians authorized for the Reserve Components of the Army and Air Force. The budget request included an increase in the statutory limit on dual status technicians for the Army Reserve by 50 members and the Army National Guard by 1,170 members. Although the committee is supportive of the operational reserve and believes that there are requirements for increases in full time support, the committee cannot support an increase in the number of technicians at this time. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to review the projected 5-year requirements for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve full-time manning and implement a plan to increase full time manning in both those components. The committee has yet to receive the review and the implementation plan from this directive. After several field visits and meetings with the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, the committee believes it is best to take a comprehensive approach to the full-time manning of the operational reserve rather than piecemeal which has been the case over the past 5 years. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to conclude the review and provide a comprehensive full time support implementation plan to the committee. The committee's increase to the President's FY13 budget request reflects the corresponding manpower requirements for the committee's limitation on retiring, divesting or transferring any aircraft assigned to the Air Force.

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2013 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, 2013:

Service	FY 2012 Authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Commmitte Recom-mendation	FY 2013 Request	FY 2012 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of Reserve Component personnel who may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty during fiscal year 2013 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 2012 Authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Commmitte Recom-mendation	FY 2013 Request	FY 2012 Authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Naval Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in the funding table in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee has taken a number of initiatives in this title that address major issues of concern.

In the area of general service authorities, the committee authorized additional behavioral health professionals to conduct pre-separation medical exams for post-traumatic stress disorder. To improve the process for accounting for missing persons, the committee authorized the Department of Defense to accept voluntary services from non-Department of Defense entities. With regard to expanding the roles of women in the military services, the committee required the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the feasibility of developing gender neutral performance standards

In the area of military justice the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to make changes to policy or the Manual for Courts-Martial that would require the special court-martial convening authority to administer the process for handling cases of rape and sexual assault. Under the policy, no commander below colonel or Navy captain could administer justice for those offenses. The committee also directed the Secretaries of the military services to establish special victim teams. These teams comprised of specially trained investigators, prosecutors, and victim witness support

personnel, would be available to deal with the offenses of child abuse, serious domestic violence and sexual offenses. In addition, the committee would require a briefing, recommendations and a plan to improve the way the military services address hazing.

To assist the transition of service members out of the Armed Forces, the committee transferred the Troops to Teachers program from the Department of Education to the Department of Defense, and expanded the eligibility to service members with four years of active service rather than the six years of service required under current law.

To improve family readiness, the committee authorized $30 million to support local educational activities heavily impacted by dependents of military families, and the committee provided statutory protection for child custody arrangements for parents who are members of the Armed Forces. That provision is to ensure that deployed service members do not lose custody simply on the basis that a parent with custody was deployed.

Finally, the committee acted to preserve the editorial independence of the Stars and Stripes military publications by requiring that the Stars and Stripes staff remain in its current leased location until such time as the Department of Defense can find no-cost government office space that is geographically removed from the Defense Media Activity at Fort Meade, Maryland.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assistance for Service Members Transitioning to the Civilian Sector

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) provided the Secretaries of the military departments the authority to establish apprenticeship programs to prepare service members for employment in the civilian sector. The committee is aware of the high unemployment rate for veterans, particularly younger veterans who have recently left the military service. The committee strongly supports programs that assists service members in gaining apprenticeship training so that they can successfully enter the workforce with a defined skill set. The committee encourages the Secretaries of the military departments to provide information on such transition programs to both service members, the private sector, including contractors that support the Department of Defense and other entities to improve awareness and increase the availability of apprenticeship opportunities for transitioning service members. The committee also urges the Secretaries of the military departments to consider establishing a transitional support program that would fast-track service members into civilian positions, particularly in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

Award of Prisoner-of-War Medal to Service Members Held at Wauwilermoos, Switzerland

The committee understands that during World War II, airmen who were forced to make emergency landings in the Swiss Confederation were interned under generous circumstances, some in hotels, and given strict instructions not to attempt to escape in order

for Switzerland to maintain neutrality. Some service members who attempted to escape were transferred to Wauwilermoos. There, as documentation available to the Secretary of the Air Force substantiates, Air Force internees were held under extremely inhumane conditions.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to review the rationale for awarding the prisoner-of-war medal to some Wauwilermoos internees and not to others, and to provide a written summary of the review and its conclusions to the House Committee on Armed Services. The report concluded that since Switzerland remained neutral during World War II, it was not a foreign armed force that was hostile to the United States, and therefore, service members interned at Wauwilermoos did not meet the qualifying criterion of the medal. The report also concluded that the decision to award the prisoner-of-war medal to some Wauwilermoos internees was a mistake, but it does not appear that the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Air Force took any action to revoke the awards.

The committee believes that all Wauwilermoos internees should have been treated in a similar fashion and awarded the prisoner-of-war medal. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would amend section 1128 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the statutory language on which denials have been based. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to award the prisoner-of war medal to all Air Force internees held at Wauwilermoos within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Biometric Identification for Recruiting

The committee commends the Department of the Army for its innovative use of biometric identification equipment to conduct moral background checks during the initial stages in the recruiting process, which saves valuable time and resources before the recruit processes into the Army at the Military Entrance Process Stations (MEPS). Fielding biometric capabilities enables the Department of Defense to rapidly verify the backgrounds of recruits to ensure they are commensurate with the high standard of military service prior to final enlistment. There is often a lengthy time period between when the recruit signs an enlistment contract and processes through the MEPS, creating a delay for background verification and potentially wasted time and resources for the recruiter, if the result is a negative background check. The Army's Early Background Check Program allows recruiters at almost all Army recruiting locations to conduct the verification process early to ensure their efforts are focused on qualified candidates. Although all the military services use electronic fingerprint capture at the MEPS to initiate background checks prior to final acceptance into the military, the committee believes there is value for the Secretary of Defense to consider the feasibility of expanding the Army's program to all the military services.

Comptroller General Review of the Secretary of Defense's Efforts To Increase the Capability and Capacity of the Department of Defense to Account for Missing Persons

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of Defense's efforts to increase the effectiveness, integration, capability, and capacity to account for missing persons has not complied with section 541 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). To date, the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Joint Prisoners of War, Missing in Action Accounting Command (JPAC), and the military service organizations have been unable to work together to achieve a unified, synchronized program. Rather, the committee notes that the effort to account for missing persons is being hampered by what appears to be an inter-agency dispute between the major accounting organizations, the Defense Prisoners of War/Missing Personnel Office and JPAC. The committee believes that a lack of oversight by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff is a contributing factor to the current situation and must be improved upon in the future.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Secretary of Defense's efforts to significantly increase the capability and capacity of the Department of Defense to account for missing persons in accordance with section 1509 of title 10, United States Code. The Comptroller General should report the findings and recommendations of the review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2013. The review should include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) An assessment of any guidance provided by the Secretary of Defense to implement the program required by section 1509 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) An assessment of the process used by the Department of Defense to determine the proper funds, personnel and resources required to implement a program involving all elements of the accounting command; to increase the integration and coordination of the accounting effort; to expand the capability and capacity of the Department of Defense to achieve the requirement to account for 200 missing persons annually by 2015; and whether the current plans within the accounting community are being implemented in a manner to accomplish the goal for annual accounting of missing persons.

(3) An assessment of the structure of the POW/MIA accounting community, as defined in section 1509(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to include the command relationships in-and-between the organizations; whether those command relationships constitute the most efficient organizational structure to effectively and efficiently accomplish the POW/MIA accounting mission; and whether there are duplicate efforts within the organizations in the POW/MIA accounting community which can be consolidated or eliminated in order to create efficiencies and continuity.

(4) Recommendations to improve the accounting effort, including any recommended legislation required to improve the

effectiveness, integration, and capability to account for missing persons.

Department of Defense Outreach Efforts to Increase the Hiring of Wounded Warriors

The committee commends the Department of Defense for their efforts to assist in the transition of wounded warriors into civilian positions within Federal agencies, Congress, and the private sector. The committee encourages the Department to continue its outreach efforts, and to include State and local governments that may be interested in hiring wounded warriors.

Fair Treatment for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Service Members

The committee is concerned that the value of highly experienced Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve service members will not be taken into consideration during the reduction of force structure and change in unit missions announced with the release of the budget request. The committee believes that every effort should be explored to retain service members by instituting robust reassignment and retraining initiatives. In those cases where service members cannot be retained in an Active Duty status, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, before the first of those involuntary separations is executed, to examine the process by which service members are separated and the package of benefits made available to them. The committee believes that service members' length of service should be considered and that the welfare of service members and families are protected, to include special attention to health care and educational benefits. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to inform the Secretary of Defense and Congress of any legislative proposals that may be required to remedy deficiencies in the separation benefits package being provided to Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve service members.

Increased Flexibility of Military Families to Choose Enrollment of their Dependents in Local Educational Agencies

The committee recognizes that the availability of a quality public education for children is an important quality-of-life factor for service members and their families, and that concerns about the availability and quality of elementary and secondary education options impact readiness, job satisfaction, and retention of military personnel. A majority of the children of military personnel attend a school administered by a local educational agency near the military installation where one or both of their parents are assigned. Military families are typically reassigned every 3 years and have little choice in their assignments. The average military child will move six to nine times during their K–12 school career, which is three times more often than the average non-military child. Family mobility creates a variety of challenges for military families seeking a quality education.

While the committee is encouraged by State and school district adoption of inter-district and intra-district policies that allow greater flexibility to service members in choosing schools for their chil-

dren, research conducted by the American Institutes for Research in 2011 for the Department of Defense demonstrates that a significant percentage of military families still reside in districts that do not allow the family to choose a regular public school through inter- or intra-district transfer programs. Rather, these families are assigned schools by geographic default, even when other school district boundaries are near the base or multiple school boundaries overlap onto the base. This is particularly troubling for military families who reside on military installations and are assigned to schools that have been identified as being in need of improvement. The committee notes that the lack of flexibility available to military families when selecting public school assignments negatively impacts morale, readiness, and retention of military personnel.

The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to identify the school districts with substantial on-base military dependent populations, such as those receiving impact aid from the Department of Education or from the Department of Defense or other bases, that have not implemented inter- or intra-district transfer programs. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on an action plan for providing better educational equity, opportunity and flexibility for military families residing on military installations in those districts. The plan should identify the greatest problem areas and provide recommended courses of action.

Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

The committee notes that the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, to develop and implement a plan to increase the number of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) units to not less than 3,700 by September 30, 2020. There are approximately 3,459 JROTC units currently being supported by the military services. The committee understands that given the constraints of the current fiscal environment, the services are reassessing their plans to reach the required number of units. However, the committee remains committed to the goal of not less than 3,700 total JROTC units by 2020, and awaits the Secretary of Defense's report on any modifications to the services' plans to reach the required number of units.

In addition, the committee is interested in how the authority requested by the Department of Defense to allow the services to provide arms, tentage, and equipment to schools without a JROTC unit with at least 50 students who are in the grade above the eighth grade may impact the ability of the services to support an end state of 3,700 JROTC units. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on how a change in the authority will balance the demands for resources between the JROTC units and other institutions without an official JROTC unit. The briefing should also provide any change to the mandate to achieve 3,700 JROTC units by 2020, if the proposed authority is enacted.

Marketing and Advertising for Recruiting

The committee recognizes the importance of using marketing and advertising, such as motorsports and extreme sports sponsorship, for the purposes of recruiting qualified youth to serve in the military and to maintain a positive presence with influencers. Without this ability, the military services may be faced with challenges recruiting qualified youth when economic conditions are favorable for employment in the civilian workforce. The committee encourages the service secretaries to ensure proper resources are applied to marketing and advertising programs essential to maintaining the All-Volunteer Force.

Military Technician (Dual Status)

The committee continues to have concerns with the management of the military technician (dual status) workforce and encourages the secretaries concerned to ensure that military technicians (dual status) understand the requirements of their employment, and the benefits and entitlements available to them as military technicians (dual status), including their rights before the Qualitative Retention Board and Selective Retention Boards. The committee also encourages the leadership of the Reserve Components to ensure the use and management of military technicians (dual status) is consistent with the laws, policies, and regulations governing military technicians (dual status).

Private John Sipe Medal of Honor Review

The committee is aware that for nearly 10 years the Department of Defense has been reviewing the request to award the Medal of Honor to Private John A. Sipe, Company I of the 205th Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, United States Army, for his bravery at the Battle of Fort Stedman during the Civil War. Private Sipe showed inspirational leadership and gallantry by fearlessly charging the rebel lines and subsequently capturing the rebel flag.

The committee is aware that the Army recommended Private Sipe be awarded the Medal of Honor in 2009. The committee is disappointed with the protracted amount of time the Department of Defense has taken to review the Medal of Honor request and urges the Department to complete its review in a timely manner and report its findings back to the committee.

Recognition for Remotely Piloted Aircraft Pilots

The Committee recognizes the important contributions remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) pilots have made in the theaters of operation. RPA pilots are crucial to missions overseas, flying some of the military's important weapons systems such as the MQ–1 and MQ–9. Their efforts have led to the collection of important intelligence by carrying out missions that would otherwise be too dangerous for manned aircraft. Their role in supporting the war fighters with precision fire support and high endurance surveillance is invaluable. Since the deployment of remotely piloted aircrafts into combat zones, they have proven to be a crucial component in the War on Terror. RPA pilots have supported their fellow war fighters in hazardous situations, both in the conduct of day-to-day activities, as

well as special operations. The RPA mission has allowed service members to better execute their military missions, and has aided in the capturing or killing of many high value targets. The committee encourages the Secretaries of the military departments to properly recognize these pilots for their contributions and accomplishments. In particular, the committee is concerned that RPA pilots may not have fair and equal opportunities for promotion as compared to their manned aircraft pilot counterparts and urges the services to continue to review and improve their policies to address this issue.

Recognition for the Surviving Children of Those Who Die While Serving Our Nation

Over 6,400 service members have made the ultimate sacrifice while serving in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn. While each and every loss is painfully heartbreaking, it is particularly hard for the hundreds of children who are now bereft of their father or mother. The committee recognizes their tragic loss, and recommends that the Secretary of Defense consider awarding these children a token of appreciation for their sacrifice, such as a Gold Medal of Remembrance.

Report on Metrics To Track Sexual Assault

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has developed a centralized, case-level database for documenting reported cases of sexual assault that became initially operational on March 30, 2012, and is expected to be fully operational by August 2012. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to continue to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services with reports on the status of the Defense Incident-Based Reporting System and the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database until the Secretary certifies that both systems are fully functional and operational. The committee further notes that the Government Accountability Office has made a number of recommendations that address the development and implementation of the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database. Accordingly, not earlier than 1 year following certification by the Secretary of Defense, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database to ensure that the appropriate metrics and data are being gathered to allow for greater transparency and assessment of sexual assault within the Department of Defense. The committee further directs the Comptroller General to complete the review and provide a report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 545 days after the date of the certification by the Secretary of Defense.

Robust Diversity Outreach Efforts for Officer Accessions

It is important that recruitment and retention policies and programs ensure that a wide-range of communities across the United States are captured to provide the Services a large pool of well-

qualified, diverse candidates to consider. To address this issue, the committee encourages the Services to provide resources and personnel to ensure robust diversity outreach efforts for officer accessions so that each Service has access to qualified diverse individuals for initial development of officers. This critical investment will allow the Services to identify the best and brightest for our military and for America's future.

Support for Naval Heritage Initiatives

The committee urges the Department of the Navy to support initiatives that honor and recognize U.S. naval heritage.

Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program

The committee recognizes the Department of Defense continues to improve its efforts to assist military personnel successfully transition from the military to civilian life. The committee applauds the National Guard and Reserve Components for its implementation and enhancement of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program. The Office for Reintegration Programs has made significant strides in working with States to assist in the development of outreach programs for members of the Armed Forces and their families. This has been invaluable for informing and educating members of the National Guard and the Reserve Components on the services and assistance available to them to ensure that the Nation fulfills its promise to the All-Volunteer Force. However, the committee is concerned that there are still gaps in transition from the Department of Defense to the Department of Veterans Affairs that impacts service members and their families, many of whom are simply unaware of the numerous services and assistance programs provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Further, the men and women who are most susceptible to falling victim to the inadequacies of the transition from the Department of Defense to the Department of Veterans Affairs are oftentimes the most "at-risk" veterans. In addition, the committee believes that there are transitioning Active Duty service members who may benefit from the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act on the feasibility of expanding access and outreach to transitioning Active Duty service members into the latter phases of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program. The briefing should also address the ability of the Office for Reintegration Programs to work with the Department of Defense, the States, and Department of Veterans Affairs regional offices to contact service members and veterans returning from Active Duty, and discuss any initiatives necessary that may improve information sharing between the agencies, and awareness of transitioning and returning veterans at the outreach execution level within communities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

Section 501—Limitation on Number of Navy Flag Officers on Active Duty

This section would eliminate the exemption for the Director of the Nurse Corps and the Director of the Medical Service Corps from counting against the statutory limits on Navy flag officers on Active Duty.

Section 502—Exception to Required Retirement After 30 Years of Service for Regular Navy Warrant Officers in the Grade of Chief Warrant Officer, W–5

This section would increase from 30 years to 33 years the total active military service a Navy warrant officer in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–5, may serve prior to being statutorily retired for length of service.

Section 503—Air Force Chief and Deputy Chief of Chaplains

This section would establish the positions of Chief of Chaplains and Deputy Chief of Chaplains in the Air Force in statute. This section would replace the Air Force's current central selection process for the Chief of Chaplains, which is restrictive, with a process similar to that used for the selection of Staff Judge Advocates General of the military services. This section would also allow candidates in the grade of colonel and above to be considered for selection.

Section 504—Extension of Temporary Authority To Reduce Minimum Length of Active Service as a Commissioned Officer Required for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer

This section would continue the authority for the Secretaries of the military departments to reduce from 10 to 8 years, the amount of commissioned service required for a service member to retire as an officer. The expiration of the authority would be extended from September 30, 2013, to September 30, 2018.

Section 505—Temporary Increase in the Time-in-Grade Retirement Waiver Limitation for Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps and Commanders and Captains in the Navy

This section would create a temporary discretionary authority for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to retire in their current grades up to 4 percent of the total population of officers in the grades of O–5 and O–6 within each service, even though the officers do not possess 3 years service-in-grade. The limit under current law is 2 percent. The authority would expire September 30, 2018.

Section 506—Modification to Limitations on Number of Officers for Whom Service-In-Grade Requirements May Be Reduced for Retirement in Grade Upon Voluntary Retirement

This section would create a temporary discretionary authority for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to retire in their current grades up to 5 percent, or 10 percent in the case of the Marine Corps, of their total population of officers in the grades of 0–7 and 0–8, even though the officers do not possess 3 years service-in-grade. The limit under current law is 2 percent. The authority would expire September 30, 2017.

Section 507—Diversity in Military Leadership and Related Reporting Requirements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a plan to measure the efforts of the Department to achieve a diverse leadership that reflects the population of the United States. The Secretary would also be required to include information on progress in implementing the plan and additional demographic data in the Department of Defense Manpower Requirements report.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Codification of Staff Assistant Positions for Joint Staff Related to National Guard and Reserve Matters

This section would repeal section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) and make the provisions of that section part of title 10, United States Code. This section would also amend the language of the new section in title 10 by requiring the assistants to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have significant joint duty experience, as determined by the Chairman, and that the assistants be included in the limited exclusions for joint duty assignments, under section 526(b) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 512—Automatic Federal Recognition of Promotion of Certain National Guard Warrant Officers

This section would automatically confer Federal recognition on members of the National Guard who are promoted from the grade of warrant officer 1, W–1, to chief warrant officer 2, W–2.

SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Section 521—Modifications to Career Intermission Pilot Program

This section would expand the population eligible for the Career Intermission Pilot Program to include Reserve Component members serving on Active Duty. This section would also authorize service members to retain their earned leave balance as well as to go through processing for disability separation while participating in the program.

Section 522—Authority for Additional Behavioral Health Professionals to Conduct Pre-Separation Medical Exams for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

This section would authorize licensed clinical social workers and psychiatric nurse practitioners to conduct pre-administrative separation medical examinations to determine if the service member suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder, a factor that should be considered by the service member's commander prior to administrative separation.

Section 523—Authority to Accept Voluntary Services to Assist Department of Defense Efforts To Account for Missing Persons

This section would amend section 1501(a)(6) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept gratuitous or voluntary services in circumstances in which the Secretary deems that such services may assist in accounting for missing personnel.

Section 524—Authorized Leave Available for Members of the Armed Forces Upon Birth or Adoption of a Child

This section would increase the number of days of non-chargeable leave from 21 to 42 that a service member may be granted following adoption of a child, if the service member is the primary caregiver of the child. The section would also provide that the other service member of a dual military couple may also be awarded 10 days of non-chargeable leave that may be taken at the same time as the primary caregiver is on adoption leave. This section would bring the adoption leave authority in line with the non-chargeable leave provided to service members who delivered a newborn child and dual military couples who were able to conceive a child naturally.

Section 525—Command Responsibility and Accountability for Remains of Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps Who Die Outside the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that there is a continuous military command responsibility and accountability for the remains of each deceased member of the military services who died outside of the United States.

Section 526—Report on Feasibility of Developing Gender-Neutral Occupational Standards for Military Occupational Specialties Currently Closed to Women

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the feasibility of incorporating gender-neutral occupational standards for military occupational specialties closed to female members of the Armed Forces.

Section 527—Compliance with Medical Profiles Issued for Members of the Armed Forces

The section would require the Secretary of a military department to ensure commanding officers do not prohibit or restrict the ability of physicians to issue a medical profile and to comply with the terms of the medical profile for the member of the armed forces.

SUBTITLE D—MILITARY JUSTICE AND LEGAL MATTERS

Section 531—Clarification and Enhancement of the Role of Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps

This section would authorize the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps to supervise the administration of justice and delivery of legal assistance within the Marine Corps; provide professional supervision over all judge advocates of the Marine Corps; and establish a direct relationship with the Secretary of the Navy.

Section 532—Persons Who May Exercise Disposition Authority Regarding Charges Involving Certain Sexual Misconduct Offenses Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement a policy to have the Secretaries of the military departments withhold disposition authority under the Uniform Code of Military Justice for certain sexual offenses under sections 920, 925 and 880 of title 10, United States Code. The policy required by this section would establish that the disposition authority in such cases would be no lower than the special court-martial convening authority, who holds the grade of colonel, or in the case of the Navy, the grade of captain, who has a legal advisor and is in the chain of command of the person accused of committing the offense. This section would not preclude the general court-martial convening authority from acting in lieu of the special court-martial convening authority, nor would this section preclude other offenses related to the alleged sexual offenses from being considered by the special court-martial convening authority.

Section 533—Independent Review and Assessment of Uniform Code of Military Justice and Judicial Proceedings of Sexual Assault Cases

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an independent panel to conduct a review and assessment of judicial proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice involving sexual assault and related offenses in order to develop potential improvements in such proceedings. Authority for the panel would expire September 30, 2017.

Section 534—Collection and Retention of Records on Disposition of Reports of Sexual Assault

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to establish a record on the disposition of sexual assaults and retain the records for at least 20 years.

Section 535—Briefing, Plan, and Recommendations Regarding Efforts To Prevent and Respond to Hazing Incidents Involving Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by May 1, 2013, on the plan to establish the Department of Defense effort to prevent hazing in the Armed Forces, and to respond to and resolve alleged hazing incidents. This section would also require the Secretary to provide recommendations for changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the Manual for Courts-Martial to improve the prosecution of hazing incidents as part of the briefing. In addition, this section would require the Secretary to establish a database to determine the extent to which hazing incidents are occurring and the nature of such incidents, as well as to track, respond to, and resolve hazing incidents involving members of the Armed Forces.

Section 536—Protection of Rights of Conscience of Members of the Armed Forces and Chaplains of Such Members

This section would require the Armed Forces to accommodate the moral principles and religious beliefs of service members concerning appropriate and inappropriate expression of human sexuality and that such beliefs may not be used as a basis for any adverse personnel actions. This section would establish the responsibility of chaplains to provide for the spiritual needs of their faith group and comply with the tenets of their faith while facilitating the religious needs of all service members. This section would also prohibit any member of the Armed Forces from (1) requiring a chaplain to perform any duty or religious ceremony that is contrary to the tenets of the chaplain's conscience, moral principles, religious beliefs or the tenets of the chaplain's religious faith, or (2) discriminating or taking any adverse personnel action against a chaplain because of a refusal to comply with a direction to perform a duty or religious ceremony that is contrary to the tenets of the chaplain's conscience, moral principles, religious beliefs or the tenets of the chaplain's religious faith.

Section 537—Use of Military Installations as Sites for Marriage Ceremonies or Marriage-Like Ceremonies

This section would preclude marriage and marriage-like ceremonies from being conducted on military installations or other property owned or rented by, or otherwise under the control of the Department of Defense, unless the ceremony involves the union of one man with one woman.

SUBTITLE E—MEMBER EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 541—Transfer of Troops-to-Teachers Program from Department of Education to Department of Defense and Enhancements to the Program

This section would transfer responsibility and authority for operation and administration of the Troops to Teachers Program from the Department of Education to the Department of Defense.

Section 542—Support of Naval Academy Athletic and Physical Fitness Programs

This section would amend chapter 603 of title 10, United States Code, to grant the Secretary of the Navy authority to enter into a collaborative agreement with the Naval Academy Athletic Association in support of the United States Naval Academy's athletic and physical fitness programs.

Section 543—Department of Defense Inspector General Review of Access to Military Installations by Representatives of For-Profit Educational Institutions

This section would require the Department of Defense Inspector General to conduct a review to determine the extent of access that representatives of for-profit educational institutions have to military installations and whether there are adequate safeguards in place to regulate such access.

SUBTITLE F—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Section 551—Issuance of Prisoner-of-War Medal

This section would amend section 1128 of title 10, United States Code, to permit the prisoner-of-war medal to be awarded to any person serving in any capacity with the Armed Forces who was taken prisoner or held captive by a foreign armed force under circumstances that the Secretary concerned finds to have been comparable to those under which persons have generally been held captive by enemy armed forces. Under current law, the foreign armed forces must have been found to be hostile to the United States.

Section 552—Award of Purple Heart to Members of the Armed Forces Who Were Victims of the Attacks at Recruiting Station in Little Rock, Arkansas, and at Fort Hood, Texas

This section would require the Secretary concerned to award the Purple Heart to members of the Armed Forces who were killed or wounded in the attacks that occurred at the recruiting station in Little Rock, Arkansas, on June 1, 2009, and at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009.

SUBTITLE G—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION AND MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

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 (DOD) assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by the enrollment of dependent children of military members and DOD civilian employees. This section would also authorize $5.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies with significant changes in enrollment of school-aged dependents of military members and civilian employees due to base closures, force structure changes, or force relocations.

Section 562—Transitional Compensation for Dependent Children Who Were Carried During Pregnancy at the Time of the Dependent-Abuse Offense Committed by an Individual While a Member of the Armed Forces

This section would extend transitional compensation benefits and payments provided to victims of dependent abuse under section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, to children carried during pregnancy at the time of a dependent-abuse offense.

Section 563—Modification of Authority to Allow Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools to Enroll Certain Students

This section would authorize the dependent of a member of the Armed Forces or a dependent of a Federal employee who had been enrolled in the overseas Defense Dependents' Education System and was evacuated, to enroll in a Department of Defense domestic elementary and secondary education school near the safe haven where they were evacuated. This section would also authorize the dependent of an Active Duty member of the Armed Forces who upon return to the United States is enrolled in the elementary or secondary school of a local educational agency, to enroll in the Department of Defense's virtual elementary and secondary education program on a tuition-paying basis.

Section 564—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 against a service member when determining the best interest of a child.

Section 565—Treatment of Relocation of Members of the Armed Forces for Active Duty for Purposes of Mortgage Refinancing

This section would amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533) to authorize a service member to refinance a principal residence if the service member does not reside in the residence because of a permanent change of duty station.

Section 566—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Yellow Ribbon Day

This section would express the sense of Congress supporting the goals and ideals of Yellow Ribbon Day in honor of members of the Armed Forces and U.S. civilians who are serving overseas apart from their families and loved ones.

SUBTITLE H—IMPROVED SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Section 571—Establishment of Special Victim Teams to Respond to Allegations of Child Abuse, Serious Domestic Violence, or Sexual Offenses

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to establish special victim teams for the investigation, prosecution, and victim support in connection with child abuse, serious domestic violence, or sexual offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In addition, this section would require the Secretary of each military department to determine the number of special victim teams to be established, and prescribe regulations for the management and employment of the teams in order to provide effective, timely, and responsive world-wide support. This section would also require that at least one special victim team in each military department be available for employment not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Furthermore, this section would require each Secretary to provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a plan and time line for the establishment of the remainder of the special victim teams that the Secretary has determined are needed.

Section 572—Enhancement to Training and Education for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide for sexual assault training during pre-command and command courses.

Section 573—Enhancement to Requirements for Availability of Information on Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Resources

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prominently post information on sexual assault prevention and response at specific locations throughout the Department of Defense.

Section 574—Modification of Annual Department of Defense Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Assaults

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to include additional information in the case synopsis portion of the report on sexual assaults required by section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

Section 575—Inclusion of Sexual Harassment Incidents in Annual Department of Defense Reports on Sexual Assaults

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to include information on sexual harassment in the annual Department of Defense report on sexual assault.

Section 576—Continued Submission of Progress Reports Regarding Certain Incident Information Management Tools

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to continue to provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report on the establishment of the Defense Incident-Based Reporting System and the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database until the Secretary certifies that both systems are fully functional and operational.

Section 577—Briefings on Department of Defense Actions Regarding Sexual Assault Prevention and Response in the Armed Forces

This section requires the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to brief the Senate Committee Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the status of implementation of the sexual assault provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 112–81) and the initiative announced by the Secretary of Defense on April 24, 2012.

Section 578—Armed Forces Workplace and Gender Relations Surveys

This section would require the Armed Forces Workplace and Gender Relations Survey be conducted in 2014 and 2015 and every 2 years thereafter and include information in the reports on sexual assault.

Section 579—Requirement for Commanders to Conduct Annual Organizational Climate Assessments

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide for matters relating to sexual assault to be included in organizational climate assessments conducted annually and within 120 days of assuming command.

Section 580—Additional Requirements for Organizational Climate Assessment

This section would require the secretary of Defense to direct the secretaries of the military departments verify and track compliance of commander conducting organizational climate assessments.

Section 581—Review of Unrestricted Reports of Sexual Assault and Subsequent Separation of Members Making Such Reports

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of all unrestricted reports of sexual assault made by members of the Armed Forces since October 2000 to determine the number of members who were separated from the service following reporting sexual assault and the reason the member was separated. The amendment would require the Secretary to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of the review.

Section 582—Limitation on Release From Active Duty or Recall to Active Duty of Reserve Component Members Who Are Victims of Sexual Assault While On Active Duty

This section would authorize members of the reserve components to remain on active duty or be recalled to active duty for up to 180 days to complete a line of duty determination in cases of sexual assault.

Section 583—Inclusion of Information on Substantiated Reports of Sexual Harassment in Member's Official Service Record

This section would require substantiated reports of sexual harassment made against a member of the military services to be included in the service record of the member.

SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

Section 590—Inclusion of Freely Associated States Within Scope of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Program

This section would amend section 2031(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to establish and maintain a unit of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps at a secondary education institution if the conditions of section 2031(b) of title 10, United States Code, are met.

Section 591—Preservation of Editorial Independence of Stars and Stripes

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to extend the lease for the commercial office space in the District of Columbia currently occupied by the editorial staff and management operations of "Stars and Stripes." This section would extend the lease until the Secretary can provide space and support for the operations of "Stars and Stripes" in a Government-owned facility that is located within the National Capital Region that is geographically remote from the Defense Media Activity's facilities at Fort Meade, Maryland. The committee believes it is critically important to preserving the editorial independence of "Stars and Stripes."

Section 592—Sense of Congress Regarding Designation of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps" as National Song of Remembrance

This section would express the sense of Congress that "Taps" should be designated as the National Song of Remembrance.

Section 593—Recommended Conduct During Sounding of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps"

This section would establish the recommended conduct of persons during the sounding of the bugle call known as "Taps".

Section 594—Inspection of Military Cemeteries Under the Jurisdiction of Department of Defense

This section would amend section 1(d)1 of Public Law 111–339 to eliminate the requirement for the Secretary of the Army to report on Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, and the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, District of Columbia, in fiscal year 2013. Instead, this section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct the inspection, thereby eliminating the current requirement that both the Secretary of the Army and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense conduct inspections in 2013.

This section would also provide both the Inspector General of the Department of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments an additional 6 months to meet the inspection and reporting requirements in section 592(d)(2) of Public Law 112–81, which requires the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to inspect a statistically valid sample of cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Secretaries of the military departments and for the Secretaries of the military departments to report their plans for corrective actions to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. The new suspense dates for the Inspector General and the Secretaries of the military departments would be June 29, 2013, and October 1, 2013, respectively.

Section 595—Pilot Program to Provide Transitional Assistance to Members of the Armed Forces With a Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct pilot programs to provide transitional assistance to members of the Armed Forces with a focus on science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that robust and flexible compensation programs are central to maintaining a high-quality, combat-ready force. Accordingly, the committee recommends an across-the-board pay raise of 1.7 percent to ensure that military pay rates keep pace with pay increases in the private sector, as measured by the Employment Cost Index. The committee recommends that the authorities for a wide array of bonuses, special and incentive pays, and other compensation benefits set to expire on December 31, 2012, be extended for an additional year.

The committee also recommends two provisions that would extend the availability of housing and shopping benefits to service

members and their families following an involuntary separation during the drawdown of military forces.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Military Resale Participation in Container Deposit Programs

The committee is aware that military exchange and commissary systems do not directly participate in State and local container deposit programs designed to control litter and advance recycling objectives. The committee understands that as agencies of the Federal Government, military exchange and commissary systems would not historically participate in State and local programs that are viewed as taxation, although container deposit programs are generally viewed as user fees. The committee recognizes that container deposit programs are highly valued initiatives in the States and locales in which they are operated. However, the committee would like to better understand the implications of requiring the military resale community to participate in container deposit programs, as well as the potential for setting a precedent with broad consequences for the Federal Government regarding the participation of a Federal agency in State and local tax or user fee programs. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2013, assessing if it is appropriate for military exchange and commissary systems to participate in State and local container deposit programs. The Secretary should consider the implications of a decision to support the participation of military resale organizations in container deposit programs and, at a minimum, provide an assessment of:

(1) The impact on the operations and financial management of military resale organizations.

(2) The cost and other burdens imposed on patrons of military resale organizations.

(3) The potential for far reaching precedents with implications for all appropriated and nonappropriated fund activities throughout the Federal Government.

(4) The legal questions associated with such a decision, to include any concerns about the constitutionality of such participation.

(5) Examples of how the Department of Defense complies with State or local beverage container laws.

The Secretary should also include in the report a recommendation concerning the propriety of military exchanges and commissaries participating in State and local container deposit programs. The committee further directs the Secretary not to assign responsibility for managing the conduct of the study and the writing of the resulting report to any military exchange system or commissary system.

Military Retirement Modernization Commission

The committee has reviewed the President's legislative proposal to establish a military retirement modernization commission to review and make recommendations to modernize the military retire-

ment system to ensure that the system remains fiscally sustainable and supports the need to recruit and retain a quality force. The committee is concerned that the proposal includes provisions that would unnecessarily limit the legislative authority of the House of Representatives by imposing a legislative process that eliminates the ability of the House of Representatives to amend the legislation proposed by the President. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should submit to the President, for submission to Congress, the retirement modernization proposal that he and the uniformed leaders of the military departments consider necessary. The committee believes that Congress, with the benefit of a retirement modernization proposal that reflects the best judgment of the civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense, can debate and, if judged appropriate, improve and finalize a reform proposal. The committee believes that the House of Representatives should have a voice in shaping this important benefit and should not abandon its Constitutional responsibility to consider this specific legislation in accordance with the regular order rules of the House of Representatives.

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Nonappropriated Fund Contract Options

The committee is concerned that military department managers of Department of Defense morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) nonappropriated fund activities have concluded that they do not have the authority to engage in service contracts that involve multiple installations and extend over several years. The committee believes this question should be formally settled and, if necessary, resolved with corrective legislation. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2013, a report verifying whether the perceived contracting restriction identified by MWR managers is in place and, if so, to identify the contracting law that imposes the restriction. The report should also include a legislative proposal that would remove the restriction, as well as the Secretary's assessment of the situation and recommendations for an appropriate course of action.

Physical Evaluation Board Liaison Officers

The committee continues to receive information that suggests there is an inadequate number of Physical Evaluation Board Liaison Officers (PEBLO) at some Department of Defense (DOD) installations, and that some of the PEBLOs are inadequately trained and lack sufficient experience to fulfill their job responsibilities. The committee is aware that wounded warriors and other individuals required to meet Physical Evaluation Boards (PEB) have reported that their assigned PEBLOs are overworked, yet many also lack the experience necessary to assist them successfully resolve their status within the Disability Evaluation System (DES).

The committee is concerned that in light of current budgetary constraints, DOD officials responsible for managing the DES have overlooked the importance of PEBLOs to the successful operation of the system and the appropriate care and fair treatment for service members with disabilities. Accordingly, the committee directs

the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report by March 31, 2013, on the ratio of assigned PEBLOs to the number of service members meeting PEBs, the number of vacant PEBLO positions, and the authorized grades of PEBLO positions by installation across the Department of Defense. The report should also provide assessments of the adequacy of the Department's standard for the ratio of PEBLOs to service members meeting PEBs; the sufficiency of experience levels within the PEBLO workforce; and the effectiveness of PEBLO training programs.

Transition of U.S. Territories from Overseas Housing Allowance to Basic Allowance for Housing

The committee recognizes that the administrative process supporting the payment of Overseas Housing Allowance (OHA) is more cumbersome for service members and program managers than is the process supporting payment of the Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH). The committee is interested in examining whether the BAH system would be better than the OHA system at providing housing allowances to service members assigned to duty in U.S. territories. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2013, a report on the feasibility and appropriateness of changing the process for determining housing allowances in U.S. territories from the OHA system to the BAH system. The report should provide an assessment as to which system better supports the quality of life of service members, and is most suitable to the housing market of each U.S. territory (American Samoa, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). The report should also provide the comparable costs of operating the OHA and BAH systems in each of the U.S. territories, as well as the cost of implementing the transition from the OHA system to the BAH system.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Fiscal Year 2013 Increase in Military Basic Pay

This section would increase basic pay for members of the uniform services by 1.7 percent, effective January 1, 2013. This raise would match the pay raise rate in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index.

Section 602—Basic Allowance for Housing for Two-Member Couples When One Member is on Sea Duty

This section would authorize dual military couples without dependents below the grade of E–6 to receive basic allowance for housing while serving on sea duty. This section would also eliminate the requirement that such couples must be simultaneously serving on sea duty before becoming eligible to receive basic allowance for housing.

Section 603—No Reduction in Basic Allowance for Housing for Army National Guard and Air National Guard Members Who Transition Between Active Duty and Full-Time National Guard Duty Without a Break in Active Service

This section would prevent reductions in the rate of basic allowance for housing for National Guard service members who transition from full-time National Guard duty to Active Duty, or from Active Duty to full-time National Guard duty, when the transition occurs without a break in active service.

Section 604—Modification of Program Guidance Relating to the Award of Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence Administrative Absence Days to Members of the Reserve Components Under DOD Instruction 1327.06

This section would grandfather members of the Reserve Component mobilized under wartime or national emergency circumstances prior to October 1, 2011, from the policy changes implemented on that date by the Secretary of Defense relating to the award of Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence administrative absence days under DOD Instruction 1327.06.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, income replacement payments for Reserve Component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service, and the authority to reimburse travel expenses for inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distance until December 31, 2013.

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, 2013.

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, 2013.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health professions incentive pay and bonus authorities, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units until December 31, 2013.

Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates until December 31, 2013.

Section 616—Increase in Maximum Amount of Officer Affiliation Bonus for Officers in the Selected Reserve

This section would increase the maximum amount that may be paid to officers who enter into an agreement to serve in the Selected Reserve for a specified contract period from $10,000 to $20,000.

Section 617—Increase in Maximum Amount of Incentive Bonus for Reserve Component Members Who Convert Military Occupational Specialty to Ease Personnel Shortages

This section would increase to $4,000 the amount of the bonus that may be paid to Reserve Component members who convert their military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortages.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES GENERALLY

Section 621—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Members Receiving Care in a Residential Treatment Program

This section would authorize non-medical attendants to receive travel and transportation benefits when assisting a service member receiving care in a residential treatment program if medical au-

thorities determine that the presence and participation of such an attendant is essential to the treatment of the member.

SUBTITLE D—BENEFITS AND SERVICES FOR MEMBERS BEING SEPARATED OR RECENTLY SEPARATED

Section 631—Extension of Authority To Provide Two Years of Commissary and Exchange Benefits After Separation

This section would extend the period of eligibility from December 31, 2012, to December 31, 2018, in which service members who are involuntarily separated may continue to use commissary and exchange stores for 2 years following the date of separation.

Section 632—Transitional Use of Military Family Housing

This section would establish October 1, 2012, through December 31, 2018, as the period of eligibility in which service members who are involuntarily separated may remain in Government-provided family housing for up to 180 days after the date of separation.

SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Section 641—Charitable Organizations Eligible for Donations of Unusable Commissary Store Food and Other Food Prepared for the Armed Forces

This section would clarify that the Secretary of Defense may make donations of unusable food to charitable food banks, food pantries, and soup kitchens.

Section 642—Repeal of Certain Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements Applicable to Commissary and Exchange Stores Overseas

This section would eliminate the requirement that the Secretary of Defense report to Congress the changes in restrictions on the sale of merchandise by commissary and exchange stores overseas that are required to prevent the resale of such merchandise in violation of treaty obligations of the United States or host-nation laws.

Section 643—Treatment of Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, as a Fisher House

This section would codify in title 10, United States Code, the designation of the Fisher House for Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, and clarify that authorized Fisher House residents of that facility include the primary next of kin, other family members of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while serving overseas, and escorts of those family members.

Section 644—Purchase of Sustainable Products, Local Food Products, and Recyclable Materials for Resale in Commissary and Exchange Store Systems

This section would require the governing body giving oversight and management direction to the military exchange and commissary systems in accordance with section 2481(c) of title 10, United States Code, to establish guidelines for the identification of fresh meat, poultry, seafood, produce, and other products raised or produced through sustainable methods that are not harmful to the ecology. This section would require the guidelines to be established not later than 2 years from the date of the enactment of this Act. The committee believes the guidelines should consider the impact of implementing sustainable product policies on the cost of goods and the pricing of the products offered to patrons. This section would also require that the governing body to establish, not later than September 30, 2017, goals for all exchange and commissary stores to purchase sustainable products, local food products, and recyclable materials.

SUBTITLE F—DISABILITY, RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Section 651—Repeal of Requirement for Payment of Survivor Benefit Plan Premiums When Participant Waives Retired Pay to Provide a Survivor Annuity Under Federal Employees Retirement System and Terminating Payment of the Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity

This section would authorize retired military service members when retiring under the Federal Employees Retirement System to forgo the payment of premiums under the Survivor Benefit Plan. The option would occur when the retired service member waives military retired pay in order to elect a civil service retirement and provide a survivor annuity.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 661—Consistent Definition of Dependent for Purposes of Applying Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Certain Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents

This section would change the definition of "dependent" with regard to the limitations on the terms of consumer credit extended to service members and their dependents to align with the definition of "dependent" as used to establish eligibility for military medical care in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code. The change would simplify the process for determining which family members are covered by the limits on the terms of consumer credit.

Section 662—Limitation on Reduction in Number of Military and Civilian Personnel Assigned to Duty with Service Review Agencies

This section would extend from December 31, 2013, to December 31, 2016, the limitation that the manpower levels within the service review agencies of the military departments shall not be reduced below the manpower levels that existed on January 1, 2002, unless the Secretary of a military department reports the scope and purpose of the reduction and a 90-day period elapses.

Section 663—Equal Treatment for Members of Coast Guard Reserve Called to Active Duty Under Title 14, United States Code

This section would authorize certain benefits for members of the Coast Guard Reserve when mobilized to ensure that they are provided equal benefits as those received by reserve members of the military departments. The benefits would include eligibility for retired pay and educational assistance.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains strongly committed to ensuring that members of the Armed Forces, retirees, survivors, and their families have access to quality health care. The committee is aware of the fiscal constraints that the Department of Defense faces and the resultant challenges providing for military medical readiness, combat casualty care for our deployed forces, health care for our physically or emotionally wounded service members as well as health care services to all eligible beneficiaries.

Recognizing these challenges, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) included authority for the Secretary of Defense to raise TRICARE Prime enrollment fees. In addition, the committee continued to encourage the Department of Defense to address the cost of providing health care by adopting proven practices to improve the health status of the beneficiary population and improve the cost-effectiveness of the care provided to beneficiaries. In this context, the committee notes with concern the Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2013 proposals to reduce the cost of health care by increasing the cost of TRICARE to retirees, including TRICARE for Life beneficiaries. The Department proposal included new fees in addition to significantly increasing existing fees. The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense continues to rely too narrowly on shifting the cost burden to beneficiaries without aggressively pursuing internal efficiencies. The committee continues to believe that career members of the uniformed services and their families endure unique and extraordinary demands and make sacrifices over the course of a military career and that those decades of sacrifice constitute a significant pre-paid premium for health care after retiring.

The committee continues to support the Department of Defense's efforts to identify and treat traumatic brain injury (TBI) occurring in members of the Armed Forces as a result of combat. The committee commends the Department for the many ongoing efforts to identify TBI and the collateral medical issues that accompany TBI such as visual dysfunction. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to expand access to treatment programs for all service members, including those in the Reserves and National Guard, and to identify community resources and expertise to assist in this effort.

Finally, the committee remains concerned with the Department of Defense plan to restructure the governance of the military health system. The committee remains unconvinced that the Department has conducted sufficient analysis of the plan to develop

a comprehensive cost estimate of implementing the proposed governance structure. The committee continues to support a unified medical command to improve the quality of care being provided by the services at a significant cost savings. However, the committee looks forward to the results of Comptroller General review, required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), of the options considered for reorganizing the military health system.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assessment of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operators Mental Health

The committee commends the U.S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine for their efforts to assess the mental health of the Air Force Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) operators, which included a survey of Reaper, Predator, and Global Hawk operators, along with support personnel. While the remote nature of these Air Force operations shield airmen from traditional combat threats, research being conducted on the psychological impact of those currently serving in this form of warfare is important, particularly in understanding the impact of a sustained operational tempo. While the Air Force has undertaken this initiative, the committee notes that the other services have not performed similar assessments of their UAV operators and support personnel, who are closer to the fight, and whose mental health assessment may be different from those in the Air Force. The committee believes there may be merit in the Army and Navy conducting a similar mental health assessment and urges the other services to conduct similar assessments of their UAV personnel.

Comptroller General Report on Chiropractic Health Care Professionals

The committee understands that for more than a decade, the Department of Defense has provided high-quality chiropractic health care services to Active Duty military personnel at military treatment facilities throughout the world. Today, chiropractic health care continues to be a key benefit for the men and women of the Armed Force as a result of increased incidences of musculoskeletal injuries sustained in combat. However, the committee is concerned by disparities in pay and job classifications that have resulted in chiropractors receiving lower wage rates than health care providers with either comparable or less training, skill sets, and health care responsibilities for patients in military treatment facilities. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2013, on the wage rates for chiropractors within the Department of Defense as compared to health care providers with either comparable or less training, skill sets, licensure and certification requirements, and health care responsibilities.

Improvements to the Measurement of Vital Signs

The committee commends the military medical system for continuing to improve its operational strategies to accommodate the

reality of modern warfare. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee noted the challenges encountered while providing critical care to war fighters regarding the ability to curtail the progression and minimize complications of shock. The committee encouraged the Department of Defense to develop methods for providing automated resuscitation during medical evacuation. The committee remains concerned that the assessment measures currently employed on the battlefield do not provide definitive early indications of internal bleeding or other non-visible symptoms. The committee is aware that there are potential technologies and systems that may provide for a more precise measurement of vital signs and assessment of an individual's current medical state that would improve the assessment and treatment of injuries with greater accuracy. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue efforts to improve care in this area.

Modification to the Report on Department of Defense Autism Pilot and Demonstration Projects

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its continued efforts to ensure that military families have access to autism diagnosis, intervention, and treatment services. The committee encourages the Department to continue to assist military families with autistic children to receive the full and expanding range of evidence-based intervention and treatment approaches. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include in the report required by Section 577 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) any efforts to provide services specifically for autistic children of military families living in rural or underserved communities using mobile diagnostic capabilities.

Optimizing Blood Transfusions for Service Members

The committee is aware of efforts to improve medical care that will minimize medical complications, including life-threatening transfusion reactions, incompatible blood transfusions, and pregnancy complications due to antibody formation, as a result of blood transfusions. These complications are particularly critical in patients from different ethnic backgrounds. The committee supports military medical research that will help to improve outcomes for the military community which has a diverse ethnic population reflective of American society. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to pursue efforts that would optimize blood transfusion to reduce medical complications.

Overseas Medical Research Laboratories

The committee recognizes the historic and critical role that Army and Navy Overseas Medical Research Laboratories have played in military medicine, and just as importantly, in civilian medical applications. Research conducted by these laboratories in indigenous infectious diseases, such as malaria and dengue virus, have led to prevention and treatment efforts that have protected our service members, American citizens abroad, and global public health. The committee urges the Department of the Army and the Department

of the Navy to remain mindful of these accomplishments and the critical role these laboratories have played in military medicine and the protection of our troops.

Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Training for Mental Health Providers

The committee continues to recognize the Department of Defense's efforts to address the issue of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). PTSD has been a continuing and growing issue across the Department, with significant impact on readiness and quality of life for personnel and military families. To address this ongoing and growing need, multifaceted solutions focusing on the skills of behavioral health professionals, training on treatment of the disorder as well as innovative treatment approaches are required. To that end, the committee encourages the Department to develop training programs for psychology and behavioral health professionals, including those that combine education, outreach and biofeedback research for the treatment of PTSD.

Prostate Imaging

The Committee is aware that in spite of the magnitude of the prostate cancer epidemic in the military and civilian populations, men do not have reliable diagnostic tools for guiding early detection and treatment which is critical for saving lives, improving quality of life and reducing health care costs. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Department to intensify research for the advancement of prostate imaging technologies.

Safety of Blood Products

The Committee is aware of efforts by the United States Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (USAMRMC) to enhance blood product safety, particularly with regard to whole blood and platelet transfusions. To complicate the issue, platelets can only be stored at room temperature and for a few days, unlike other blood components such as plasma and red cells which can be refrigerated for weeks. Currently, the quality of platelet concentrates can be determined by either an extremely subjective visual check or by testing random samples directly from the sterile bag, thus compromising the sterility of the remaining platelets. The Committee believes the research being done on the monitoring of platelets and whole blood at USAMRMC could improve the quality of stored platelets by allowing constant, non-invasive testing of multiple therapeutic doses, rather than a random sample. Such testing could result in labor reduction and multiple bag readings, thereby increasing the efficiency of distribution and supply. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to expedite the blood product safety research and development efforts to ensure that the blood products used on the battlefield and during combat casualty care efforts are of the highest quality.

Substance Abuse

The committee is aware that the number of service members in need of substance abuse treatment continues to rise as a result of

the continued and sustained deployment cycle of the force. Over 10 years of combat have lead to an increase in the rate of misuse of alcohol, painkillers, and illicit drugs. The services have made efforts to invest in treatment and prevention programs. For example, the Army hired 125 additional counselors in 2011 to address the increasing demand for these services. The committee commends the Army for its support of substance abuse treatment programs, and encourages the services to ensure that effective programs and credentialed providers are available for service members. In addition, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to pursue translational research focused on the development of new treatments for alcoholism, addiction, and related neuropsychiatric conditions to further improve the tools and therapies available to treat service members dealing with substance abuse.

Traumatic Brain Injury

The committee continues to support the Department of Defense's efforts to identify and treat traumatic brain injury (TBI) occurring in members of the Armed Forces as a result of combat. The committee is aware of ongoing efforts to identify TBI, in particular the short-term medical needs associated with TBI, and expand access to treatment programs for all service members, including members of the Reserve Components and the National Guard. However, the committee is increasingly concerned about the potential long-term implications of TBI for members of the Armed Forces, in particular those who experience multiple traumatic brain injuries, and the support needed for these service members and their families.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue to work with the National Guard, and its state organizations, to identify and partner with regional health providers and medical centers with expertise in psychiatric care and traumatic brain injury. The goal of this partnership is to develop, implement, and evaluate programs to improve the psychological and behavioral health and well-being of members of the National Guard and the Reserves. In addition, in order to maximize the use of publicly funded resources and organizations, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to collaborate with state government programs to assist service members, their families, and caregivers in accessing community resources and services that enable members with TBI to return to their homes and communities. The committee also encourages the Department to continue the research it has conducted with universities and similar entities, on the long-term risks of TBI and potential interventions, including novel drug therapies to enhance the treatments available for service members with TBI.

The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Vision Center of Excellence is working together with the Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury to develop clinical practice guidelines for primary medical providers to detect vision dysfunction associated with TBI. The Vision Center of Excellence is also working to develop a more effective ocular, oculomotor, and visual systems diagnostic capabilities and assessment strategies to address research gaps that have been identified. The committee is aware that there are several research projects involving visual dys-

function associated with TBI and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the results of these studies and the development of the clinical practice guidelines.

Treatment of Musculoskeletal Injuries

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) provided the Secretary of Defense the authority to enter into partnerships to enable coordinated, rapid clinical evaluation and application of evidence-based treatment strategies for wounded service members, particularly those with musculoskeletal injuries. In addition, the Department was urged by the committee to continue to invest in orthopedic research to provide cutting edge tools and technologies to military providers. The committee understands that the Department has undertaken a number of different initiatives in this area, including a joint effort with the Department of Veterans Affairs in pain management that focuses on musculoskeletal injuries. The committee encourages the Department to continue to invest in orthopedic research and continue their efforts to work with a broad range of partners to accelerate the deployment of effective treatments to improve musculoskeletal care of service members.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—IMPROVEMENTS TO HEALTH BENEFITS

Section 701—Sense of Congress on Nonmonetary Contributions to Health Care Benefits Made by Career Members of the Armed Forces and Their Families

This section would express the sense of Congress that career members of the uniformed services and their families endure unique and extraordinary demands and make extraordinary sacrifices over the course of a military career and those decades of sacrifice constitute a significant pre-paid premium for health care during a career member's retirement that is over and above what the member pays with money.

Section 702—Extension of TRICARE Standard Coverage and TRICARE Dental Program for Members of the Selected Reserve Who Are Involuntarily Separated

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide TRICARE Reserve Select and TRICARE dental insurance coverage for 180 days to members of the Selected Reserve who are involuntarily separated from the Selected Reserve.

Section 703—Medical and Dental Care Contracts for Certain Members of the National Guard

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that members of the National Guard and the Reserves who receive medical and dental care under contracts by the National Guard or State meet medical and dental readiness standards upon mobilization.

SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

Section 711—Unified Medical Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a unified medical command to provide medical services to the Armed Forces and other health care beneficiaries of the Department of Defense as defined in chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code. This section would also require the Secretary to develop a comprehensive plan to establish a unified medical command.

Section 712—Authority for Automatic Enrollment in TRICARE Prime of Dependents of Members in Pay Grades Above Pay Grade E–4

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to automatically enroll dependents of a service member in TRICARE Prime. This section also would allow Active Duty service members the option to terminate the enrollment of a dependent at any time.

Section 713—Cooperative Health Care Agreements Between the Military Departments and Non-Military Health Care Entities

This section would permit the Secretaries of the military departments to establish cooperative health care arrangements and agreements between military installations and local and regional non-military health care entities.

Section 714—Requirement To Ensure the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Health Engagements

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a process to ensure that health engagements conducted by the Department of Defense are effective and efficient in meeting the national security goals of the United States. This section would provide the Secretary authority to conduct pilot programs to assess the effectiveness of any process developed to ensure the applicability of the process.

Section 715—Clarification of Applicability of Federal Tort Claims Act to Subcontractors Employed to Provide Health Care Services to the Department of Defense

This section would include individuals working under a subcontract of a personal services contract for health care as covered Government employees for medical malpractice purposes under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

Section 716—Pilot Program on Increased Third-Party Collection Reimbursements in Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program for 3 years at not less than two military installations to asses the feasibility of using revenue-cycle improvement processes, including cash flow management and accounts-receivable processes to increase amounts collected by military treatment facilities from third party payers. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit a report of the results of the pilot program to

the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after completion.

Section 717—Pilot Program for Refills of Maintenance Medications for TRICARE for Life Beneficiaries Through the TRICARE Mail-Order Pharmacy Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program for 5 years that would require TRICARE for Life eligible beneficiaries to obtain refill prescriptions for maintenance medication from the TRICARE mail order pharmacy. This section would allow beneficiaries to opt out of the mail order program after 1 year and would authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive the mail order requirement on an individual basis if the Secretary deems it appropriate.

Section 718—Cost-Sharing Rates For Pharmacy Benefits Program of the TRICARE Program

This section would establish the cost-sharing rates under the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program as $5 for generic medications, $17 for formulary medications and $44 for non-formulary medications obtained through retail pharmacies, and $0 for generic medications, $13 for formulary medications and $43 for non-formulary medications obtained through the TRICARE mail order pharmacy. This section would also limit any annual increase in cost-sharing rates under the TRICARE pharmacy program to the amount equal to the percentage increase by which retiree pay is increased beginning October 1, 2013.

Section 719—Review of the Administration of the Military Health System

This section would amend Section 716 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to require the Secretary of Defense to implement and complete any recommendations included in the report on the review of the administration of the military health system submitted by the Comptroller General before restructuring or reorganizing the military health system.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 721—Extension of Comptroller General Report on Contract Health Care Staffing for Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would extend the deadline for the Comptroller General of the United States to submit the report required by section 726 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) on the contracting activities used by the military departments to provide health care professional services by civilian providers.

Section 722—Extension of Comptroller General Report on Women-Specific Health Services and Treatment for Female Members of the Armed Forces

This section would extend the deadline for the Comptroller General of the United States to submit the report required by section 725 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) on health care services for female members of the Armed Forces.

Section 723—Establishment of TRICARE Working Group

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a working group to review the TRICARE program with respect to providing pediatric health care, including special and chronic health care needs, and make recommendations to ensure children receive appropriate care and access remains available for military families with children. This section would require the working group not later than 12 months after convening to submit a report to the congressional defense committees and submit a final report to the congressional defense committees not later than 18 months after the first report. In addition, this section would express the sense of Congress on pediatric health care needs.

Section 724—Report on Strategy to Transition To Use of Human-Based Methods for Certain Medical Training

This section would require the Department of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2013, a report that outlines a strategy to refine, and when appropriate, transition to using human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of combat trauma. It would also require an annual report on the development and implementation of human-based training methods beginning on March 1, 2014.

The committee is aware that effective combat-trauma training has contributed to the lowest killed-in-action rate and fatality rate in U.S. military history. Over the past few years, the committee encouraged use of simulation technology in medical training by the Department of Defense, but also noted that the use of live animals in combat-trauma training is appropriate for critical, high-risk medical procedures until alternatives are developed that provide combat medics an equal or better training experience. The committee believes that the Department has striven to provide realistic combat-trauma training while also ensuring the humane treatment of animals.

However, as also expressed in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee believes that the Department should continue to aggressively pursue alternatives to the use of live animals in combat-trauma training and to implement a strategy for the development of future technology to refine, reduce, and when appropriate, replace the use of live animals in medical education and training. The committee is encouraged that such progression has already taken place in the area of chemical-biological defense training, and encourages the Department to continue this progression in other areas of medical training.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Comptroller General Report of the Air Force Launch Services New Entrant Certification Guide

The committee notes that new commercial launch providers are developing launch vehicles to compete against established launch providers for missions. As a result, the Air Force has developed a Launch Services New Entrant Certification Guide. This guide serves as a risk-based approach that the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center will use to certify the capability of potential new entrant launch companies to provide launch services for Department of Defense national security space missions on evolved expendable launch vehicle class launch vehicles. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2013 with a review and analysis of the implementation of the Air Force Launch Services New Entrant Certification Guide.

Counterfeit Electronic Parts

The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Department of Defense and elements of the defense industrial base to confront the challenge of preventing counterfeit electronic parts from entering the defense supply chain. The committee believes it imperative that the Department engage industry in a consistent and meaningful dialogue as it continues to craft and implement policies and procedures for meeting this challenge. The committee considers close and continuing communication between industry and policy makers to be instrumental to effecting sound policies and procedures, throughout the defense industrial base, and for avoiding costly or ineffectual missteps in mitigating the threat of counterfeit electronic parts. The committee is also concerned that the presence of, or reliance on, obsolete or obsolescent electronic components within the defense supply chain may increase the risk of counterfeit part usage. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the risks associated with obsolete or obsolescent electronic parts and counterfeits thereof to the defense supply chain and to brief the congressional defense committees, on or before April 1, 2013, on the findings of the assessment and any recommendations for reducing the assessed risks or incentivizing the industrial base to implement effective remedies.

Incentives to Combat Counterfeit Microelectronics

The committee has been concerned for several years about the Department of Defense's ability to assure its supply chain of trusted microelectronics. Section 254 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) directed the Department to assess the vulnerability of the microelectronics supply chain, including updating policies to procure assured, trusted microelectronics. Section 818 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) directed the Depart-

ment to assess its policies to detect and avoid acquisition of counterfeit electronic parts to deal with one aspect of that problem. As it implements new policies and regulations to prevent acquisition of counterfeit microelectronics, the committee encourages the Department to find ways to incentivize microelectronics manufacturers to supply components and provide system assembly within the United States.

Incorporation of a Proposal Adequacy Checklist for Certain Solicitations

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense is taking steps to amend the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to incorporate the use of a proposal adequacy checklist for proposals received in response to solicitations that require submission of certified cost and pricing data. The committee believes that the incorporation of such a checklist will aid in the development of high-quality proposals and will assist offerors in being able to self-validate the adequacy of their proposal before submission. The committee also believes that the use of such a checklist will allow the Defense Contract Audit Agency to more quickly close out audits, and will thereby reduce the current backlog of audits.

Inspector General Review of Database of Senior Department of Defense Officials Seeking Employment with Defense Contractors

The committee wishes to be apprised of the Department of Defense's record of compliance with section 847 of Public Law 110–181 (10 U.S.C. 1701 note). Therefore, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct a review of the database established pursuant to section 847 of Public Law 110–181 and to submit to the congressional defense committees, in a manner that ensures the protection of confidential, personal, or proprietary information, a report on the findings of that review on or before July 8, 2013. At a minimum, the report should include the following: the findings of previous Inspector General of the Department of Defense reviews to ensure that written opinions are being provided and retained in accordance with section 847 of Public Law 110–181; the total number of opinions issued and the total number of opinions retained in accordance with section 847 of Public Law 110–181; and any instances in which a request for a written opinion pursuant to section 847 of Public Law 110–181 lacked a corresponding written opinion, or in which the written opinion was not provided to the requesting official or former official of the Department of Defense by the appropriate ethics counselor within 30 days after the request for a written opinion.

Report on Contingency Contracting Lessons Learned

The United States has been engaged in military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan since late 2001, as well as conducted military operations in the Republic of Iraq from 2003 to 2011. In these conflicts, the Department of Defense utilized a variety of contractors, contract vehicles, authorities, and funds for operational contract support to execute a variety of small- and large-scale services and reconstruction projects. The committee notes that operational contract support and reconstruction activities of

the Department of Defense have faced substantial challenges. These challenges, as noted by many observers, including the Commission on Wartime Contracting, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, the Government Accountability Office, and the Department of Defense itself, occurred along the full spectrum of operational contract support and, at times, included the failure to properly understand the operating environment and actors in that environment, a lack of transparency in the contracting network, and inchoate or improperly defined requirements. In turn, the committee notes that, at times, these challenges led to results that undermined the desired effects of U.S. military operations, such as the diversion of funds to enemy forces or corrupt actors and the creation of perverse incentives for local actors to maintain instability.

The committee believes that operational contract support capabilities are critical to the success of current and potential future contingency operations, and further notes that the Department of Defense has undertaken a variety of efforts to improve these activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as planning for future operations. The committee supports a vigorous effort to capture lessons learned related to the full breadth of operational contract support. The committee further notes that past efforts to capture lessons learned were slowed by a lack of resources and insufficient institutional support. The committee believes that a joint force, commander-centric, multi-disciplinary, holistic process is needed to capture and ultimately codify effective solutions.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake an effort, utilizing the National Defense University or other such educational institution of the Department of Defense, to capture lessons learned related to Department contract activities, such as operational contract support, resource and financial management, Commanders' Emergency Response Program, and reconstruction programs. Such an effort should utilize personnel from the Department of Defense with related subject matter expertise and experience in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee also encourages the participation of non-Department personnel with similar expertise. The lessons-learned effort should build upon already documented insights and observations, including but not limited to those challenges noted above, as well as successes of operational contract support efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. The study should recommend changes to the full spectrum of activities within contingency contracting operations, including delivery of supplies, services, and reconstruction, in order to fully integrate business operations with kinetic and non-kinetic lines of operations.

The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report on the conclusions of the lessons-learned effort to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2013.

Review of Department of Defense Processes and Procedures Related To Federal Retail Excise Tax

The committee is aware that section 4051 of title 26, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense to pay a 12 percent tax on certain medium and heavy trucks, trailers, and semi-trailers that it procures. The current procedure requires that when

the Department of Defense awards a contract, the contractor receives funds to produce the vehicles as well as to cover the Federal retail excise tax (FRET) liabilities. Thus, the funds to pay the Federal retail excise tax originate from the Department of the Treasury as appropriated funds, are then allocated to the Department of Defense to award to the contractor, which are collected from the contractor by the Internal Revenue Service, and then ultimately end up back at the Department of the Treasury. The committee is concerned that the current process for making FRET payments is inefficient, generates unnecessary overhead and compliance burdens for all parties, and ultimately squanders taxpayer dollars. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, to examine the manner by which FRET is calculated and processed by the Department of Defense. The examination should:

(1) Assess the benefits and drawbacks of the current process of using contractors as pass-through taxpayers; and

(2) Identify alternatives to the current process to improve efficiency, such as waiving the tax on vehicles acquired by the Department of Defense, or using interagency transfer authorities to aggregate tax payment.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2013, on the findings of the examination along with recommendations for eliminating the inefficiencies and unnecessary overhead related to FRET as it applies to Department of Defense procurements.

Service and Support Business Model for Certain Simulation Capabilities

The committee recognizes there could be potential benefits and efficiencies achieved through the acquisition of certain simulation capabilities using a service and support business model. Such a model could enable the Department of Defense to acquire off-the-shelf capabilities through fixed-price contracts that would:

(1) More efficiently deploy superior simulation technologies;

(2) Improve technological relevance of simulators and training devices;

(3) Provide data necessary to develop performance metrics about the quality of training events; and

(4) Provide incentives for vendors to better maintain and upgrade equipment to reflect both existing and emerging training requirements.

The committee believes that such a business model is not appropriate for the acquisition of complex, military-unique simulators such as flight simulators, but the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to examine opportunities where this approach could reduce cost and increase training capabilities, especially for commercial-off-the-shelf and non-developmental simulation capability.

Ship Maintenance and Modernization

The committee recognizes that small businesses are critical partners in the ship maintenance and modernization market; however, the committee is concerned that the recent repeal of the sections

701 through 722 of the Business Opportunity Development Reform Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–656), commonly referred to as the Competitive Demonstration Program, may upset the critical balance in the ship repair industrial base, resulting in a restricted marketplace and reduced competition. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct an assessment of the impact of the repeal of the Competitive Demonstration Program on the ship maintenance and modernization market, to include the Military Sealift Command and all other vessels controlled by the Department on Defense. The assessment should also review prime contracts that have been awarded for ship repair or decommissioning since January 31, 2011, to determine if large, technically complex activities were inappropriately awarded to small businesses. The Secretary should provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the results of the assessment, along with any recommendations to strengthen the ship repair industrial base, by October 1, 2012. Elsewhere in this title, the committee also includes a provision that would require, among other things, that product support managers ensure that product support strategies are implemented in a manner that maximizes small business participation at the appropriate tiers, while ensuring that small business concerns are not inappropriately selected for performance as a prime contractor.

Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Certain Commercial Items

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense submitted a legislative proposal that requested the authority for use of simplified acquisition procedures for certain commercial items be made permanent. The committee is concerned that there is no data regarding the effectiveness of this authority and that proper oversight may be lacking. While the authority is intended to provide flexibility, streamline acquisition processes for certain commercial items, and allow contracting activities to better utilize limited resources, the committee is concerned that the authority could be abused or otherwise result in procurement irregularities. Therefore, the committee does not believe permanent extension of the authority is prudent at this time, and elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would extend the authority to January 1, 2015.

Furthermore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the use of the authority. The review should examine:

(1) The extent of use of the authority;
(2) The cited rationales for use of the authority;
(3) The acquisition outcomes that have resulted; and
(4) An identification of waste, fraud, or abuse of the authority.

The Comptroller General should provide the findings and recommendations, to include a recommendation as to whether the authority should be made permanent, to the congressional defense committees and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by October 1, 2013.

Titanium Procurement Restrictions of Domestic Manufacturers

The committee understands that specialty metals, to include titanium, are essential in the manufacturing processes of military grade aircraft components. The committee notes that Section 842 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) modified statutory requirements for the procurement of specialty metals from domestic sources and codified these requirements in section 2533b of title 10, United States Code. Included in section 2533b is an exception, relating to agreements with foreign governments, that allows foreign manufacturers to procure specialty metals from foreign sources for the purposes of offsetting sales made by the United States Government or United States firms in approved cases, or in furtherance of agreements with foreign governments in which each government agrees to remove barriers to purchases of supplies produced or services performed in the other country.

The committee is concerned that the implementation of exceptions related to agreements with foreign governments may be creating situations in which U.S. manufacturers are losing market share to foreign manufacturers, who are able to obtain specialty metals from foreign sources. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to perform an assessment of the effects of section 2533b on U.S. aircraft component manufacturers. The assessment should include:

(1) a review of foreign manufacturers' market share of Department of Defense (DOD) aircraft component contracts since fiscal year 2005;

(2) the cost of U.S.-produced titanium compared to foreign-produced titanium since fiscal year 2005;

(3) the number of U.S. manufacturers who stopped producing titanium aircraft components for DOD since section 2533b was enacted;

(4) an assessment of the overall impact of section 2533b on the defense aircraft component manufacturing base since such section was enacted; and

(5) an assessment of U.S.-based aircraft component manufacturers' abilities to compete with foreign competitors who are not required to buy U.S.-produced titanium.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the findings of this assessment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Section 801—Pilot Exemption Regarding Treatment of Procurements on Behalf of the Department of Defense in Accordance with the Department of Energy's Work for Others Program

This section would authorize a 24–month pilot exemption for certain procurements performed by the Department of Energy on behalf of the Department of Defense from duplicative and unnecessary Inspector General of the Department of Defense reviews and

compliance certifications required by section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). This section would also require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to certify to the congressional defense committees within 20 months after the date of the enactment of this Act that the procurement policies, procedures, and internal controls of the Department of Energy provide sufficient protection and oversight for Department of Defense funds expended through the Department of Energy's Work For Others Program, and to provide a recommendation regarding whether the pilot exemption should be extended.

Section 801 of Public Law 110–181 requires the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to annually review the procurement policies, procedures, and internal controls for all non-defense agencies that perform procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense to determine consistency with defense procurement requirements. Section 801 also requires the Inspector General to certify compliance with these requirements for procurement of property or services performed by a non-defense agency on behalf of the Department of Defense if the procurement is above the simplified acquisition threshold. The committee believes that these requirements are inefficient and duplicative, and that the Department of Energy's methods for overseeing contractor procurement and efficiency are equivalent to those used by the Department of Defense.

Furthermore, the committee understands that the Department of Defense has issued an annual exemption to the requirements of section 801 each year the statute has been in effect. The committee notes that these waivers have been issued because the Department of Defense believes the requirements of section 801 are unnecessary and that the requirements have the potential to impact the Department of Energy nuclear security laboratories' ability to perform critical national security work for the Department of Defense under the Department of Energy's Work For Others Program.

SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 811—Modification of Time Period for Congressional Notification of the Lease of Certain Vessels by the Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2401 of title 10, United States Code, by modifying the time period for congressional notification of the lease of certain vessels from 30 days of continuous session to 60 days.

Section 812—Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Certain Commercial Items

This section would amend section 4202 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (division D of Public Law 104–106), as most recently amended by section 816 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to extend the authority for use of simplified acquisition procedures for certain commercial items to January 1, 2015.

Section 813—Codification and Amendment Relating To Life-Cycle Management and Product Support Requirements

This section would codify section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) as section 2335 of title 10, United States Code, and include a new requirement for a product support manager for a major weapon system to use advanced predictive analysis technologies to improve material availability and reliability, increase operational availability rates, and reduce operation and sustainment costs. This section would also ensure a product support strategy maximizes small business participation at the appropriate tiers in a manner that ensures that small businesses are not inappropriately selected for performance as a prime contractor.

Section 814—Codification of Requirement Relating To Government Performance of Critical Acquisition Functions

This section would codify section 820 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), relating to Government performance of critical acquisition functions, as a new section in subchapter I of chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 815—Limitation on Funding Pending Certification of Implementation of Requirements for Competition

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending more than 80 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2013 until such time as the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense is implementing the requirements of section 202(d) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23), as amended. This section would also require that such certification be accompanied by: (1) a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the processes and procedures that have been implemented across the military departments and defense agencies to maximize competition throughout the life-cycle of major defense acquisition programs; and (2) a representative sample of solicitations issued since May 22, 2009, intended to fulfill the objectives of section 202(d) of Public Law 111–23.

The committee continues to believe that competition in procurement actions can reduce costs, improve contractor performance, and result in a better product being delivered to our warfighters. As such, the committee continues to closely monitor Air Force planning and decision-making related to the sustainment of C–17 engines. While Department of the Air Force officials have worked with the committee to address some concerns regarding the Department's initial desire to execute a sole-source procurement strategy for F117 engine supply chain management, depot-level repair actions, and provisioning of parts, the committee continues to believe that more can, and should, be done to introduce competition into sustainment actions related to the C–17, the F117 engine, and other programs of the Department of Defense. For example, the committee notes that the F117 engine is derived from a commercial engine and that the content of the engine is 91 percent identical

to the commercial variant. While the committee understands that military flight profiles vary greatly from commercial aviation profiles, the committee continues to believe that the Air Force can greatly benefit from maximizing competition in sustainment of the engine. Furthermore, the committee has been provided little evidence that the Department is introducing more competition in procurement and sustainment activities as required by Public Law 111–23.

Section 816—Contractor Responsibilities in Regulations Relating to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts

This section would amend section 818 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to provide an exception to the prohibition on allowable costs under Department of Defense contracts for the cost of rework or corrective actions that may be required to remedy the use or inclusion of counterfeit parts.

Section 817—Additional Definition Relating to Production of Specialty Metals Within the United States

This section would amend section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, to define the term "produced", as used in section 2533b, to mean melted or processed in a manner that results in physical or chemical property changes that are the equivalent of melting. This section would also clarify that the term does not include finishing processes such as rolling, heat treatment, quenching, tempering, grinding or shaving.

Section 818—Requirement for Procurement of Infrared Technologies from National Technology and Industrial Base

This section would amend section 2534 of title 10, United States Code, to include infrared technologies on the list of items subject to miscellaneous limitations on the procurement of goods other than United States goods.

Section 819—Compliance with Berry Amendment Required for Uniform Components Supplied to Afghan Military or Afghan National Police

This section would require that the requirements of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, to buy certain articles from American sources shall apply without exception or exemption to any textile components supplied by the Department of Defense to the Afghan National Army or the Afghan National Police for the purposes of the production of uniforms.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONTRACTS IN SUPPORT OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ OR AFGHANISTAN

Section 821—Extension and Expansion of Authority To Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan

This section would amend section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) relat-

ing to temporary authority to acquire products and services produced in countries along a major route of supply to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would extend the authority through December 31, 2014. This section would also expand the authority under section 801 to acquire products or services to be used by U.S. and coalition forces in Afghanistan, subject to a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such products or services will be acquired from a country that has agreed to allow the retrograde of coalition personnel, equipment, and supplies from Afghanistan. This section would prohibit the preferential procurement of goods or services from the Islamic Republic of Pakistan until such time as the Government of Pakistan re-opens the ground lines of communication through Pakistan in support of coalition operations in Afghanistan. Finally, this section would repeal an expired reporting requirement.

The committee believes these changes are necessitated by the continued reliance on the Northern Distribution Network (NDN) and encourages the Secretary of Defense to use the expanded authority to increase the capacity of the NDN.

Section 822—Limitation on Authority To Acquire Products and Services Produced in Afghanistan

This section would amend section 886 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to require the Secretary of Defense to make a determination that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan is not taxing assistance provided by the United States to Afghanistan in violation of any bilateral or other agreement with the United States, before providing preferential treatment for the acquisition of a product or service produced in Afghanistan.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 831—Enhancement of Review of Acquisition Process for Rapid Fielding of Capabilities in Response To Urgent Operational Needs

This section would strike the requirement in section 804 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) that the acquisition process for rapid fielding of capabilities in response to urgent operational needs (UON) may only be applied for capabilities that can appropriately be acquired under fixed price contracts. Section 804(b)(1) of Public Law 111–383 required the Secretary to develop a process to determine whether capabilities proposed as urgent operational needs are appropriate for fielding through the process for the rapid fielding of capabilities or should be fielded through the traditional acquisition process. The committee notes that this review is ongoing, but has had delays and is now scheduled to be complete in August 2012. The committee expects the review to be complete in August 2012.

The committee notes that when a capability is proposed as an urgent operational need, it may not be known if the capability can be fulfilled through fixed price contracting at a reasonable cost and in an acceptable amount of time. The committee understands that

many solutions used to address urgent operational needs have required varying degrees of research and development efforts in order to field an effective solution that addressed the warfighter's need. The committee is aware that fixed price contracts are generally used when there is adequate market data and the requirement is not expected to change. Any change in quantity, performance, or delivery terms requires the contractor to develop a new proposal for modification, resulting in renegotiation, which can often lead to significant cost growth, and performance and schedule delays.

Section 832—Location of Contractor-Operated Call Centers in the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that any call center operated pursuant to a contract entered into by the Secretary or by the head of any of the military departments is located in the United States.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assessment of Department of Defense Future Years Defense Program Workforce Requirements

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) directed the Department of Defense (DOD) to take a more holistic approach to its manpower requirements in order to achieve the appropriate balance in its total workforce, rather than simply managing to budgetary targets. The Secretary of Defense was required to develop a total force management plan that would provide the means to establish the appropriate mix of manpower to perform the Department's mission in consideration of the distinct value of each component of the plan, whether by military (Active and Reserve Components), civilian, or contractor personnel.

The committee is concerned, however, that the budget request does not reflect the holistic approach called for in Public Law 112–81. For example, the committee notes that the Department of Defense is reducing its Active Duty and Reserve Component end strength by 31,300 from fiscal year 2012–13, reducing civilian full time equivalents (FTEs) by 10,517 over the same period, and increasing contractor FTEs by 18,399. Further, section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department to annually compile and review an inventory of activities performed by contractors to help provide greater insight into the number of contractor FTEs providing services to the Department and the functions that they perform. The committee notes that in its report, "Further Actions Needed to Improve Accountability for DOD's Inventory of Contracted Services" (GAO–12–357), the Government Accountability Office concludes that a number of factors, and in particular the Department of Defense's reliance on the Federal Procurement Data System as the basis for the inventory for most defense components, has limited the utility, accuracy, and completeness of the inventory data. Further, the report noted that the military departments' re-

quired reviews of the inventories were incomplete, despite the fact that "reliance on contractors to support core missions . . . can place the Department at risk of contractors performing inherently governmental functions." Such issues underscore the need for the Department to embrace a more holistic approach to workforce management.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess what measures the Department of Defense is taking to appropriately balance its current and future workforce structure against its requirements, and to provide a report of the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 15, 2013. The Comptroller General should consider the following when conducting the assessment:

(1) Historical trends on the levels of military, civilian and contractor personnel;

(2) The process by which the Department identified its civilian workforce requirements, especially in light of the withdrawal from the Republic of Iraq and impending withdrawal from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(3) What analysis the Department conducted to identify core or critical functions and to determine which of those activities would be most appropriately performed by military, civilian, or contractor personnel;

(4) The role of the Department comptroller in determining workforce levels; and

(5) How the defense agencies and military departments used the inventory of contracted services to inform their fiscal year 2013 and 2014 budget submissions.

Assessment of Legal Authorities for Cyberspace Operations

The committee is aware that cyberspace operations are an increasingly important capability for the Department of Defense, but one where many areas are ill-defined. Despite a number of reports on the subject, the committee remains concerned that the legal and policy challenges associated with many aspects of cyber operations have not been adequately addressed. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on March 20, 2012, the Commander, U.S. Cyber Command indicated that the Department was working on "getting the authorities correct that we need" as a key task.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report by March 1, 2013, assessing the legal authorities and policy challenges of the Department of Defense to conduct full spectrum cyber operations. The report should include the following:

(1) A description of the legal authorities underpinning the ability of the Department of Defense to conduct full spectrum cyberspace operations;

(2) A description of the risk management process for the Department, including how the Department assesses and mitigates risks related to the international ramifications of proposed cyberspace operations;

(3) A description of the policy framework affecting the ability of the Department to conduct cyberspace operations, including

who manages specified policy processes and who determines when and how changes may be made to policy authorities;

(4) A description of how procedures governing Defense Support of Civil Authorities are applied to cyberspace operations;

(5) An analysis of any shortcomings in the legal and policy framework governing cyberspace operations by the Department of Defense;

(6) Any recommendations of the Secretary for changes to such legal and policy framework; and

(7) Any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

Commercial Satellite Imagery

The committee is aware that commercial imaging satellites and services are key parts of the overhead imagery architecture. Commercial satellite imagery provides releasable electro-optical (EO) imagery and geospatial intelligence product to support military, intelligence, diplomatic, worldwide counterterrorism/counterproliferation operations, disaster response, and humanitarian assistance. These resources provide and maintain access to an unclassified imagery repository for developing geospatial products that support foundation based operations and sharing intelligence with host government and coalition partners.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's fiscal year 2013 budget request included a significant reduction to the EnhancedView program, which modernizes the constellation of commercial geospatial satellites and supports the purchase of commercial satellite imagery. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by December 1, 2012, on the Joint Requirements Oversight Council validated satellite imagery requirements and how the Department plans to address those requirements.

Department of Defense Intelligence Activities

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence recently began an effort to create new guidelines governing designations for the Military Intelligence Program (MIP) and the National Intelligence Program (NIP). The committee commends this effort and encourages continued coordination regarding such designations. The committee also recognizes that this effort is just one example of the unprecedented level of cooperation throughout the U.S. intelligence community.

The committee notes, however, that consistent with the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (Public Law 108–458), the Secretary of Defense must retain the authority to manage Department of Defense personnel, as well as develop and manage the annual budget for intelligence activities supporting the war fighter. Further, while the committee recognizes that there are certain instances in which a military service may be able to uniquely address particular national intelligence requirements, the fundamental purpose of service intelligence activities should be to respond to Department of Defense requirements.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to designate as part of the MIP intelligence and counterintelligence programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense that primarily support Department of Defense requirements, including: programs, projects, and activities that are primarily conducted in support of military operations or are primarily undertaken at the direction of, or pursuant to requirements of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the military departments or the combatant commands. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by October 1, 2012, evaluating how these principles compare to the new guidelines governing MIP and NIP designations, identifying current designations that would be inconsistent with these principles, and analyzing the implications of such inconsistent designations as they relate to the Secretary of Defense's ability to develop and manage the intelligence budget for intelligence activities that support the warfighter.

Improving the Strategic Management Plan

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has made important strides in improving the management and oversight of its business operations since the establishment of the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Strategic Management Plan (SMP) in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). In a resource-constrained era, the committee believes that additional rigor and attention to managing DOD operations is vital to ensuring that the Department maintains technological superiority. To support that goal, the committee encourages the Department to adjust the SMP to increase its effectiveness as a management tool. For instance, by incorporating the salient details and measurable performance goals of the Better Buying Power memorandum, the Department could better measure the effectiveness of those acquisition-related guidelines. The committee also believes that aligning the Performance Improvement report more closely to the SMP would make it possible to better measure progress in meeting the Department's overall strategic management goals. Finally, the committee believes that the Department should incorporate data on transition of small business technologies used in major acquisition programs into the SMP, as noted by the recommendations of the Findings of the Panel on Business Challenges in the Defense Industry.

National Centers of Excellence in Information Assurance Education and Research

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense maintains a program, jointly sponsored by the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security, to designate National Centers of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance (IA) Education (CAE/IAE) and Research (CAE-R). The goal of these programs is to reduce vulnerability in our national information infrastructure by promoting higher education and research in IA and producing a growing number of professionals with IA expertise in

various disciplines. The designation as a CAE/IAE or CAE-R is valid for 5 academic years, after which the school must successfully reapply in order to retain its CAE designation. The committee encourages the Department to find opportunities to leverage those centers for the protection of the national energy infrastructure, and as appropriate, to work with international academic and professional partners such as the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence in the research and development of technologies, best practices and other means to defend critical infrastructure including the national electric grid.

Policy Matters Related to the Defense Supply Chain

The committee is concerned that the authority for critical materials policy is diffused throughout the Department of Defense into offices that inadequately oversee this policy. For example, section 187 of title 10, United States Code, establishes a Strategic Materials Protection Board and charges the Board with identifying and proposing risk mitigation steps for such materials, but the Board has failed to comply with congressional intent, fails to meet in accordance with statutory requirements and, in its tenure, has only labeled one material as critical, despite the reality of a complex global supply chain for many materials upon which the Department of Defense relies. Likewise, the Defense Logistics Agency has done little to respond to the recommendations from the Department's April 2009 report entitled "Reconfiguration of the National Defense Stockpile Report to Congress". The committee also notes that the focus of the office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy (MIBP) continues to emphasize the capability and viability of original equipment manufacturers and prime contractors, to the exclusion of the raw materials suppliers and other critical segments of the supply chain that support the defense industrial base. The committee is also concerned that the Department of Defense has paid little attention to the need for assured availability of technical skills, competencies, and data rights necessary to support the defense supply chain.

The committee continues to believe that a secure supply chain is in the national interest and therefore, the office of MIBP should place greater emphasis on the health of the defense industrial base for raw material suppliers. The committee also believes that the office of MIBP should serve as the lead office for all Department of Defense policy matters related to materials critical to national security, including policy matters related to the supply chain for raw materials through, and including, prime contractors. The committee further believes that centralizing and focusing policy for supply of critical materials within the greater industrial base strategy of the Department should aid in mitigating some of the risk of supply chain interruption by creating a balanced approach that considers supply chain issues from a bottom-up view of raw materials availability, as well as a top-down view from the prime contractors that provide end items to the Department. Therefore, the committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would expand the role and responsibility of the Deputy Assistant Secretary and would restructure the Strategic Materials Protection Board.

Study on National Air and Space Intelligence Center and Marine Corps Intelligence Activity Management Structure

The committee notes the management structure of the National Air and Space Intelligence Center (NASIC) and the Marine Corps Intelligence Activity (MCIA) does not mirror the management structure of the other military intelligence centers. The demand for intelligence increased exponentially over the past decade and the intelligence centers require a stable, strong command structure to effectively meet the information demand. The lack of a civilian senior executive service (SES) executive director could impede managerial effectiveness and limit interaction with colleagues from other military and civilian organizations.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, to examine the command structure of NASIC and MCIA, respectively, with regard to establishing a civilian SES executive director. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and Secretary of the Navy to report the findings of the study along with any recommendations the Secretaries may have relating to modifying the command structure of the NASIC and MCIA to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2013.

The Role of National Guard Cyber Defense Units

The committee is aware of the important role that certain National Guard units are playing in the computer network defense (CND) of Department of Defense information systems and computer networks. However, the committee is also aware that some CND-related activities may not be limited to dedicated cyber units. Moreover, it is unclear how the role of the CND-related units may differ or be affected when activated in a title 32 or State Active Duty-status.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act identifying the National Guard units that have a CND role for the Department of Defense and a description of that role. The briefing should also include a description of what activities these units may be expected to perform when activated in a title 32 or State Active Duty-status, and the policies and authorities that are in place to govern those activities.

Use of Open Source Information in Intelligence Analysis

The committee believes that open source information is underutilized relative to other sources of information in key areas of intelligence analysis. The committee also believes that an increased emphasis on open source information would improve overall analytical quality and value. In particular, open source information on military or dual-use technology, industrial activity and investment, technology markets and projections of future activities provides a relatively inexpensive information baseline that can be readily used with U.S. allies and partners and to supplement information from classified sources. The committee believes Department of Defense intelligence elements with analytical responsibility should maintain data on their efforts to increase use of open source information.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

Section 901—Additional Duties of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy and Amendments to Strategic Materials Protection Board

This section would amend section 139c of title 10, United States Code, by directing additional duties of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy. The duties would include prescribing policies and procedures for ensuring reliable sources of materials that are critical to national security. This section would also amend section 187 of title 10, United States Code, by reconfiguring the Strategic Materials Protection Board to include: the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy; an official within the Defense Logistics Agency with responsibility for strategic materials; and designees from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Section 902—Requirement for Focus on Urgent Operational Needs and Rapid Acquisition

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior official to be the focal point within the Department of Defense to lead the Department's urgent operational needs and rapid acquisition efforts. The senior official's responsibilities would include, but not limited to: (1) acting as an advocate within the Department for issues related to the Department's ability to rapidly respond to urgent needs; (2) improving visibility across all urgent operational needs entities and processes; and (3) ensuring tools and mechanisms are used to track, monitor, and manage the status of urgent operational needs, from validation through the transition, including a formal feedback mechanism or channel for the military services to provide feedback on how well fielded solutions met urgent operational needs.

The committee notes that the Secretary's lack of visibility over all urgent operational needs requests is due in part to having no senior-level focal point who is given the responsibility to manage, oversee, track, and monitor all emerging capability gaps identified by the warfighter in theater. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Department has not established a senior-level focal point to: (1) lead the Department's efforts to fulfill validated urgent needs requirements; (2) develop and implement Department-wide policy on the processing of urgent needs or rapid acquisition; or (3) maintain full visibility over its urgent needs efforts and the costs of those efforts. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, GAO officials have discussed the benefits of establishing a senior level point of focus to coordinate and integrate various DOD efforts to address concerns, such as with counterterrorism and the transformation of military capabilities.

The committee recognizes that in June 2011, the Department created a Senior Integration Group to serve as the single authority for prioritizing and directing action to fulfill all joint urgent operational needs (JUON) and to be the overarching entity through

which the Office of the Secretary of Defense's previously established urgent needs organizations and task forces (including the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Task Force, and the Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance (ISR) Task Force) would report to the Secretary on the status of JUON related actions. However, the committee notes that it is unclear to what extent, if at all, the Senior Integration Group would: (1) lead all Department-wide efforts to fulfill validated urgent needs requirements; (2) develop and implement Department-wide policy on processing urgent needs or rapid acquisition; or (3) maintain full visibility over urgent needs efforts and the costs of these efforts, as GAO has recommended. The committee is concerned that without establishing a senior-level focal point to address these issues, Department of Defense officials may be unable to identify areas for improvement, including consolidation, to prioritize validated but unfunded requirements, to identify funding challenges and a means to address such challenges, or ensure collaboration to modify capabilities in development to meet several similar urgent operational needs requirements and may be unable to reduce any overlap or duplication that may exist as solutions are developed or modified.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee expresses its concerns with multiple funding streams, lack of coordination, and the need for consolidation as well as improved oversight. Further, the committee notes that section 804 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's urgent operational needs and rapid acquisition processes and report the findings to the congressional defense committees by January 2012. The committee is concerned that this review is not scheduled to be complete until August 2012.

Section 903—Designation of Department of Defense Senior Official for Enterprise Resource Planning System Data Conversion

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior official to be responsible for coordination and managerial oversight of data conversion for all enterprise resource planning systems within the Department of Defense.

Section 904—Additional responsibilities and resources for Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation

This section would amend section 139b of title 10, United States Code, to have the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation report directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics without the interposition of any other supervising official, and clarifies the resources available to that official.

Section 905—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would re-designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine

Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Section 911—Annual Assessment of the Synchronization of Segments in Space Programs That Are Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to submit an annual assessment for 5 years of the synchronization of satellite, ground, and user terminal segments of space major defense acquisition programs. For each such space program for which a primary capability of such program will be operable by one program segment at least 1 year after the date on which such capability is operable by another program segment, the Under Secretary would provide the cause of the delay and identification of the steps the Department is taking to improve the alignment of when the program segments become operable and the related challenges, costs, and risks. The assessment would also include a description of the impact to the mission of the space system from the delay.

Section 912—Report on Overhead Persistent Infrared Technology

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the congressional defense and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence within 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on Overhead Persistent Infrared (OPIR) that specifically addresses the following: (1) an assessment of whether there are further opportunities for the Department and the intelligence community to capitalize on increased data sharing, fusion, interoperability, and exploitation; and (2) a recommendation as to how to better coordinate efforts between the Department and the intelligence community for exploitation of OPIR sensor data.

This section would also require that not later than 90 days after the Department delivers its report to the congressional defense committees, the Comptroller General of the United States will assess the Department's report to ensure it is comprehensive, fully supported, and sufficiently detailed. Further, the Comptroller General shall identify any shortcomings, limitations, or other matters that affect the quality or findings of the Department's report on OPIR.

The committee is aware of significant investments in Overhead Persistent Infrared (OPIR) that span multiple agencies and support a variety of missions such as missile warning, missile defense, battlespace awareness, and technical intelligence. The committee is also aware that the Department and intelligence community have completed their Joint OPIR Ground study and are in the process of completing an OPIR space architecture study.

The committee commends the Department and the intelligence community for establishing a Joint OPIR Ground Integrated Pro-

gram Office to improve the connectivity and sharing of OPIR sensor data as it relates to theater missile warning and defense, battlespace awareness, and technical intelligence. The committee believes the defense and intelligence communities have taken steps to improve the utilization and exploitation of OPIR sensor data, but further efforts should be made to more fully exploit the OPIR sensors.

Section 913—Prohibition on use of Funds to Implement International Agreement on Space Activities That Has Not Been Ratified by The Senate or Authorized by Statute

The section would prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act for use by the Secretary of Defense or the Director of National Intelligence to limit the activities of the Department of Defense or the Intelligence Community in outer space to implement or comply with an international agreement concerning outer space activities unless such agreement is ratified by the Senate or authorized by statute.

The section would require a report not later than 90 days after the date of enactment by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense on the negotiations on an international agreement concerning outer space activities. The report would be required to include a description of which foreign countries have agreed to sign such an international agreement and any implications that the agreement may have on both classified and unclassified military and intelligence activities of the United States in outer space. The report would be required until the President certifies the United States is no longer involved in negotiations on an international agreement concerning outer space activities. The report would be submitted to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, the foreign relations committees, the intelligence committees, and the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. The report would be submitted unclassified, with a classified annex as necessary that may be submitted to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the intelligence committees.

The section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress, including all committees with an interest in outer space activities, an unclassified annual report to be submitted not later than January 1 of each year detailing foreign countries with counter-space programs that could be a threat to the national security or commercial space systems of the United States, and the name of such country. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to submit a classified annex to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the intelligence committees containing any classified information required to be submitted for such report. The names of such countries would be required to be released in the report on unclassified basis, with waiver authority for the Secretary of Defense if the Secretary determines it is in the national security interest to waive such identification and submits to Congress an explanation of why the Secretary waived such requirement. The section would also provide that in any year in which the Secretary does not submit the required report on counter-space programs, the Department may not expend any funds for travel ex-

penses related to the negotiation of the international agreement concerning outer space activities.

Section 914—Assessment of Foreign Components and The Space Launch Capability of The United States

This section would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an independent assessment of the national security implications of continuing to use foreign component and propulsion systems for the launch vehicles under the evolved expendable launch vehicle program. This report would be due no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the congressional defense committees.

Section 915—Report On Counterspace Technology

The section would require a report, to be submitted to the House and Senate Armed Services and foreign relations committees, not later than 1 year after enactment and annually thereafter for 2 years, which details key space technologies that could be used, or are being sought, by a foreign country with a counter space or ballistic missile program, and should be subject to export controls by the United States or an ally of the United States, as appropriate.

SUBTITLE C—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Section 921—Authority To Provide Geospatial Intelligence Support To Certain Security Alliances and Regional Organizations

This section would amend Title X, Section 443, United States Code. It would give the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) the authority to provide regional organizations with defense or security components and security alliances of which the United States is a member with imagery intelligence and geospatial information support. The existing Title X, Section 443 authorities already gave the Director of the NGA the authority to provide imagery intelligence and geospatial information support to foreign countries.

This section would also require, in each case of providing imagery intelligence or geospatial information support to a regional organization or security alliance, the Director of the NGA:

(A) Ensure that such intelligence and such support are not provided by such regional organization or such security alliance to any other person or entity;

(B) Notify the congressional defense committees, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate that the Director of the NGA has provided such intelligence or support; and

(C) Coordinate the provision of such intelligence and such support with the commander of the appropriate combatant command.

Section 922—Technical Amendments to Reflect Change in Name of National Defense Intelligence College to National Intelligence University

This section would provide a technical correction by recognizing the Department of Defense's redesignation of the "National Defense Intelligence College" as the "National Intelligence University".

SUBTITLE D—TOTAL FORCE MANAGEMENT

Section 931—Limitation on Certain Funding Until Certification that Inventory of Contracts for Services Has Begun

This section would withhold funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2013 as specified in the funding table in section 4301 of this Act for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force until the defense agencies, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force comply with the Inventory of Contracts for Services, which is mandated by section 2330a(c) of title 10, United States Code. The committee continues to be disappointed that the defense agencies, the Navy, and the Air Force have not fully implemented the Inventory of Contracts for Services, a requirement initially codified by section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee notes that the Department of the Army has successfully undertaken an extensive manpower and costing inventory of all Army service contractors since 2002, and the Army's inventory has been designated as the model for implementation of section 807. The committee remains convinced that the inventory is an important tool to provide transparency in Government contracting and would be a beneficial tool for decision-makers in their planning, programming, and budgeting.

Section 932—Requirement to Ensure Sufficient Levels of Government Management, Control, and Oversight of Functions Closely Associated with Inherently Governmental Functions

This section would amend section 129a of title 10, United States Code, relating to the policy for total force management, to require the Secretary of a military department or head of a Defense agency with oversight of contractor personnel that are performing functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions to provide sufficient levels of management, control, and oversight.

The committee recognizes that functions closely associated with inherently governmental are, in appropriate circumstances, performed by contractors. The committee believes that in order to ensure full transparency of closely associated work being performed by contractors, this information should be included in the inventory of contract services required by section 2330a of title 10, United States Code.

Section 933—Special Management Attention Required for Certain Functions Identified in Inventory of Contracts for Services

This amendment would amend section 2330a(e) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the inventory on contract services,

to require that special management attention be given to functions identified in the inventory as being closely associated to inherently governmental functions.

SUBTITLE E—CYBERSPACE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 941—Military Activities in Cyberspace

This section would affirm that the Secretary of Defense has the authority to conduct military activities in cyberspace. The committee recognizes that because of the evolving nature of cyber warfare, there is a lack of historical precedent for what constitutes traditional military activities in cyberspace.

In particular, this section would clarify that the Secretary of Defense has the authority to conduct clandestine cyberspace activities in support of military operations pursuant to a congressionally authorized use of force outside of the United States, or to defend against a cyber attack on an asset of the Department of Defense.

The committee notes that Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces are increasingly using the internet to exercise command and control as well as to spread technical information enabling attacks on U.S. and coalition forces in areas of ongoing hostilities. Terrorists often rely on the global reach of the internet to communicate and plan from distributed sanctuaries throughout the world. As a result, military activities may not be confined to a physical battlefield, and the use of military cyber activities has become a critical part of the effort to protect U.S. and coalition forces and combat terrorism globally. In certain instances, the most effective way to neutralize threats is to undertake military cyber activities in a clandestine manner. While this section is not meant to identify all or in any way limit other possible military activities in cyberspace, the Secretary of Defense's authority includes the authority to conduct clandestine military activities in cyberspace in support of military operations pursuant to an armed conflict for which Congress has authorized the use of all necessary and appropriate force or to defend against a cyber attack on a Department of Defense asset.

Section 942—Quarterly Cyber Operations Briefings

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a quarterly briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on significant military cyberspace operations that were carried out by the Department of Defense in the preceding quarter.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 951—Advice on Military Requirements by Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff and Joint Requirements Oversight Council

This section would amend section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in identifying, assessing, and approving military requirements to meet the national military strategy, and in ensuring that life-cycle cost, schedule, and performance objectives are achieved in the acquisition of material solutions to meet such requirements. The section would also amend section 181 of title 10, United States Code,

to clarify the role of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council in assisting the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in these matters. Additionally, this section would amend section 2547 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the role of the Chiefs of the Armed Forces in the development and certification of requirements for equipping the Armed Force concerned.

Section 952—Expansion of Persons Eligible for Expedited Federal Hiring Following Completion of National Security Education Program Scholarship

This section would amend section 1902(k) of title 50, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense and other agencies and organizations with national security responsibilities to appoint to the excepted service position those individuals who have successfully completed the requirements of the National Security Education Program (NSEP) and meet eligibility for appointment. Award recipients are required by NSEP to enter into a service commitment before receipt of an award.

Section 953—Annual Briefing to Congressional Defense Committees on Certain Written Policy Guidance

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees annually on the defense planning guidance and the written policy guidance regarding the preparation of contingency plans, developed pursuant to section 113 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 954—One-Year 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 extend for 1 year the current authority under section 941(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended by section 941 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), for the five Regional Centers for Security Studies of the Department of Defense to waive the reimbursement costs required under section 184(f) of title 10, United States Code, for personnel of nongovernmental organizations and international organizations to participate in activities of the centers. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the effectiveness of the Regional Centers for Security Studies in meeting the centers' objectives and advancing the priorities of the Department of Defense; the extent to which the centers' perform a unique function within the interagency community; measures of effectiveness and impact indicators each center uses to internally evaluate its programs; oversight mechanisms within the Department of Defense; and the benefits, if any, of waiving reimbursement costs for personnel of nongovernmental organizations and international organizations to participate in activities of the centers on an ongoing basis. The Comptroller General would be required to submit a report of such assessment by March 1, 2013, to the appropriate congressional committees.

The committee seeks greater clarity regarding the activities of the regional centers. In a fiscally constrained environment, the

committee wishes to ensure that the regional centers focus on unique needs of the Department and the combatant commanders, and do not replicate programs conducted by other U.S. Government agencies or conduct programs best suited for universities or civilian entities. This includes "track II" diplomatic programs, which should be conducted at arm's length from the U.S. Government.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Counter-Drug Activities in Afghanistan

The committee recognizes the President's current plan to cease combat operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan by the end of 2014. The Government of Afghanistan's ability to provide security for its own population relies in part on its ability to control narco-trafficking. The committee notes that Afghanistan's link to the worldwide drug trade promotes instability and provides funding for terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda. Following the end of combat operations in 2014, the counter-drug programs developed in Afghanistan will remain vital to preserving stability in the region. The committee acknowledges that over the course of Operation Enduring Freedom, the United States has invested approximately $2.25 billion in counter-drug training and programs. This investment must not be neglected by the pending withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for counter-drug programs and funding following combat operations in Afghanistan, and to submit a report on the strategy to the congressional defense committees by November 30, 2012. The strategy should outline the goals of both the U.S. military and civilian personnel as well as the Afghan military and police forces with respect to counter-drug programs. Also, the committee notes the need to outline timelines and resources necessary to accomplish these goals.

Humanitarian Efforts in U.S. Southern Command

The committee understands that the U.S. Navy will not deploy a ship, such as the USNS Mercy or the USNS Comfort, on a humanitarian mission in the Central or South American region in 2012. The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy is abandoning its longstanding practice of humanitarian ship deployments. While the committee understands the tremendous budgetary pressure facing the military, the presence and annual deployment of naval ships with hospital-mission capabilities is a humanitarian, diplomatic, and vital national security exercise which the people of that region welcome. Additionally, the committee recognizes the benefit of these missions to the Armed Forces in developing both relationships and skills that would prove beneficial should a contingency situation arise in that region. The committee encourages the Department of the Navy to take these factors into

consideration and develop a scheduled humanitarian deployment to the region as soon as possible.

National Guard Bureau Counter-Drug Threat Based Resource Model

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau's counter-drug Program uses a threat based resource model to allocate counter drug funding to be disbursed across the 54 states and territories. The committee is also aware that the data used for the United States territories, specifically Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands, is not accurate. The variables used in the model including narcotics abuses, interdiction, and production of narcotics are not representative of the real threat facing these territories and, consequently, the United States homeland. The committee recognizes that the threat of violence and regional instability related to narco-trafficking and money laundering in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands directly impacts our national security.

The committee stresses the importance of accurate data information and entry into the threat based resource model in order to allocate funds and resources appropriately. The committee therefore supports efforts for the National Guard Bureau's counter-drug Program to reexamine their data inputs into the threat based resource model concerning Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands with regard to narco-trafficking and other illicit activities.

Study on Terrorist Organization Linkages in the Western Hemisphere

The committee notes the efforts made by the United States and governments in the Western Hemisphere in combating counter-drug and counter-terrorism activities. The committee commends these governments for improving stability in the region as a result of counter-drug initiatives.

However, the committee continues to be concerned about the increasing presence of transnational criminal organizations and internationally recognized terrorist organizations throughout the Western Hemisphere. The committee is aware that international terrorist organizations have participated in narco-trafficking, human-trafficking, and money laundering within the region, which has contributed to increasing violence. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on terrorist organizations operating in the Western Hemisphere and submit the findings of the study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee by November 30, 2012. The study should include the activities of state sponsors of terror within the region, the current locations and organizational structure of the international terrorist groups operating in the Western Hemisphere, as well as a comprehensive analysis of the activities and strategic intentions of Hezbollah, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, Quds Force, and Al Qaeda and its associated movements in the Western Hemisphere.

OTHER MATTERS

Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Strategic Portfolio Review

The committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC), to conduct a strategic portfolio review of current, planned, programmed, and required manned and unmanned medium-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities of the Department of Defense during the period covered by the Future Years Defense Program accompanying the President's request for fiscal year 2013. The committee directs the Chairman to report the results of the review to the congressional defense committees and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

In conducting the review, the Chairman should consider the following:

(1) The complete architecture for medium and high-altitude manned and unmanned systems, including vehicles, sensors, communications, processing, exploitation, analysis, and data storage and dissemination;

(2) Requirements with respect to defense intelligence information enterprise architecture and standards;

(3) Assumptions by the military departments regarding the designation of manned and unmanned ISR aircraft assets for joint operations with respect to making such aircraft available to a Joint Theater Commander or assigned to a military department;

(4) The projected budget for each program and project during the period covered by the fiscal year 2013 Future Years Defense Program for manned and unmanned medium-altitude ISR;

(5) The availability of manned and unmanned high-altitude ISR capabilities to support the required capabilities of the commanders of the combatant commands; and

(6) Opportunities for transfer to other Government agencies and/or foreign military sales of any quick reaction ISR capability JROC finds to be unnecessary for future requirements and/or is not a necessary component of the architecture described in (1).

B–61 Gravity Bomb Tail Kit

The committee wants to ensure that the Air Force explore all appropriate options for its new tail kit that can make it as effective as possible to satisfy military requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in conjunction with the Commander of U.S. STRATCOM and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, to report to the congressional defense committees on the options under consideration for the tail kit of the B61 gravity bomb, including any decisions that reduce or limit the gravity bomb's accuracy. The section would require that the report be provided to the congressional defense committees in an unclassified report, with a classified annex if necessary. The report shall be provided not later than August 15, 2012.

Comptroller General Review of Combatant Commands

The committee notes that as the challenges to national security have expanded, the Department of Defense faces missions of increasing scope, variety, and complexity around the world. To perform these missions, the Department operates geographic combatant commands that conduct activities within assigned areas of responsibility, to include stability, security, transition and reconstruction operations, disaster relief, and humanitarian assistance. Each combatant command also has dedicated military service component commands and task forces, which support the combatant command carry out its missions. At a time of growing economic and fiscal constraints, the committee believes that the Department must ensure the combatant commands and its supporting elements have the appropriate levels of personnel and resources to meet mission requirements. The committee further notes that in a March 2012 report, the Government Accountability Office concluded that there may be additional opportunities to consolidate organizations and centralize functions across the Department, to include the combatant commands.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the personnel and resources of the combatant commands, its supporting military service component commands, and other assigned task forces, and to submit a report on the findings to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2013. The review should cover the following:

(1) The level of resources, both personnel and overall support costs, associated with the commands from fiscal years 2001 through 2011 to meet its assigned missions and responsibilities;

(2) How the commands, its supporting military service component commands, and other assigned task forces are currently organized and structured to ensure efficiency and avoid duplication within and among the various organizations; and

(3) What steps, if any, the Department has taken to reexamine size and structure in light of the new strategic guidance issued in 2012.

Counterterrorism Policy and the Growing Threat of Al Qaeda Regional Affiliates

The committee is concerned about the spread of Al Qaeda regional affiliates and the lack of a comprehensive counterterrorism strategy to mitigate these threats. The committee has previously expressed concern in this area, most recently in section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

The committee notes that the February 2012 U.S. Intelligence Community Worldwide Threat Assessment depicted a core Al Qaeda (AQ) with diminished operational importance and a more decentralized leadership movement. The assessment further noted that continued robust U.S. and partnered counterterrorism (CT) efforts and pressure would likely lead to fragmentation of the movement within a few years.

While core AQ is diminishing in operational importance, the committee is concerned that regional Al Qaeda affiliates, particularly

in Africa and the Arabian Peninsula, continue to increase attacks both locally and globally, expand ideological influence, and gain territorial control in strategic areas of concern. Additionally, several senior national security officials have identified Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) in the Republic of Yemen as the most serious terrorist threat to the United States. The committee notes that AQAP continues to exploit local political instability and expand local influence, particularly in the southern provinces. While remaining an international threat, AQAP has expanded domestic operations within Yemen to launch a wide-scale domestic insurgency, thereby transforming the organization from an Al Qaeda affiliate to a Taliban-like movement further threatening the region. The committee notes that such gains provide AQAP with greater freedom to move, plan, and project threats regionally and internationally.

Similarly, Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) continues operations in northern Africa and the U.S. intelligence community has noted that AQIM is seeking opportunities to strike Western targets. The committee is concerned that post-coup political instability in the Republic of Mali presents another regional point of vulnerability given the concentration of AQIM members in Mali's northern desert. There are also fears that the Islamic extremist group Boko Haram in the Federal Republic of Nigeria has engaged with elements of AQIM, suggesting a wider regional trend of shared tactics and resources threatening security and stability throughout the region.

Additionally, Al Shabaab in Somalia recently announced a public merger with core AQ. Al Shabaab grew out of a nationalist movement within Somalia to repel what was viewed by Al Shabaab as Ethiopian troops occupying Somali lands. However, with the help of AQ leaders such as the recently deceased AQ operative, Huran Fazul, Al Shabaab has demonstrated the capacity to strike outside of the Somali borders, as evidence by the terrorist attacks in the Republic of Uganda during the World Cup in July 2010. Additionally, Al Shabaab has been responsible for recruiting would-be militant from the Somali diaspora in the West.

The committee is concerned that the present strategy to mitigate these threats lacks a holistic approach. While the committee believes that kinetic options are an important component to the overall strategy, the committee is concerned that over-reliance on such options distracts from the need for a comprehensive approach to reverse the gains made by these regional affiliates and to protect the homeland. In particular, a comprehensive strategy should place greater emphasis on capacity building, particularly in fragile states or areas that too easily become terrorist sanctuaries. For this reason, the committee included section 1032 in Public Law 112–81, which requires National Security Planning Guidance that would serve as an interagency strategy to enhance the capacity of partner governments to assist in eliminating the ability of Al Qaeda and its affiliates to establish or maintain safe havens.

The June 2011 National Strategy for Counterterrorism highlights the need for building security partnerships as part of comprehensive strategy. However, the committee believes that U.S. and partnered counterterrorism (CT) efforts require additional emphasis. Specifically, the committee believes that activities that utilize

U.S. Special Operations Forces and an "indirect approach" that leverages local and indigenous forces should be used more aggressively and surgically in Africa and the Arabian Peninsula in close coordination with and in support of geographic combatant commander and U.S. embassy country team requirements. The committee believes that current indirect activities are not fully resourced and underutilized to counter gains and preclude the expansion of Al Qaeda affiliates in these regions.

The committee believes a comprehensive strategy should also include greater prioritization of capture operations of high value terrorists. In 2009, former CIA Director, General Michael Hayden, noted that information obtained during interrogations of senior AQ members provided the majority of U.S. intelligence regarding the terrorist organization and had led to successful follow-on operations throughout the world. The committee is concerned that the lack of a comprehensive detention regime for high-value terrorists has diminished U.S. intelligence on AQ and its affiliates.

The committee believes that an aggressive strategy that builds security partnerships, develops host nation capabilities, leverages such an indirect approach, and prioritizes capture operations would effectively supplement the need for kinetic options and presents a more balanced approach. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and provide an update on efforts to counter the spread of Al Qaeda regional affiliates and other efforts to improve national security planning guidance pursuant to section 1032 of Public Law 112–81.

Defense Business Board Public-Private Cooperation Review

The committee notes the 2010 National Security Strategy highlighted the importance of public-private cooperation as "critical to U.S. success at home and abroad." Public-private cooperation is defined as the voluntary interaction between the public and private sector through which both parties leverage their respective resources in order to address an issue or opportunity for greater impact and efficiency. The committee is also aware that the Defense Business Board is conducting a study to provide recommendations to the Department of Defense on how to better use the advantages of public-private cooperation.

The combatant commands have established public-private cooperation offices in order to leverage best business practices, expertise, and capabilities to enhance combatant command theater security cooperation activities. However, these initiatives have limited policy guidance from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff requested the Defense Business Board conduct a study to provide recommendations by July 2012 to the Department on how it could use the benefits of public-private cooperation. 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 November 1, 2012, on the conclusions of the Defense Business Board. The report should include the following:

(1) An assessment of the Department's organizational structures supporting public-private cooperation;

(2) An evaluation of the Department's successes and lessons learned regarding public-private cooperation;

(3) An evaluation of the legal framework within which the public-private cooperation efforts operate; and

(4) An assessment of the Defense Business Board recommendations regarding public-private cooperation, and the Department's plan, if any, to implement the recommendations.

Disposition of Detainees in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan

The committee is concerned about the disposition of detainees currently held by U.S. forces under the law of armed conflict in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. On March 9, 2012, the United States signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Afghanistan regarding the "Transfer of U.S. Detention Facilities in Afghan Territory to Afghanistan." Pursuant to the MOU, Afghanistan affirmed the establishment of an administrative detention regime. Also pursuant to the MOU, the United States agreed to transfer Afghan nationals detained by U.S. forces at the Detention Facility in Parwan within six months to Afghan custody. Many of these detainees have been identified by U.S. forces as "enduring security threats" to the United States. The MOU states that Afghanistan will "consult" with the United States before releasing a detainee and will "consider favorably" U.S. input regarding the continued detention of transferred detainees.

The committee notes that while some transition of responsibility for the detention of Afghan citizens is consistent with the resumption of sovereignty by Afghanistan, the committee is concerned about Afghanistan's capacity and willingness to continue to detain these individuals or to prosecute them. The committee notes that much of the information related to the threat posed by these individuals is classified U.S. intelligence, which makes prosecution in the Afghan criminal justice system unlikely. The committee urges the President and the Secretary of Defense to ensure that these dangerous individuals will not return to the battlefield following the transition to Afghan custody.

Electromagnetic Pulse Survivability

The committee remains concerned with the Nation's preparedness to withstand, mitigate, and respond to the effects of naturally occurring or manmade electromagnetic pulse (EMP). The committee expressed concerns in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. The committee is also aware that the Defense Science Board (DSB) has also noted similar concerns over the Department of Defense's (DOD) planning and assessment process. After conducting periodic independent assessments of the Department's EMP survivability program, the DSB Task Force on the Survivability of Systems and Assets to Electromagnetic Pulse and other Nuclear Weapon Effects has noted the following in its interim report from August 2011:

(1) Service assessments tend to identify mission critical equipment instead of mission critical capabilities;

(2) Fragmentation of responsibilities and lack of priority for survivability of communications networks and command and control (C2) systems hinders progress;

(3) Lack of engagement of Combatant Commands inhibits visibility into the problem;

(4) The Department has limited understanding of survivability of infrastructure critical to DOD missions;

(5) Overall fragmentation of efforts translates into little movement in developing a national enterprise recommended by two previous DSB task forces; and

(6) Technical enterprise continuing to atrophy.

The committee agrees with the findings of the DSB, and strongly urges the Department to expedite the completion of the threat assessment and planning report called for in H. Rept. 112–78. The committee believes that any planning in this area should identify critical DOD assets vulnerable to EMP, and to determine appropriate actions to mitigate those vulnerabilities. In addition, the committee encourages the Department to also look at key supporting capabilities to enhance EMP preparedness and survivability, such as workforce and modeling and simulation capabilities.

Global Rebalancing of U.S. Special Operations Forces

The committee is aware of an ongoing effort within U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) to comprehensively review its present force structure to facilitate the accomplishment of special operations activities as defined in section 167 of title 10, United States Code. The committee understands that USSOCOM is coordinating the review with the respective staffs of the geographic combatant commands, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The committee further understands that these initiatives are focused in several areas, including enabling and resourcing of the Theater Special Operations Commands (TSOCs), the development of a USSOCOM force management directorate, the improvement of USSOCOM's interagency coordination and presence, and the strengthening of global special operations forces (SOF) relationships through the establishment of regional SOF coordination centers. The committee understands that the proposed changes in USSOCOM authorities pertain to command authorities primarily identified within the Unified Command Plan and that the changes being considered would reflect USSOCOM's global area of operations and emphasize trans-regional roles and responsibilities.

On balance, the committee supports this ongoing review of U.S. Special Operations Forces and USSOCOM's coordination within the Department of Defense. In particular, the committee is encouraged by the potential establishment of a force development directorate within USSOCOM that would consolidate force development and management functions and ensure a unified approach to training, education, and management of the force. The committee expects such an initiative to greatly improve deployment predictability and ultimately enhance operational flexibility of the force. The committee encourages USSOCOM to consider incorporating more formalized degree and non-degree educational programs for officer and enlisted personnel and to leverage existing programs and re-

sources such as those within the National Defense University's College of International Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, and the Joint Special Operations University.

While the committee supports efforts to establish additional regional coordination centers similar to North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters, the committee encourages USSOCOM to conduct a comprehensive review of requirements in this area to include geographic prioritization and resourcing and also additive funds through Major Force Programs 2, 10, and 11. Additionally, the committee encourages a concomitant review of existing statutory authorities to support SOF security force assistance, training, and advising to improve regional security and support geographic combatant commander requirements. Such a review should include potential modifications to current statutory authorities presently being utilized with the goal of making these existing authorities flexible enough to support SOF activities.

While the committee is supportive of additional interagency coordination efforts, the committee expresses concern at the potential redundant costs associated with the establishment of interagency coordination centers within the National Capitol Region, associated infrastructure costs, information technology, and how these potentially duplicative centers may be rendering previous multi-million dollar investments such as USSOCOM's Interagency Task Force redundant or obsolete. The committee expects these interagency initiatives to be resource-neutral. The committee further expects to be kept fully and currently informed of these interagency initiatives.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to brief the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act providing an update on these initiatives and all efforts to globally rebalance U.S. Special Operations Forces.

Humanitarian Mine Action and Security Force Assistance

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) program is a key component of U.S. security force assistance activities and programs. The committee understands that the program advances geographic combatant commander's (GCC) Theater Security Cooperation Programs, strategies, and objectives by training host-nation personnel in landmine and other explosive remnants of war clearance, mine risk education, and victims' assistance. The committee is aware the program is overseen by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict and that the Defense Security Cooperation Agency performs financial management, including allocation of funds to the geographic combatant commands.

The committee has supported the Department's HMA program and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) expanded the definition of humanitarian demining assistance to also include stockpiled conventional munitions assistance so that the Department could implement more holistic programs with host-nation partners. The committee looks forward to reports from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special

Operations/Low Intensity Conflict on this program and further understanding how the inclusion of stockpiled conventional munitions assistance will contribute to the overall program and specifically minimize threats posed by dangerous stockpiles subject to proliferation. The committee believes that in addition to generating good will within the host-nation and the region, HMA programs aid in the development of host-nation leadership and organizational skills, provide access to geographical areas otherwise not easily available to U.S. forces, and improves highly perishable U.S. skills in such critical areas as language, cultural, and foreign internal defense.

However, the committee remains concerned that the Department's HMA program is under-utilized and under-resourced given the present limited geographic scope of only 12 countries and total investment of $2.6 million for fiscal year 2011, and that research, development, testing and evaluation efforts have been similarly under-resourced. Because of these shortfalls, the committee is concerned that the potential for HMA programs and projects to contribute to GCC Theater Security Cooperation and security force assistance strategies is not being realized. Further, the committee believes that HMA programs are not globally prioritized properly in order to target specific countries with the greatest strategic results in line with larger U.S. Government security force assistance and national security goals.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that outlines the strategic value of a global HMA program as a part of broader security force assistance strategies to include a multi-year outlook. The briefing should also include efforts to improve research, development, test, and evaluation in this area, and ways to ensure coordination mechanisms exist to determine whether counter improvised explosive device technology could be applicable to HMA. In addition, the briefing should outline ways to improve interagency coordination with similar programs underway in the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development. Finally, the briefing should include a review of Active Duty and Reserve Component resourcing requirements for global HMA to include the potential inclusion of U.S. Special Operations Forces as previously codified in section 167 of title 10, United States Code.

Improving Certification and Accreditation for Information Technology Systems

The committee has been concerned for several years that the cumbersome nature of the information technology (IT) acquisition process adds cost and complexity that delays the deployment of useful capabilities for the warfighter. The committee believes that the software certification and accreditation processes are major contributors to that added cost and complexity. Furthermore, the committee believes that the Department of Defense's certification and accreditation process should be addressed holistically by the rapid IT acquisition process established by section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), along with other contributors to system delays like test and evaluation. As the Department implements Section 804, the

committee encourages the Department to review and, if practical, consolidate the certification and accreditation process to make it more efficient, and simpler for industry to understand and comply with.

Independent Report on China's Nuclear Weapons Program

In 2011, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing concerning the nuclear weapons modernization programs of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China. The committee is concerned that there may be gaps in U.S. understanding of China's nuclear weapons program and its role in China's national security, modernization plans, capabilities, and other key details.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to direct an Federally Funded Research and Development Center to convene a panel of nuclear weapons and military experts, consisting of persons with significant Government or nuclear weapons laboratory experience and subject matter expertise, including past and current access to the intelligence community and Department of Energy classified information, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by April 15, 2013, that examines the Chinese nuclear weapons program. The report should include: an assessment of China's nuclear deterrence strategy, a historical perspective and the assessed geopolitical drivers of its strategy; a detailed description of China's nuclear arsenal, its capabilities (including the number of weapons capable of being delivered at intercontinental range), and associated doctrines (including targeting doctrines); a comparison of United States nuclear forces, including deployed, in reserve or awaiting dismantlement; projections of possible future Chinese nuclear arsenals, their capabilities, and associated doctrines; a description of command and control functions and gaps; an assessment of China's fissile material stockpile, and civil and military production capabilities and capacities; an assessment of China's production capacities for nuclear weapons and nuclear weapon delivery vehicles; and a discussion of any significant uncertainties surrounding China's nuclear weapons program.

The report should identify knowledge gaps, regarding China's nuclear weapons program, and discuss the implications of any such gaps for the security of the United States and its allies. Lastly, the report should include any recommendations for how to improve U.S. understanding of the Chinese nuclear weapons program.

Information Operations Programs

The committee recognizes the improvement of the Department of Defense's budget justification material related to information operations (IO) programs, as well as in the accounting for such programs. The committee continues to support IO as a non-kinetic means of exerting influence and furthering the national security goals of the United States. In particular, IO provides a critical tool for countering the ideological influence of violent extremist groups.

The committee further recognizes the need to constitute and sustain a level of activity in the information domain even after the U.S. drawdown in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The absence of overt hostilities does not mean an absence of hostile intent

towards the United States, and so vigilance in the information environment should be maintained at a reasonable level. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to determine the level of information operations planning and support the U.S. will need in the future, and to ensure that needed resources are programmed accordingly within the base budget of future budget submissions. The committee additionally looks forward to reviewing the report on information operations and strategic communication as directed in Section 1086 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Cost-Benefit Analysis Tool

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) has developed several cost-benefit analysis tools to enable basic cost-effectiveness analysis of the acquisition and allocation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets. The committee believes that to better achieve full cost-effectiveness analysis, any further development of such tools should include at a minimum the following:

(1) An inventory of all existing and planned DOD ISR platforms and sensors, including programs of record and quick reaction capabilities, through the Future Years Defense Program;

(2) Validated attributes/capabilities of each platform and sensor, concept of operations for their employment, and performance data;

(3) Commanders' prioritization of platform and sensor attributes, using a zero-sum ranking scheme that forces tradeoffs;

(4) Full cost data (both base and incremental wartime costs to include procurement, research and development, operation and sustainment and other life cycle costs); and

(5) Other contextual inputs as needed (for example, the type of conflict, phase of conflict, target deck, and so forth).

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Commander, Joint Forces Functional Command for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to brief the congressional defense committees and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence within 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the development and use of such tools to inform pre-milestone A ISR acquisition decisions and the allocation of ISR assets to the combatant commands.

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Task Force

The committee commends the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Task Force on the instrumental role it has played in responding quickly to warfighter ISR needs in the area of responsibility of U.S. Central Command. The committee is aware that the ISR Task Force was established by the Secretary of Defense as a means to rapidly assess and address near-term ISR requirements, gaps, and shortfalls that arise outside the normal budgetary planning and programming cycles. The Task Force has increased the number of fielded ISR platforms by over 200 percent

in the 5 years it has existed, playing a key role in force protection and in the find, fix, finish cycle.

The committee notes the Secretary of Defense is reviewing the acquisition process for the rapid fielding of capabilities in response to urgent operational needs, as directed by section 804 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). As part of this review, the committee expects the Secretary to address the present and future role of the ISR Task Force. The committee notes the Secretary should consider how the Joint Functional Component Command for ISR could assume the role of helping combatant commands refine its ISR requirements and how the Joint Staff's operational needs process could best address time-sensitive requests for ISR. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence within 90 days of meeting the reporting requirements directed by section 804 of Public Law 111–383, on the Secretary's findings regarding the role of the ISR Task Force.

Military Auxiliary Radio System

The committee appreciates the important role played in support of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the armed forces by volunteer and amateur radio operators who comprise the Military Auxiliary Radio System (MARS). Under Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 4650.02 "Military Auxiliary Radio System", MARS provides contingency radio communications support to U.S. Government operations. The committee understands that use by MARS of high-frequency (HF) radio to convey situational awareness and information in the event of natural or man-made disaster provides an important back-up to more technologically sophisticated communications systems that can be disrupted or destroyed as a result of unanticipated failures or deliberate hostile actions.

DODI 4650.02 places policy oversight for MARS within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration/DOD Chief Information Officer (ASD(NII)/DoD CIO). However, since NII has been disestablished, the committee is concerned that oversight of the MARS program is unclear, and that there is a lack of standardization in policies, processes, and procedures among the three MARS branches within the Army, Air Force, and Navy-Marine Corps since MARS is independently managed within each service. As such, the committee encourages the Department to clarify and maintain policy oversight of MARS within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and to update DoDI 4650.02 with respect to the disestablisment of NII. Further, the committee urges the Department to appoint an individual manager with authority and responsibility for coordination of MARS policies and activities across each of the three MARS branches and within the Department to ensure holistic policy oversight of the MARS program. The committee also encourages the service secretaries and the geographic combatant commanders to integrate MARS more fully into their operational planning and activities, in accordance with the guidance and direction outlined in DoDI 4650.02.

Navy Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officer Program

The committee recognizes that Navy Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officers (NEPLOs) serve as senior Navy representatives for Defense Support to Civil Authorities during emergencies and events of national significance such as hurricanes, forest fires, flooding, and earthquakes. The committee understands that NEPLOs depend heavily on an ability to communicate rapidly with Service and interagency partners and to maintain an accurate common operating picture that facilitates Defense Support to Civil Authorities and interagency response efforts. However, the committee is concerned that the present communications and information sharing enterprises lack tools to manage and ensure readiness which may impede response times and potentially contribute to loss of life and property.

The committee therefore encourages the Department of Defense to consider improvements to readiness, information sharing, communications, and situational awareness tools and technologies in support of NEPLO and similar programs that provide Defense Support to Civil Authorities during emergencies and events of National significance.

Personal Mobile Device Policy

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is developing a policy that would allow government personnel to utilize their own personal mobile devices to access work-related email and documents securely. The committee recognizes that this would reduce the need for government employees to carry more than one mobile computing device both at work and at home. However, the committee also recognizes that there are significant security and network management challenges to implementing such a policy that make it difficult to execute in a short time frame. The committee believes there are a number of efficiencies that might be gained in the long run, and encourages the Department to continue developing this policy, and to it implement it as expeditiously as possible.

Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

The committee notes the importance of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities for the warfighter. New technology combined with a wartime environment has led to an exponential growth in ISR collection capability over the past decade. The committee notes previous Government Accountability Office reports that found the Department's capacity for processing, exploiting, and dissemination is limited and has not kept pace with the increase in collection platforms and combat air patrols. The committee believes the solution will be a holistic approach that includes personnel as well as new tools and technology. The Department has been trying to address this, but continues to face technical, planning, manpower, and training challenges. The committee notes that these challenges may be exacerbated as the Department begins to shift operational and ISR focus to other regions and modes of operation that will differ from recent and ongoing oper-

ations, in addition to the future integration of wide area airborne surveillance technologies.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committees on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by March 1, 2013, addressing the extent that the Armed Services:

(1) Have developed a structure to process, manage, store, fuse, tag, search and analyze the ISR data that is currently collected and is scalable to future data collection;

(2) Have sufficient and secure communications and information architectures to manage ISR data;

(3) Have a plan to develop capabilities, or use identified established training centers, to train a workforce adequate to meet current and future ISR needs; and,

(4) Are making use, or investing in, technology to automate and efficiently process, exploit, and disseminate ISR data.

Public Key Infrastructure Tokens for Classified Network Access

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is currently pursuing an initiative that would allow access to the Secure Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET) using dedicated public key infrastructure (PKI) tokens. This initiative mirrors procedures taken by the Department in implementing the use of a common access card (CAC) to access unclassified DOD networks. Both efforts are intended to provide authenticated identity management that will enable a common secure computing environment and integrity for all data moving within DOD networks.

The committee supports the development and deployment of PKI tokens for SIPRNET access, but encourages the Department to do more to enable specific network applications to access such tokens. The committee recognizes that PKI-enabled network access is a necessary first step to improve network security, but will also support role-based access control that will make both external and internal unauthorized access to information significantly more difficult. The committee believes that implementing PKI tokens for applications as well as network access will improve the network security posture of the Department and address concerns about insider threats expressed by the committee in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Report by Commander U.S. Strategic Command on Locating and Targeting Mobile Ballistic Missiles

The committee is aware that nations are increasingly attempting to deploy mobile ballistic missiles believing that they will be immune from, or significantly more difficult to defend against, U.S. military forces, including missile defense systems. The committee believes that the United States may need to develop and deploy capability to locate and target mobile ballistic missiles and the committee is interested in how such capability, if deployed, would impact requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command to provide an unclassified report in form to the congressional defense committees by November 15, 2012, with a classified

annex, if necessary, on its ability to locate and target, with U.S. military forces, mobile ballistic missiles.

Report on Command and Control Arrangements of the European Phased Adaptive Approach and NATO Ballistic Missile Defense Systems

The committee is aware that the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA), which is a U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), will at times be under the command of the Commander, U.S. European Command (EUCOM), and at times be under the command of NATO. The committee is concerned that it is not yet clear as to how this command structure will work in practice. The concern is amplified by the committee's understanding that the NATO system, of which the EPAA is an element, will be declared to have achieved interim operating capability at the May 2012 Chicago Summit.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by July 15, 2012, specifying the command and control arrangements for U.S. missile defense systems deployed in Europe when under U.S. command and under NATO command. The plan should focus on who will maintain fire control authority, when such authority will change hands between EUCOM and NATO, and what the concept of operations will be for the defense of Europe, including priority of defense of U.S. deployed forces and NATO territory using available missile defense interceptor inventory.

Report on Joint Task Force for U.S. Northern Command

The committee is aware that the mission of U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) is to provide command and control of Department of Defense homeland defense efforts and to coordinate defense support of civil authorities. The committee is also aware that USNORTHCOM plans, organizes and executes homeland defense and civil support missions, but has few permanently assigned forces. The committee understands that USNORTHCOM is assigned forces whenever necessary to execute missions, as ordered by the President of the United States or the Secretary of Defense.

The committee is also aware that USNORTHCOM has several standing joint task forces assigned to deal with and concentrate on specific responsibilities, including Joint Task Force Alaska, Joint Task Force Civil Support, Joint Task Force North.

The committee recognizes that improvised explosive devices (IEDs) have become the weapon of choice for insurgents and terrorists across the globe and that such devices could pose a considerable threat if employed systematically across the homeland.

The committee also recognizes that the Department of Defense has developed a uniquely trained and highly qualified Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) community capable of rendering safe and mitigating IED threats, as well as considerable Counter-IED (C–IED) technologies and capabilities. To deal with potential emerging homeland defense and defense support to civil authorities in the areas of EOD and C–IED the committee recognizes the potential need for a standing joint task force to augment

and provide specialized capabilities for civil authorities when properly requested and authorized.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than November 12, 2012 that contains a detailed programmatic assessment of all current and future NORTHCOM EOD and C–IED capabilities and operational requirements to include any potential capability gaps as well as the strategies and plans to address these capability gaps. The committee expects the report to also include the advisability and feasibility of creating a Joint Task Force for EOD and C–IED within NORTHCOM and how this task force could help mitigate any potential capability gaps and shortfalls that may be identified by this assessment to include force structure requirements.

Report on the Assessed Efficacy of the Location of X-band Radar on the East Coast of the United States

The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency continues to maintain a large X-band radar located on Kwajalein Atoll in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, a radar that was intended to be deployed in the Czech Republic prior to the Administration's decision to cancel the European Third Site deployment. The committee believes this radar, formerly known as the European Midcourse Radar, could be usefully employed by the United States for its missile defense by contributing to the acquisition, tracking, and discrimination of ballistic missile threats launched from the Middle East.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to conduct a study the costs and capabilities for homeland missile defense involved with basing this radar at an advantageous site along the East Coast of the United States, and to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by September 30, 2012, on the results of the study.

Report Regarding Impacts of W76 Nuclear Warhead Life Extension Program Delay

On February 16, 2012, the Chief of Naval Operations, testified to the committee that the Navy is concerned with the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) plans to slow the production schedule of the W76 nuclear warhead life extension program (LEP), stating that "we are concerned beyond the [fiscal year 2013] submission by the NNSA with regard to their warhead upgrade . . . when we look at [fiscal year 2014] and up, we are concerned." The committee shares the Navy's concern about NNSA's production slow-down for the W76 LEP, particularly if the slowed schedule risks not meeting the operational or hedge requirements of the Navy or U.S. Strategic Command.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chief of Naval Operations, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, the Director of the Navy's Strategic Systems Programs, and the Administrator for Nuclear Security, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by August 15, 2012, on if and how the NNSA's proposed schedule for the W76 LEP meets the operational and hedge stockpile requirements of the Navy and U.S. Strategic

Command throughout the full life of such LEP. If the plan does not meet such requirements, the report should include a detailed description of why it does not. Finally, the report should include a description of the impacts of the slow-down on the Navy and U.S. Strategic Command.

Role of State Government Sponsored Aerospace Infrastructure

The committee recognizes that it is in the national security interest of the United States to reduce the cost of launching space payloads into orbit. The committee also recognizes the legitimate role of state government-sponsored aerospace infrastructure as space assets that may be used to reduce the cost of space access and to preserve the United States capabilities through providing alternative options for both equatorial and polar orbits. To provide resilience and assurance and to reduce the cost of space operations, the Department of Defense should consider, where operationally and economically feasible, state government space capabilities in providing operational solutions which enhance the space program for the United States.

Research and Development Assessments in Quadrennial Defense Review and the Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense will conduct a quadrennial defense review (QDR) during 2013. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee encouraged the Secretary, among other things, to identify the assumptions used in future QDRs related to research and development and the core capabilities relating to research, development, test, and evaluation required to support the national defense. In addition, the committee observed the importance for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to include in his advice to the Secretary the research and development needs of the combatant commanders. As the Secretary conducts the 2013 QDR, the committee commends the language in last year's committee report to him for his consideration.

Resiliency and Survivability for Nuclear Air-Launched Cruise Missile Basing

As the United States reduces its deployed nuclear forces in the coming years to comply with limits established in the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), the resiliency and survivability of the nation's enduring strategic nuclear deterrent assumes a new level of importance. Since the decertification of one Air Force Weapons Storage Area (WSA) in 2007, the Air Force has relied upon a single WSA to meet U.S. Strategic Command's nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missile requirement.

The committee notes that following serious Air Force security incidents in 2006 and 2007, the September 2008 Phase 1 Report of the Secretary of Defense Task Force on DoD Nuclear Weapons Management concluded that "The closure of the WSA at one of the bomber bases was a significant mistake with a negative operational impact," and that "[the closure] simplifies enemy targeting and creates more concentration of vulnerability for the B–52 bomber

force." In response, the Air Force requested and Congress appropriated $73 million for activities to recertify and reopen the closed WSA. However, in testimony before the committee in February 2011, Air Force Chief of Staff General Norton A. Schwartz stated that the Air Force had decided not to pursue these activities because of budget constraints.

A reconstituted second WSA could enhance the resiliency of the bomber force, provide redundancy in a critical national security mission, and reduce operational risk. Consolidation of the old WSA's existing security perimeter and installation of modern detection and denial systems could reduce security personnel requirements and result in significant cost savings from original estimates. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to reexamine plans, including requirements and costs, for reconstituting a second nuclear weapons storage capability for nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missiles.

Use of Existing Authorities for U.S. Special Operations Forces

The committee commends the efforts by the Commander, United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), to rebalance our Special Operations Forces (SOF) in terms of geographic focus and a return to traditional SOF activities beyond the counter-terrorism focus of recent years. The committee understands that the Commander, USSOCOM may require broader authorities, both command and statutory, to accomplish some of the command's stated goals. The committee is aware of a legislative proposal initiative by USSOCOM that may consider such broader authorities. However, elsewhere in this report, the committee has expressed concern that some existing authorities are not exercised to their full potential due to self-imposed bureaucratic constraints. In that context, the committee would like to highlight two existing authorities which it believes are well-suited for the Commander, USSOCOM's rebalancing effort.

First, the committee believes that the Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) authority (10 U.S.C. 2011) is a valuable tool for the training of United States Special Operations Forces (SOF). JCET events and activities with host nation military forces improve joint and allied readiness and interoperability, facilitate the exchange of techniques, and mutually enhance military professionalism. The activities often enhance U.S. influence in the host countries, providing an invaluable means of establishing critical military-to-military relationships. JCETs are also an important part of a Geographic Combatant Commander's theater engagement plan. However, the committee believes that, while JCET engagements have most recently taken place in 50 countries per year, these engagements have not fully realized their potential due to insufficient resourcing and an inability to persistently engage on a recurring basis in key regions and countries.

The committee also notes that section 2011 title 10, United States Code, authorizes the training of a friendly foreign country's "armed forces and other security forces" and that this training is therefore not limited to the foreign country's Special Operations Forces. Further, the committee notes that while the purpose of the authority is to "train the Special Operations Forces of a [United States] combatant command," that this training is not limited to

only counter-terrorism related training. Therefore, as the Geographic Combatant Commands develop JCET engagements, the committee encourages them to consider JCETs that address the broader requirements of a friendly foreign country's armed forces and other security forces, and also the full range of Special Operations Activities as described by section 167 title 10, United States Code, as appropriate.

Second, the committee understands that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) routinely provides funding to the commanders of the geographic combatant commanders to conduct activities authorized by the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund (CCIF) (section 166a of title 10, United States Code). The committee believes that the Commander of USSOCOM, by virtue of commanding a global and unified combatant command, is fully eligible for participation in the CCIF process. Moreover, USSOCOM's mission areas, as set forth in section 167 of title 10, United States Code, make it particularly suited to accomplish certain CCIF-related activities. Therefore, the committee recommends that the CJCS provide guidance on how USSOCOM might directly participate in the CCIF, including how to coordinate with any relevant geographic combatant commanders as required, or how changes to the Unified Command Plan may provide USSOCOM with more autonomy to execute CCIF activities. The committee also encourages the Commander, USSOCOM to be proactive in developing CCIF activity proposals for the consideration of the CJCS.

Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team Reductions

The committee believes that continued weapons of mass destruction (WMD) threats demonstrate the enduring need for a robust domestic consequence management (CM) enterprise that is integrated across State and Federal units. The committee notes that the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) directed the Department of Defense (DOD) to "improve the responsiveness and flexibility of consequence management response forces." In response to QDR concerns, the committee believes that the Department and National Guard Bureau (NGB) produced a new domestic CM response organizational concept better aligned with the National Strategy for Homeland Security and the National Response Framework.

With the domestic CM response enterprise, the committee notes that the current 57 state-based WMD Civil Support Teams (CSTs) constitute the initial rapid response force to support local first responders; and that CSTs provide unique capabilities and expertise such as WMD detection and identification and rapid assessments of hazardous material, often not available to local responders. The committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense certified the 48th (Florida) and 24th (New York) WMD CSTs in 2011 and 2010, respectively. The President's fiscal year 2013 request, however, eliminated funding for the 48th and 24th CSTs. The committee is concerned that disestablishing these two CSTs may hinder response times to WMD events and increase the challenge of integrating operations with other State and Federal WMD response teams. The committee notes that neither the Department nor NGB coordinated with, or solicited input from, affected State and local authorities before making this decision. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that these disestablishments will occur right

after funding was expended to train, equip, and prepare CSTs for certification.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to deliver a report to the House Committee on Armed Services no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act. The report should discuss the justification for eliminating funding to the 48th and 24th CSTs. Furthermore, the report should cover the following matters:

(1) The impact on operational capability, resourcing, response, potential gaps in integration with remaining CSTs and other State and Federal WMD CM response teams;

(2) The expected budgetary savings over the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) generated by disestablishing the 48th and 24th CST;

(3) The costs of preparing the 48th and 24th CST for certification;

(4) Resulting changes to the latest domestic WMD CM response construct;

(5) Plans for future reduction in any CSTs over the FYDP; and

(6) A strategy for engaging with State and local authorities if the Department plans to eliminate additional CSTs.

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 2013 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount transferred under this authority to $3.5 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

Section 1002—Budgetary Effects of This Act

This section would specify that the budgetary effects of this Act for purposes of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139) will be determined by reference to a statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

Section 1003—Annual Report on Armed Forces Unfunded Priorities

This section would require the military service chiefs, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command to submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing a list of the unfunded priorities for the Armed Force under the jurisdiction of that member or commander, not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1011—Extension of the Authority of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau To Establish and Operate National Guard Counterdrug Schools

This section would authorize the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to continue to operate the five National Guard Counterdrug Schools currently in existence for an additional period of 5 years. The five schools are located in St. Petersburg, Florida; Johnston, Iowa; Meridian, Mississippi; Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania; and Camp Murray, Washington.

The committee notes that four of the five schools were previously authorized by section 901 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469). The fifth school has been in operation since 2009.

The budget request contained $999.4 million for the Counternarcotics Central Transfer Account within Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide. Funding for the National Guard Counterdrug Schools is included as part of this request. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends $999.4 million, the amount of the President's budget request, for the Counternarcotics Central Transfer Account.

Section 1012—Reporting Requirement on Expenditures To Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities

This section would extend, by 1 year, the reporting requirement on expenditures to support foreign counter-drug activities under section 1022(a) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), as most recently amended by section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Section 1013—Extension of Authority To Support Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend, by 1 year, the unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia under section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1007 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Section 1014—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces To Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-Terrorism Activities

This section would extend, by 1 year, the support for joint task forces under section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1021—Policy Relating To Major Combatant Vessels of the Strike Forces of the United States Navy

This section would amend section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) which required all combatant vessels of the strike forces of the Navy, including all new classes of such vessel, be designed with integrated nuclear power systems. This amendment would require the Secretary of the Navy to notify the congressional defense committees if, after a cost benefit analysis, the Secretary decides it would not be practical for the new class of ships to be nuclear powered.

Section 1022—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Delayed Annual Naval Vessel Construction Plan

This section would fence some funds available to the United States Navy until the annual shipbuilding plan has been submitted to Congress.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1031—Findings on Detention Pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Enacted in 2001

This section would provide several congressional findings related to the detention authority provided by the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40).

Section 1032—Findings Regarding Habeas Corpus Rights

This section would provide two congressional findings related to the writ of habeas corpus.

Section 1033—Habeas Corpus Rights

This section would state that nothing in the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40) or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) shall be construed to deny the availability of the writ of habeas corpus in a court ordained or established by or under Article III of the Constitution for any person who is detained in the United States pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40).

Section 1034—Extension of Authority To Make Rewards for Combating Terrorism

This section would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or Government personnel of Allied Forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces through fiscal year 2014 and require a report that outlines future requirements of the authority.

Section 1035—Prohibition on Travel to the United States for Certain Detainees Repatriated to the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands

This section would prohibit the rights and benefits afforded by section 141 of the applicable Compact of Free Association (Public Laws 99–658; 108–188) to be afforded to an individual currently or previously detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who has been repatriated to the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, or the Republic of Palau.

Section 1036—Prohibition on the Use Of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013 to transfer or release detainees at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions.

Section 1037—Requirements for Certifications Relating to the Transfer of Detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 2013 to transfer or release individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within a foreign country or any other foreign entity. This prohibition would apply unless the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, provides a written certification to Congress addressing several requirements at least 30 days prior to the transfer of any such individual.

This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds for the transfer of any such individual to the custody or effective control of a foreign country or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the same country or entity who engaged in terrorist activity subsequent to their transfer.

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the general prohibition against transfers to a foreign country if there is a confirmed case of any individual transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as well as two of the requirements for other transfers. In these instances, the Secretary must determine that alternative actions will be taken, that it is not possible to certify the risks have been completely eliminated, and that actions taken will substantially mitigate the risk of recidivism.

Whenever the Secretary uses the waiver, he must provide a report that includes a copy of the waiver, determination, a statement of the basis for the determination, and a summary of the alternative actions to be taken.

Section 1038—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 for fiscal year 2013 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 1039—Reports on Recidivism of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, that Have Been Transferred to Foreign Countries

This section would require two different reports relating to transfers of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. These required reports represent two of the recommendations made by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation's report following an investigation of the transfer and release of Guantanamo Bay detainees. The committee is concerned that these recommendations have not otherwise been adopted by the Department of Defense and other agencies. In the future, it is the strong preference of the committee that such recommendations be addressed without requiring legislation.

Section 1040—Notice and Report on Use of Naval Vessels for Detention of Individuals Captured Outside Afghanistan Pursuant To the Authorization for Use of Military Force

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than 5 days after detaining an individual pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40) outside the United States on a U.S. naval vessel. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report on the use of U.S. naval vessels for detention purposes.

Section 1041—Notice Required Prior to Transfer of Certain Individuals Detained at the Detention Facility at Parwan, Afghanistan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the appropriate congressional committees no later than 10 days before the transfer of any third country national detainee held at the Detention Facility at Parwan, Afghanistan, to the custody of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan or of any other country. This section would also require the Secretary to provide additional assessments and certifications regarding such transfers.

Section 1042—Report on Recidivism of Individuals Formerly Detained at the Detention Facility at Parwan, Afghanistan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the relevant congressional committees a report addressing certain issues relating to recidivism of individuals formerly detained at the Detention Facility in Parwan, Afghanistan.

Section 1043—Additional Requirements Relating to the Transfer of Individuals Detained at Guantanamo to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities

This section would amend section 1028 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to require the Secretary of Defense to provide certain certifications prior to the transfer of an individual detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba by not later than 90 days before the transfer. This section would also require an assessment of the likelihood that the individual to be transferred will engage in terrorist activity after the transfer takes place, a detailed summary of the individual's history of associations with foreign terrorist organizations, and the individual's record of cooperation while in Department of Defense custody.

SUBTITLE E—NUCLEAR FORCES

Section 1051—Nuclear Weapons Employment Strategy of the United States

This section would restate the sense of Congress regarding its role in oversight of the Nation's nuclear weapons employment strategy, plans, and options. This section would hold that congressional oversight is vital to the oversight of the Nation's nuclear weapons employment strategy, plans, and options, and that the Secretary would be required to provide such briefings to the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, and such professional staff as they designate, not later than March 15th of each year.

Section 1046 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) that also expressed the sense of the Congress regarding its oversight function over the Nation's nuclear weapons employment strategy, plans, and options. Section 1046 of Public Law 112–81 was informed by the understanding that the oversight process in place in the early 1990s whereby the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, including designated professional staff, were afforded extraordinary access to the Nation's nuclear weapons employment strategy, plans, and options. The conferees were encouraged by a letter that from the Secretary of Defense on November 2, 2011, indicating this oversight process would resume but, to date, it has not resumed.

Section 1052—Commitments for Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Modernization

The section consists of a series of Congressional findings on U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile modernization.

Section 1053—Limitation and Report in the Event of Insufficient Funding for Modernization of Nuclear Weapons Stockpile

The section states the Sense of Congress regarding the linkage between the New START Treaty and modernization of the U.S. nu-

clear weapons stockpile in Condition 9 of the Resolution of Ratification of the treaty.

The section would amend section 1045(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to require a report in any year in which funding is appropriated for nuclear modernization activities that is less than projected in the November 2010 update of the plan referred to in section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) within 60 days of the determination of insufficient funding. The section would prohibit the reduction of U.S. deployed nuclear warheads until the President certifies that the resource shortfall identified in the report has been addressed and 120 days have elapsed following such certification. The limitation on reductions would not apply regarding reductions made to ensure the safety, security, reliability and credibility of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile and delivery systems.

Section 1054—Progress Of Modernization

The section would limit any funds made available for fiscal year 2012 or any fiscal year thereafter to implement a new nuclear weapons employment strategy until a period of 1 year after a report detailing such strategy has been submitted to Congress.

The section would also provide that for fiscal years 2012 through 2021, no funds made available for each such fiscal year may be used to carry out the decisions of the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review Implementation study that would alter the nuclear weapons employment strategy, guidance, plans or options of the United States until the President certifies that the resources projected in February 2011 update to the report required under section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) have been requested from the Congress, have been provided in appropriations enacted by the President, and the sequestration mechanism of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 have been repealed or otherwise terminated.

Section 1055—Limitation On Strategic Delivery System Reductions

The section would require the President to annually certify in writing whether plans to modernize or replace strategic delivery systems are fully resourced and being executed at a level equal to or more than the levels set forth in the November 2010 update to the plan referred to in section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

The section would further prohibit the use of funds to reduce, convert, or eliminate strategic delivery systems as a result of the New START treaty or otherwise unless the President is able to issue the required certification. The section would except from the limitation reductions made to ensure the safety, security, reliability and credibility of the nuclear weapons stockpile and delivery systems, and such systems awaiting dismantlement on the date of the referenced certification.

Section 1056—Prevention Of Asymmetry Of Nuclear Weapon Stockpile Reductions

The section would require the President to certify whether reductions in the United States nuclear weapons stockpile would result in the stockpile being smaller than that of the Russian Federation. The section would provide that if the President certifies that the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile is smaller than the Russian stockpile, he may not make any reductions to the U.S. stockpile until the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command reports on a potential strategic imbalance created by the reductions, and a period of 180 days has elapsed following the submission of the report to the congressional defense committees. The section would except from the limitation reductions made to ensure the safety, security, reliability and credibility of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

Section 1057—Consideration Of Expansion Of Nuclear Forces Of Other Countries

The section would provide that in any year in which the President recommends any reductions in the nuclear forces of the United States, no funds made available for fiscal year 2012 or any fiscal year thereafter may be used for such reduction until the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding foreign nuclear weapons programs and a certification by the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command as to whether the recommended reductions in U.S. nuclear forces could have specific implications for U.S. national security.

Section 1058—Chemistry And Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility And Uranium Processing Facility

The section would require an annual certification by the President whether the construction of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility (CMRR-NF) and the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) will be completed not later than 2021 and whether both facilities will be fully operational by not later than 2024. The section would further require that if the President is not able to so certify, then no funds made available for fiscal year 2012 or any year thereafter may be available to reduce the nondeployed nuclear warheads of the United States until 120 days after the President is able to make the certification. The section would include an exception for reductions necessary to ensure the safety, security, reliability and credibility of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

Section 1059—Nuclear Warheads On Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles Of The United States

The section states the sense of the Congress that strategic stability is not enhanced by reducing the deployment of multiple warheads on U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles if other states are increasing the warhead loading of their intercontinental ballistic missiles. The section would also limit the reductions in warhead loading on U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles unless the President certifies that the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China are carrying out similar reductions. The section in-

cludes an exception for reductions made to ensure the safety, security, reliability and credibility of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile and delivery systems.

Section 1060—Nonstrategic Nuclear Weapon Reductions and Extended Deterrence Policy

The section would state the policy of the United States regarding nonstrategic nuclear weapons reductions as well as the United States policy on the extended deterrence commitment to Europe. The section would also limit any funds made available for fiscal year 2012 or any fiscal year thereafter to reduce, consolidate or withdraw U.S. nuclear weapons that are based in Europe until certain specific conditions are met, as established by a certification from the President submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, and a period of 180 days has elapsed.

Section 1061—Improvements to Nuclear Weapons Council

The section would amend the charter of the Nuclear Weapons Council to enable the Department of Defense to have greater insight into and control of the budget of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Section 1062—Interagency Council on the Strategic Capability of the National Laboratories

This section would establish an Interagency Council on the Strategic Capability of the National Laboratories. The membership of the council would include the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Administrator for Nuclear Security, and other officials as designated by the President. The council would be responsible for a variety of matters related to identifying, assessing, and ensuring adequate support for strategic capabilities at the national laboratories that could be used by the participating agencies to accomplish national security missions. This section would also require each member of the council to create streamlined consideration and approval processes for their agency to procure the services of the national laboratories on appropriate matters. Finally, this section would require the council to submit a report to appropriate congressional committees on the functions and effectiveness of the council.

In June 2010, the Secretary of Energy, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Defense signed a "Governance Charter for an Interagency Council on the Strategic Capability of DOE National Laboratories as National Security Assets." The committee supports the intent of this charter, and recommends this provision to codify the Council and provide congressional direction regarding its functions. Elsewhere in this report, the committee discusses the Work For Others program at the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Section 1063—Report on Capability of Conventional and Nuclear Forces Against Certain Tunnel Sites

This section would require the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command to prepare a report for the congressional defense committees within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act on the implications of the underground tunneling network of the People's Republic of China for the capacity of the conventional and nuclear forces of the United States to hold those tunnels (and assets contained within) at risk, including any implications for U.S. force structure and requirements. Such report would be provided to the congressional defense committees in an unclassified report, with a classified annex if necessary.

The committee also directs the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command to prepare a classified update of a report on the known hardened and deeply buried sites of foreign nations, as well as an assessment of the ability of the United States to neutralize such sites with conventional and or nuclear forces.

Section 1064—Report on Conventional and Nuclear Forces in the Western Pacific Region

The section would state the sense of the Congress regarding U.S. conventional and nuclear forces in the Western Pacific as a response to North Korean aggression. The section would require a report related to deploying additional conventional and nuclear forces to the Western Pacific, and specific issues with such deployments including an evaluation of any bilateral agreements, basing arrangements and costs of such deployments.

Section 1065—Sense of Congress on Nuclear Arsenal

This section would express a sense of Congress that the nuclear force structure of the United States should be periodically reexamined, through nuclear posture reviews, to assess assumptions that shape the structure, size, and targeting of U.S. nuclear forces and to ensure that such forces are structured, sized, and targeted to be capable of holding at risk the assets that potential adversaries value and to provide robust extended deterrence and assurance to allies of the United States.

SUBTITLE F—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1066—Assessment of Department of Defense Use of Electromagnetic Spectrum

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Energy and Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee of the Senate, within 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act assessing the Department of Defense's use of electromagnetic spectrum. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to also submit this report to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration at the time it is provided to the congressional committees.

The committee is concerned that discussions regarding potential reallocation of electromagnetic spectrum bands have not adequately accounted for the operational and cost impacts on critical national security missions. The committee is also concerned that the Department is not proactively planning in order to be in the best possible position to respond should reallocation decisions need to be made. The committee recognizes that this type of planning is complex and requires significant resources and personnel from other mission areas to transition systems and processes, as well as adequate time to do this in a methodical, efficient, coordinated, and cost-effective manner. Therefore, in conducting the assessment, the committee encourages the Secretary to focus on the impact of the 1755–1850 MHz spectrum band, in particular the 1755–1780 MHz band, with regards to cost, the time needed for transition, and required comparable spectrum to relocate. The committee also seeks information on technology development and implementation that would affect spectrum relocation.

Section 1067—Electronic Warfare Strategy of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review and update Department of Defense guidance related to electronic warfare not later than January 1, 2013, to ensure that oversight roles and responsibilities within the Department are clearly defined. This section would also require the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command to update and issue guidance regarding the responsibilities of the combatant command with regard to joint electronic warfare capabilities. Finally, this section would include additional reporting requirements in the annual report on electronic warfare required by section 1053 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1068—Report on Counterproliferation Capabilities and Limitations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, outlining operational capabilities, limitations, and shortfalls within the Department of Defense with respect to counterproliferation and combating weapons of mass destruction involving special operations forces and key enabling forces.

SUBTITLE G—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1071—Rule of Construction Relating To Prohibition on Infringing on the Individual Right to Lawfully Acquire, Possess, Own, Carry, and Otherwise Use Privately Owned Firearms, Ammunition, and Other Weapons

This section would amend section 1062(c) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), relating to the rule of construction regarding the prohibition on collecting or recording information regarding the lawful ownership of a privately owned firearm or other weapon by a member of the Armed Forces or a Department of Defense civilian employee, to clarify that a military mental health professional or com-

manding officer may inquire if a member of the Armed Services owns any weapons, if such member is at high risk for suicide or causing harm to others.

Section 1072—Expansion of Authority of the Secretary of The Army To Loan or Donate Excess Small Arms for Funeral and Other Ceremonial Purposes

This section would amend section 4683(a) of title 10, United States Code, to change the statutory limitation on the number of excess small arms that the Secretary of the Army can donate to certain eligible organizations for funeral and other ceremonial purposes. This section would also establish a rotational small arms loan program should the demand for ceremonial small arms exceed currently available excess supply.

Section 1073—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for Manufacturing Beyond Low-Rate Initial Production at Certain Prototype Integration Facilities

This section would change current restrictions on prototype manufacturing activities from "low-rate initial production" to "low-rate initial production or 1,000 units, whichever is greater," at prototype integration facilities within certain components of the Army's Research, Development, and Engineering Command.

Section 1074—Interagency Collaboration on Unmanned Aircraft Systems

This provision would add a finding to section 1036 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). This provision would also direct the Secretary of Defense to collaborate with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on research to seek solutions to challenges associated with the safe integration of unmanned aircraft systems in the National Airspace System.

Section 1075—Authority to Transfer Surplus Mine-Resistant Ambush-Protected Vehicles and Spare Parts

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer surplus Mine-Resistant Ambush-Protected vehicles, including spare parts for such vehicles, to non-profit United States humanitarian demining organizations for purposes of demining activities and training of such organization. This section would specify that any transfer of such a vehicle shall be made on a loan basis; require the cost of operation and maintenance of the vehicles to be borne by the recipient organization; and include any other appropriate conditions as determined by the Secretary. This section would require the Secretary to notify the congressional defense committees in writing 60 days prior to making any transfer of vehicles or spare parts.

Section 1076—Limitation On Availability of Funds for Retirement of Aircraft

This section would prohibit any fiscal year 2013 funds from being used to retire, divest or transfer any aircraft of the Air Force and C–23 Sherpa aircraft of the Army. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, a report by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Chiefs of Staff of the Air Force, and the Army that specifies the rationale, criteria, and costs associated with the proposed retirement, divestment, or transfer of the aforementioned aircraft during fiscal years 2013 through 2017. This section would also require the Comptroller General to submit to the congressional defense committees a review of the Secretary's report no later than 90 days after the Secretary's submission of the report to the congressional defense committees. This section would also make various transfers of funding among accounts within this Act in order to provide sufficient funding for aircraft that are proposed for retirement, divestment or transfer in fiscal year 2013.

Section 1077—Prohibition on Department of Defense Use of Nondisclosure Agreements to Prevent Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department from Communicating with Members of Congress

This section would modify section 1034(a) of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit any person from restricting a civilian employee of the Department of Defense from communicating with a Member of Congress or an Inspector General. This section would further amend section 1034(a) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the prohibition on restricting communication of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the Department of Defense also precludes the use of a nondisclosure agreement to restrict communication, but does not prevent the use of nondisclosure agreements to prevent the disclosure of deliberations regarding base realignment and closure, commercial proprietary information, and the inappropriate release of classified information.

SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1081—Bipartisan Independent Strategic Review Panel

This section would establish a bipartisan independent strategic review panel to conduct a regular review of the national defense strategic environment of the United States and to conduct an independent assessment of the quadrennial defense review required under section 118 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee notes that the final report of the Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel, established by section 1061 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), found that there was insufficient top down guidance on priorities, roles, and missions to allow the Department of Defense to effectively plan its missions, structure, or resources, or to develop integration and coordination with other departments and agencies. The report recommended the establishment of an independent strategic review panel to review the national security strategic environment of the next 20 years and provide prioritized goal

and risk assessment guidance for use by the U.S. Government. The committee intends this section to be an incremental step in adopting this recommendation. In addition, the committee notes that section 1071 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) established an enduring requirement for an independent panel to assess the report of the Quadrennial Defense Review. Therefore, the committee has consolidated the duties of these two panels into a single panel for the purposes of greater efficiency and information sharing.

Section 1082—Notification of Delayed Reports

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section 122a, which would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees if the Secretary determines that a report required by law to be submitted by an official of the Department of Defense to Congress will not be submitted by the date required.

Section 1083—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System

The committee notes that in 2011, the Secretary of Defense returned all defense intelligence employees in the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System pay bands to the original grade structure, with the exception of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2012, on the status of the transition back to a grade structure. The briefing should include the impact on retention and recruiting as a result of the change, including information on pay banding impacts on retention and recruiting, incentives and authorities available to retain critical skill sets, and information on the process by which employees have the ability to appeal reviews and compensation within the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System.

Guidance Regarding the Conversion of Performance of Certain Functions

The committee commends the Department of Defense for issuing guidance in December 2011 entitled "Prohibition on Converting Certain Functions to Contract Performance." As the Department noted, during downsizing, "We must be particularly vigilant to prevent the inappropriate conversion of work to contract performance." The committee directs the Department to clarify that this guidance applies as well to functions performed by Non-Appropriated Fund employees, which is consistent with section 2461 of title 10, United States Code. The committee also commends the Department for the

issuance of "Guidance Related to the Utilization of Military Manpower to Perform Certain Functions" so that "tasks that are not military essential in nature must be designated for government civilian personnel, or contractor performance, where appropriate."

National Security Education Program

The committee recognizes the importance of the National Security Education Program and the value it provides to enhance national security by educating future government leaders in language and cultural studies. The committee notes the decreased funding in fiscal year 2013 and encourages the Department of Defense to consider the importance of this program when developing future year budget requests.

Pay Parity for Department of Defense Federal Wage System Employees Employed at Joint Military Institutions

The committee continues to be concerned about pay parity for Department of Defense employees at joint bases and is disappointed that it has not yet received the briefing it directed the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to provide in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, regarding the actions being taken to address the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC) recommendations. In October 2010, the FPRAC recommended consolidation of the Federal Wage System area within the same General Schedule locality pay area; however, no further action has been taken. As previously noted, an example of pay disparity is Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, New Jersey, where the former McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, and Fort Dix, New Jersey, are in the Philadelphia cost of living area, and the former Lakehurst NAES is in the New York cost of living area. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, to provide the briefing directed by the committee in H. Rept. 112–78 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 30, 2012. The briefing should include actions being taken to correct the disparities between General Schedule and Federal Wage System employees employed at joint military installations.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Expansion of Personnel Management Authority Under Experimental Program With Respect to Certain Scientific and Technical Positions

This section would amend subsection (b)(1) of section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) in subparagraph (A), by striking '40' and inserting '60'.

The committee is aware of the specialized personnel hiring needs of organizations requiring a competent, highly technical workforce, such as the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA).

In the conference report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (House Report 112–329), the conferees expressed concern that DARPA did not have a solid analytical basis for its request. In numerous discussions with DARPA, the committee has received more rigorous justification supporting the need for the increase in hiring billets for this experimental personnel program, and therefore supports the rationale for an increase. The committee cautions DARPA to make judicious use of this authority, along with more effective use of other hiring authorities, in order to prevent additional requests for incremental increases in billets for this authority.

Section 1102—Authority to Pay for the Transport of Family Household Pets for Federal Employees During Certain Evacuation Operations

This section would amend section 5725 of title 5, United States Code, to add an eligibility for Government-provided or reimbursed shipment of household pets of civilian employees during evacuations from permanent stations in foreign locations. The shipment of pets of Department of Defense (DOD) civilian personnel would be subject to the same DOD rules as those applied to the shipment of pets of members of the military.

Section 1103—Extension of Authority To Fill Shortage Category Positions for Certain Federal Acquisition Positions for Civilian Agencies

This section would extend until September 30, 2017, direct-hire authority to appoint candidates to certain Federal acquisition positions where there is either a severe shortage of candidates or a critical hiring need. The committee recognizes that acquisition is a critical area that suffered from years of downsizing leading to a lack of capacity and oversight of requirements.

Section 1104—One-Year Extension of Authority To Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas

This section would extend, for 1 additional year, the authority of the head of a Federal agency to waive the limitations on the amount of premium pay that may be paid to a Federal civilian employee who performs certain work in an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Central Command, an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Africa Command, in support of a military operation, or responding to an emergency declared by the President. The payment may not exceed the annual rate of salary payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3, United States Code.

Section 1105—Policy on Senior Mentors

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide written notice to the congressional defense committees 60 days in advance of a change to the Department of Defense policy on senior mentors, which was initially issued by the Secretary of Defense on April 1, 2010.

SUBTITLE B—INTERAGENCY PERSONNEL ROTATIONS

Section 1111—Interagency Personnel Rotations

This section would direct the establishment of a Committee on National Security Personnel that will manage the interagency personnel rotation among national security positions across the executive branch, except for the intelligence community.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to conduct oversight on ongoing operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the larger war on terrorism, and the increasingly uncertain global security environment. In particular, the committee focuses on three core areas in this title directly connected to current U.S. national security interests and emerging threats facing our country. First, the committee resources the mission to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, while concurrently authorizing resources for and providing oversight of the transition to Afghan security forces lead for maintaining security. Second, the committee strengthens its oversight of security force assistance and military-to-military interactions throughout the world, including authorizing resources to combat transnational terrorism. Third, the committee worked to enhance its oversight of, and the resourcing of, efforts to deal with emergent and evolving threats around the world, including the nuclear ambitions of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The committee applauds the success of the United States military in its global pursuit of Al Qaeda, including the demise of Osama bin Laden. The committee remains concerned that Al Qaeda and associated forces continue to threaten the United States and seek to expand their influence throughout the world. The committee supports expanding the capacity of the United States military to combat these transnational threats to our country. To this end, the committee seeks to ensure the capability of the Taliban in Afghanistan and Pakistan is marginalized, particularly the Haqqani Network which has been the most important Afghanistan-based protector of Al Qaeda. Therefore, the committee continues to resource key programs that will help to further consolidate gains in Afghanistan, including the Commanders' Emergency Response Program, reintegration activities in Afghanistan, support to coalition forces, and the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund. Additionally, the committee further strengthens its oversight of the campaign plan in Afghanistan by authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to provide updates on the United States' plans in Afghanistan beyond 2014. However, in light of these same objectives, the committee is concerned about recent memoranda of understanding that were signed as a prelude to the Strategic Partnership Agreement with the Afghan government and forthcoming negotiations on a bilateral security agreement. The committee believes the United States must maintain its capability to conduct operations in Afghanistan that are aligned with our vital national se-

curity interests and ensure that all necessary protections are afforded U.S. forces.

The committee encourages the United States and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to continue to negotiate in good faith to improve their partnership, which is important to both countries. The committee encourages the Government of Pakistan to reconsider its closure of the supply routes through Pakistan into Afghanistan, and recommends strict controls of assistance and reimbursement to Pakistan until such time as the supply routes are open and the Secretary of Defense can certify that Pakistan is cooperating in certain key areas. In addition, the committee notes that significant funding previously authorized to be appropriated in support of cooperation with Pakistan remain unexpended, as a result of closures of Pakistan's supply routes. Therefore, the committee has reduced its authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for these activities, without prejudice regarding the importance of such activities.

The committee also has taken several steps to resource key security assistance programs and activities which are critical to addressing other security challenges. The committee remains committed to supporting the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF), but encourages the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Department of State, to establish GSCF with all deliberate haste and to be flexible and adaptive in responding to emerging circumstances which may threaten U.S. national security interests. The committee does not support, at this time, the extension of temporary authorities that could be covered by the GSCF and believes the GSCF must be founded and aligned with the central purpose and intent as outlined in section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

As previously noted, the committee continues to strengthen its oversight of security force assistance programs and military-to-military interactions. However, the committee is concerned that these programs may foster contradictory incentive structures that are implicit to, and can emerge from, funding the training and operations of security forces of foreign nations with the intent of combating against a threat to our national security interests. Often these programs do not properly control for these diverging incentive structures. Therefore, the committee directed the Comptroller General to conduct an in-depth assessment regarding how to control for these incentive structures.

The committee also seeks ways to support the efforts of the Department of Defense to prepare and position itself in preparation for new and emerging threats. Iran continues to defy the international community and appears to be committed to developing nuclear weapons. The committee believes the development of such weapons would destabilize the region as well as threaten U.S. national security interests. Thus, the committee includes a specific declaration of policy with regard to Iran's nuclear weapons program, requirements to enhance the credibility of the U.S. military deterrent against such a program, and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide an annex to a report on the military power of Iran in which the Commander of the U.S. Central Command provides a comprehensive review of the command's intelligence, capability,

capacity or authority gaps with respect to Iran's ability to threaten U.S. forces or U.S. interests in the region.

Finally, the committee has taken steps to ensure that the United States military is well positioned to address challenges in the Asia-Pacific region. The President's new defense strategic guidance envisions a rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific. The committee agrees with the importance of the region, but seeks to ensure that the military has sufficient capability and capacity to effectively operate in the region. Consequently, in this title the committee seeks to enhance reporting on the cyber and space capabilities of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China. The committee also includes provisions regarding the assessment of the Commander of the U.S. Pacific Command on the command's gaps in intelligence, capability, capacity and authority, with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to build and strengthen its military relationships with regional allies and partners in order to cooperatively meet regional security challenges. These assessments are critical to facilitating the Department of Defense's ability to appropriately shift its resources and capabilities to the Asia-Pacific region.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Accountability and Stewardship of Department of Defense Reconstruction Activities in Afghanistan

The committee supports the International Security and Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, but encourages the Department of Defense to maximize its stewardship of Department of Defense appropriated funds that are being disbursed in support of ISAF efforts. The committee believes that it is critical to analyze the stewardship of these funds and capture the lessons learned associated with Department of Defense funded reconstruction.

As a result, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an analysis on the extent to which corruption within Afghanistan has diverted Department of Defense financial assistance from its intended purpose, and the accountability measures in place to maximize the stewardship of Department of Defense financial assistance in Afghanistan. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a briefing on the results of such analysis to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2012. The briefing, at a minimum, should include: a summary of Department of Defense reconstruction projects in Afghanistan between 2001–12; a quantitative analysis of the corruption associated with such projects in Afghanistan; a framework for accountability measures that the Department of Defense utilizes to control for the effects of corruption in reconstruction projects in Afghanistan; and a summary of lessons learned in the distribution of monies for Department of Defense reconstruction projects in Afghanistan.

Afghan National Security Forces

The committee applauds the efforts of the International Security Assistance Force to build the Afghan National Security Forces

(ANSF). The Afghan National Army (ANA) and the Afghan National Police (ANP) have matured beyond their nascent stages and now possess many of the fundamental capabilities necessary to conduct their mission sets. The next steps in their organizational maturation include the further professionalization of these entities. More specifically, the committee believes the Department of Defense should continue to build out the noncommissioned officer corps within the ANA and transition the ANP from paramilitary activities toward traditional policing missions in order for the ANP to more effectively secure population centers. However, the committee notes that these efforts, focused on operations and organization, should not be executed at the expense of the professionalization of core functions, such as building out the administrative, equipping, and logistics support capacity of the ANSF, which are critical to the long-term sustainability of the ANSF. Additionally, the committee recommends integrating more active duty police officers into the ANP training and mentoring programs in order to provide role models for members of the ANP and to ensure that the most up-to-date law enforcement expertise and techniques are employed. While the ANP benefits from classroom instruction from retired law enforcement officers, it is essential that the ANP receive peer mentoring and hands-on partnering with current law enforcement practitioners in their day to day operations. The committee encourages greater coordination between the ANSF at the district level, in the form of operational coordination centers, to improve responsiveness and command and control. The committee further recommends an additional focus towards literacy programs at the district levels. These literacy programs will complement the professionalization and growth path of the ANSF.

The committee expresses concern regarding the development and effectiveness of the Afghan border police. These forces are not fully arrayed along the critical border areas where contraband, drugs, weapons, and improvised explosive device materials move in and out of Afghanistan. The committee believes that professionalizing the regulation of official ports of entry is not only essential for security, but to expand the tax base in support of Afghanistan's economy. The Department of Defense should maintain a focus on the border security forces or consider the feasibility of transferring their mission to the ANA.

More broadly, the effort to build and further professionalize the ANSF is a vital to the United States' efforts in Afghanistan. The committee remains concerned over the Afghan National Security Forces' susceptibility to corruption. These forces must have the confidence of the Afghan people and be able to continue to assume the lead in critical security operations across the country, as they have been, so that they can maintain the hard-won gains of the coalition and secure the Afghan population from criminal elements, the Taliban, and Al Qaeda.

Bilateral Security Agreement with Afghanistan

The committee is aware that after the completion of the Strategic Partnership Agreement between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the United States and Afghanistan will likely begin negotiating a bilateral security agreement to replace the 2003 Status of Forces Agreement and to govern an enduring

U.S. military presence post-2014. While the committee strongly endorses such an agreement between the United States and Afghanistan, the committee notes that it must be carefully constructed if it is to further the United States national security interests. The committee believes that any future bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan must be informed by the core U.S. interest, to "disrupt, dismantle, and eventually defeat Al Qaeda, and to prevent its return to either Afghanistan or Pakistan," as articulated by the President at West Point in 2009. To ensure that this goal is achieved, the committee believes that any future bilateral security agreement between the United States and Afghanistan must include the ability to carry out missions against Al Qaeda, and associated forces, in concert with Afghan forces or unilaterally. An agreement should also allow U.S. forces access to sufficient bases to allow for such counterterrorism missions and to permit U.S. forces to further assist the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) through training and assistance, as it is the ANSF that will ultimately be required to secure Afghanistan and prevent terrorist safe havens in Afghanistan in the future. The committee further believes that the agreement should preserve the exclusive jurisdiction of United States authorities for the prosecution of offenses in Afghanistan by United States military personnel. Finally, the committee believes that an agreement should explicitly note the absolute right of U.S. personnel to defend themselves and should clearly permit U.S. forces and authorities to take such measures as they deem necessary to provide for their self-defense.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to take careful note of the committee's expressed position on a new bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan and further expects the Secretary of Defense to keep the committee informed about the progress of negotiations on such an agreement.

Challenges with Military-to-Military and Security Force Assistance Efforts

The committee notes the significant improvements that have resulted from U.S. investments in the capacity of partner nations to conduct counter-terrorism, stability, counter-narcotics, and related operations. The committee further notes the report, "Utilization of Certain Global Partnership Authorities" was submitted to the committee as required by section 1237 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). While this report was useful in providing a detailed summary of the processes associated with building global partnership programs and an assessment of the impact of these programs, the report did not specifically assess and provide recommendations to control for potential moral hazard issues associated with these types of efforts.

The committee notes that partnership building activities are instrumental to the ability of the United States military to defend the homeland and to conserve its fiscal resources. Nevertheless, as the investment in these programs have increased, the committee endeavors to ensure that the Department of Defense fully addresses the challenges to military-to-military and security-related assistance. Among these challenges is the potential of creating negative incentive structures for nations seeking such assistance, which may

adversely affect their internal political environment. In particular, the committee seeks to ensure these activities are not causing certain parties, who become insulated from risk, to behave differently from how they would behave if they were fully exposed to the risk.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 30, 2012, on the procedures the Department of Defense has in place to control for the challenges inherent to the provision of assistance and associated efforts to foreign partners. The Comptroller General may focus on a sample of such Department of Defense programs and may satisfy this by leveraging work already conducted or underway. The briefing should outline the extent to which the Department of Defense, either alone or in conjunction with other agencies, considers and evaluates the potential for perverse incentive structures and negative unintended consequences due to moral hazard issues or similar factors.

Commendation for Operation Unified Protector

The committee notes that the execution of Operation Unified Protector led to the ousting of Muammar Muhammad Abu Minyar al-Gaddafi, former leader of Libya. While the committee celebrates the ousting of Gaddafi, it expresses concern that this multi-lateral operation, which was conducted in conjunction with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), was not able to be initiated, executed, or sustained without robust operational and logistical support from the United States. The President and the Secretary of Defense must consider, when they may join future operations with NATO, that these operations will continue to require a significant resource contribution from the United States; therefore, the mission should possess a vital U.S. national security interest. Moreover, the committee remains concerned for the democratic transition and future in Libya.

Competitive Strategies Study

The committee recommends that the Department of Defense further develop its policies for deterring aggression through closer examination of military strategies and capabilities that impose disproportionate costs on adversaries seeking to defend against them. The Department of Defense's "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense" (hereafter Defense Strategic Guidance, or DSG) noted that "Credible deterrence results from both the capabilities to deny an aggressor the prospect of achieving his objectives and from the complementary capability to impose unacceptable costs on the aggressor." The committee recognizes that such cost-imposing deterrence strategies are already being implemented by potential adversaries of the United States. The DSG noted that China and Iran are examples of states that are pursuing "asymmetric means to counter [U.S.] power projection capabilities," which include missiles and mines that are far less expensive than the countermeasures the U.S. military would have to deploy in response. Under conditions of fiscal austerity, the U.S. military may not always be able to invest in the level of force structure or range of capabilities necessary to overcome all adversary capabilities. Instead, the U.S. military would have to respond to initiatives under-

taken by potential adversaries more efficiently by investing in discrete capabilities that hold at risk interests of particular value to a given adversary, forcing the adversary to expend substantially more resources in defending that particular interest.

The committee directs the Director of the Office of Net Assessment to conduct a study to identify cost imposing/competitive strategies focused on countering potential challenges posed by foreign nations. The study shall be submitted within 365 days of the enactment of the Act to the Committee on the Armed Services of the House. The study's findings and recommendations shall be submitted in an unclassified report, with a classified annex if necessary. The report study should include the following:

(1) an identification and analysis of potential cost-imposing strategies focused on at least two potential adversaries known to be developing anti-access and area-denial capabilities, based on a thorough assessment of the potential adversaries' particular strategic culture and military vulnerabilities;

(2) an assessment of the congruence of such strategies with the current defense strategy and defense program of record;

(3) the implications of pursuing such strategies for the U.S. defense posture, to include capabilities, force posture, and the role of allies and partners; and

(4) recommendations for defense investments by the Department of Defense and the defense industrial base, including, but not limited to, investments in personnel, technologies, equipment, and training that would be consistent with the objectives of one or more feasible cost-imposing strategies.

Comptroller General Review of Use of General Purpose Forces and Special Operations Forces for Security Force Assistance

The committee understands that, in the past few years, the Department of Defense has emphasized security force assistance which encompasses efforts to build the capacity and capability of partner nation security forces. Historically, special operations forces have conducted the majority of the Department's activities to train, advise, and assist partner nation security forces. However, in anticipation of its growing importance, the Department has identified the need to strengthen the capabilities of its general purpose forces to conduct security force assistance. In the budget request for fiscal year 2013, the Department noted that with the drawdown of forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, more opportunities will be available for special operations forces to conduct advising and training of partner nation security forces, and requested additional resources for U.S. Special Operations Forces. At the same time, the Department has taken steps to identify capability requirements, implement new approaches to organizing units, and adjust training to enhance the ability of general purpose forces to conduct security force assistance.

The committee is aware of the Government Accountability Office's previous work on challenges the Department faces in defining its concept for security force assistance and guiding combatant command and military service efforts to plan for, prepare and conduct related activities, as well as its work on challenges U.S. Special Operations Command has faced in providing sufficient numbers of trained personnel to meet the demand for increased deploy-

ments. Given the Department's plans to continue to rely on special operations forces, as well as its efforts to expand the capabilities of the general purpose forces to perform security force assistance at a time when the overall size of the force is constrained, the committee believes that the roles and responsibilities of both of these forces, with regard to security force assistance, needs to be clearly drawn and understood to avoid confusion and duplication. In order to better understand the Department's vision for the security force assistance mission within both forces, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that evaluates the Department of Defense's efforts in this area, including: the extent to which the Department has delineated the roles and responsibilities of general purpose and special operations forces; distinguished between the types of situations or environments where the respective types of forces would be used to conduct security force assistance activities; and whether the Department has identified, synchronized, and prioritized the respective requirements and resource needs for building the capabilities of both types of forces.

Concerns About Supporting Data on Impact and Sustainability of Authorities Relating to Program to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

The committee remains concerned about the lack of data regarding the impact and sustainability of projects undertaken pursuant to the global train and equip authority included in section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), commonly referred to as "1206" funding. For example, the committee believes there remains little insight into whether the basic objectives of section 1206 have been met, including whether a recipient nation has undertaken counterterrorism (CT) operations autonomously or successfully mitigated an acute or emerging CT threat. The committee acknowledges that the combatant commanders reiterate annually in testimony before the committee that capacity building is a top priority, but the committee has yet to be presented with substantive validation of the impact of 1206 programs on recipient nations' CT capabilities. Further, the committee has not received any data regarding recipient nations' readiness to sustain 1206 programs. The committee reiterates that the 1206 program is not intended as a military-to-military engagement tool, but rather as a capacity building tool, and the committee requires validation that capacity building efforts in proposed countries are working. Seven years after the commencement of this program, the committee believes such data should be available. The committee also welcomes clarification on how the Department plans to incorporate 1206 into the Global Security Contingency Fund after fiscal year 2013.

The committee expects the Department of Defense and the Department of State to continue to provide related information to the congressional committees, including:

(1) a summary of 1206-funded equipment provided to a country to date;

(2) a review of capabilities or exercises that a country has conducted independently as a result of the 1206-funded equipment to date;

(3) a country's future plans with regard to the equipment;

(4) a description of the extent to which a proposed tranche of projects would complement the existing 1206 program; and

(5) a description of the recipient country's sustainment plan for the 1206-provided equipment.

Counter Lord's Resistance Army and Related Operations

The committee notes the efforts of the Department of Defense and U.S. Africa Command, consistent with the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–172), to assist the Ugandan People's Defense Force as they combat the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) and attempt to bring Joseph Kony to justice. The deployment of approximately 100 United States special operations forces in support of this mission is a step in addressing a two decade reign of terror that has killed and brutalized thousands while destabilizing the region. The committee notes that Congress has provided the authority in section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to support this effort and commends it to the attention of the Secretary of Defense. However, the committee also cautions that special operations forces should be employed judiciously and within circumstances that fully leverage the unique skill sets that these highly trained units possess, in keeping with important U.S. national security interests.

The committee believes that stability in Africa is in the United States' national interest. Supporting justice, human rights, and poverty reduction, as well as facilitating access of African goods and services to world markets, brings a stability that stretches beyond just the local region and has a positive impact upon the United States and our global partners. Therefore, the committee encourages the Administration to continue its interagency approach to stabilization efforts and security sector reform programs across the region, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic, and South Sudan, among others. In so doing, the Administration should consider using the authorities granted by the Global Security Contingency Fund, which was crafted for this sort of multi-faceted security challenge. The committee notes that the Administration has used the Global Train and Equip authority (i.e. "1206") for this purpose but cautions that this was a special case use of that authority. Generally, the intent of "1206" in the counter-terrorism role is to combat terrorist organizations with a global reach and an agenda that is directly hostile to the United States and our partners. The LRA, while a heinous entity, does not necessarily rise to that standard on its own.

Developments in Syria

The committee notes with grave concern that the conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic has now entered its second year. President Assad's crackdown has been ruthless, including flagrant human rights violations; extrajudicial killings; use of force against noncombatant civilians, including children; and interference with the

provision of medical aid and humanitarian assistance. Although a tenuous ceasefire has been put in place, instances of violence continue. The committee is concerned that the situation remains both uncertain and dire.

The committee is also concerned about the implications for regional conflict. Assad-backed military units have shot across the border into Syrian refugee camps located in the Republic of Turkey, killing five individuals. Violence has spilled into the Lebanese Republic. The Republic of Iraq, governed by a Shi'a coalition, may consider the prospect of a Sunni-controlled government succeeding the Assad regime on its western border or alliances forming between Syria's Sunni opposition and Iraq's own Sunni population as contrary to Iraq's strategic interests. Moreover, the committee believes that the situation in Syria could present a strategic opportunity to deal a blow to known supporters of terrorism in the region, as the Islamic Republic of Iran continues to back the Assad government, and groups such as Hezbollah have enjoyed support and residence in Syria.

The President has stated that the violence in Syria must end and that Assad must go. However, the committee is concerned that the means available to achieve such goal may be insufficient. The committee notes that much remains unknown about the opposition and that Syria maintains robust air defenses that limit military options. Given these factors and the significant budget constraints facing the military, the committee acknowledges that United States military intervention is not a viable option at this time. The committee further believes such a decision should only be taken in the event U.S. vital national security interests are at stake. In the interim, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct robust planning to provide the Commander in Chief an array of options, should such U.S. interests be threatened.

European Union Support for Arms Embargo on the People's Republic of China

Maintaining the arms embargo against the People's Republic of China, which entered force in 1989 following the Tiananmen Square protests, is a national security interest of the United States. The committee expects that our European Union allies will continue to support this arms embargo.

The committee requests that the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the current position of each European Union member state on maintaining the current European Union arms embargo against the People's Republic of China.

Funding Source for the Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

The committee has supported the judicial and prudent use of the Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism, known as "1208" authority, from section 1208 of the Ronald W.

Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). The committee is aware that this authority has been critical in providing support to foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals engaged in supporting or facilitating ongoing military operations by U.S. Special Operations Forces to combat terrorism. The committee notes that since its inception, funding for this authority has been taken from base budget funds for operation and maintenance rather than from a distinct funding line within Major Force Program 11 (MFP–11) up to the present authorized level of $50.0 million per year.

Considering the future of the authority and the need to provide program consistency and agility, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that analyzes the feasibility of creating a distinct MFP–11 funding line in the budget to support "1208" activities rather than using base budget funds made available for operations and maintenance. The report may be submitted in classified or unclassified formats, as required.

Geographic Positioning of the Headquarters for U.S. Africa Command

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct an analysis of the placement of the headquarters of the U.S. Africa Command and report the findings to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2012. The committee was disappointed that the report was not completed by that deadline, but has granted the Secretary an extension through July 1, 2012.

The committee continues to believe that the establishment of U.S. Africa Command as a geographic combatant command was an appropriate response to meet the national security challenges originating in, and transiting through, the African region. The committee also believes that the physical location of the command's headquarters must balance operational requirements with resource constraints to enable the command to function both effectively and efficiently. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive analysis of options for the permanent placement of the U.S. Africa Command headquarters and to provide a report of the analysis to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2012. The study should consider locations both in the United States and overseas, or a combination thereof.

Global Security Contingency Fund

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has submitted a legislative proposal for extending the authority in 1207(n) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), relating to the provision of certain types of assistance to forces in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, and Yemen. However, the committee feels that the authority provided

by section 1207(b) is sufficient for this purpose. The authority provided in 1207(n) was expressly transitional, intended to cover the initial period required to establish the organization and policies for the administration of the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF). The committee believes that the time between the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and the expiration of the transitional authorities in Section 1207(n) is sufficient to stand up the GSCF.

The committee will not favorably consider any new requests for building partnership capacity authorities in a unique, stand-alone provision at this time because (1) the GSCF was designed to be flexible and responsive, (2) the committee anticipates that adjustments may be required to the GSCF authority in the very beginning of the pilot period, and (3) the committee is concerned that the proliferation of similar, overlapping and/or competing building partner capacity authorities creates unnecessary confusion and friction. Instead, any such request will be considered only in the context of modifying the GSCF or other existing authorities as appropriate. Moreover, committee staff has been briefed that the current GSCF authorities are sufficient.

The committee is concerned that as the Department of State and the Department of Defense establish the organizational procedures to administer the GSCF, they will create bureaucracies and processes that unnecessarily constrain an authority that Congress designed to be flexible and responsive to a range of security challenges. The committee notes that, while the GSCF brings together a variety of authorities in a new way, many of those authorities existed in previous forms prior to the GSCF formation. As a result, there are existing organizations and procedures to administer them. The committee recognizes that, while these existing bureaucracies may not be optimized for the administration of the GSCF, creative and productive leadership within the Executive Branch will allow the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to use them to exercise the GSCF authority even as they finalize the structure for its administration. The committee believes that this will encourage the development of an organizational process that is as agile and flexible as the GSCF authority was designed to be. Since the GSCF is a pilot program, the committee fully expects that there will be a refinement process over its lifespan. It does not expect the administrative process to be in final form before the end of fiscal year 2012, nor in time for the presentation of the first proposed GSCF activity. The committee expects the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to begin exercising the authority in a timely matter.

Ground Lines of Communication through Pakistan

The committee expresses grave concern about the Islamic Republic of Pakistan's closure of the Ground Lines of Communication (GLOC) through Pakistan, following the U.S. operation that killed Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad in 2010, as well as the cross-border incident between U.S. forces and the Pakistani military in November 2011. The inability to utilize the GLOC has hampered the United States' efforts in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and has forced the International Security and Assistance Forces (ISAF) to rely extensively on the Northern Distribution Network, which

does not possess the same capacity for through-put of supplies and equipment. The closure of the GLOC has also significantly increased the cost for supplying ISAF and poses challenges for retrograde of equipment as U.S. forces redeploy from Afghanistan.

The committee expresses support for continued cooperation with Pakistan as a critical element to successfully combat global terrorism. The committee hopes that Pakistan will re-open the GLOC and strongly urges their continued support of the Pakistan-United States relationship moving forward.

Iranian Influence in Iraq

The committee is concerned about the malign influence of the Islamic Republic of Iran within the Republic of Iraq. The committee is aware that Iranian influence has undermined the U.S. efforts in Iraq and further heightens sectarian tensions. The committee understands that Iran projects its influence in at least three ways: politically, socially, and through covert support for militant groups. Iran's political influence is directed primarily through former Iraqi exiles who lived and worked in Iran during Saddam Hussein's rule and through senior figures in the Iraqi government. Iran also is attempting to influence Shiite religious institutions in Iraq. Moreover, the committee expresses concern regarding Iran's support to major militant networks in Iraq, including Asaib al-Haqq, the Promised Day Brigades, and Kataib Hizballah which has, in effect, operated as an arm of the Iranian Qods Force.

The committee believes that Iran's malign influence in Iraq could potentially increase sectarian tensions in the region, further the likelihood of regional conflict, and have the overall effect of undermining U.S. policy goals in the region.

National Guard State Partnership Program

The committee supports the National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP), which focuses on improving long-term international stability through unique cooperative partnerships between 53 U.S. states and territories and 61 foreign partner countries. The committee applauds the SPP activities supporting 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 programs. In Section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), the Comptroller General of the United States was directed to submit a report assessing the program's effectiveness, including its goals, objectives, activities, and funding levels.

The committee is aware that the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) preliminary findings have shown widespread consensus among the combatant commands and embassy staffs that the SPP provides considerable benefits, such as promoting stability and security cooperation and assisting with building partnership capabilities. Additionally, the program is providing experience to participating guardsmen as well as a mechanism for developing relationships between the state Guard units and the partner countries. However, the committee is concerned that the GAO's preliminary findings also indicate that the SPP does not have clear and

current program goals, objectives, and performance metrics to measure progress or allow a systematic assessment of the program's effectiveness. In addition, the committee understands the GAO's preliminary findings have found activity and cost data for SPP is incomplete and there is limited understanding among many program participants about implementing activities that include civilians. The committee looks forward to receiving GAO's final report and how the Department of Defense plans to address these program concerns.

Rebalancing to Asia-Pacific Region

The committee recognizes the importance of the Asia-Pacific region and agrees that the economic and security interests of the United States are closely linked to developments in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia. The committee also supports the planned rotational presence of the U.S. Marines to northern Australia and the deployment of additional U.S. Navy ships to the region. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consult with the congressional defense committees on its Pacific basing strategy in order to facilitate understanding of the needs and requirements of the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command and to support U.S. troops deployed in the region. The committee requests a briefing from the Secretary of Defense focusing on specific objectives of the strategy for the United States and our regional allies, including an assessment of how current and future U.S. military engagements, including deployments, training, exercises, and other activities, may meet regional strategic and theater campaign plan objectives.

Report on North Atlantic Treaty Organization Chicago Summit

The committee notes the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will host its 25th summit in Chicago, Illinois, on May 20–21, 2012. The committee recognizes the sustained commitment of NATO to mutual defense and regional stability and security. The summit provides an important opportunity for follow-on discussions from the 2010 Lisbon Summit regarding the future of NATO, with a focus on the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, smart defense, missile defense, and the future force composition of the alliance.

The committee recognizes the contribution of NATO, NATO-aspirant nations, and non-NATO nations that have committed more than 39,000 of the more than 129,000 troops deployed in Afghanistan. NATO has been a key player in Afghanistan by conducting operations against the insurgency and supporting the growth in capacity and capability of the Afghan National Security Forces. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue working with NATO, NATO-aspirant nations, and non-NATO nations to support ISAF operations and encourage long-term bilateral cooperation between the military and security forces of our partner nations and Afghanistan. Further, the committee encourages the President to use the summit as an opportunity to obtain multi-year commitments from ISAF coalition nations to support the sustainment of the Afghan National Security Forces post-2014.

The committee is aware of NATO's smart defense concept that focuses on developing and maintaining military capabilities to address current and future security problems. While in times of austerity every dollar counts, the committee believes each nation must also contribute its fair share. The committee is concerned that few NATO nations are contributing the required 2 percent of its gross domestic product. The committee will continue to follow the development of the smart defense concept and the areas of multinational cooperation for smart defense projects developed at and following the Chicago summit.

As part of the committee's continued oversight of the summit's outcomes, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by October 1, 2012, on how the Department of Defense may support the summit's outcomes. The report should include a description of how the U.S. military may support the development and execution of the summit results, including projected and current U.S. military deployments, training, exercises, and other engagement activities.

Strategic Partnership with the Kingdom of Bahrain

The committee strongly supports the longstanding partnership between the United States and the Kingdom of Bahrain and notes that Naval Support Activity-Bahrain is a valuable strategic asset for the United States and a key component of continued mutually beneficial United States-Bahrain strategic cooperation.

While reaffirming its commitment to the United States-Bahrain partnership, the committee calls upon Bahrain to continue to support protections of human rights and reduce sectarian divisions in all facets of society.

The committee commends Bahrain for establishing the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (BICI), which filed a report on November 23, 2011, noting instances of excessive force against protesters. The committee further commends Bahrain for establishing a National Commission to implement the BICI's recommendations to expand political rights and reduce sectarian divisions in Bahrain.

The committee believes that peaceful resolution of domestic political disputes and the implementation of meaningful political reforms that uphold the rights of all Bahraini citizens will facilitate further strengthening of the United States-Bahrain strategic partnership.

Strengthening Asia-Pacific Partnerships

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to engage with our allies and partners in the Asia-Pacific region to build and strengthen regional security and stability. U.S. economic and security interests are closely linked to the Asia-Pacific region. Two of the four largest economies are in the region, and about 40 percent of the world's trade passes through the Strait of Malacca. Regional stability and open trade lanes are crucial for the U.S. economy. Our allies and partners have played an important role, alongside the

United States military, in maintaining peace for the past six decades. The region's vast maritime domain, with strategic chokepoints, numerous archipelagos, and the largest seas and oceans, requires close working relationships with our five treaty allies and many strategic partners. The committee encourages the Department to continue strengthening its partnerships with Asia-Pacific allies and partners to contribute to regional security.

Study of Post Combat Role of U.S. Forces in Afghanistan

The committee notes that the United States military mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan will evolve over the next several years as the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) increasingly take responsibility for providing security in Afghanistan. Over that time, United States forces will draw down significantly and eventually end their direct combat role, and, as currently conceived by the Administration, limit their role to training and equipping the ANSF and counterterrorism missions after 2014. This transition could face substantial challenges and will likely require intense planning to succeed. The committee is aware that the Comptroller General has undertaken several studies on aspects of this transition, including the planning for the draw-down of U.S. forces and the planning for the future of the ANSF, but believes that an additional study of the planning for the post-2014 role of the Department of Defense and U.S. military forces in Afghanistan is appropriate.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake a study of the nature and extent of planning underway by the Department of Defense for the role of the U.S. military and the Department in Afghanistan post 2014, including progress in (1) developing a framework for making key decisions such as assigning organizational responsibilities and structures within the Department; (2) establishing a planning approach to include identifying (a) key assumptions about the environment in Afghanistan and roles of the Department, the U.S. military, and contractors, (b) how the Department will collaborate with other agencies, and (c) issues to be resolved such as the level of support to be provided by the Department to other agencies and disposition of U.S. equipment and assets; (3) key decision points and related milestones for taking actions to implement decisions, and (4) potential risks and mitigation plans. The Comptroller General should periodically brief the committee on the status of its work and provide a final report no later than April 1, 2013.

Support for Security Cooperation Efforts Between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

The committee expresses support for the U.S. Armed Forces continued security cooperation efforts with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. To date, the nature and scope of the military-to-military engagement between United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has included developing interoperability, augmenting self-defense capability, and supporting their deployment capability. This security cooperation enhances the overall security of both nations as well as the region, and it should continue in its current form.

United States Military Capabilities in the Central Command Area of Responsibility

The committee is aware of a number of reprogramming requests submitted during fiscal years 2011 and 2012 by the Department of Defense to the congressional defense committees in support of joint urgent operational needs identified by the Commander of U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) to counter threats from the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee has approved additional funding for these joint urgent operational needs.

Moreover, the committee understands that additional reprogramming requests will be submitted during fiscal year 2012 to address similar CENTCOM operational needs such as the MK 38 Mod 2 machine gun system for Coastal Patrol Craft; the Griffin missile for Coastal Patrol Craft; the Spike shoulder-fired electro-optic weapon; digital rocket launchers; beyond-line-of-sight command and control architecture; MAGIC VIEW; hard and deeply buried target defeat systems; indications and warning and systems performance enhancements; Scan Eagle; and tactics development and evaluation. The committee supports efforts to enhance the credibility of U.S. military capabilities in the CENTCOM area of responsibility to deter further aggression by Iran. Therefore, the committee expects to consider such future reprogramming requests favorably.

The committee is also aware of additional investments identified by CENTCOM to counter Iranian threats that are included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2013. Elsewhere in this bill, the committee authorizes funds for fiscal year 2013 in support of these operational needs, including underwater explosive ordnance disposal programs; naval military intelligence program support equipment; the MK 38 Mod 2 machine gun system for Coastal Patrol Craft; the Griffin missile for Coastal Patrol Craft; the Spike shoulder-fired electro-optic weapon; unmanned aerial vehicle detection and tracking; joint service explosive ordnance development; advanced anti-radiation guided missiles; integrated, fixed surveillance systems; and U.S. Cyber Command activities.

United States Participation in Headquarters Eurocorps

The committee is aware that Headquarters (HQ) Eurocorps was established in 1992 to strengthen French-German military cooperation, and that is has since grown to include other European nations, including North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members. Since its establishment, HQ Eurocorps has been a "deployable high readiness force headquarters" in support of European Union (EU) and NATO missions, including to Bosnia and Herzogovina, Kosovo and Afghanistan. The committee acknowledges that Spanish Chief of Defense, on behalf of HQ Eurocorps, extended an invitation to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on July 16, 2007, to provide permanent contributions to the headquarters.

However, the committee is concerned that U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) took over four years years to determine congressional authorization was required to assign U.S. military personnel permanently to the HQ Eurocorps staff because HQ Eurocorps is not a part of the NATO force structure, and to submit the proposed legislation to the congressional defense committees. The committee questions why USEUCOM did not designate a U.S.

military liaison officer during the four years to HQ Eurocorps to gain insight into HQ Eurocorps and to examine the need, scope and value of U.S. Armed Forces personnel working as a part of the HQ Eurocorps staff. The committee is also concerned that the Commander of USEUCOM chose to withdraw seven billets from four NATO Rapid Deployable Corps in 2009 before congressional authorization was sought for U.S. participation in HQ Eurocorps. Therefore, the committee encourages the Commander of USEUCOM to assign a U.S. military liaison officer to gain insight into HQ Eurocorps and determine the potential necessity, scope and value of U.S. Armed Forces personnel that might be permanently assigned to the HQ Eurocorps staff.

United States Military Relationship with People's Republic of China

The committee recognizes the importance of military-to-military contacts between the United States and the People's Republic of China in the broader policy to advance U.S. security interests. The committee is concerned about the lack of Chinese transparency in the U.S.-China military relationship. The committee requests a briefing from the Secretary of Defense on military-to-military relations with China and how they may best support the national security objectives of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region. The briefing should also include an analysis of historical costs, including monetary costs, and benefits associated with supporting military-to-military relations with China.

The committee is also aware that the People's Liberation Army is increasingly active in other regions of the world, such as Africa and Latin America. The committee encourages the other combatant commands to consult and coordinate with U.S. Pacific Command in their relations with the People's Republic of China to ensure effective unity of effort.

Use of Security Force Assistance Advisory Teams in Afghanistan

A central element of the U.S. strategy in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan has been the development of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF). Since military operations began, the Department of Defense has used a variety of approaches to mentor, advise, and partner with ANSF, including the use of individual training teams, as well as brigade combat teams specially augmented with leaders to carry out the advisory and assistance mission. Neither the training teams nor the augments provided to the brigade combat teams existed in any of the military services' doctrinal structures. Instead, they were typically sourced with personnel who were identified individually, and generally consisted of company- and field-grade officers and senior non-commissioned officers who were taken from other units. In the past, the Department of Defense has faced some difficulty in sourcing these teams without affecting the readiness of its overall force.

In June 2011, the President announced that the U.S. mission in Afghanistan would be moving from combat to support by December 31, 2014. Over the next 2 years, lead responsibility for security will transition to the Afghan Government, and its security forces. To support this transition, the Department of Defense plans to use

small teams of advisors, referred to as "security force assistance advisor teams," to help generate, employ, and sustain the ANSF. While this concept is in the early stages of implementation, U.S. commanders in Afghanistan believe these teams will intensify the pace of development of ANSF capabilities amidst the drawdown of coalition forces. The majority of the security force assistance advisor teams are being sourced from the Marine Corps and the Army. In some cases, deployed units have been tasked with creating the teams, while in other cases teams have been created using individuals drawn from U.S.-based units or globally sourced.

The committee is aware of the prior work conducted by the Government Accountability Office evaluating the use of advisor teams for training security forces in the Republic of Iraq and in Afghanistan, and the impact this had on the readiness of U.S. forces. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review plans for establishing the security force assistance advisory teams and the use of these teams to further develop the capabilities of the ANSF, and to report the results of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 15, 2013. The Comptroller General should evaluate the extent to which the Department of Defense has defined intended roles and missions for the advisor teams, including personnel, equipment, and training requirements; the extent to which the Marine Corps and the Army have met these requirements; adjustments, if any, in the Department of Defense's plans for continuing to use the augmented brigade/regimental combat teams for advisory missions; and the Marine Corps and Army's ability to source these requirements, including any impacts on overall readiness.

Village Stability Operations and Afghan Local Police

The committee is aware of continued expansion of local security initiatives such as Village Stability Operations (VSO) and the Afghan Local Police (ALP) program, designed to empower local elders and marginalize the influence of the criminal and extremist insurgency. The committee is aware that these activities have grown in scope and scale, and are effectively empowering Afghans to enable security and stability at the local level with support from, and in coordination with, district, provincial, and national level authorities from the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIRoA) and coalition forces. To support VSO and ALP expansion, the committee is also aware that conventional U.S. infantry battalions have been assigned under the operational control of Combined Forces Special Operations Component Command-Afghanistan (CFSOCC–A), which had heretofore been manned almost exclusively by Special Operations Forces. The committee understands that program goals include an expansion to approximately 30,000 Afghan Local Police within nearly 100 districts.

The committee understands that as ALP sites mature, the need for daily U.S. Special Operations Forces presence decreases, and that certain mature sites are being monitored and maintained by U.S. general purpose forces. While the committee understands that these mature sites require limited over-watch by U.S. and coalition forces, the committee remains concerned that improper and inconsistent expansion of VSO/ALP efforts are jeopardizing realized

gains, encouraging splinter and outlier activities not coordinated within the overall strategy, and potentially damaging credibility of coalition forces and GIRoA when unable to deliver security, development, and governance as promised or envisioned at the local, district, provincial and national levels. These concerns may be manifesting in recent incidents of violence involving ALP suggesting at best, potential problems in vetting and recruiting, or at worst, Taliban and insurgent infiltration of ALP.

The committee therefore encourages the Commander, International Security Forces in Afghanistan to ensure consistent program expansion, to ensure vetting and recruiting standards are not lowered, and to incorporate or disband where appropriate non-GIRoA approved similar or outlier programs not coordinated within the overall strategy such as Critical Infrastructure Protection, Community-Based Security Solutions, and the Interim Security for Critical Infrastructure.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan

This section would amend subsection (a) of section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by extending the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan through fiscal year 2013.

Section 1202—Modification of Authorities Relating to Program to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

This section would modify the authority of the Secretary of Defense to direct, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, programs to build the capacity of foreign forces to conduct counterterrorism and stability operations authorized pursuant to section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), commonly referred to as "1206" authority, to include small-scale military construction as part of the authorized types of capacity building. The committee believes that small-scale military construction, under $0.75 million per program, may be required for long term sustainability of capacity building activities. However, the committee expects that any small-scale military construction projects authorized under this section would be a supporting, logical component of a comprehensive "1206" program, and not a stand-alone project. This section would limit the total amount authorized for small-scale military construction projects to no more than $25.0 million of the $350.0 million authorized for the "1206" authority in fiscal year 2013.

This section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to obligate and expend up to 20 percent of the amount authorized for fiscal year 2013 for programs authorized in fiscal year 2014, provided the Secretary submits written certification and notification to the specified congressional committees by September 30, 2013.

Section 1203—Three-Year Extension of Authority for Non-Reciprocal Exchanges of Defense Personnel Between the United States and Foreign Countries

This section would extend, through September 30, 2015, the authority provided in section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) that allows the Secretary of Defense to enter into non-reciprocal international defense personnel exchange agreements.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND PAKISTAN

Section 1211—One-Year 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 2012 (Public Law 112–81), by extending the authority for reimbursement of coalition nations for support provided to the United States for military operations through fiscal year 2013, and making certain technical amendments. This section amends the limitation on amounts available by establishing that the authority must not exceed $1.65 billion and that the total amount of reimbursements and support to Pakistan may not exceed $650 million during fiscal year 2013. Additionally, this section would prohibit reimbursement or support authorized to be provided to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan until the Secretary of Defense provides a report to the congressional defense committees that outlines: the model for reimbursement, including how claims are proposed and adjudicated; new conditions or caveats that the Government of Pakistan places on the use of its supply routes; and the new cost associated with transit through supply routes in Pakistan. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to certify that the Government of Pakistan is committed to: supporting counterterrorism operations against Al Qaeda, its associated movements, the Haqqani Network, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations; dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs; preventing the proliferation of nuclear-related material and expertise; and issuing visas in a timely manner for United States visitors engaged in counterterrorism efforts and assistance programs in Pakistan.

Section 1212—Authority To Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq

This section would amend section 1215(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by specifying that the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may use funds provided to the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC–I) to provide training and assistance to Iraqi Ministry of Defense personnel. This section would also limit the total funding authorized for operations and activities for OSC–I to $508.0 million in fiscal year 2013. In addition, this

section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act that includes: (1) the plan to consolidate Office sites; (2) the status of any pending requests for additional United States military forces for the Office; (3) the legal status and legal protections provided to Office personnel, the operational impact of such status and protections, and the associated constraints on the operational capacity of such personnel by reason of their legal status; (4) the operational and functional limitations and authorities of Office personnel; and (5) a description of potential direct threats to Office personnel and their capacity to provide adequate force protection to thwart those threats.

Finally, in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee noted the importance of the stability and security of the Republic of Iraq and expressed concerns about "essential gaps" in the Iraqi Security Forces capabilities, as reported by U.S. Forces-Iraq. Consistent with these concerns, the committee is disappointed that balances within the Iraq Security Forces Fund (ISFF), which could be used to address these gaps, remain unobligated, due in large part to the inability of the Secretary of Defense to make certain certifications regarding the commitment of the Government of Iraq. The committee encourages OSC–I to minimize unnecessary staffing or overhead and to utilize the funds authorized for the Office to provide adequate force protection and to address the capability gaps of the Iraqi Security Forces to the maximum extent practicable.

Section 1213—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Funds for Reintegration Activities in Afghanistan

This section would amend section 1216 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), as amended most recently by section 1216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by extending the authority to use funds for reintegration activities in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and authorizing $35.0 million for fiscal year 2013 for this authority.

Section 1214—Prohibition on Use of Private Security Contractors and Members of the Afghan Public Protection Force To Provide Security for Members of the Armed Forces and Military Installations and Facilities in Afghanistan

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for the purpose of contracting for security-guard functions at a military installation or facility in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan at which members of the Armed Forces deployed to Afghanistan are garrisoned or housed; otherwise employing private security contractors to provide security for members of the Armed Forces deployed to Afghanistan; or employing the Afghan Public Protection Force (APPF) to provide security for such members or to perform such security-guard functions at such a military installation or facility. This section would further require the Armed Forces to provide such functions organi-

cally and for the President to provide sufficient members of the Armed Forces to ensure that such duties do not detract from other missions in Afghanistan. This section would allow the President to waive the requirements of this section if the President certifies that private security contractors or the APPF can provide at least an equal level of security and force protection as members of the Armed Forces and that such contractors or APPF are independently screened and vetted by the Armed Forces. Finally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense submit a quarterly report to the congressional defense committees on attempted and successful attacks on U.S. Armed Forces conducted by members of the Afghan National Security Forces, APPF, or private security contractors and efforts to prevent such attacks.

Section 1215—Report on Updates and Modifications to Campaign Plan for Afghanistan

This section would repeal section 1226 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) and establish a report on updates and modifications to the campaign plan for the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would require that the Comptroller General of the United States submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the date on which any substantial updates for modifications are made to the campaign plan for Afghanistan. This reporting requirement would terminate on September 30, 2014.

Section 1216—United States Military Support in Afghanistan

This section would express the sense of Congress about the United States mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would also require the President to notify the congressional defense committees of any decision to reduce the number of United States Armed Forces deployed in Afghanistan below the number of such Armed Forces deployed to Afghanistan on (1) December 31, 2012, (2) December 31, 2013, and (3) December 31, 2014, prior to any public announcement of such a decision. This section would require such a notification to include an assessment of conditions on the ground that enable such a force reduction, including the relevant security risk metrics associated with the reduction in force levels and an assessment of the operational capability of the Afghan National Security Forces.

Section 1217—Extension and Modification of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund

This section would amend section 1224(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as most recently amended by section 1220 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), by extending the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) through fiscal year 2013. Additionally, this section would modify section 1220(b)(2) of Public Law 112–81, to require, in any year in which amounts are made available to PCF, the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of State, to submit an update to the report on the strategy to utilize the fund, and the metrics used to determine progress with respect to the fund. This section would

also limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to obligate or expend funds made available to the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund during fiscal year 2013 to not more than 10 percent of the amount available until such time as the update is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAN

Section 1221—Declaration of Policy

This section would express certain findings related to the threat represented by the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United States, the State of Israel, and Iran's neighbors. This section would further declare that it is the policy of the United States to take all necessary measures, including military action if necessary, to prevent Iran from threatening the United States, its allies, or Iran's neighbors with a nuclear weapon.

Section 1222—United States Military Preparedness in the Middle East

This section includes findings that recognize the importance to the national security of the United States and its allies of conducting military exercises in the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman. These exercises benefit the readiness of the U.S. military and allied forces, as well as serve as a signal to the Islamic Republic of Iran regarding the willingness of the United States to defend its national security interests.

This section would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a plan to strengthen the presence of the U.S. 5th Fleet in the Middle East to include conducting military deployments, exercises, and other military readiness activities.

Section 1223—Annual Report on the Military Power of Iran

This section would amend Section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2541) by requiring an annex to the military power report on Iran in which the Commander of U.S. Central Command would provide an assessment of:

(1) Any critical gaps in intelligence that limit the ability of U.S. Central Command to counter threats emanating from Iran;

(2) Any gaps in the capabilities, capacity, and authorities to counter Iranian threats to the United States Armed Forces and U.S. interests in the region;

(3) Any gaps in the capabilities and capacity of the U.S. Central Command Commander to take military action against Iran to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon; and

(4) Any other matters the U.S. Central Command Commander considers to be relevant.

This section would apply to a military power report on Iran submitted following the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1231—Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China

This section would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), as amended by section 1246(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), and as most recently amended by section 1238 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), by requiring assessments of space and cyber strategies, goals, and capabilities of the People's Republic of China. This section would also require the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command to provide his assessment of gaps in intelligence, capabilities, capacity and authorities to address challenges from the People's Republic of China.

Section 1232—Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a second report on military and security developments involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which would be due on November 1, 2013. This section would also require the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command to provide his assessment of gaps in intelligence, capabilities, capacity, and authorities to counter North Korean threats to U.S. Armed Forces and U.S. interests in the region.

Section 1233—Report on Host Nation Support for Overseas United States Military Installations and United States Armed Forces Deployed in Country

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees not later than March 1 of each year from 2013 through 2015, on the direct, indirect and burden-sharing contributions made by host nations in support of U.S. Armed Forces deployed in country. The committee believes the current fiscal environment requires an understanding of host nation contributions in order to evaluate the costs of the forward deployment of U.S. Armed Forces. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense was required to submit an Annual Report on Allied Contributions to the Common Defense, in accordance with the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98–94), until repeal of the reporting requirement in 2004. The committee also recognizes that the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress not later than 30 days after each fiscal year, a report regarding direct contributions from foreign countries which are accepted and expended for real property, services, and supplies. However, the committee believes additional information is required for proper congressional oversight.

Section 1234—NATO Special Operations Headquarters

This section would authorize appropriations for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ) through fiscal year 2013. This section would also limit the obliga-

tion or expenditure of funds for fiscal year 2013 to not more than 50 percent until the Secretary of Defense finalizes and formalizes the establishment of an executive agent and lead component for NSHQ.

Section 1235—Reports On Exports of Missile Defense Technology to Certain Countries

The section would require a report by the Secretary of Defense, not later than 180 days after enactment, and each year through 2015, detailing the types of defense assistance, including assistance related to missile defense, provided by the Department of Defense to countries that export space, counter-space and ballistic missile equipment, material and technologies that could be used in other countries' space, counter space and ballistic missile programs. The report would also include a description of such exports by recipients of U.S. defense assistance to countries with space, counter-space and ballistic missile programs, including a description of specific technologies that are exported to such countries. The section would require the report to be provided to the congressional defense committees, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Section 1236—Limitation on Funds to Provide the Russian Federation with Access to Missile Defense Technology

The section would provide that no funds made available for fiscal years 2012 or 2013 may be used to provide the Russian Federation with access to missile defense information that is or was classified as of January 2, 2012. The section would permit access to be provided to other U.S. missile defense information if certain reporting and certification requirements are met; such reports would be provided to the House and Senate Armed Services and foreign relations committees.

Section 1237—International Agreements Relating to Missile Defense

The section would state the sense of the Congress that an agreement regarding missile defense cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or a provision to amend the charter of the NATO-Russia Council, should not be considered politically or legally binding on the United States unless ratified by the Senate as a treaty or specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

The section would further provide that any limitation on U.S. missile defenses shall not be binding, nor enter into force with respect to the United States unless ratified by the Senate as a treaty or specifically authorized by an Act of Congress. The section would also impose an annual notification requirement concerning recognition by Russia of the sovereign rights of the United States with respect to missile defense.

The section would also provide that no funds authorized for fiscal year 2012 or after may be used to implement a defense technology cooperation agreement with the Russian Federation until 60 days after such agreement has been transmitted to the congressional defense committees.

The section would prohibit the use of funds authorized for fiscal years 2012 or 2013 for the implementation of a missile defense agreement with the Russian Federation until the President transmits to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the foreign relations committees a copy of the draft agreement proposed between the United States and the Russian Federation at Deauville, France in May of 2011.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $519.1 million for fiscal year 2013, representing an increase of $10.9 million from the amount requested and authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2012. The request for fiscal year 2013 included $68.3 million for Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination, $14.6 million for Chemical Weapons Destruction, $99.8 million for Global Nuclear Security, $276.4 million for Cooperative Biological Engagement, $32.4 million for Proliferation Prevention, $2.4 million for Threat Reduction Engagement, and $25.2 million for Other Assessments/Administrative support.

The committee continues to support the goals of the CTR program and believes that the program is important to United States national security. In past years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, has sometimes limited progress of the CTR program. The committee notes, however, that the CTR program has made significant achievements, and that much work remains to be done.

Congress has addressed these concerns by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the former Soviet Union; increasing CTR funding; including funding for new CTR initiatives; requiring reports by the National Academy of Sciences and the Secretary of Defense on the development of new CTR initiatives and metrics; requiring a report by the Secretary of Defense regarding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project in the Russian Federation at Schuch'ye; requiring increased reporting from the Secretary of Defense on CTR defense and military contacts; providing CTR programs with authority for urgent threat reduction activities; authorizing the CTR program to accept international contributions; and ensuring that the CTR program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee notes that the CTR Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP) now encompasses over one half of the CTR budget request. The committee reaffirms its view, stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and reaffirmed in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, that biological threat reduction and engagement 'should be guided by a comprehensive long-term interagency engagement and coordina-

tion; rigorous Department management and oversight; coordination and integration with other Department programs and activities; and concrete metrics for measuring progress.' The committee further reaffirms its view that the CTR program as a whole should 'maintain a strong focus' on the full range of threat reduction challenges. Lastly, the committee continues to believe that concrete metrics remain important for measuring the impact and effectiveness of CBEP activities. The committee welcomes efforts by the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and keep the committee fully informed of efforts and developments in these areas.

The committee authorizes $519.1 million, the amount of the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Cooperative Biological Engagement Program

The committee continues to support the important nonproliferation objectives of the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP). The committee recognizes that the continued success of this program is directly tied to the unique involvement of the host partner countries, as well as international and U.S. private sector involvement through the sustainment and commercialization effort. The committee believes this effort leverages U.S. Government funds by providing additional contributions to CBEP projects from the various other sources. The involvement of the U.S. private sector and international partnerships helps ensure the program's ability to provide non-military, commercial employment opportunities for former and potential weapons of mass destruction scientists and engineers in the former Soviet Union and other countries and regions of non-proliferation concern. The committee recommends that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency ensure that CBEP projects include a sustainment and commercialization component which include international, as well as commercial U.S. industry partnerships.

Cooperative Threat Reduction Biological Surveillance Network

The committee remains concerned that the proposed biological surveillance network within the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP) could prove insufficient to monitor, detect, and deter manmade pathogens, even if implemented widely. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to assess whether the biological surveillance network would fall short of addressing the global biological threat. The assessment was supposed to examine the potential for dangerous pathogens to be weaponized:

(1) By relatively unsophisticated non-state actors, including terrorists;

(2) By state or non-state actors in countries that do not fully cooperate with such a network; or

(3) By rogue state or sub-state actors who, with modest biological knowledge and equipment, might be able to circumvent

such a network even in countries that would participate in such a network.

In the committee report, the committee also directed the Secretary to submit a report within 150 days of the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, House Committee on Armed Services, and House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on any necessary modifications to the CBEP mission, in unclassified form with a classified annex. The committee looks forward to receiving the Secretary's report by May 29, 2012, as required.

Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Metrics

The committee is aware of the January 2012 National Academy of Sciences study "Improving Metrics for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program" that recommended ways the Secretary of Defense could improve the metrics of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) and better communicate the approach to metrics. While the report notes some CTR program activities have reasonable metrics, others do not have a concise statement of objectives and a description of how the program is intended to reduce a threat or risk. The committee encourages the Secretary to develop clear, concise statements of objectives for the CTR program, descriptions of how program activities intended to reduce a threat or risk; prioritize and refine metrics within a program to help decision makers; and improve planning for how program changes and metric results may feed into the CTR program decision making process. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue consulting with the congressional defense committees about improvements and developments to the CTR program.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would define the programs and funds that are Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act and specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program element under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program from within the overall $519.1 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 2013. This section would also require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2013 funds for purposes other than those specifically authorized. In addition, this section would provide limited authority to obligate amounts for a program element under the CTR

program in excess of the amount specifically authorized for that purpose.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Working Capital Fund Cash Corpus Concerns

The committee is concerned that the restrictions the Department of Defense places on itself are constraining the management of working capital funds, specifically the Defense Working Capital Fund as it pertains to the management of fuel and the Air Force Working Capital Fund in regards to its fuel-centric transportation mission. The Department's Financial Management Regulation places heavy emphasis on maintaining a 7- to 10-day cash balance. This narrow range does not provide the flexibility required for the management of funds when attempting to mitigate market fluctuations in fuel. This arbitrary cash corpus range constricts the ability of the fund managers to achieve their primary objective, which is to maintain a constant rate for the customer throughout the year. The committee has attempted twice thus far to highlight this management problem to the Department with little success. Instead of repeatedly sending unsuccessful legislative proposals requesting authority to establish special accounts, the committee recommends that the Department modify the 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 prefers to see the Department take this action voluntarily through its own regulatory process, but the committee will consider a legislative mandate if necessary to achieve the stated objective.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1405—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1406—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1407—Cemeterial Expenses

This section would authorize appropriations for the Army Cemeterial Expenses for Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $44.9 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2013. This section would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

Section 1412—Additional Security of Strategic Materials Supply Chains

This section would amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to include "single point of failure" as an additional objective of the National Defense Stockpile.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1421—Reduction of Unobligated Balances Within the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund

The committee continues to be concerned with the execution of funds within the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund. Unobligated balances within the account are estimated to be lower in fiscal year 2013 than they were in the fiscal year 2011 budget request. However, this unobligated balance is still above the levels maintained when the Pentagon was under significant renovation, and capital expenditures dictated a larger balance due to the multi-year nature of the expenses. In addition, while the targeted cash balance position for the fund is $92.0 million, the current projections place the balance at more than $200.0 million.

Without a plan to use these funds for future improvements or to return funds to the customer, the committee believes this high-cash balance is unnecessary. Based on these findings, the committee questions the need for a high-cash balance without future obligations, and recommends a transfer of $26.0 million in unobligated balances to the treasury.

Section 1422—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 1423—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $67.6 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2013.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee notes that section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) requires the budget submission to Congress for each fiscal year to include:

(1) A request for the appropriation of funds for ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(2) An estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for operations; and

(3) A detailed justification of the funds requested.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations to be available upon enactment of this Act to support overseas contingency operations principally associated with Operation Enduring Freedom.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained no funding for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment. Elsewhere in this Act, the budget request contained $3.1 billion for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment.

The committee notes that the base request is a 44 percent reduction from the fiscal year 2012 enacted level. The specific amount of resources, including equipment, needed to adequately sustain

the National Guard and Reserve Component's new operational reserve status remains a concern because of the fiscal environment, especially given the dual mission responsibility of the National Guard and Reserve Components, in particular the National Guard. The committee believes the National Guard and Reserve Components still have significant equipment shortages in modernized equipment, specifically in rotorcraft and the tactical wheeled vehicle fleet. Over the past 8 years, National Guard and Reserve Component equipment procurement averaged $7.0 billion annually. The committee notes that across the Future Years Defense Program, procurement is expected to average $3.8 billion annually, a significant reduction from previous year requests. The committee also notes that National Guard and Reserve component equipment modernization is not funded to 100 percent of what the National Guard and Reserve Components believe their requirements to be and that they are expected to have unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2013. For example, the Army National Guard will require additional funding over the next 10 years for tactical wheeled vehicles and aviation systems of $500.0 million and $1.3 billion, respectively. The Air National Guard equipment modernization shortfall is $1.4 billion over the next 10 years.

The committee believes additional funds would help eliminate identified shortfalls in the areas of critical dual-use equipment. The committee expects these funds to be used for the purposes of, but not limited to the procurement of: aircraft, missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, non-system training devices, logistics automation systems, remote weapon stations, chemical/biological protective shelters, internal and external fuel tanks for CH–47 and AH–64 rotorcraft, and other critical dual-use procurement items for the National Guard and Reserve Components.

The committee recommends $500.0 million, an increase of $500.0 million, for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends $3.1 billion, full funding of the 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 additional appropriations for procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize additional appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act.

Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance programs at the levels identified in section 4302 of division D of this Act.

Section 1505—Military Personnel

This section would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

Section 1506—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1507—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1508—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the level identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1509—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations

This section would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to $3.0 billion of additional war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1531—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would authorize various transfer authorities, reporting requirements, and other associated activities for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund.

Section 1532—One-Year Extension of Project Authority and Related Requirements of Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan

This section would amend section 1535 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), as amended by section 1534 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), relating to the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations (TFBSO) in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, by extending the authority for TFBSO, narrowing the scope of authorized projects to those associated with Afghanistan's mining and natural resource industries, and reducing the amount of funds authorized for TFBSO to $50.0 million for fiscal year 2013. This section would also restrict the authority of the Secretary of Defense to obligate or expend authorized funds for fiscal year 2013 until such time as the Secretary notifies the appropriate congressional committees that the activities of the Task Force will be transitioned to the Department of State by September 30, 2013.

Section 1533—Limitations on Availability of Funds in Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would amend section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by subsection 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), by extending the existing limitations on the availability of funds for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund through fiscal year 2013. Additionally, this section applies a limitation for funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2013, or otherwise available, for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund in fiscal year 2013 for the Afghan Public Protection Force (APPF) until the Secretary of Defense makes several certifications regarding the content of each subcontract to a contract of the Department of Defense for APPF services, or any agreement between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for services of the APPF for the Department.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to certify that the Minister of Interior of Afghanistan is committed to ensuring sufficient numbers of APPF personnel are trained to match demand and attrition; sufficient clarity exists with respect to command and control of APPF personnel and the role of risk management consultants; the program established pursuant to section 1225 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) relating to a program to provide for the registration and end-use monitoring of defense articles and defense services transferred to Afghanistan, is sufficient to account for any United States Government-owned defense articles transferred to

the APPF; mechanisms are in place to ensure the United States does not pay redundant charges in the performance of an APPF effort; the Minister of Interior of Afghanistan has established elements for the APPF as required by subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 862(a)(2) of Public Law 110–181 relating to contractors performing private security functions in areas of combat operations; and the Secretary is confident the security provided to supply convoys to Department of Defense construction projects, and to Armed Forces deployed in support of operations in Afghanistan will not be degraded. In addition, this section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2013 for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund for infrastructure improvements at an APPF training center. Finally, this section would require a quarterly report on the APPF be submitted to the congressional defense committees through the quarter ending December 31, 2014.

TITLE XVI—INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

OVERVIEW

The committee established a Panel on Business Challenges within the Defense Industry, appointed by Chairman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon and Ranking Member Adam Smith on September 12, 2011. The panel's activities extended over the course of 6 months. This Panel was charged with examining:

(1) Contracting or regulatory challenges facing the defense industry;

(2) The use of incentives and mandates to shape the defense industrial base;

(3) Structural challenges facing various sectors within the industrial base, including universities and research institutes;

(4) The impact of the current fiscal environment on the health of the defense industrial base at both the prime and subcontractor levels; and

(5) Opportunities to reduce barriers to entry.

The Panel on Business Challenges within the Defense Industry conducted hearings, held roundtable discussions with industry, and examined many challenges within the defense industrial base (DIB). Through this work, the Panel developed a report and an accompanying set of recommendations to increase the efficiency and health of the DIB.

As a direct result of the Panel's work, the committee includes several provisions in this title regarding the defense industrial base and the activities of the Department of Defense related to small businesses. The committee also includes a provision elsewhere in this Act related to the roles and responsibilities of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy. Furthermore, the committee includes a subtitle in this title that addresses small business matters writ large.

The committee applauds the exceptional, bipartisan effort of Panel in examining these complex matters and providing the committee with focused, actionable recommendations that can be included in this Act. The committee also commends the House Committee on Small Business and the House Committee on Oversight

and Government Reform for their hard work in developing and advancing this important legislation.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Audit Agencies

The committee notes that the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) is under the authority, direction, and control of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), and the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) is under the authority, direction, and control of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The committee is also aware that section 133 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to prescribe policies to ensure that audit and oversight of contractor activities are coordinated and carried out in a manner to prevent duplication by different elements of the Department of Defense. However, the findings of the committee's Panel on Business Challenges in the Defense Industry indicate that more needs to be done to improve the coordination, efficiency, and oversight of DCAA and DCMA. The committee believes there would be potential benefits if the two organizations were more closely aligned within the Department's organizational structure. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of realigning DCAA and DCMA such that they are under the authority, direction, and control of the same Under Secretary of Defense, and to submit a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2012.

Effect of Drawdown on Manufacturing Industrial Base

The committee is aware that the drawdown of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan has caused, and will continue to cause, manufacturing workload to diminish. The committee believes this diminished workload and workforce reductions ultimately could lead to the loss of critical industrial base capabilities. As the Department of Defense moves forward in developing the strategy required in section 1604 of this Act, the committee believes the Secretary should identify and consider critical manufacturing capabilities across the various components of the industrial base in the public and private sectors. The committee also believes that the Secretary should evaluate workload requirements for sustaining critical activities across the industrial base to support military operations.

Export Control Reform

The committee is aware of ongoing efforts to reform the current U.S. export control system. While the committee supports efforts to reduce the complexity of the export control system by improving efficiency, increasing transparency, and improving inter-agency coordination, the committee is concerned that the U.S. Government has not fully assessed the potential impact of the proposed reforms. The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) raised concerns regarding the proposed reforms in its March 12, 2012 report entitled "Export Controls: Agencies Need to Assess Control List Reform's Impact on Compliance Activities" (GAO–12–

394SU). Among the findings, the GAO report states that U.S. agencies have not fully assessed the potential impact that the proposed reforms might have on compliance activities, to include the identification of resources necessary to support such activities. Additionally, the committee is aware that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence required a review of the threats to U.S. security by "technological export" in the committee report (S. Rept. 112–43) accompanying the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. The results of that review have not yet been reported to Congress. Furthermore, the committee notes that the President's budget request for the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 2013 did not identify the need for additional compliance officers. The committee believes that the risks and resource implications of the potential reforms to the export control system should be identified and steps should be taken to sufficiently resource affected agencies in order to prevent increased backlog in licensing, degraded enforcement, and increased risk of loss of control of information and technology from the defense industrial base.

Germanium Wafer Procurement

The committee notes that germanium is currently a key component in satellite solar panels where size, efficiency, and power are crucial, as germanium enables solar energy to power satellites and other spacecraft. Further, the committee notes that because of this capability, the Department of Defense maintains an interest in the secure supply of solar-cell capable germanium wafers. The committee is aware that a request for information concerning germanium wafer production for use in space-based solar technology was recently released by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). The committee is concerned that the current solicitation unfairly and unnecessarily limits competition to a sole-source procurement on the basis of an urgent national security requirement. No evidence has been provided to the committee to support this justification. The committee is concerned that DLA has unfairly eliminated a potential domestic supplier of space solar cell-capable germanium wafers by failing to take steps necessary to qualify a second domestic source of germanium wafers and, as a result, is restricting the competition from domestic suppliers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Defense Logistics Agency, in coordination with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, to review any related procurement action by August 1, 2012, in order to:

(1) Determine if the need for germanium wafers is so urgent as to require a sole-source procurement in lieu of the opportunity to qualify a second domestic producer;

(2) Examine the current requirements documentation and acquisition plans for opportunities to increase competition and make such changes as necessary to meet the near-term needs of the warfighter, while maximizing opportunities for the industrial base; and

(3) Identify steps necessary to qualify additional providers of germanium wafers to meet national security requirements.

The committee directs the Director, Defense Logistics Agency to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2012, on the findings of the review and to provide any rec-

ommendations for improving surety of supply of germanium wafers.

Impact of Federal Prison Industries on the Clothing and Textile Industry

The committee remains concerned with the continued reliance on the Federal Prison Industries (FPI) clothing and textile business segment by the Department of Defense. The committee is specifically troubled that FPI's 2011 Annual Financial Management Report and 2011 Sales Report clearly show that 78% of their clothing and textile sales are to the Department of Defense. This accounts for approximately 25% of FPI's total sales, even though clothing and textiles represent only one of FPI's seven business segments.

The committee believes that any continued expansion of FPI contracts in the Department of Defense clothing and textile market in fiscal year 2013 will weaken the domestic manufacturing base as loss of contracts under FPI's mandatory source preference will lead to job losses in the industry. As already required by law, FPI should diversify its business, and develop new revenue streams that will not result in U.S. job losses, nor harm the domestic manufacturing base in the clothing and textile business segment.

Importance of Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé Program

The committee notes that the Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé Program (MPP) is critical. The program assists small businesses (protégés) to successfully compete for prime contract and subcontract awards by partnering with large companies (mentors) under individual, project-based agreements. The committee further notes that the program has offered substantial assistance to small, disadvantaged businesses and that it is essential to reversing the negative perception of doing business with small businesses, especially service-disabled veteran-owned businesses. The committee supports the Department of Defense MPP and notes that successful mentor-protégé agreements develop a symbiotic relationship for the protégé, the mentor, and the Department of Defense, and ensure that more small businesses are able to contract with the Department. In coordination with the House Committee on Small Business, the committee also includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish mentor-protégé programs for other agencies of the Federal Government.

Inclusion of Small Business Participation Statistics in Annual Assessments of Selected Weapon Programs

In accordance with the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 110–329), the Comptroller General of the United States conducts an annual assessment of selected weapon programs. The committee finds these assessments valuable. However, the committee notes that small business participation statistics are not currently included in the Comptroller General's annual report and believes that inclusion of such information would be beneficial. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to incorporate small business participation statistics for each

weapon program included in its annual assessment of selected weapon programs delivered to the congressional defense committees.

Inspector General Review of Intellectual Property Issues

The committee is concerned with protecting small business intellectual property rights when doing business with the Department of Defense (DOD). As noted in the Panel on Business Challenges in the Defense Industry's report "Challenges to Doing Business with the Department of Defense", "Smaller businesses can experience particular difficulties in protecting their rights because of their size and the comparatively limited resources available to them." The report also notes that, "DOD contractors, including small businesses, have objected both to the breadth of the rights in technical data that the government acquires under government contracts and subcontracts, and to the government's compliance with the restrictions upon the use, disclosure, or release of technical data in which the Government has government purpose or limited rights. Small business contractors, in particular, have alleged that Government employees improperly furnished materials to their competitors so that their competitors could 'reverse engineer' their proprietary products, as well as undertook research projects duplicating proprietary solutions and then published the resulting intellectual property as Government-owned." Unfortunately, the committee has little grounds for action beyond anecdotal claims.

Therefore, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct a review to address the lack of empirical data and to submit a report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Inspector General should review a representative sample of protests, including lawsuits and other administrative contracting procedures, between the Government and contractors, as well as between prime contractors and their subcontractors, in order to:

(1) Estimate the number of cases involving breeches of intellectual property rights;

(2) Analyze the representative cases to determine if there are significant similarities in the grounds for the protests;

(3) Determine if there was compliance with current laws and regulations related to intellectual property rights;

(4) Assess if there are trends in these cases that might indicate gaps in existing intellectual property rights laws and regulations;

(5) Report on the outcomes of the cases that have been concluded; and

(6) Provide recommendations as appropriate.

Procurement Technical Assistance Program

The committee notes that the Procurement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP) was authorized by section 1241 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1985 (Public Law 98–525) in an effort to expand the number of businesses capable of participating in Government contracts. The committee also notes

that Procurement Technical Assistance Centers serve as a unique resource for small businesses to obtain information and training on acquisition procedures, specialized solicitations, and Federal contracting information. The committee believes that PTAP is a key program for fostering small business contracting with the Department of Defense by helping to generate new suppliers for the Department, which results in a stronger industrial base and increased competition. The committee directs the Director, Defense Logistics Agency to review the Procurement Technical Assistance Program and to submit to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2012, its recommendations for strengthening the program and ensuring that local Procurement Technical Assistance Centers are sufficiently resourced to educate the small business community and that small businesses are aware of PTAP and the services it provides.

Recycling of Rare Earth Elements

The committee is aware that in its December 2011 report entitled "Critical Materials Strategy," the Department of Energy states that the heavy rare earth phosphors, dysprosium, europium, terbium, and yttrium, are particularly important given their relative scarcity combined with their importance to clean energy, energy efficiency, hybrid and electric vehicles, and advanced defense systems, among other key technologies. While new sources of production of rare earth elements show promise, these are focused primarily on the light rare earth elements. The committee notes that the recycling of end-use technologies that use rare earth elements can provide a near-term opportunity to recapture, reprocess, and reuse some of the rare earth elements contained in them.

The committee believes that fluorescent lighting materials could prove to be a promising recyclable source of heavy rare earth elements, and the committee believes the Department of Defense can increase supplies of heavy rare earth elements by performing a cost-benefit analysis on the viability of recycling its own fluorescent lighting waste for use in defense systems. While the committee is concerned that rare earth materials are being lost due to inadequate recycling efforts, the committee believes that the recycling of such elements, as well as the maturation of new sources of production and a developmental effort focused on alternatives to heavy rare earth elements, are necessary components of a prudent strategy to address global demand for these elements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, with its recommendations on how the Department of Defense can capture its fluorescent lighting waste and make the material available to entities that have the ability to extract rare earth phosphors, reprocess and separate them in an environmentally safe manner, and return these rare earths into the domestic rare earth supply chain. The report should specifically address disposal and mitigation plans for residual mercury and other hazardous byproducts to be produced by the recycling process. The report should also specifically establish recommendations to prevent the export of such heavy rare earth materials obtained from U.S. Government sources to non-allied nations.

Sector-by-Sector, Tier-by-Tier Review

The committee is aware that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy is undertaking an effort to conduct a comprehensive, repeatable, and fact-based approach to mapping the defense industrial base. The "Sector-by-Sector, Tier-by-Tier" (S2T2) review is aimed at creating a common taxonomy across multiple sectors of the industrial base to better identify and quantify the defense industrial base. The committee is encouraged by this effort and believes that both the Department of Defense and the industrial base would benefit from the identification of early-warning indicators of risk, single points of failure, and areas where the Department has an over-reliance on foreign sourcing. The committee believes that the S2T2 review would assist long-term planning and investment decisions both within and across the military departments, and it would aid in the development of the national security strategy for the national technology and industrial base, as required elsewhere in this title. However, the committee is concerned that the potential benefits of the S2T2 review will not be actualized if the mapping is not continuously updated and leveraged to inform decision-makers. The committee notes that Section 852 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) requires the Secretary of Defense to include a status report on the S2T2 effort in the annual report to Congress on the defense industrial base submitted for fiscal year 2012. The committee believes this information, when aggregated with the other matters required in the report, will be useful to the Department and to Congress. The committee also notes that this report, due March 1, 2012, has yet to be delivered.

Service Disabled Veteran Contracting Within the Department of Defense

A March 2012 Department of Defense Inspector General report that found significant shortcomings with the Department of Defense's service-disabled veteran owned small business (SDVOSB) set aside program. Among its finding, the report found that in a sample of 27 contracts from FY2010, $340 million in federal taxpayer dollars were awarded to contractors "who potentially misstated" their company's eligibility for SDVOSB set-asides. Another six contracts cited in the report, valued at approximately $1.9 million, were awarded to ineligible contractors. Further, the report states that procedures to verify that recipients were eligible for these set-aside contacts "were not adequate" and that "if the office does not establish adequate procedures, it will continue to convey the message that assisting service-disabled veterans is not a priority." The report added that "the lack of action compromises the integrity and intention of the program, which is to serve veterans with disabilities incurred or aggravated in the line of duty."

The committee directs the department to submit a report by October 1, 2012 outlining the department's plan to address the findings of the inspector general's report. The report shall include an explanation of the department's process for verifying the eligibility of those companies seeking SDVOSB set-aside contracting opportu-

nities, as well as improvements that would provide more accurate verification of a bidder's eligibility.

Small Business Specialists in the Acquisition Workforce

The committee is concerned that although the Department of Defense has taken aggressive steps to rebuild the capacity and capability of the acquisition workforce, it has done little to ensure that the workforce includes a sufficient number of small business specialists responsible for ensuring that the Department achieve its small business contracting and subcontracting goals. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the acquisition workforce, identify the small business specialists, and evaluate whether the capability and capacity of the small business specialists in the acquisition workforce are sufficient to meet the Department's needs. This assessment should also include the feasibility and advisability of establishing a small business specialist career field in the acquisition workforce. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit to a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2012.

Strategic Materials Protection Board

The committee believes that securing adequate supplies of strategic and critical materials is necessary for the maintenance of properly-equipped armed forces. In order to ensure that the defense industrial base has the necessary access to these materials, Congress established a Strategic Materials Protection Board in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act of 2007 (Public Law 109–364). In accordance with this law, the Board is responsible for reviewing the availability and utilization of strategic and critical materials through biennial meetings and providing its findings and recommendations to Congress. These required reports are intended to stimulate a bottom-up review of the defense industrial base with a particular focus on the use and availability of strategic and critical materials required to support the United States defense industrial base, including plans to address current and future supply-chain vulnerabilities for strategic and critical materials.

The committee expresses concern about the Board's failure to fulfill its statutory obligations. In 2008, the Board issued a report that did little to assist the Department of Defense or the congressional defense committees in determining the status of, and way forward for, strategic material issues. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee noted the poor performance of the Board and requested several additional reports from the Department regarding strategic materials. In 2010, the committee requested additional information in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. The Department has consistently failed to meet these requirements.

Furthermore, Department officials have indicated that they have encountered difficulties with scheduling regular Board meetings as a result of the senior personnel assigned to the Board. Therefore elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that

would amend the composition of the Board in deference to these concerns, but would require that senior officials from the Department continue to review and approve the Board's reports and recommendations.

Transfer of Technology to Foreign Entities

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has an obligation to ensure that Congress is advised of the potential national security implications of the transfer of technologies initially developed under Department of Defense contracts, or the transfer of technology that has dual-use or military applications, to foreign entities. Many U.S. companies that participate in the defense industrial base are seeking to expand their business in the global market. However, some of these transactions and joint ventures may result in the transfer of U.S. defense technologies, such as fighter aircraft engine technologies, to foreign governments and foreign militaries. While the legal framework to address such technology transfers rests within current export control law and regulations, current law does not prevent the Secretary of Defense from exercising due diligence to protect U.S. defense technologies. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to take such steps as necessary to prevent the illicit transfer of defense technologies to foreign entities, and to advise the relevant congressional committees of the risks associated with any such commercial transactions or joint ventures.

The committee directs the Director, Defense Security Service, in coordination with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, to conduct an assessment of the impact of joint ventures related to the cleared U.S. defense contractor community, and the potential for transference of U.S. technologies to another nation as a result of such ventures. At a minimum, the assessment should: (1) survey the cleared defense contractor community regarding joint ventures in place, or being pursued, by the cleared defense contractor community; (2) determine the extent to which such joint ventures are putting sensitive U.S. technologies, including dual-use technologies, at risk of transference to other entities; and (3) assess the degree to which such joint ventures with cleared defense contractors are tied to foreign governments or foreign militaries. The committee further directs the Director, Defense Security Service to provide the results of the assessment, along with any recommendations to reduce risk of transference of sensitive U.S. technologies to foreign governments or foreign militaries, to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

Section 1601—Disestablishment of Defense Materiel Readiness Board

This section would repeal section 871 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) that established the Defense Materiel Readiness Board (DMRB) within the Department of Defense. This section would also repeal section

872 of Public Law 110–181 that provided for designation of critical materiel readiness shortfalls by the Secretary of Defense and created the Department of Defense Strategic Readiness Fund. The committee is aware that the military departments have venues and means by which they address materiel and readiness deficiencies, and the committee believes that the intended functions of the DMRB can be sufficiently addressed through those mechanisms and under a joint governance structure, such as the existing Joint Logistics Board.

Section 1602—Assessment of Effects of Foreign Boycotts

This section would amend section 2505 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the periodic defense capability assessment to include an assessment of the impact of foreign boycotts on the national technology and industrial base. This section would also require identification of actions necessary to minimize the impact of foreign boycotts on the national technology and industrial base. The committee notes the Comptroller General of the United States review of this matter, required in the conference report (H. Rept. 112–329) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, is currently under way. In addressing the matters required to be reported as a result of this assessment, the committee requests the Comptroller General cite examples of foreign government or foreign business boycotts that pose a material risk to the defense industrial base.

Section 1603—Advancing Innovation Pilot Program

This section would allow the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to establish an Advancing Innovation Pilot Program to accelerate the commercialization of research innovations. The committee notes that universities are important contributors to innovation for the defense community. The predominance of the basic research for the Department of Defense is carried out by universities and has been focused on increasing the fundamental understanding of scientific principles and processes. As those fundamental concepts mature, they lead to more applied technologies that are of direct benefit to the warfighter. The committee is aware that over the past 3 decades, there has been an increasing trend on university campuses to link research activities to commercialization in order to more quickly translate research into industrial products. Unfortunately, the committee is concerned that the current process does not operate effectively, and the success rate and potential return on investment are generally not realized as often as needed to provide useful tools to the military.

Section 1604—National Security Strategy for National Technology and Industrial Base

This section would amend section 2501 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to develop a national security strategy for the technology and industrial base. This section would require that the strategy ensure the national technology and industrial base is capable of supplying, equipping, and supporting the force structure necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in the national security strategy. This section would also codify the

requirements of section 852(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), relating to a strategy for securing the defense supply chain and industrial base, within section 2504 of title 10, United States Code. Finally, this section would amend section 2440 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the national technology and industrial base strategy developed pursuant to section 2501 of such title be considered in the development and implementation of acquisition plans for each major defense acquisition program.

SUBTITLE B—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SMALL BUSINESS MATTERS

Section 1611—Pilot Program To Assist in the Growth and Development of Advanced Small Business Concerns

This section would require the establishment of a pilot program within the Department of Defense to assist in the growth and development of advanced small business concerns. Under the pilot program, competition for contract awards may be restricted to advanced small business concerns under certain conditions.

Section 1612—Role of the Directors of Small Business Programs in Requirements Development and Acquisition Decision Processes of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and promulgate guidance to ensure that the director of each office of the Small Business Programs in the Department of Defense are participants in the Department's requirements development and acquisition decision processes.

Section 1613—Small Business Advocate for Defense Audit Agencies

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate an official in each defense audit agency to: advise the director of the respective agency on all issues related to small business concerns; serve as the agency's primary point of contact and source of information for small business concerns; collect relevant data and monitor the agency's conduct of audits of small businesses; and develop and implement processes and procedures to improve the performance of the agency related to the timeliness of audits of small businesses.

Section 1614—Independent Assessment of Federal Procurement Contracting Performance of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a Federally Funded Research and Development Center to conduct an independent assessment of the Department of Defense's Federal procurement performance related to small business concerns. This section would require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than January 1, 2014, on the independent assessment.

Section 1615—Assessment of Small Business Programs Transition

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an independent review and assessment of the transition of small business-developed technologies, such as those developed under the Small Business Innovation Research Program, into a representative sample of major weapon systems and major automated information systems for the Department of Defense.

Section 1616—Additional Responsibilities of Inspector General of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct peer reviews of the Department of Defense audit agencies in accordance with and in such a frequency as provided by Government auditing standards as established by the Comptroller General of the United States. This section would also require the Inspector General to include, as part of the semiannual reports to Congress required by the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–452), information concerning any Department of Defense audit agency that has either failed peer review or has not had a peer review conducted in the required period.

Section 1617—Restoration of 1 Percent Funding for Administrative Expenses of Commercialization Readiness Program of Department of Defense

This section would amend subsection (y) of section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 5141(b)(1)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to use not more than 1 percent of the funds available to the Department of Defense pursuant to the Small Business Innovation Research Program for payment of expenses incurred to administer the Commercialization Readiness Program.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

PART I—PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES

Section 1621—Procurement Center Representatives

This section would amend subsection (l) of section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) to strengthen and clarify the role and responsibilities of Procurement Center Representatives (PCRs). This section would also allow PCRs to review and make recommendations related to acquisition plans and procurement methods and would require that PCRs hold a Level III Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting, or the equivalent Department of Defense certification.

Section 1622—Small Business Act Contracting Requirements Training

This section would require the Defense Acquisition University and the Federal Acquisition University to establish a course on contracting requirements under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C.

644) and would require the course to be completed by certain individuals. This section would also require that business opportunity specialists have a Level I Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting. Furthermore, this section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to to the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the House Committee on Small Business not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the relationship between the size and quality of the acquisition workforce and the Federal Government's ability to maximize small business participation in Federal procurement.

Section 1623—Acquisition Planning

This section would amend subsection (e) of section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) to require that each Federal department or agency enumerate opportunities for the participation of small business concerns during all acquisition planning processes, and invite the participation of the appropriate Procurement Center Representatives and appropriate Directors of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization in all acquisition processes.

PART II—GOALS FOR PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS AWARDED TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

Section 1631—Goals for Procurement Contracts Awarded to Small Business Concerns

This section would amend subsection (g) of section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) by establishing a Government-wide goal for participation by small business concerns at not less than 25 percent of the total value of all prime contracts for each fiscal year, and 40 percent of the total value of all subcontract awards for each fiscal year. This section would also require that agency goals related to small business concerns cannot be less than Government-wide goals.

Section 1632—Reporting on Goals For Procurement Contracts Awarded to Small Business Concerns

This section would amend subsection (h) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) to clarify and expand the reporting requirements related to procurement contracts awarded to small businesses. The section would require the head of each Federal agency to submit an annual report to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration that describes the extent of participation by small businesses and requires the head of the agency to also provide the justification for the failure to achieve the goals established in accordance with the Act. This section would also require the Administrator to report to the President and to Congress, not later than 60 days after receiving such a report, the data provided by each head of agency in a manner that would improve visibility of agency performance related to small business goals and that would enhance oversight of such activity.

Section 1633—Senior Executives

This section would require programs established for the development of senior executives to include training in Federal procurement requirements, including contracting requirements under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644). This section would also ensure that evaluation of members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) responsible for acquisition, and other senior officials responsible for acquisition and SES members, as appropriate, include consideration of the agency's success in achieving small business contracting goals.

PART III—MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ PROGRAM

Section 1641—Mentor-Protégé Programs

This section would amend the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) by authorizing the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a mentor-protégé program for small business concerns. This section would also require the Administrator to issue, subject to notice and comment, regulations with respect to mentor-protégés programs at agencies other than the Department of Defense. The section would not apply to the Department of Defense mentor-protégés program or any mentoring assistance provided under a Small Business Innovation Research program or a Small Business Technology Transfer program.

Section 1642—Government Accountability Office Report

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study examining the potential affiliation between mentors and protégés and to update the study required by section 1345 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–240).

PART IV—TRANSPARENCY IN SUBCONTRACTING

SUBPART A—LIMITATIONS ON SUBCONTRACTING

Section 1651—Limitations on Subcontracting

This section would amend the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631) by changing the limitations on subcontracting by small business concerns from cost to price and by allowing, in case of a contract that combines services, construction or supplies, the limitation on subcontracting to be determined by the category that is the greatest percentage of the contract amount. This section would also require that amounts expended by a covered small business concern on a subcontractor that is a similarly situated entity shall not be used in the determination of the subcontracting limitations.

Section 1652—Penalties

This section would amend section 16 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 645) by establishing penalties for anyone who violates the subcontracting limitations established in section 45 of that Act.

Section 1653—Conforming Amendments

This section would make conforming amendments to the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632, 637, and 644).

Section 1654—Regulations

This section would require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to issue guidance with respect to compliance with the changes made to the Small Business Act by the amendments in this part no later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBPART B—SUBCONTRACTING PLANS

Section 1655—Subcontracting Plans

This section would amend subsection (d) of section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637) to require an offeror or bidder responding to a Federal solicitation to submit a subcontracting report every 6 months during contract performance, an annual report during performance and a summary report within 30 days of the end of the contract. This section would also provide authority for a Procurement Center Representative (PCR) to determine if the subcontracting plan fails to provide the maximum practicable opportunity for small business concerns to participate and, allows the PCR to delay acceptance of the subcontracting plan for up to 30 days in that case. However, this section would provide an exception if the appropriate personnel of the contracting agency certify that the agency's need for the property or services is of such an unusual and compelling urgency that the United States would be seriously injured unless the agency is permitted to accept the subcontracting plan. Furthermore, this section would not provide a Procurement Center Representative the authority to delay the award or performance of a Department of Defense contract.

Section 1656—Notices of Subcontracting Opportunities

This section would amend subsection (k) of section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637) by requiring notices of small business contracting opportunities to be posted on an appropriate Federal website as determined by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Section 1657—Regulations

This section would require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to issue guidance with respect to changes made to the Small Business Act by amendments made in this Act, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBPART C—PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS

Section 1658—Publication of Certain Documents

This section would amend the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631) by requiring a Federal agency, other than the Department of Defense, to convert a function of a small business concern to a performance by a Federal employee only after the agency has made

publicly available the procedures and methodologies for determining which contracts will be studied for potential conversion, procedures and methodologies to evaluate contracts for inherently governmental or critical functions, and procedures and methodologies for estimating and comparing costs.

PART V—SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN SIZE STANDARDS

Section 1661—Small Business Concern Size Standards

This section would amend section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) to allow common size standards among related industries only if the Administrator of the Small Business Administration finds that the common size standard is appropriate for each industry independently. This section would also prohibit the Administrator from limiting the number of size standards, and would require the Administrator to assign the appropriate size standard to each North American Industrial Classification System Code. Furthermore, this section would require the Administrator to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking and include a detailed description of the industry, analysis of the competitive environment for that industry, the methodology used by to develop the proposed size standard, and the anticipated effect of the proposed size standard in such notice.

PART VI—CONTRACT BUNDLING

Section 1671—Consolidation of Provisions Relating To Contract Bundling

This section would amend section 44 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q) by expanding and clarifying the definition of a bundled contract and eliminating procedures related to contract consolidation. This section would exclude contracts under $2.0 million dollars generally, or contracts under $5.0 million for construction, from the definition of a bundled contract. This section would also exclude contracts for major defense acquisition programs.

Section 1672—Repeal of Redundant Provisions

This section would repeal redundant provisions contained in the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(a, e, p, q)) as a result of other actions taken in this Act.

Section 1673—Technical Amendments

This section would make technical amendments to section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644).

PART VII—INCREASED PENALTIES FOR FRAUD

Section 1681—Safe Harbor for Good Faith Compliance Efforts

This section would amend subsection (d) of section 16 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 645) by clarifying that a firm or individual will not be held liable if acting in reliance on a written advisory opinion from outside counsel. This section is intended to allow the firm or individual to establish that they acted in good faith in attempting to comply with current laws related to small

business concerns. The committee believes this provision is necessary in order to aid firms or individuals who may not have absolute certainty as to whether or not they are considered a small business and are fully intending to comply with law. The committee also recommends a provision elsewhere in this title that establishes an Office of Hearings and Appeals, which would adjudicate matters related to firms accused of misrepresenting themselves as small businesses.

Section 1682—Office of Hearings and Appeals

This section would amend section 5 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 634) to codify the existence of the Office of Hearing and Appeals within the Small Business Administration, which adjudicates matters related to firms accused of misrepresenting themselves as small businesses. This section would also require the designation of a Chief Hearing Officer and describe the qualifications and duties of such office.

Section 1683—Requirement Fraudulent Businesses Be Suspended or Debarred

This section would amend subsection (d) of section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) by clarifying that misrepresentation as a small business concern is an independent basis for suspension or debarment of a contractor. This section would also require a revision to the Federal Acquisition Regulation and would require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to develop and promulgate guidance implementing this section, and to publish standard operating procedures for suspension and debarment on its website.

Section 1684—Annual Report on Suspensions and Debarments Proposed by Small Business Administration

This section would require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to submit an annual report to the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the House Committee on Small Business on the suspension and debarment actions taken by the Administrator during the year preceding the year of submission of this report.

PART VIII—OFFICES OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UNITS

Section 1691—Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization

This section would amend subsection (k) of section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) to ensure that an individual serving as the Director of an Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU) be a member of the Senior Executive Service, or in the case of an agency where the Chief Acquisition Officer and senior procurement executives are not members of the Senior Executive Service, the Director may be appointed to a position compensated at not less than the minimum rate of pay for grade GS–15 of the General Schedule. This section would also require that the head or deputy head of the agency conduct the per-

formance appraisal for the Director of an OSDBU. Furthermore, this section amends subsection (k) by including additional requirements for the Director of an OSDBU and specifies minimum experience for an individual to be selected as a Director.

Section 1692—Small Business Procurement Advisory Council

This section would amend section 7104(b) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 644) by requiring the Small Business Procurement Advisory Council to conduct reviews of each Office of Small and Disadvantage Business Utilization and to identify best practices for maximizing small business utilization in Federal contracting.

PART IX—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1695—Surety Bonds

This section would amend section 694b of title 15, United States Code, by raising the maximum surety bond amount from $2.0 million to $6.5 million. This section would also allow the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to guarantee a surety bond of up to $10.0 million if a contracting officer of a Federal agency certifies that such a guarantee is necessary. The committee is aware that many contracts awarded by the Department of Defense are suitable for small business performance, but may exceed the proposed $6.5 million threshold for bonding. The committee believes that providing authority for the Administrator to guarantee a surety bond of up to $10.0 million in certain cases may increase small business contracting opportunities with the Department of Defense.

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 2013. As recommended by the committee, division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $10,838,192,000 for construction in support of the active forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2013.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $9,095,836,000 for military construction, $476,093,000 for Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities, and $1,650,781,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends authorization of $8,838,015,000 for military construction, $349,396,000 for BRAC activities and $1,650,781,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2013.

Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013."

Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVII and XXIX shall expire on October 1, 2015, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Section 2003—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII and XXIX of this Act take effect on October 1, 2012, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,923,323,000 for Army military construction and $534,692,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends authorization of $1,923,323,000 for military construction and $534,692,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013.

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 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2013.

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 2010 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously

authorized construction project. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2105—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

Section 2107—Extension of Limitation on Obligation or Expenditure of Funds for Tour Normalization

This section would continue a tour normalization prohibition of funds included in section 2111 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81). This section would specifically limit additional tour normalization in the United States Forces Korea area of responsibility until certain conditions are met. These conditions include an analysis of alternatives and a tour normalization master plan. Finally, a specific authorization is required for an expenditure of funds to support tour normalization.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,701,985,000 for Navy military construction and $480,412,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends authorization of $1,549,164,000 for military construction and $480,412,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013.

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 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2013.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2013.

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 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2207—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $388,200,000 for Air Force military construction and $581,653,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends authorization of $388,200,000 for military construction and $581,653,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013.

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 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2013.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2013.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize appropriations for Air Force military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,654,623,000 for defense agency military construction and $54,024,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends authorization of $3,569,623,000 for military construction and $54,024,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2013.

The budget request also contained $151,000,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of $151,000,000 for chemical demilitarization construction for fiscal year 2013.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $10,000,000 for Contingency Construction. The budget request included $10,000,000 to support contingency construction requirements in support of projects not previously authorized by law. The committee notes that significant unobligated balances remain in this account and other authorities exist to construct projects that are in keeping with a national security interest. Accordingly, the committee recommends $-0-, a reduction of $10,000,000, to support this program.

(2) $75,000,000 for the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex at Deveselu, Romania. The budget request included $140,932,000 to construct an Operations Building to support

an Aerospace Data Facility. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012. Accordingly, the committee recommends $70,932,000, a reduction of $70,000,000, to support this project.

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 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects and require that the Secretary of Defense reserve a portion of the amount for energy conservation projects for Reserve Components.

Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize appropriations for defense agencies military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) and authorize the Secretary of Defense to make certain modifications to the scope of previously authorized construction projects. This provision was included in the President's request.

The committee remains committed to completing the construction associated with the Landstuhl Army Medical Center, Germany, but remains concerned that the proposed facility scope of the medical center may not be aligned with the future force structure in Europe and U.S. Central Command. The committee supports an increase in the overall scope of the medical center but has not received adequate justification to approve the full authorization of the medical center as proposed in the President's budget request.

Section 2405—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds

for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

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 1997 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–201) and authorize the Secretary of Defense to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This provision was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $254,163,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends authorization of $254,163,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2013.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this Act and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,022,542,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year

2013. The committee recommends authorization of $1,022,542,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2013.

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 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2611—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of previously authorized construction projects. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2612—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2601 of Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2613—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2614—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2013, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $349,396,000 for activities related to prior Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities and $126,697,000 for activities related to BRAC 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $349,396,000 for prior BRAC activities and $126,697,000 for BRAC 2005 activities. The committee notes that significant unobligated balances exist within the BRAC 2005 account and have decided to include a prior year savings line

item that would fully fund the BRAC 2005 budget request for fiscal year 2013.

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 1990

This section would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of prior Base Realignment and Closure activities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2702—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2013 that are required to implement the decisions of the Base Closure and Realignment 2005 activities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2711—Consolidation of Department of Defense Base Closure Accounts and Authorized Uses of Base Closure Account Funds

This section would strike sections 2906 and 2906A of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510) that establish Treasury accounts for the Base Closure and Realignment rounds of 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005, and would unify these Treasury accounts into a single Treasury account known as the "Department of Defense Base Closure Account".

Section 2712—Air Armament Center, Eglin Air Force Base

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to retain an Air Armament Center at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. While the Base Closure and Realignment 2005 process validated the necessity to support an Air Armament Center, the Air Force proposed to reorganize the command within the Air Force Material Command. As validated by the Secretary of the Air Force in testimony before the committee this year, this section would maintain an Air Armament Center in Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, until it is modified pursuant to section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, or a subsequent law providing for additional base closures.

Section 2713—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round

This section would prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act from being used to propose, plan for, or execute an additional BRAC round.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Alternative Financing Instruments

The committee is concerned that the process to determine costs and savings from future basing decisions may overlook costs that should be taken into consideration. Specifically, the Department of Defense has effectively leveraged private capital to improve military family housing through the Military Housing Privatization Initiative; promote renewable energy use on installations through Energy Savings Performance Contracts, Utility Energy Service Contracts, guaranteed loans from the Department of Energy, and other alternative financing vehicles; developed unused installation property for consideration from private developers through the Enhanced Use Leasing Program; and improved Army lodging through the Privatization of Army Lodging program. At the same time, a future basing decision could lead to a closure of an installation before the associated ground leases or other contractual arrangements between the government and the developer have been satisfied. Thus, the long-term contractual obligations may affect future basing decisions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to determine the impact of base closures on alternatively financed projects and to provide a report of the findings to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013. At a minimum, the Comptroller General's study should assess the following:

(1) What alternatively financed projects exist on military installations in the United States and what contractual obligations related to contract or ground lease termination or loan guarantees exist in these contracts, leases, or loans;

(2) How the Department of Defense ensures that the U.S. Government's interests are protected in addressing contract or ground lease termination, or loan guarantees;

(3) To what extent the Department of Defense's process for estimating costs and savings from candidate basing modifications capture any termination liability that the U.S. Government could incur from these contractual obligations; and

(4) The Comptroller General should add such additional questions as deemed relevant to complete this study.

Alternative Site Assessment for the Broadway Complex, San Diego, California

The committee is aware of the legal and regulatory challenges faced by the Department of the Navy in executing lease No. N6247307RP07P24, redevelopment of the Broadway Complex in San Diego, California. Even with these challenges, the committee is concerned that the Navy has been unable to move forward with the construction of a new Government Administrative Facility (GAF) nearly 6 years after entering into a long-term lease to develop the existing site. The committee is also troubled that project delays are requiring the Navy to expend funds to maintain the cur-

rent Broadway Complex 3 years after the new GAF was originally scheduled for completion.

Given the delays and unanticipated maintenance costs associated with this lease, the committee believes the Navy should consider relocating the GAF to a military facility in the San Diego metropolitan area. While the committee is aware that the Navy faces land use restraints that could make this option impractical, insufficient data exists to make such a determination. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a report and submit it to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013. Such a report should include a land availability study of Department of the Navy property located on a military installation in the San Diego metropolitan area to determine if sufficient land is available, or could be made available, to construct a GAF that meets Department of the Navy requirements. This report should also include a cost assessment to compare the various alternatives with the existing lease.

Army Energy Initiatives Task Force

The committee recognizes the work the Army Energy Initiative Task Force has undertaken to improve and expand opportunities with the private sector to execute large scale renewable energy projects on Army bases. The committee encourages the Energy Initiative Task Force to also consider alternative energy efficiency and other sustainability proposals that could also assist the Army in meeting its energy goals.

Briefing on Alternative Power Applications on Military Installations

The committee recognizes that there may be merit to the development of small modular reactors (SMR), that produce under 300 Megawatts, to support the electricity consumption on military installations. The Center for Naval Analysis (CNA) report, entitled Feasibility of Nuclear Power on US Military Installations, indicated that an SMR could be a viable option for a military installation provided the Department does not assume First Of a Kind (FOAK) expenses. If the Department was required or assumed FOAK expenses SMR was not determined to be a viable option for military installations. The committee is interested, however, in the Department's assessment of the CNA report, and whether the Department has assessed the practicality of partnering with interested parties that would undertake the FOAK expenses in order to assess the viability of SMR on a military installation. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2012, on any actions the Department has undertaken to date on this issue. If action has been taken to move forward on the deployment of SMR, the briefing should include the current and potential budget for such an undertaking, including any personnel costs associated with such projects, a timeline for the proposed projects, a plan for storing the resulting nuclear waste, if necessary, the additional security requirement that may be required, and any other factors that are pertinent to the successful execution of establishing a SMR on a military installation.

Briefing on Direct Solar and other Energy Efficient Technologies Applications on Military Installations

The committee recognizes direct solar as one technology available to reduce Department of Defense energy consumption and enhance energy security on military installations. The committee also recognizes that direct solar devices such as daylighting systems and direct solar pipe technology can have broader application across military installations and may reduce demand load while providing light for facilities. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, direct solar was listed as one of several possible technologies for the Department of Defense to consider jointly with Department of Energy when generating its list of energy efficient technologies. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Energy in consultation with the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees no later than December 31, 2012 about existing projects where direct solar devices as well as other energy efficiency technologies listed in the Energy Performance Master Plan have been employed across military installations. The briefing shall include a description of the most promising technologies, the savings achieved, and details regarding the impact of such technologies on the Department of Defense efforts to meet its energy goals and mandates.

Building Conversions

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is contemplating facility standards to support sustainable design features and has generally adopted Leadership in Energy and Environment Design (LEED) standards to meet these requirements. The committee supports sustainable design and building reuse standards that value existing and historic facilities as integral elements of the overall installation. The committee believes that the adoption of sustainable design and building reuse standards concurrently reduces the one time construction and renovation costs. For example, the Department of the Army has indicated their intent to reuse an existing building at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, and upgrade the facility for the purpose of conducting high performance computing. The committees urges the Secretary of Defense to adopt a comprehensive set of sustainable design and reuse standards that values building reuse and provides facility savings.

Decentralized Steam Generation

In fiscal year 2013, the committee recommends authorization of over $180.0 million in military construction projects to support rapid energy savings in decentralizing steam utilities at three locations. In addition to the quick payback period, these investments are expected to reduce steam lost in the transmission lines and provide a more reliable utility. While the Department of Defense has proposed additional energy projects in the budget request for fiscal year 2013, the Department has elected to not prioritize any further decentralized steam systems. The committee supports investments in projects that provide a rapid return on investment and believes the payback period associated with these facilities

makes them ideal candidates for future military construction projects.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, on the current inventory of centralized steam systems. The briefing should include an assessment of the costs to decentralize these steam systems, the payback associated with decentralizing these assets, the current locations of decentralized steam systems, the potential location of additional decentralized steam systems, and funding options available to support these decentralized efforts.

Department of Defense Energy Demonstration and Validation

The committee recognizes the services' efforts to reduce energy consumption, increase use of renewable energy, conserve water and utilize sustainability building practices for new construction, and implement energy efficiency initiatives. In this resource constrained environment, the committee commends the services' for their efforts to ensure that energy demonstration and validation programs continue to demonstrate an acceptable return on investment. The committee urges the services to continue their efforts to transition demonstration and validation energy programs into operational and installation initiatives and ensure there continues to be a sufficient payback.

Departments of Defense and Energy Collaboration and Technology Transition

The committee notes that in July 2010, the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to encourage innovative energy and conservation technologies, from research and development to end user applications within the Department of Defense. The committee commends both agencies for working together to maximize both of their technical expertise in emerging energy technology. The committee is aware that the Department of Energy has made significant investment in the development of alternative energy sources, and the committee urges the Department of Defense to leverage those investments in its alternative energy initiatives. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense's Environmental Security and Technology Certification program funds an installation energy test bed to demonstrate energy efficiencies and renewable energy technologies to validate performance, cost, and environmental impacts, and to determine which technologies would be applicable for broader application across the Department of Defense's inventory of installations. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by October 31, 2012, on the current status of activities under the MOU, details regarding the installation energy technology selection process, the list of companies and technologies that received awards in fiscal years 2011–12, a description of how the technologies were transitioned, and the installations where they were employed.

Department of Defense Energy Technologies

The committee is aware of efforts by the Department of Defense to reduce energy consumption and improve energy efficiency. The committee is aware of a variety of technologies, to include waste-to-energy systems and other new technologies, which can help the Department meet its energy goals and mandates. The committee encourages the Department to leverage these technologies where appropriate and continue its efforts to improve operational and installation energy programs.

Facility Demolition Program

The budget request contained $125.0 million for the facilities demolition program for fiscal year 2013. The committee believes that the effective use of demolition appropriations provides long-term savings to the Department of Defense by decreasing facility sustainment costs and reducing additional environmental liability. Therefore, the committee supports the overall facility demolition budget request and encourages the Department to better assess future demolition requirements. The committee also supports appropriately assessing the budget request to remove the entirety of excess and obsolete facilities through the judicious use of the facilities demolition program.

Inclusion of Cost-Benefit Analysis for Energy Security

The committee recognizes the importance of energy security on military installations to ensure access to reliable supplies of energy sufficient to meet mission essential requirements. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) required the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy for military installations to include favorable consideration for energy security in the design and development of energy projects on military installations using renewable energy sources, and to provide guidance to commanders in order to minimize the effects of a disruption of services by a utility. The committee believes that energy security projects are vital to the operational requirements that support national security. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that any installation energy project that excludes energy security in its design due to excessive costs provide details of the factors used to value energy security within the required cost-benefit analysis.

Increased Utilization of Third Party Financing for Energy Efficiency Projects

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has very aggressive goals and mandates to reduce energy consumption on military installations and to enhance energy security. A critical component of this effort includes large-scale energy efficiency and conservation efforts at military installations, particularly through partnerships with the private sector. The committee urges the Department and the service secretaries to partner with third parties through energy savings performance contracts, enhanced use leases, and other third party authorities to achieve their goals, maximize savings, and achieve a demonstrated return on these in-

vestments. The committee also encourages the Department of Defense to consider the best complement of technologies that provide energy security to include consideration for those that provide continuous power at a cost-competitive price.

Leasing Real Property

The committee is concerned that by using real property leases as allowed under section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, for the purchase of services being performed on non-excess Department of Defense land, the Department and the military departments are bypassing the small-business considerations provided for under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). For example, the Department of the Navy has sought to lease to public or private entities a portion of the former Ship Repair Facility on non-excess real property at the U.S. Naval Base Guam under the authority of section 2667. In addition, the Navy's request for proposal states that it was issued to "competitively select a private sector ship repair facility operator . . . The successful offeror should be capable of operating as, or partnering with, a fully qualified ship repair and overhaul enterprise." The committee urges the Department and the military services to use appropriate statutory and regulatory authorities when leasing real property and to pursue contracted services through the FAR, and not via leasing arrangements, so that proper consideration is given to small business interests.

Local Communities' Capacity to Support Military Installation Change

The committee is concerned about the impact of Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC), overseas rebasing, and force structure changes on local communities surrounding installations affected by these initiatives. The committee is concerned that some communities affected by significant installation growth were not as well prepared as others to ensure that adequate transportation infrastructure, schools, utilities services, and housing were available when needed to support installation growth. The committee notes that some communities that coped relatively well with the growth may have implemented strategies that, if adopted, might benefit other communities experiencing similar installation growth in the future. The committee also notes that many communities have been affected by the closure of about 100 major installations through 5 BRAC rounds authorized and carried out between 1988 and 2011. The committee is aware that the Government Accountability Office has issued a series of reports since 2004 on such issues as to how communities fared after the first four BRAC rounds, how effectively the Army communicated growth plans at its installations with local communities, the main challenges in coping with local installation growth, and the Department of Defense's Defense Access Roads program. Coping with growth is particularly important because the ability of the installation to meet mission requirements can be affected by overburdened transportation and utilities networks.

Now that the Department of Defense has completed its fifth BRAC round and the potential exists for future infrastructure, force structure, and installation mission changes, local communities

may once again have to manage potentially significant installation change. Communities that encounter such changes in the future could benefit from lessons learned from those communities that coped relatively well with such change. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to study the practices and strategies that local communities and States used to cope with such changes, and to prepare and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013. At a minimum, the Comptroller General's report should address the following:

(1) The best practices that communities or states relied on to cope with installation growth, installation closure, or mission changes and how could those practices be replicated by similarly situated communities in the future;

(2) Opportunities that exist to share best practices to cope with installation change that were successfully implemented by communities or States;

(3) The extent to which local communities' or states' economies recover from the closure of a major military installation in any of the five BRAC rounds conducted through 2011; and

(4) Any such additional questions that the Comptroller General deems relevant to this study.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Preparation of Military Installation Master Plans

This section would require installation master plans at a period not to exceed 10 years. Such plans shall address environmental planning, sustainable design and development, sustainable range planning, real property master planning, and transportation planning.

Section 2802—Sustainment Oversight and Accountability for Military Housing Privatization Projects and Related Annual Reporting Requirements

This section would provide additional oversight and accountability in the pursuit of military housing privatization projects to include an assessment of the financial viability of the long-term project, a resident satisfaction assessment and an assessment of the backlog of maintenance and repair. Furthermore, this section would delete several reporting requirements that were duplicative or obsolete and replace them with reporting requirements associated with the long-term viability of the family housing projects.

Section 2803—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States

This section would amend section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) and extend the Department's ability to use operations and maintenance appropriations for military construction

purposes for the U.S. Central Command and Horn of Africa area until September 30, 2013.

Section 2804—Treatment of Certain Defense Nuclear Facility Construction Projects as Military Construction Projects

This section would make several findings regarding a May 2010 agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy regarding the transfer of Department of Defense budget authority to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to fund activities the Secretary of Defense determines to be high priorities.

This section would also mandate that certain construction projects of the NNSA be deemed military construction projects and require that such projects therefore be subject to: (1) the advance-project authorization requirement of section 2802(a) of title 10, United States Code, and other requirements of chapter 169 of such title related to military construction projects carried out by the Secretary of Defense; and (2) annual acts authorizing military construction projects (and authorizing the appropriation of funds therefor) for a fiscal year. This section would require that the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement (CMRR) project, in Los Alamos, New Mexico, the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) project, in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and any nuclear facility of the NNSA initiated on or after October 1, 2013 that is estimated to cost more than $1.0 billion (and is intended to be primarily utilized to support NNSA's nuclear weapons activities), be treated as military construction projects. Further, this section would authorize, as military construction, the CMRR project in the amount of $3.5 billion and the UPF project in the amount of $4.2 billion.

This section would specify that the Secretary of Energy shall retain authority to regulate design and construction activities for these projects, that the Secretary of Defense must coordinate with the Administrator for Nuclear Security regarding requirements for these facilities, and that the Administrator must make available to the Secretary of Defense the expertise of the NNSA to support design and construction activities. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, upon completion of these projects, to negotiate with the Administrator to transfer the constructed facility to the authority of the Administrator for operations.

This section would also express a sense of Congress that during fiscal year 2014 and thereafter, the budgetary authority provided by the Secretary of Defense to the Administrator under the May 2010 agreement should be reduced by the amount needed to fund design and construction of the CMRR and UPF projects under the military construction authority established by this section.

Finally, this section would apply to the designated projects for fiscal year 2014 and thereafter, and require that by September 30, 2013, the Administrator shall transfer to the Secretary of Defense all information related to architectural and engineering services and construction design for the CMRR and UPF projects. This section would mandate that all environmental impact statements and legal rulings in effect before September 30, 2013 would remain valid upon transfer of responsibility for the CMRR and UPF projects to the Secretary of Defense.

Section 2805—Execution of Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement Nuclear Facility and Limitation on Alternative Plutonium Strategy

This section would state that it is the policy of the United States to create and sustain the capability to produce plutonium pits for nuclear weapons, and to ensure sufficient plutonium pit production capacity to respond to technical challenges in the existing nuclear weapons stockpile or geopolitical developments. This section would also express a sense of Congress that: (1) successful and timely construction of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement (CMRR) nuclear facility in Los Alamos, New Mexico, is critical to achieving the aforementioned policy and that such facility should achieve full operational capability by fiscal year 2024; (2) prior-year funds provided for CMRR, up to $160.0 million being available, should be applied to continue design and construction of CMRR in fiscal year 2013; and (3) during fiscal year 2014 and thereafter, the budgetary authority provided by the Secretary of Defense to the Administrator for Nuclear Security under a May 2010 memorandum of agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy should be reduced by the amount needed to fund design and construction of the CMRR under the military construction authorities provided by section 2804 of this title.

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Administrator, to request such funds in fiscal year 2014 and subsequent fiscal years under the military construction authority provided by section 2804 to ensure the CMRR facility achieves full operational capability by 2024. Finally, this section would limit any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act from being obligated or expended on any activities associated with a plutonium strategy for the National Nuclear Security Administration that does not include achieving full operational capability of the CMRR facility by fiscal year 2024.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Authority of Military Museums to Accept Gifts and Services and To Enter Into Leases and Cooperative Agreements

This section would consolidate and extend available authorities for the use by military museums. In addition to providing the ability of military museums to accept services and enter into cooperative agreements, this section would maintain the military museums' ability to retain funds locally that were developed as a result of out-leasing elements of the military museum.

Section 2812—Clarification of Parties With Whom the Department of Defense May Conduct Exchanges of Real Property at Certain Military Installations

This section would amend section 2869(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 2815 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to change the party with whom a real estate exchange can be conducted.

Section 2813—Indemnification of Transferees of Property at Any Closed Military Installation

This section would provide an indemnification for properties transferred at all closed military installations after October 24, 1988. This section would unify the protections previously provided to properties closed pursuant to a base closure process with those properties that were closed pursuant to section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2814—Identification Requirement for Entry on Military Installations

This section would establish minimum identification requirements for military installation access.

Section 2815—Plan To Protect Critical Department of Defense Critical Assets from Electromagnetic Pulse Weapons

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees the Department's plan to protect defense-related critical assets from the adverse effects of electromagnetic pulse and high-powered microwave weapons.

SUBTITLE C—ENERGY SECURITY

Section 2821—Congressional Notification for Contracts for the Provision and Operation of Energy Production Facilities Authorized To Be Located on Real Property Under the Jurisdiction of a Military Department

This section would require the Department of Defense to notify Congress when entering into contracts for the provision and operation of energy production facilities on real property owned by the United States if the contract is longer than 20 years.

Section 2822—Continuation of Limitation on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold or Platinum Certification and Expansion To Include Implementation of ASHRAE Building Standard 189.1

This section would continue the prohibition on the use of funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design gold or platinum certifications for fiscal year 2013 set forth in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). This section would also limit the use of funds for implementation of ASHRAE building standard 189.1. The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense is investing significant funding for more aggressive certifications without demonstrating the appropriate return on investment. The committee looks forward to receiving the Department's report required in section 2830 of Public Law 112–81 by June 30, 2012.

Section 2823—Availability and Use of Department of Defense Energy Cost Savings To Promote Energy Security

This section would amend section 2912(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Department of Defense to also use the en-

ergy cost savings resulting from shared energy savings contracts for energy security.

SUBTITLE D—PROVISIONS RELATED TO GUAM REALIGNMENT

Section 2831—Use of Operation and Maintenance Funding To Support Community Adjustments Related To Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to assist the Government of Guam in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities associated with the realignment of military forces to the territory of Guam. This authorization would be provided if the Secretary determines that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by the Government of Guam to provide the services and facilities in the absence of the Secretary's assistance. This authority would expire on September 30, 2020.

Section 2832—Certification of Military Readiness Need for Firing Range on Guam as Condition on Establishment of Range

This section would prohibit the establishment of a firing range on the territory of Guam until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the firing range is required to meet a national security need.

Section 2833—Repeal of Conditions on Use of Funds for Guam Realignment

This section would strike a requirement of section 2207 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) to obtain a coordinated Federal agency plan that supports the civilian infrastructure on Guam, as well as a requirement in such Act to obtain tangible progress regarding the relocation of Marine Corps Air Station Futenma as a condition for moving forward with the Marine Corps realignment of forces to Guam.

The committee has been informed by the Department of the Navy that the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision is required for the beddown of Marines on Guam. The Department of the Navy has also indicated that the Federal agency efforts to mitigate the overall impact of the proposed redevelopment will be completed in the Record of Decision. The committee believes that the Record of Decision is the correct forum to fully consider the impacts of the overall realignment from a Federal agency perspective. Considering the timing of the Record of Decision, the committee believes that there are discrete elements of the overall realignment that have independent utility and should move forward.

SUBTITLE E—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2841—Modification to Authorized Land Conveyance and Exchange, Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson, Alaska

This section would modify section 2851 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) and would change the lead agency responsible for

completing the land conveyance and exchange at Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson, Alaska, from the Secretary of the Air Force to the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 2842—Modification of Financing Authority, Broadway Complex of the Department of the Navy, San Diego, California

This section would modify section 2732 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (division B of Public Law 99–661) to expand the Secretary of the Navy's ability to use the proceeds from the Broadway Complex lease to construct real property in San Diego, California.

Section 2843—Land Conveyance, John Kunkel Army Reserve Center, Warren, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, the John Kunkel Army Reserve Center, Warren, Ohio to the Village of Lordstown for public purposes.

Section 2844—Land Conveyance, Castner Range, Fort Bliss, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey the Castner Range at Fort Bliss, Texas, to the Parks and Wildlife Department of the State of Texas for the purpose of establishing an additional element of the Franklin Mountains State Park.

Section 2845—Modification of Land Conveyance, Fort Hood, Texas

This section would modify a land conveyance at Fort Hood, Texas, that was provided in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375). Specifically, the Secretary of the Army would be authorized to expand the development of Texas A&M University, Central Texas, to include elements that the University System of the State of Texas considers appropriate.

Section 2846—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Fort Lee Military Reservation and Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a land exchange for 1.170 acres of real property at the Fort Lee Military Reservation, Virginia, and the Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Inclusion of Religious Symbols as Part of Military Memorials

This section would add a new section to chapter 21 of title 36, United States Code, and would authorize the inclusion of religious symbols as part of a military memorial that is established or acquired by the U.S. Government. This section would also authorize the inclusion of religious symbols on certain military memorials that are not established by the U.S. Government.

Section 2862—Redesignation of the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies as the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to rename the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies as the "William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies" and other conforming changes.

Section 2863—Sense of Congress Regarding Establishment of Military Divers Memorial at Washington Navy Yard

This section would provide a sense of Congress that the Navy should provide an appropriate site at the former Navy Dive School at the Washington Navy Yard, District of Columbia, for a Military Divers Memorial.

Section 2864—Gold Star Mothers National Monument, Arlington National Cemetery

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a Gold Star Mothers National Monument in Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, or on Federal lands that are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army and are located in the vicinity of Arlington National Cemetery.

Section 2865—Naming of Training and Support Complex, Fort Bragg, North Carolina

This section would name the training and support complex at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, the "Colonel Robert Howard Training and Support Complex".

Section 2866—Naming of Electrochemistry Engineering Facility, Naval Support Activity Crane, Crane, Indiana

This section would rename the electrochemistry engineering facility on Naval Support Activity Crane, Crane, Indiana as the "John Hostettler Electrochemistry Engineering Facility".

Section 2867—Retention of Core Functions of the Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to retain the core functions of the Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, with the same integrated mission elements, responsibilities, and capabilities as existed as of November 1, 2011, until modified pursuant to section 2687 of title 10, United States Code or a subsequent BRAC authorization.

Section 2868—Retention of Core Functions of the Air Force Material Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to retain the core functions of the Air Force Material Command at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, as existed as of November 1, 2011, until modified pursuant to section 2687 of title 10, United States Code or a subsequent BRAC authorization.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $-0- for activities related to Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction. The committee believes that the Department should have included several projects in this account and has moved these projects from title XXII of the bill. The committee recommends authorization of $150,768,000 for Overseas Contingency Construction Operations Military Construction. The committee notes that significant unobligated balances exist within the Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction account and have decided to include a prior year savings line item that would fully fund this budget request for fiscal year 2013.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2901—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

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 2013 contained $17.7 billion for atomic energy defense activities. The committee recommends $18.1 billion, an increase of $361.6 million to the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request contained $11.5 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends $11.9 billion, an increase of $401.6 million to the budget request.

Consideration and Incorporation of Surety Features in Life Extension Programs

During each nuclear warhead life extension program conducted by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), designers and policymakers consider incorporating enhanced safety and security features into the life extended weapons. The committee encourages the NNSA, the Department of Defense, and the Nuclear Weapons Council to ensure that cost-effective improvements to safety and security (or, "surety") that do not jeopardize reliability margins are an important consideration in all life extension programs. The committee expects designers and policymakers to carefully evaluate safety and security weaknesses, technologies or other enhancements available to eliminate or mitigate those weaknesses, and the costs and benefits of such enhancements during the life extension program and throughout the lifecycle of the weapon.

Directed Stockpile Work and Life Extension Program

The budget request contained $2.1 billion for all Directed Stockpile Work (DSW). DSW supports a variety of activities related to stockpile management and stockpile stewardship, including life extension programs, stockpile surveillance and sustainment, testing and experiments, component manufacturing, and weapons dismantlement and disposition.

Within DSW, the budget request contained $543.9 million for life extension programs (LEP)—$369.0 million for the B61 LEP and $174.9 million for the W76 LEP. The budget request would delay the B61 LEP by two years, with a first production unit delivered in fiscal year 2019, and slow the production rate for the W76 LEP. The budget request would also slow the Phase 6.1 life extension study for the W78.

The committee recommends $2.3 billion for DSW, an increase of $219.0 million to the budget request. This includes $690.9 million for LEPs and $607.4 million for stockpile systems to return to previous schedules and reduce risk in the B61 LEP, W76 LEP, and W78 life extension study. Finally, this includes $957.7 million for stockpile services to improve capabilities that support the entire stockpile, in particular research and development in support of stockpile certification and safety and plutonium sustainment activities.

Ignition and Support of Other Stockpile Programs

Achieving fusion ignition in a laboratory environment has been a key goal of the Department of Energy's (DOE) stockpile stewardship and nuclear energy programs since the early 1990s when the ignition mission was first identified by the DOE Fusion Policy Advisory Committee and the National Academy of Sciences Inertial Fusion Review Group. In the mid-2000s, the National Ignition Campaign (NIC) was developed to outline a path for using research facilities such as Sandia National Laboratories' Z-machine and OMEGA at the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics to inform eventual ignition experiments at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's National Ignition Facility (NIF). The experimental schedule in the June 2005 NIC Execution Plan

showed an aggressive timeline for beginning integrated ignition experiments in fiscal year 2010.

Once fully operational in 2009, NIF scientists encountered several technical challenges that have slowed progress towards achieving ignition. By early 2012, several of these technical challenges have been resolved, but the remaining challenges and gaps in understanding remain significant. With the NIC scheduled to conclude in fiscal year 2012, NIC scientists and managers have significantly increased the rate at which NIF experiments are conducted in an attempt to achieve ignition before the end of the fiscal year in September 2012.

The committee understands that achieving self-sustained thermonuclear fusion in a laboratory setting is a difficult undertaking and believes that achieving ignition at NIF would be a tremendously valuable and historic accomplishment. However, the committee is concerned that, should ignition not be achieved by the end of fiscal year 2012, the fiscal year 2013 budget request would continue an aggressive pace for ignition experiments at NIF even though the NIC itself will be concluded. The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contains $84.2 million for ignition experiments. The committee believes that, should ignition not be achieved, the scientists and managers associated with NIC should slow the ignition experimental schedule, take stock of the ignition-related experiments to date, thoroughly evaluate the remaining technical challenges and gaps in understanding, and seek to fully incorporate experimental data into computer models to enable better prediction of experimental results. The committee believes that, during this time, the NIF should increase its non-ignition high-energy density physics experiments in direct support of near-term stockpile stewardship needs. The committee therefore recommends $54.2 million for the ignition subprogram, a decrease of $30.0 million to the budget request, and $34.8 million for Support of Other Stockpile Programs, an increase of $20.0 million to the budget request.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends a provision limiting the availability of funds for ignition research and experiments until the Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies that fusion ignition has been achieved at the NIF or the Administrator submits a report to the congressional defense committees. The committee also believes that in a time of budget austerity, the top priority of the Administrator must be the achievement of the warhead life extension program goals and timelines that support military requirements.

Prioritization of Resources and Programs

The committee views execution of the stockpile stewardship program as the paramount component of the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) broad nuclear security mission. This program uses data from previous nuclear explosives tests, unique experimental tools, advanced simulation and computing capabilities, and the world's foremost scientists, engineers, and technicians to assess, certify, and sustain the nuclear weapons stockpile without additional nuclear explosive testing. The committee notes that continually improving scientific understanding of how nuclear weapons function and age is critical to this effort.

The committee believes that the nuclear security enterprise's core mission is in the process of transitioning from a focus, in the past two decades, largely on developing new tools and capabilities to a focus on applying those tools and capabilities in direct support of stockpile. After evaluating the NNSA's stockpile work-plan, the committee recognizes that in the next two decades the levels of effort and funding required to complete direct stockpile sustainment work, such as life extension programs, will be considerable. The committee believes a prioritization of near-term deliverables and programs that are in direct support of Department of Defense stockpile requirements is needed, while still maintaining sufficient investment to continue advancing scientific understanding and capabilities.

Therefore, the committee recommends various alterations to the budget request for NNSA Weapons Activities, as reflected in the accompanying tables. In particular, the committee recommends $2.3 billion for Directed Stockpile Work, an increase of $219.0 million, to provide increased support to near-term deliverables. The committee also recommends $395.6 million for the Science Campaign, an increase of $45.5 million to the budget request, to support increased hydrodynamic experiments under the Advanced Certification account. The committee further recommends $167.1 million for the Engineering Campaign, an increase of $16.5 million to the budget request, to support Enhanced Surveillance and Enhanced Surety efforts. The committee expects these increases to be utilized for efforts focused on near-term challenges directly related to the stockpile. To focus resources on near-term efforts in Directed Stockpile Work and other campaigns, the committee recommends $570.0 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign, a decrease of $30.0 million to the budget request. Finally, the committee recommends $72.6 million for Site Stewardship, a decrease of $17.4 million to the budget request. This reduction would eliminate funding for the Project Management Standardization program, which the committee believes is antithetical to the governance reforms recommended elsewhere in this title. This reduction would also eliminate funding for the Energy Modernization and Investment Program, funding which the committee believes would show slow return on investment and would be better spent on immediate stockpile sustainment needs.

Work for Others at the Nuclear Security Laboratories

The committee has long understood that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) laboratories provide unique and invaluable expertise to other federal government agencies through the Work For Others (WFO) program. In its February 2012 Phase 1 report on the quality of science and engineering at the NNSA laboratories, the National Academies of Science said, "Work for Others at the three national security laboratories benefits the nation in two ways. It produces valuable research and technology for the national security efforts of the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security, and for the Intelligence Community; and it provides a mechanism to help sustain some of the people and capabilities for the nuclear weapon program. It also strengthens the laboratories' broad science and engineering capabilities." The committee agrees with the National Academies' assessment, and believes the WFO

program has broad benefits to the laboratories' core mission of nuclear weapons and to wider national security challenges. The committee encourages the NNSA and other government agencies to fully support the laboratories' transition from narrowly focused nuclear weapons labs to broader-based nuclear security labs. The committee recognizes that the NNSA labs contribute broadly to homeland security missions, warfighter support, and the intelligence community, and believe the labs' unique expertise must be leveraged for these national security missions.

In July 2010, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence signed the "Governance Charter for an Interagency Council on the Strategic Capability of DOE National Laboratories as National Security Assets," which provides a framework for the four agencies to coordinate on shared, long-term planning for capabilities at the NNSA labs that can be applied to strategic national security challenges in each agency. The committee believes this governance charter is a step in the right direction, but encourages the Secretaries and the Director to take additional actions to provide a forcing function behind the agreement. Further, the committee is concerned that this governance charter does not address cost-sharing or long-term institutional support of the NNSA laboratory capabilities by these other agencies. As the National Academies report points out, "These other agencies are exploiting the infrastructure that has resulted from NNSA's investment, and are by and large not contributing directly to the building and maintenance of that infrastructure." The committee believes the National Academies report is correct in saying, "The four-agency agreement does not solve the long-term problems of resources and institutional support, but it is a good beginning that provides a structure within which a solution may be reached."

Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends a section that would strengthen WFO at the NNSA labs by creating streamlined processes, procedures, and regulations for approving and conducting WFO projects; a section that would codify and provide congressional direction to the Interagency Council; and a section that would exempt the DOE from statutory requirements currently hindering WFO from the Department of Defense.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

Adopting the Gold Standard for Section 123 Agreements

The committee supports agreements made in accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–703) and that 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. If the commitment is broken, the United States has grounds to terminate the agreement.

The committee is now concerned that the Administration may not require "the Gold Standard" in upcoming 123 agreements. The committee believes this would weaken United States nonproliferation efforts and leverage to limit the potential spread of uranium

enrichment and reprocessed spent nuclear fuel. The committee understands that the enrichment of uranium and reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel can be used for both peaceful and military purposes, and to produce stockpiles of fissile material. The resulting increase of fissile material could be used by a state to make nuclear weapons or could be stolen by terrorists. To preclude such a scenario, the committee believes the Gold Standard represents an important legally binding commitment by a foreign country to not enrich uranium or reprocess plutonium and to open its nuclear sites to international inspections.

Assessment of Location and Vulnerability of Highly-Enriched Uranium

The committee reaffirms the importance of continuing to assess the location and vulnerability to theft or diversion of known stocks of highly-enriched uranium worldwide. In particular, the committee notes section 3122 (c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) which required the Secretary of Energy to submit a list, by country and site, reflecting the total amount of known highly-enriched uranium around the world, and an assessment of the vulnerability of such uranium to theft or diversion. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to include, as part of this required annual assessment, a vulnerability assessment including: a letter grade noting how vulnerable the material is; a brief description of the site's security; a brief description of what actions, if any, have been undertaken to improve the security of the site; and a brief description of what challenges or gaps remain.

Conversion of Research Reactors

The committee commends the Administrator for National Nuclear Security for the progress made by the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and related National Nuclear Security Administration nonproliferation programs on converting additional research reactors to use low-enriched uranium (LEU) instead of highly-enriched uranium. Using LEU reduces the continued use of nuclear weapons-grade material that may be vulnerable to diversion or theft. This program remains crucial to reducing the risk of nuclear terrorism. In particular, the committee is encouraged that the United States and the Russian Federation agreed in 2010 to conduct feasibility studies to convert six Russian research reactors, and notes that the studies for converting four research reactors have been recently completed. The committee further notes that work is now proceeding to begin conversion activities on two reactors, including regulatory analyses, procurement of LEU fuel, and facility modifications. This progress in cooperation on starting the conversion of Russian reactors represents a significant step following years of reluctance by Russia to discuss conversion of its research reactors.

Global Security Through Science Partnership Programs

The committee notes the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) assessed the Global Initiative for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) program and did not recommend phasing out the program in the Russian Federation and the countries of the former

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The committee is concerned about the continued funding for the GIPP program and that the NNSA decided to broaden the GIPP circles of engagement to states outside of the former USSR. The committee notes the NNSA commissioned a report, published in October 2010, which recommended transforming the GIPP and seeking congressional authorization to allow the proposed program changes. The committee is aware that the NNSA submitted a report to the congressional defense committees, as required by the conference report (H. Conf. Rept. 112–331) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, renaming the GIPP program to the "Global Security through Science Partnerships" program. The committee is concerned that the report included a five year budget plan, with plans to budget $15.6 million for fiscal year 2013 and proposed funding of $70.4 million from fiscal year 2014–17. The committee is also concerned that the Department of Energy has not justified to the appropriate congressional committees the continuing need for the GIPP program or performance metrics for meeting objectives and phasing out the program. The committee believes the program achieved measured success in Russia and the former USSR, but that it is time for the program to end if its continuation cannot be justified by the continuing threat or the program's ability to address this threat, as stated in this title.

Nuclear Security Summit 2012

The committee recognizes the success of the 2012 Nuclear Security Summit, which occurred in the Republic of Korea on March 26–27, 2012. This summit followed the 2010 Nuclear Security Summit, held in Washington, D.C. The committee commends the achievements announced at the summit, particularly the efforts to secure vulnerable nuclear material at the Semipalatinsk test site in the Republic of Kazakhstan, and the announcements that Ukraine and the United Mexican States have been cleaned out of highly-enriched uranium (HEU) and that the Czech Republic, Mexico, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam have converted their research reactors using HEU fuel to low-enriched fuel. The major themes of the 2012 summit focused on important areas of nonproliferation, including global nuclear security architecture, nuclear security and safety, combating illicit trafficking, and greater international cooperation. The committee believes the increased participation of foreign governments is important, particularly in recognizing the threat of nuclear terrorism, seeking to secure vulnerable nuclear material and radioactive sources, and developing nuclear forensics capabilities. The committee encourages the National Nuclear Security Administration to develop its strategic guidance, objectives, activities and metrics in accordance with U.S. national security interests, and where appropriate align with the 2010 workplan, which was the basis for evaluating progress at the 2012 summit, and the 2012 communiqué.

Plutonium Disposition Program and Mixed Oxide Fabrication Facility

The committee continues to be concerned about the significant cost escalation, delays and planning related to the plutonium disposition program at the Savannah River Site and construction and

operations of the Mixed Oxide Fuel (MOX) Fabrication Facility. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2004 cost estimate for the facility was $1.6 million, but that costs have risen to $4.9 billion, and is aware that a potential change to the project's baseline could increase the latest cost estimate by an additional $600.0 million to $900.0 million. In addition, the committee is concerned the projected operating costs for the plant have doubled. The committee is also concerned that almost five years after construction began, the Department of Energy has not yet confirmed any buyer for the MOX fuel. The committee notes the potential for further delays until additional testing and certification are completed, which could take several more years, leading to the production of MOX fuel without any committed buyer. The committee requests Department of Energy brief the committee by July 31, 2012, on a plan with potential changes to the baseline and an explanation of the costs.

Naval Reactors

Naval Reactors

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion efforts, including reactor plant technology design and development, reactor plant operation and maintenance, and reactor retirement and disposal. The program ensures the safe and reliable operation of reactor plants in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers that represent over 40 percent of the Navy's combatants.

The fiscal year 2013 budget request proposed to delay procurement of the OHIO-class ballistic missile submarine replacement by two years from previous schedule. The committee disagrees with this decision, and supports procurement of the OHIO-class replacement submarines on the original schedule. To support this, the committee recommends $1.2 billion for the Naval Reactors program, an increase of $99.0 million to the budget request. This increase will support continued development of an advanced "life-of-the-boat" nuclear reactor for the OHIO-class replacement submarine program.

Report by the Director of Naval Reactors

United States civil nuclear cooperation carries the intrinsic risk that some technology transferred for civilian purposes may directly or indirectly provide benefits to foreign military nuclear programs. The committee believes such risk must be kept to the minimum possible when civilian nuclear cooperation occurs.

The committee directs the Director, Naval Reactors, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by November 15, 2012, detailing any nuclear cooperation under a so-called "123" nuclear cooperation agreement in the preceding 5 years that directly or indirectly advantaged, or has the potential to advantage, the military nuclear program, including nuclear naval propulsion or weapons programs, of another nation. The Director's report should be submitted in classified form.

Report on Potential Use of Low-Enriched Uranium for Naval Reactors

The committee is aware of a study conducted by the Director, Naval Reactors in 1995 to assess the technical, environmental, economic, and proliferation implications of using low-enriched uranium (LEU) in place of highly-enriched uranium (HEU) in Naval nuclear propulsion systems. The committee notes that the report concluded that "the use of LEU in U.S. Naval reactor plants is technically feasible, but uneconomic and impractical."

The committee directs the Director, Naval Reactors to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, that describes any updates to the findings and conclusions from the 1995 report, including any changes in the estimated costs for fabricating HEU and LEU life-of-ship cores, the ability to refuel nuclear-propelled submarines and ships without extending the duration or frequency of major overhauls, and the overall health of the technology base that may be required to utilize LEU in Naval nuclear propulsion systems.

Office of the Administrator

Governance, Management, and Oversight of the Nuclear Security Enterprise

In the second session of the 112th Congress, the committee has conducted a series of oversight activities related to continuing management challenges at the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). These problems have been documented and highlighted by a long series of reports over the 12 years since NNSA was created by Congress.

In 2009, the bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States concluded that "the governance structure of the NNSA is not delivering the needed results. This governance structure should be changed." The Commission elaborated, saying, "Federal oversight of the weapons enterprise needs significant improvement. Key to that improvement is reconsidering the role and performance of the NNSA. The NNSA was formed to improve management of the weapons program and to shelter that program from what was perceived as a welter of confusing and contradictory DOE directives, policies, and procedures. Despite some success, the NNSA has failed to meet the hopes of its founders. Indeed, it may have become part of the problem, adopting the same micromanagement and unnecessary and obtrusive oversight that it was created to eliminate." The Commission also found that "efforts to implement the NNSA Act and to maintain even limited NNSA autonomy have resulted in a large and continuing measure of bureaucratic conflict. This has been a major distraction . . . the original intent of the legislation creating the NNSA has not been realized. The desired autonomy has not come into being. It is time to consider fundamental changes. Organizational changes may not be sufficient for reducing the regulatory burden, but they are clearly necessary."

A 2009 report by The Henry L. Stimson Center, "Leveraging Science for Security: A Strategy for the Nuclear Weapons Labs in the 21st Century," drew similar conclusions. The Stimson Center study group concluded: "The implementation of the NNSA Act

failed to achieve the intended autonomy for NNSA within the Department of Energy. The Labs now must operate within a complicated set of bureaucratic relationships with both DOE and NNSA. An excessively bureaucratic DOE culture has infiltrated NNSA as well." The study also concluded that "NNSA and the Laboratories do not always work in partnership with one another. Rather than the NNSA telling the Laboratories 'what' and the Labs responding with 'how,' the Labs are defining 'what' and the NNSA (in particular, the site offices) is micromanaging 'how.'" The Stimson Center study group ultimately made a series of recommendations to improve the governance, management, and oversight of the nuclear security laboratories, including "creating a fully independent agency" and "fully severing NNSA and its Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, including the Nevada Test Site, from DOE."

In February 2012, the National Academies of Science (NAS) study group on "Managing for High-Quality Science and Engineering at the NNSA National Security Laboratories" concluded in its Phase I report that "the relationship between NNSA and its [labs] is broken to an extent that very seriously affects the labs' capability to manage for quality science and engineering." The NAS group cited an erosion of trust as a principal cause for this "dysfunctional relationship," elaborating that, "there is a perception among . . . staff and managers at the three Laboratories that NNSA has moved from partnering with the Laboratories to solve scientific and engineering problems, to assigning tasks and specific science and engineering solutions with detailed implementation instructions. This approach precludes taking full advantage of the intellectual and management skills that taxpayer dollars have purchased. The [NAS] study committee found similar issues in transactional oversight of safety, business, security and operations."

In March 2012, a separate NAS group studying a different issue also commented on the governance, management, and oversight model for the nuclear security enterprise. In its report, "The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—Technical Issues for the United States," this NAS study committee said, "During this committee's investigations, we repeatedly learned of management issues that interfere with the ability to sustain the nuclear weapons enterprise." The report identified a key concern that "both the day-to-day management and the incentives are driven almost entirely by the fine print of the contract and its implications for the fees of the contractors." The NAS found that the laboratories' performance evaluations, based on the contracts, "glaringly lack incentives designed to measure the effectiveness of their support for the technical mission. Instead, the specific metrics focus on internally referential activities such as completing paperwork correctly, holding meetings on a prescribed schedule, or providing reports by a specific date." Evaluating similar issues that occurred at the United Kingdom's Atomic Weapons Establishment, and that were addressed by management and oversight reforms, the NAS commented that "it appears to the committee that this 'eyes on, hands off' approach is performing well." The NAS group ultimately found that "the current contract system for the nuclear weapons laboratories has not produced a more innovative, efficient, and cost-effective approach," and recommended that "the DOE/NNSA should re-

evaluate the current contract system for carrying out the tasks of the nuclear weapons program. At a minimum, any new approach should: (1) reduce the number of requirements in directives and simultaneously transform those requirements to performance goals (prescribing what must be done, not how to do it); and (2) shift the balance of incentives in contracts for the weapons laboratories to emphasize successful implementation of the technical mission."

The committee notes that these and many other reports and studies have reached strikingly similar conclusions—and offer many similar recommendations. The committee believes that the President and Congress must reform governance, management, and oversight structures and processes to ensure the nuclear security enterprise will effectively and efficiently meet its core nuclear weapons mission and other national security requirements. Elsewhere in this title are provisions which begin such reforms.

National Nuclear Security Administration Budget Categories

The committee has noted the expansion of the number of budget categories within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) budget request for many years. The committee understands that the NNSA executes a wide range of nuclear security programs, and that a reduced number of budgeting categories can provide both greater efficiency in management as well as increased agility to respond to new requirements—but the committee is mindful of the need for robust transparency and accountability.

The committee encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in coordination with the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB), to consider how NNSA budget categories might be changed to enable increased efficiency and agility while ensuring robust transparency and accountability to Congress. The committee expects the Administrator to consult closely with Congress before making any changes to NNSA budget categories.

Nuclear Security Laboratories as Federally Funded Research and Development Centers

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) sponsors three federally funded research and development centers (FFRDC) to carry out programs at NNSA's nuclear security laboratories—Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories. The committee notes that, according to Federal Acquisition Rule (FAR) 35.017, FFRDCs are used by the federal government to meet "some special long-term research or development need which cannot be met as effectively by existing in-house or contractor resources," and that FFRDCs enable federal agencies "to use private sector resources to accomplish tasks that are integral to the mission and operation of the sponsoring agency." Prohibiting the FFRDCs from competing against private industry, FAR 35.017 goes on to say that "long-term relationships between the Government and FFRDCs are encouraged in order to provide the continuity that will attract high-quality personnel to the FFRDC. This relationship should be of a type to encourage the FFRDC to maintain currency in its field(s) of expertise, maintain its objectivity and independence, preserve its familiarity with the needs of its sponsor(s), and provide a quick response capability."

The committee understands that FFRDCs are intended to create a special relationship and environment that allows basic and applied science to flourish by providing a buffer from government bureaucracy and politics while ensuring the FFRDC is responsive to national needs. In testimony before the committee, the co-chair of a recent National Academies of Science (NAS) panel explained that, "the FFRDC relationship is based on a partnership between the government and the laboratory in which the government decides what problems need to be addressed, and the contractor determines how best to address those problems." The NAS panel concluded that the current relationship between NNSA and its lab FFRDCs is "broken" and that this "dysfunctional relationship seriously threatens" the quality of the science and engineering at the labs. The NAS cited an erosion of trust as a principal cause for this dysfunction and recommended the following corrective measures:

(1) NAS "recommends that NNSA and each of the Laboratories commit to the goal of rebalancing the managerial and governance relationship to build in a higher level of trust in program execution and laboratory operations in general."

(2) NAS "recommends that NNSA and the Laboratories agree on a set of principles that clearly lay out the boundaries and roles of each management structure, and also that program managers at headquarters, the Site Offices, and in the laboratories be directed to abide by these principles."

(3) NAS "recommends that the goal of rebalancing the relationship and the set of principles laying out the boundaries and roles of each management structure be memorialized in memoranda of understanding between NNSA and its Laboratories. Performance against these understandings should be assessed on an annual basis over a five-year period and reported to Congress."

The committee supports these findings of the NAS, and expects NNSA and its labs to implement their recommendations. The committee is concerned that further delay in repairing the broken management structure and relationship may lead to damage to the quality of science and engineering at the laboratories. The committee encourages the NNSA and the Department of Energy to return to the original principles embodied in the FFRDC construct.

Public Release of Management and Operating Contractor Performance Evaluations

The committee believes that the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) annual Performance Evaluation Reports of the management and operating (M&O) contractors of the nuclear security enterprise are an important tool to assess management and performance, and to increase accountability for, and transparency on, the use of taxpayers' dollars.

In 2009, the NNSA promulgated a new policy to restrict the release of contractor performance evaluations for a period of three years after completion. In 2012, the NNSA reversed this decision and has returned to its practice of releasing the performance evaluations annually. The committee notes the importance of accountability and transparency in the performance of the M&O contractors and commends the NNSA's decision to publicly release these evaluations. The committee notes that it supports making these

evaluations public while exempting the release of any information that is specifically precluded by law.

Report and Implementation Actions for Findings and Recommendations Related to Governance, Management, and Oversight of the Nuclear Security Enterprise

Elsewhere in this title, the committee describes the well-documented problems related to governance, management, and oversight of the nuclear security enterprise. Based upon these concerns, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2012, on the findings and recommendations contained in: (1) the National Academies of Science report, "Managing for High-Quality Science and Engineering at the NNSA National Security Laboratories"; (2) the National Laboratory Directors' Council's (NLDC) May 31, 2011, white paper to the Secretary of Energy, "NLDC Prioritization of Burdensome Policies and Practices"; and (3) the Department of Energy's Office of the Inspector General (IG) special report, "Management Challenges at the Department of Energy," for the IG's findings that pertain to the National Nuclear Security Administration. The report should include, for each individual finding and recommendation contained in the documents: the views of the Administrator and the Secretary on the finding or recommendation; a determination by the Administrator and the Secretary on whether action will be taken to address the finding and recommendation; if a determination is made to take action on a finding or recommendation, a description of implementation actions to be taken to address the finding or recommendation; and, if a determination is made to take no action on a finding or recommendation, an explanation of why no action will be taken. The report should also include a detailed list of actions to be taken, the responsible parties for carrying out the actions, and the timeline for when these actions will be accomplished. The report should also contain a list of proposed actions Congress could take to address the findings.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $6.2 billion for environmental and other defense activities for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends $6.2 billion, a decrease of $40.0 million to the budget request.

Defense Environmental Cleanup

Environmental Management Technology Development Program

The budget request contained $20.0 million for the technology development program of the Office of Environmental Management. This program is focused on resolving technical challenges and developing transformational technology solutions to address the highest priority needs of the environmental remediation program. Technologies developed by this program have already been shown to reduce costs, improve waste processing throughput, and improve schedules for waste cleanup activities. Because the environmental

cleanup program as a whole is expected to cost over $300.0 billion and last until the 2060s, relatively small amounts of money spent today on technology and process improvements can lead to major savings in the future. Therefore, the committee recommends $30.0 million for the technology development program, an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request.

Prioritization of Environmental Cleanup Efforts

In the November 2011, special report, "Management Challenges at the Department of Energy," the Inspector General (IG) of the Department of Energy wrote that the Department's environmental remediation program costs "and related requirements are the result of individual, site-specific negotiations between the Department and Federal and state regulators." The Inspector General noted that modifying the agreements resulting from these negotiations "would be a very costly and time-consuming process and would, understandably, be extremely unpopular with a variety of constituencies," but also added that "the current strategy may not be sustainable." The Inspector General suggests that the Department of Energy "should consider revising its current remediation strategy and instead address environmental concerns on a national, complex-wide risk basis," and, "looking at the program holistically, fund only high risk activities that threaten health and safety."

The committee also recognizes the difficulty and challenges posed in fully transitioning to such a paradigm, but believes further consideration of the idea may be warranted. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 31, 2012, on prioritization of environmental cleanup efforts at the Department of Energy. The briefing should include a description of how the Department currently prioritizes cleanup efforts and the costs, benefits, and challenges of transitioning to the complex-wide risk basis recommended by the Inspector General. The committee expects the Assistant Secretary to consult with the Inspector General to fully understand and evaluate the IG's proposal.

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant

The committee continues to closely follow developments related to the design and construction of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) at the Hanford site. Problems with the concurrent approach the Department of Energy (DOE) has chosen to design and construct this facility have been well documented. This approach, coupled with continuing technical and safety challenges, have contributed to an increase in total project cost of more than 100 percent since the beginning of construction. The current total project cost for WTP is $12.5 billion. The committee understands that the DOE expects to re-baseline this project in the near-future, which will likely result in another increase in cost.

The committee remains concerned that the WTP project, which will result in the largest and most complex nuclear waste treatment facility in the world, continues to face major technical problems, safety concerns, and cost increases, despite construction being over 63 percent complete. The committee notes that the DOE Office of Environmental Management has worked closely with the

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to resolve safety issues and should continue to work closely with the Board and the DOE Office of Health, Safety, and Security (HSS) to resolve outstanding issues, including safety culture concerns highlighted by the Board and HSS. The committee supports the efforts of the Board and the DOE, and it encourages both parties to work cooperatively to put the WTP project on a successful and safe path.

Other Defense Activities

Department of Energy Office of Health, Safety, and Security

The budget request contained $245.5 million for the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Health, Safety, and Security in the Other Defense Activities account. As described elsewhere in this title, several provisions in this title would, collectively, transfer authority and responsibility for regulation, policy, and oversight of health, safety, and security in the nuclear security enterprise from the Secretary of Energy to the Administrator for Nuclear Security. Accordingly, the committee recommends $195.5 million for Health, Safety, and Security, a decrease of $50.0 million to the budget request.

Review of the Supply Chain Security and Integrity of the Nuclear Weapons Complex

The committee is concerned by the findings of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in its report, "IT Supply Chain: National Security-Related Agencies Need to Better Address Risks" (GAO–12–361). The report stated that, "Although four national security-related departments—the Departments of Energy, Homeland Security, Justice, and Defense—have acknowledged these threats, two of the departments—Energy and Homeland Security—have not yet defined supply chain protection measures for department information systems and are not in a position to have implementing procedures or monitoring capabilities to verify compliance with and effectiveness of any such measures."

The committee is also aware that its "2011 Report to Congress," the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission detailed specific supply chain threats originating from firms linked to the Government of the People's Republic of China. These firms, specifically Huawei and ZTE Corporation, have been, and are likely to continue to provide billions of dollars in Chinese Government support. The report also stated that these firms have been blocked from certain deals with U.S. firms because of national security concerns.

The committee is concerned by these developments as well and the information technology (IT) chain problems reported by GAO. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the National Counter Intelligence Executive, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by August 31, 2012, on the supply chain risks to the Department of Energy. The report should address the following: (1) IT supply chain vulnerabilities of the Department of Energy, with special attention paid to the laboratories and plants of the national nuclear weapons enterprise; (2) Evaluate whether the Department of Energy, or any its major contractors, have a supply chain that includes technology produced by Huawei or ZTE Corporation; and (3) A plan for imple-

mentation of the recommendations of the GAO report referenced above.

Finally, the committee is aware that section 806 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) provided the Department of Defense the authority to protect its supply chain. The committee is also aware that section 309 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–87) provided the intelligence community similar authority. The committee further directs the Secretary of Energy to include in the report an assessment of any concerns he may have about providing similar authority in order to protect the Department of Energy's IT supply chain.

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Blue Ribbon Commission, and Investigation of Salt Dome Disposal

The committee has long supported the development of a deep geologic repository for permanent disposal of high-level radioactive defense waste. Current law establishes Yucca Mountain in Nevada as the nation's first repository, provided the license application submitted by the Department of Energy to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission meets requirements. In 2010, the Obama Administration withdrew the license application and took actions to terminate the Yucca Mountain project. In January 2012, the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, established by executive order, released a report describing recommended actions to get the nation's nuclear waste disposal program back on track. The Commission did not evaluate Yucca Mountain or any other potential repository site and did not comment on the Administration's decision to withdraw the license application.

The committee is pleased to note that the Commission spent considerable effort addressing issues related to defense nuclear waste, even though defense waste is a small fraction of the total quantity of U.S. nuclear waste awaiting disposition. If the ongoing delay continues in finding a suitable repository, the eventual impact on defense programs, particularly the Naval Nuclear Reactors Program, will be considerable. Furthermore, the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant at Hanford, Washington, is currently being constructed with no final plan for where the waste it treats will be disposed. Due to these medium-term defense concerns, the committee will closely follow progress on developing a national nuclear waste repository. Further, the committee supports the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendation that "urges the Administration to launch an immediate review of the implications of leaving responsibility for disposal of defense waste and other DOE-owned waste with DOE versus moving it to a new waste management organization." Such a review could help clarify a potential path forward for defense nuclear waste disposal.

Finally, because the proposed capacity of the Yucca Mountain repository is already fully subscribed by the defense and non-defense nuclear waste currently awaiting disposition, the committee notes that development of another geologic repository is already required—whether the Yucca Mountain repository proceeds or not. The committee notes that since the 1957 report of the National

Academies of Science, "The Disposal of Radioactive Waste on Land," called disposal of radioactive wastes in salt deposits "the most promising method of disposal," many experts and studies have recommended disposal in salt domes—particularly for wastes that have a low probability of being reprocessed or reused. Because most defense nuclear waste is unlikely to be reprocessed or reused, the committee encourages the Department of Energy to investigate the efficacy of permanent disposal of high-level defense nuclear waste in geologic salt formations.

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 2013, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2013, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize appropriations for other defense activities for fiscal year 2013, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance

This section would authorize appropriations for energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2013, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Authorized Personnel Levels of the Office of the Administrator

This section would amend the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401) by creating a new section 3241A that would limit the total number of employees of the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Office of the Administrator. The total number of employees of the Office of the Administrator, as determined on a full-time equivalent basis, would be limited to 1,730 beginning 180 days after enactment, and 1,630 beginning October 1, 2014. This section would exclude from counting toward this limit the employees of the Office of Naval Reactors, the employees of the Office of Secure Transportation, and Members of the Armed Forces who are detailed to NNSA. The section would allow the Administrator to offer voluntary separation or retirement incentives to help

meet the personnel level limits, and would require the Administrator to establish a work placement program to assist separating employees in finding new employment.

Further, this section would also amend section 3241 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441) to increase from 300 to 450 the number of scientific, engineering, and technical positions in the NNSA. Finally, this section would require the Administrator to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of enactment of this Act on the required reductions, the cost savings from the reductions and the transition to performance-based governance, management, and oversight required by sections included elsewhere in this title, and other matters. The Comptroller General would be required to provide the congressional defense committees an assessment of this report within 180 days of its submission.

The committee believes that, as part of the reforms to the NNSA described in detail elsewhere in this title, the Administrator must streamline the NNSA's Federal workforce. A key component of the reforms required by this title is a transition from the current transaction-based system of oversight of the nuclear security enterprise to a performance-based system. Such a performance-based system will require fewer Federal employees but enable the NNSA to conduct equally robust oversight of its management and operating contractors. The committee believes that by limiting the number of Federal employees at the NNSA, Congress can provide a key mechanism for ensuring the transition to performance-based oversight occurs. The committee expects that the reductions will result in savings across the nuclear security enterprise, and that as a result, efficiencies at the laboratories and plants will increase and overhead rates will decrease.

The committee also notes that several independent assessments of NNSA's management and governance structure have stated that NNSA's Federal employees often lack the technical knowledge needed to effectively oversee many programs at the nuclear security laboratories. The committee believes that this section, which would increase by 50 percent the number of special scientific, engineering, and technical positions the Administrator may appoint within NNSA, would help address these concerns.

Section 3112—Budget Justification Materials

This section would require the Administrator of Nuclear Security to include in the budget request, beginning with the fiscal year 2014 budget request, an assessment of how that budget maintains the core nuclear weapons skills, including nuclear weapons design, engineering, production, testing, and prediction of stockpile aging. In its final report submitted to Congress in May 2009, the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States found that, "attracting and retaining the top national talent and expertise requires that the laboratories conduct challenging research on important national problems. This program of work must be sustained, predictable, and exercise the full range of laboratory skills, including nuclear weapon design skills. Exercising these design skills is necessary to maintain design and production engineering capabilities. Skills that are not exercised will atrophy." The Commission recommended that, "the Congress should require that

annual NNSA budget submissions include an assessment of whether the budget as proposed will maintain these capabilities. To monitor progress, the NNSA and the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should establish a formal mechanism for tracking funding sources for the weapons laboratories, without additional administrative burden on the laboratories. The assessment of needed expertise, its recruitment, and its retention are necessary but not sufficient preconditions for maintaining proficiency. Those skills must be exercised." This section would seek to implement the Commission's recommendation.

Section 3113—Contractor Governance, Oversight, and Accountability

This section would amend the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401) by adding a new section that would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish a system of governance, management, and oversight of management and operating contracts of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The system established by the Administrator would be required to: (1) include clear and auditable performance-based standards related to both mission effectiveness and operations of the contractor; (2) ensure that governance, management, and oversight of the contract is conducted, when applicable, pursuant to national and international standards and best practices; (3) recognize the respective roles of the Federal Government in determining performance-based objectives and the contractor (particularly contractors running a Federally Funded Research and Development Center) in determining how to accomplish such objectives; (4) conduct oversight based on outcomes and performance-based standards and not detailed, transaction-based oversight; and (5) include measures to ensure the Administrator has accurate and consistent data to manage and make decisions across the nuclear security enterprise.

The Administrator would be allowed to exempt individual areas of governance, management, and oversight from the requirements of this system and continue to conduct transaction-based oversight if the Administrator determines that such exemption is necessary to ensure the national security or safety, security, or performance. If the Administrator makes such exemptions, the Administrator would be required to submit an annual certification of such exemption to the congressional defense committees that includes a description of why such exemption is needed.

The Administrator would also be provided a 3-year period starting on the date of enactment of this Act in which the Administrator may temporarily exempt individual facilities or contractors from the system established by this section and continue to conduct transaction-based oversight if the Administrator determines that such exemption is needed to ensure that robust contractor assurance, accountability, and performance-based oversight mechanisms are in place for the facility or contractor. If the Administrator makes such exemptions, the Administrator would be required to annually submit to the congressional defense committees a written justification for such exemptions and a plan and schedule to transition the exempted facility or contractor to the performance-based system established pursuant to this section.

This section would also require the Administrator to ensure that each management and operating contract of NNSA includes robust mechanisms for ensuring the accountability of the contractor and that the Administrator exercise such mechanisms as appropriate to ensure the performance by the contractor.

Finally, this section would require the Administrator to submit a report by January 15, 2013, and each year thereafter until 2016, to the congressional defense committees that includes a description of each instance during the previous year in which an agency of the Federal Government used a procedure, standard, or process of governance, management, and oversight of a contract of the NNSA that is not a procedure, standard, or process that conforms to national or international standards or industry best practices. The report would also be required to include a description of why each such procedure, standard, or process was used instead of a national or international standard or best practice. Finally, the report would include a description of any oversight activities by any agency of the Federal Government that occurred during the previous year that the Administrator considers duplicative or unnecessary.

Section 3114—National Nuclear Security Administration Council

This section would amend section 4102 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2512) to streamline statutory requirements related to the management structure of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). This section would also reform and broaden the mandate of the Defense Programs Management Council and rename it the "National Nuclear Security Administration Council." The Council would advise the Administrator for Nuclear Security on scientific and technical issues related to policy matters, and on operational concerns, strategic planning, and development of priorities related to the nuclear security enterprise and to the mission and operations of the NNSA. The Council would be composed of the directors of NNSA's national security laboratories and nuclear weapons production facilities. This section would also provide the Council the authority to provide recommendations to the Administrator or the Secretary of Energy, and would require the Administrator or the Secretary to provide a response to the Council within 60 days of receiving such a recommendation.

The committee believes that the NNSA Council would provide an important mechanism for the directors of the national security laboratories and nuclear weapons production facilities to provide their recommendations on mission- and operational-concerns to the Administrator and the Secretary; create a necessary and sustained dialogue between NNSA and the directors of its laboratories and plants on NNSA's strategic priorities and plans; and help ensure robust implementation and successful execution of reforms to NNSA's management, governance, and oversight structures and processes.

Section 3115—Safety, Health, and Security of the National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would amend the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (Title 32 of Public Law 106–65) to require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish policies and procedures

for the regulation and oversight of health, safety, and security of the nuclear security enterprise. In conjunction with a provision the committee includes elsewhere in this title that would strengthen the autonomy of the NNSA, this section would transition the authority to make policy, prescribe regulations, and conduct oversight of health, safety, and security in the nuclear security enterprise from the Department of Energy (DOE) to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

First, this section would amend section 3231 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2421) to require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish policies and procedures to ensure the protection of special nuclear material, sensitive physical assets, and classified information in the possession of the NNSA. The Administrator would be required to establish procedures to ensure any significant problems related to security are promptly reported.

Second, this section would amend section 3261 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2461) to ensure that the Administrator is the responsible authority for ensuring and overseeing NNSA compliance with all applicable health and safety requirements. For non-nuclear operations, the Administrator would be required to ensure that NNSA complies with all applicable occupational safety and health standards promulgated pursuant to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and that NNSA's compliance and oversight of such standards is conducted in accordance with best industry and Government practices and with the performance-based system of governance, management, and oversight established pursuant to a provision included elsewhere in this title, notwithstanding the Administrator's authority under such provision to exempt individual activities and continue to conduct transaction-based oversight.

The Administrator would be limited from establishing or prescribing any order, rule, or regulation regarding occupational safety and health unless such order, rule, or regulation is pursuant to standards resulting from the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. The Administrator would be allowed the authority to waive this requirement and apply more stringent standards if the Administrator determines that such a waiver is necessary to ensure safety. The Administrator would be required to waive this requirement and apply stricter standards for operations involving beryllium. If the Administrator makes exemptions using this authority and applies more stringent standards, the Administrator would be required to submit an annual certification to the congressional defense committees regarding why such waivers are required.

For nuclear operations, this section would require the Administrator to prescribe appropriate policies and regulations to ensure that risks to the health and safety of the employees of NNSA and its contractors, as well as the general public, are as low as reasonably practicable and that adequate protection is provided. The Administrator would be required to ensure that NNSA's compliance and oversight of such policies related to nuclear operations is in accordance with the performance-based system of governance, management, and oversight established pursuant to a provision included elsewhere in this title, notwithstanding the Administrator's authority under such provision to exempt individual activities and

continue to conduct transaction-based oversight. This section would delay full transition of authority with regards to nuclear safety until October 1, 2013, and would require the Administrator to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2013, on an implementation plan and cost-benefit analysis for transitioning the policy, regulatory, and oversight authority for nuclear safety from the Department of Energy to the NNSA.

In its February 2012 Phase I report on "Managing for High-Quality Science and Engineering at the NNSA National Security Laboratories," the National Academies of Science recommended "that the NNSA, Congress, and top management of the Laboratories recognize that safety and security systems at the Laboratories have been strengthened to the point where they no longer need special attention. NNSA and Laboratory management should explore ways by which the administrative, safety, and security costs can be reduced, so that they not impose an excessive burden on essential science and engineering activities."

In its 2009 report, the bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States found that "the regulatory burden on the laboratories is excessive and should be rationalized," and "that burden imposes a significant cost and less heavy-handed oversight would bring real benefits." The Commission continued, "This conclusion is backed up by some real data. One recent external assessment of NNSA laboratories . . . found a very high cost of compliance with federal safety and security requirements—approximately 15 times as much as for companies of similar complexity (recognizing also some important differences in some of the functions of those companies). Some other data is available from a pilot program conducted by the NNSA at the Kansas City Plant in 2006 and 2007. Under this program, the plant was exempted from essentially all DOE regulations and additional oversight changes were made. An external audit documented significant savings. Extending this approach throughout the complex is feasible."

In response to a request from the Secretary of Energy, the National Laboratory Directors Council (consisting of DOE and NNSA national lab directors) submitted a white paper in May 2011, identifying 18 policies and practices the NLDC deemed "most burdensome." The NLDC stated that the DOE rule regarding occupational health goes "significantly beyond the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards and incorporates standards that were not designed to be regulatory in nature. It has not been demonstrated that the rule has improved worker safety at DOE facilities since its adoption; however, the cost to implement and maintain the requirements that go beyond the OSHA standards have significantly increased costs . . . Therefore, it is recommended that the rule be revised to implement only OSHA standards. This action would align DOE facilities with U.S. industry, academia, and other federal facilities such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology." The Strategic Posture Commission recommended this action as well, saying in its 2009 report: "the commission recommends that the Administrator should issue no regulations concerning occupational health and safety but should depend on the Occupational Safety and Health Administration for both regulations and oversight."

Based upon these and other reports, the committee believes that the lines of authority, responsibility, and oversight for health, safety, and security within the nuclear security enterprise are unclear, duplicative, and inefficient. The committee believes that safety and security must remain a paramount concern for the NNSA, but notes that, as in military operations, duplicative and confused lines of authority and responsibility often lead to less effective outcomes. The committee believes this section, coupled with other provisions included elsewhere in this title, would streamline redundant functions, and lead to more effective and more efficient oversight of these important matters.

Section 3116—Design and Use of Prototypes of Nuclear Weapons

This section would required that the Administrator of Nuclear Security should develop and carry out a plan for the national nuclear weapons laboratories and nuclear weapons production plants to design and build prototypes of nuclear weapons to further intelligence assessments of foreign nuclear weapons activities. This section would also prohibit the Administrator from conducting any experiment that would produce a nuclear yield. The committee urges the Administrator to use surrogate materials where appropriate in designing and building these prototypes.

The committee notes in its final report, one of the recommendations the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States was 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 weapons 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."

Further, the committee notes that the National Academies panel on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty made a similar recommendation when it stated: "Allowing the workforce to have the technical responsibility and flexibility in defining the paths to mission goals supports both workforce development and workforce morale. The "challenge programs" run by the AWE illustrate what can be achieved in this regard. For example, in one challenge program the AWE designed a new warhead (together with the non-nu-

clear components), although the UK has no intention of producing any such weapon. This helped to maintain proficiency and train the next generation of warhead designers. Such flexibility for activities undertaken by AWE with MOD approval (but not MOD direction) helps to recruit and maintain a top-flight workforce and to exercise the advanced tools of the program. Programs of this nature have been tried, with positive workforce response, in the U.S. complex, but have fallen victim to budget pressures and micromanagement to short term goals."

Section 3117—Improvement and Streamlining of the Missions and Operations of the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would require the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security to revise various regulations, rules, directives, orders, and policies to improve and streamline the administration, execution, and oversight of the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) missions and operations, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. These efforts would include: (1) streamlining business processes and structures to reduce unnecessary, overly burdensome, or duplicative approvals; (2) delegating approval for all but very high value or unique Work Force Others (WFO) agreements and Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADA) to DOE and NNSA's management and operating contractors while holding such contractors accountable for maintaining appropriate WFO and CRADA portfolios; (3) establishing processes for ensuring routine or low-risk procurement and subcontracting decisions are made at the discretion of the management and operating contractors; (4) assessing current procurement thresholds and taking steps to adjust such thresholds if appropriate; (5) eliminating duplicative or low-value reports and data calls and ensuring consistency in management and cost accounting data; and (6) streamlining, clarifying, and eliminating redundancy in regulations, rules, directives, orders, and policies. Finally, this section would require the Secretary and the Administrator to provide a briefing on these efforts to the congressional defense committees and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Section 3118—Cost-Benefit Analyses for Competition of Management and Operating Contracts

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit a report to the congressional defense committees before the Administrator releases any final request for proposals for competition of any contract to manage and operate a facility of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The report would be required to include a cost-benefit analysis of the competition that includes the expected costs and cost savings resulting from the competition; a description of any disruption or delay in mission activities or deliverables resulting from the competition; a description of any benefits of the proposed competition to mission performance or operations; and an assessment of how the competition complies with the Federal Acquisition Regulation regarding Federally Fund-

ed Research and Development Centers, if applicable. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a review of the Administrator's report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of the Administrator submitting any report pursuant to this section. The requirements of this section would apply to any request for proposals that is released by the Administrator during fiscal years 2012–17.

Section 3119—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds for fusion ignition research and experiments to not more than 50 percent until the Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies to the congressional defense committees that fusion ignition has been achieved at the National Ignition Facility (NIF) or the Administrator submits a report on fusion ignition. This limitation would not apply to the Z-machine at Sandia National Laboratories or the Omega facility at the University of Rochester.

If the Administrator submits a report pursuant to this section, the report would be required to include a thorough description of the remaining technical challenges and gaps in understanding with respect to ignition; a plan and schedule for reevaluating the ignition program and incorporating experimental data into computer models; the best judgment of the Administrator with respect to whether ignition can be achieved at the NIF; and a description of how, if funding being spent on ignition research were applied to life extension programs, such programs could be accelerated or otherwise improved, and how this funding change would impact the stockpile stewardship program.

Section 3120—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Global Security Through Science Partnerships Program

This section would require that not more than $8.0 million may be obligated or expended for the Global Security through Science Partnerships Program (GSSP), formally known as the Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) program, until such time as the Secretary of Energy submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees to complete the GSSP program by the end of calendar year 2015.

The committee notes that the GIPP program was established in 1994, originally known as the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP), to work with Russian Federation and other former U.S.S.R. scientists and engineers in the early days following the end of the cold war. The objectives of the IPP program were to (1) engage weapons scientists and scientific research and development institutes located in Russia and other countries of the former U.S.S.R. in nonmilitary work by supplementing their existing salaries; and (2) create sustainable private sector jobs for former weapons scientists. The committee is aware of the program's achievements, including funding over 750 projects, engaging thousands of former weapons scientists at over 180 facilities, and resulting in the creation of 2,300 new peaceful high-tech jobs. However, the Government Accountability Office issued a report in December 2007 stating the National Nuclear Security Administration had not

developed criteria for phasing out the program in Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union.

Section 3121—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security

This section would limit funds that may be obligated or expended by the Secretary of Energy for fiscal year 2013 to not more than $7.0 million for a Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security in the People's Republic of China until the date on which the Secretary of Energy reviews, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, and submits a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs certifying that current and planned nonproliferation activities with China are not directly or indirectly contributing to the proliferation of nuclear weapons development and technology to other nations.

Section 3122—Two-Year Extension of Schedule for Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium at Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina

This section would provide a 2-year extension to the schedule for the disposition of weapons-usable plutonium at the Savannah River Site, located in Aiken, South Carolina.

SUBTITLE C—IMPROVEMENTS TO NATIONAL SECURITY ENERGY LAWS

Section 3131—Improvements to the Atomic Energy Defense Act

This section would make changes to the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501) to streamline the statute, update terminology, clarify definitions, and make technical corrections.

Section 3132—Improvements to the National Nuclear Security Administration Act

This section would make changes to the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (Public Law 106–65) to streamline the statute, repeal expired sections of the code, update terminology, clarify definitions, and make technical corrections.

Section 3133—Clarification of the Role of the Administrator for Nuclear Security

This section would clarify the role of the Administrator for Nuclear Security and reinforce the semi-autonomous nature of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) by amending various sections of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401), the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501), and the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7131). This section would clarify that the Administrator is responsible for all programs, policies, regulations, and rules of the NNSA. This section would further clarify that the Secretary of Energy may disapprove any action, policy, regulation, or rule of the Administrator if the Secretary submits justification for such disapproval to the congressional defense committees and a period of 15 days has elapsed since such justification was submitted. This section would

also clarify that the Administrator has complete authority to establish and conduct oversight of policies, activities, and procedures of the NNSA without direction or oversight by the Secretary, and establish that the Secretary's authority to administer, enforce, or oversee the activities of the NNSA would be limited to the disapproval authority described above, unless otherwise specifically provided by law. This section would also amend several statutes to transfer authority for certain activities from the Secretary to the Administrator.

In its 2009 report, the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States recommended making NNSA a fully autonomous agency reporting to the President through the Secretary of Energy. The Commission recommended following the example of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), which reports to the Secretary of Energy, and for which the Secretary only has the authority to comment on and not disapprove FERC's budget. Also in 2009, a study by The Henry L. Stimson Center, "Leveraging Science for Security: A Strategy for the Nuclear Weapons Labs in the 21st Century," was highly critical of both the Department of Energy (DOE) and the NNSA. The Stimson Center Task Force concluded that the choices for reform were clear, either "initiate an extensive overhaul of DOE/NNSA to achieve intended agency autonomy" or "create a new independent agency with the institutional mechanisms and oversight in place to achieve the envisioned transformation and fully leverage the taxpayer's investments." Ultimately, the Task Force "strongly recommend[ed] creating a fully independent agency . . . the Task Force proposes fully severing NNSA and its Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, including the Nevada Test Site, from DOE."

The committee agrees with these and other recent assessments that the degree of autonomy intended by the National Nuclear Security Administration Act has not been achieved. This section would strengthen the autonomy of NNSA and reinforce the intent of the legislation.

Section 3134—Consolidated Reporting Requirements Relating to Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship, Management, and Infrastructure

This section would consolidate several existing reporting requirements in sections 4202, 4203, 4203A, 4204, 4207, and 4208 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (Public Law 106–65), as well as section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106), and consolidate them into a new section. This section would create a consolidated requirement for the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and other appropriate officials, to develop and annually update a plan for sustaining the nuclear weapons stockpile. The plan would be required to cover, at a minimum, stockpile stewardship, stockpile management, stockpile surveillance, program direction, infrastructure modernization, human capital, and nuclear test readiness. This section would require the Administrator to submit a summary of this plan, including identification of changes to the plan, to the congressional defense committees in each even-numbered year, and a detailed report on the plan in each odd-numbered year. Finally, this section would require the Nuclear Weapons Council, in each odd-numbered year, to submit to Congress an

assessment of certain aspects of the plan developed by the Administrator and determine whether the plan adequately supports nuclear security enterprise infrastructure modernization requirements.

Section 3135—Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements

This section would repeal several recurring reporting requirements. First, this section would repeal the requirement in section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) for the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a status report every 120 days to the congressional defense committees on the environmental clean-up projects conducted by the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management with funds provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5). Second, this section would amend section 4604 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2704) to repeal the requirement for the Secretary of Energy to annually submit to Congress an update of the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities workforce restructuring plan. Finally, this section would amend section 148 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2168) to eliminate the requirement that the Secretary of Energy prepare a quarterly report that identifies information determined to be Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information during the quarterly reporting period.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Section 3141—Notification of Nuclear Criticality and Non-Nuclear Incidents

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Secretary of Energy to notify the appropriate congressional committees of any nuclear criticality incident resulting from programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration or the defense environmental cleanup program which results in an injury or fatality or results in the shut-down, or partial shut-down, of a facility of the nuclear security enterprise or of a facility of the Office of Environmental Management, within 15 days of such occurrence. The notification would include a description of the incident, including the cause of the incident, any mission impacts, and any corrective action taken in response to the incident. This section would also require the Secretary and the Administrator to maintain a record of these nuclear incidents and of any non-nuclear incidents that result in serious bodily injury or a fatality. Finally, this section would require the Secretary and the Administrator to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act detailing any such incidents that have occurred in the last 10 years.

The committee continues to view nuclear and non-nuclear safety as an important tenet of nuclear operations in the context of potential changes in governance and management structures.

Section 3142—Reports on Lifetime Extension Programs

This section would require that before proceeding beyond phase 6.2 activities on any life extension activities, the directors of the

national nuclear weapons laboratories shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the lifetime extension program option for the nuclear physics package, i.e., refurbishment, reuse, and replacement, of that weapon and an assessment of why the option selected was selected, including an assessment of pros and cons of the other two options, including costs and other considerations. The lab director's assessment would be submitted to the congressional defense committees without change by the Administrator of Nuclear Security, though he may if he chooses, submit his own explanation.

The committee notes that section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) created the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States. The committee is aware that the commission stated that the "basic approaches to refurbishment and modernization are, in fact, not stark alternatives. Rather, they are options along a spectrum. That spectrum is defined at its two ends by the pure re-manufacturing of existing warheads with existing components at one end and complete redesign and new production of all system components at the other. In between are various options to utilize existing components and design solutions while mixing in new components and solutions as needed. Different warheads may lend themselves to different solutions along this spectrum. The decision on which approach is best should be made on a case-by-case basis as the existing stockpile of warheads ages." The committee is further aware that the commission recommended that, "[t]he decision on which approach to refurbishing and modernizing the nuclear stockpile is best should be made on a type-by-type basis as the existing stockpile of warheads ages."

Section 3143—National Academy of Sciences Study on Peer Review and Design Competition Related To Nuclear Weapons

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Science to conduct a study of peer review and design competition related to nuclear weapons. The National Academies study would be required to include an assessment of: the quality and effectiveness of peer review of designs, development plans, engineering and science activities, and priorities related to both nuclear and non-nuclear aspects of nuclear weapons; incentives for effective peer-review; the potential effectiveness, efficiency, and cost of alternative methods of conducting peer review and design competition related to both nuclear and non-nuclear aspects of nuclear weapons (as compared to current methods); the known instances where peer review practices and design competition succeeded or failed to find problems or potential problems; and any other related matters the Administrator considers appropriate. The Administrator would be required to ensure the National Academies receives full and timely cooperation from the National Nuclear Security Administration, and its contractors, for the purposes of conducting the study. The Administrator would be required to submit the report and any recommendations of the National Academies, together with any comments or recommendations, to the congressional defense committees by December 15, 2014.

The committee believes that peer review and design competition are critical components of nuclear stockpile stewardship and important means of ensuring the health and reliability of the stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing. Because of its importance, the committee believes an independent assessment is needed to understand the effectiveness of current practices and a thorough analysis of previous instances where peer review and design competition either succeeded or failed to find problems. Further, in a constrained fiscal environment where funds for peer review and design competition may face significant pressure, the committee seeks to better understand the effectiveness and efficiency of alternative means of conducting peer review and design competition.

Section 3144—Report on Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs

This section would require the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees no later than March 1 of each year from 2013 through 2015, detailing the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) program's budget, objectives, and metrics. This section would also require an identification and explanation of the foreign countries that are sharing the cost burden of implementing DNN programs, a description of the objectives and measurements for each DNN program, a description of the threat of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and how each DNN program counters these threats, and a description of how the programs are prioritized to meet the most urgent nonproliferation requirements.

The committee believes that the proliferation of nuclear weapons poses a serious and urgent risk to U.S. national security and impacts international stability. However, the committee is concerned about the large uncommitted annual balances in the DNN program and believes the NNSA must develop and implement stronger financial oversight. The required report would encourage the NNSA to identify and explain the uncommitted balances, as well as the partnering of foreign countries to meet these objectives.

Section 3145—Study on Reuse of Plutonium Pit

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to conduct a study of the plutonium pits available, and those that may become available as a result of nuclear weapon dismantlement, and assess the potential for reuse of these pits in future life extension programs. The study would include an analysis of: the feasibility and practicability of potential full or partial reuse options; the benefits and risks of reusing plutonium pits; the potential costs and cost savings; and the impacts of reuse on the requirements for pit manufacturing. This section would require the Administrator to submit a report on the results of the study to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 3151—Use of Probabilistic Risk Assessment to Ensure Nuclear Safety

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Secretary of Energy to ensure that the methods for certifying and overseeing nuclear safety at defense nuclear facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management use national and international standards and nuclear industry best practices, including probabilistic risk assessment, for parts, equipment, and systems for which sufficient data exists to support such methods.

The committee notes that the nuclear safety assessment and certification methods used by the Office of Environmental Management and the NNSA for proven systems have lagged behind more modern methods used by the nuclear power industry and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The highly prescriptive and deterministic methods used by the Office of Environmental Management and the NNSA have resulted in highly complex systems of engineered controls when more modern safety assessment and certification methods, such as probabilistic risk assessment, may result in much simpler systems with equally robust safety margins when sufficient data exists to support such methods. The committee expects the Office of Environmental Management and NNSA to consult with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to understand and leverage lessons learned from the development and application of modern safety assessment and certification methods in both nuclear power reactors and other civilian nuclear facilities. The committee notes that these methods may not apply to one-of-a-kind parts, equipment, or systems.

Section 3152—Advice to President and Congress Regarding Safety, Security, and Reliability of United States Nuclear Weapons Stockpile and Nuclear Forces

This section would transfer section 7274p of title 42, United States Code, and re-designate it as section 4215 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act.

This section would also amend and clarify the underlying statute to ensure that no person, including representatives of the President, may prevent or constrain a director of a national security laboratory, a director of a nuclear weapons production facility, a member of the Nuclear Weapons Council, or the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command from sharing his or her professional views with the President, the National Security Council, or Congress. This section would ensure that such individuals can freely share their professional views with national leaders on the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the nuclear weapons stockpile and nuclear forces, as well as the status of, and plans for, the capabilities and infrastructure that support and sustain the nuclear weapons stockpile and nuclear forces. This section would ensure that these individuals can provide classified information on these matters directly to Congress, and it requires the Administrator for Nuclear Security

and the Secretary of Defense to establish classified mail channels to enable provision of such information.

The committee believes that all national leaders require access to the objective, independent, and unfiltered professional opinions of the Nation's nuclear weapons experts. This section would ensure that the President, the National Security Council, and Congress have such direct access.

Section 3153—Classification of Certain Restricted Data

This section would amend section 142 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2162) to permit the Secretary of Energy, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense or the Director of National Intelligence, to restore certain information related to the design of nuclear weapons back into the Restricted Data category. This section would also make a technical correction to subsection 142e. of the Atomic Energy Act by updating the term "Director of Central Intelligence" to "Director of National Intelligence" to conform section 142e. with the transfer of functions contained in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–458).

Section 3154—Independent Cost Assessments for Life Extension Programs, New Nuclear Facilities, and Other Matters

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) and in coordination with the Administrator for Nuclear Security, to assess the cost of options and alternatives for new life extension programs and new nuclear facilities within the nuclear security enterprise that are expected to cost more than $500.0 million. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a copy of these cost assessments to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of their completion. Finally, this section would provide the Administrator for Nuclear Security the authority to ask the Secretary of Defense to seek a CAPE assessment on other initiatives of the National Nuclear Security Administration that are expected to cost more than $500.0 million.

The committee expects that an independent cost assessment will increase accountability and inform diligent planning to avoid budget overruns and schedule delays. The committee expects that the Administrator and the Secretary will conduct a cost estimate for upcoming life extension programs, including those for the W78 and W88.

Section 3155—Assessment of Nuclear Weapon Pit Production Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, to jointly assess the annual plutonium pit production requirement needed to sustain a safe, secure, and reliable nuclear weapon arsenal.

This section would require the Secretaries, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, to jointly submit a report regarding this assessment to the congressional defense committees. The report would be required to include an explanation of the rationale

and assumptions that led to the current 50 to 80 plutonium pit production requirement; an analysis of whether there are any changes to the current 50 to 80 pit production requirement; the implications for national security, for maintaining the nuclear weapons stockpile (including options for life extension programs), and costs for various levels of pit production capacity (including annual production capacity of 10–12 pits, 20–30 pits, 30–50 pits and 50–80 pits); and the implications of various pit production capacities on the requirements for the nuclear weapon hedge or reserve forces of the United States.

This section would require an update to this report if the report submitted does not incorporate the results of the currently ongoing Nuclear Posture Review Implementation Study. Such an update would be required to be submitted to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of the date on which the committees receive the results of the Nuclear Posture Review Implementation Study. Finally, this section would require that the report and any update be submitted in unclassified form, but allows a classified annex if necessary.

Section 3156—Intellectual Property Related To Uranium Enrichment

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to make available, from the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2013, not more than $150.0 million for the development and demonstration of domestic national security-related enrichment technologies. Thirty days before making such funds available for these purposes, the Secretary of Energy would be required to certify to the congressional defense committees that such funds are needed for national security purposes and describe what those purposes are. If the Secretary chooses to make such funds available, this section would require the Secretary to utilize merit selection procedures and execute an agreement with the recipient of such funds. The agreement would include a requirement for the recipient to achieve specific technical criteria by dates not later than June 30, 2014, and require that immediately upon execution of such agreement that the recipient grant to the Federal Government a royalty-free, non-exclusive license in all enrichment-related intellectual property and associated technical data owned, licensed, or otherwise controller by the recipient. This section would also require that any existing agreement between the Secretary of Energy and the recipient be amended to permit the Secretary to use or allow third parties to use such intellectual property and associated technical data for national defense purposes.

Furthermore, this section would require the recipient to surrender custody, possession, and control of all property or equipment owned or leased by the recipient that is associated with the enrichment technology should the Secretary determine that the technical criteria established by the Secretary in the agreement are not achieved by the agreed dates.

Finally, this section would apply the limitations of this section to funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2013 by this Act for development and demonstration of domestic national security-related enrichment technology, funds otherwise made available in

fiscal year 2013 or any year thereafter, and it would stipulate that the requirements of this section do not apply to the issuance of loan guarantees under section 1703 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16513).

Section 3157—Sense of Congress on Competition and Fees Related to the Management and Operating Contracts of the Nuclear Security Enterprise

This section would express a sense of Congress that:

(1) in the past decade, competition of the management and operating contracts for the national security laboratories has resulted in significant increases in fees paid to the contractors—funding that otherwise could be used to support programs and mission activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration;

(2) competition of the management and operating contracts of the nuclear security enterprise is an important mechanism to help realize cost savings, seek efficiencies, improve performance, and hold contractors accountable;

(3) when the Administrator for Nuclear Security considers it appropriate to achieve these goals, the Administrator should conduct competition of these contracts while recognizing the unique nature of federally funded research and development centers; and

(4) the Administrator should ensure that fixed fees and performance-based fees contained in management and operating contracts are as low as possible to maintain a focus on national service while attracting high-quality contractors and achieving the goals of the competition.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $29.4 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends $31.4 million, an increase of $2.0 million to the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2013.

Section 3202—Improvements to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

The section would amend the enabling statute of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) to provide congressional direction regarding the DNFSB's operation, clarify the DNFSB's mis-

sion, and improve collaboration between the DNFSB and the Department of Energy.

First, this section would clarify that each member of the DNFSB has equal responsibility and authority for establishing decisions and determining certain actions of the DNFSB, that each member must have full and simultaneous access to all information related to the DNFSB, that each member shall have one vote, that a quorum of members is needed for certain actions, and that each member of the DNFSB may propose individuals for senior staff positions and require a determination of the DNFSB on whether the individual will be appointed. This section would also require that each member of the DNFSB be provided funds to employ at least one technical advisor to directly support the member, and that such advisor would not be subject to the appointment, direction, or supervision of the DNFSB chairman.

Second, this section would clarify that the mission of the DNFSB is to provide independent analysis, advice, and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy to ensure that risks to public health and safety at defense nuclear facilities are as low as reasonably practicable and that public health and safety are adequately protected. In any recommendations submitted to the Secretary, the DNFSB would be required to consider, and specifically assess, the technical and economic feasibility, the costs and benefits, and the practicability of implementing its recommended measures.

Third, this section would revise the statutory authority for the DNFSB to submit recommendations to the Secretary of Energy, creating a more collaborative recommendation process in which the DNFSB provides a draft recommendation to the Secretary, who then has at least 45 days to provide comments on the recommendation. After this comment period, the DNFSB may choose to formalize and publish the recommendation in the Federal Register and seek public comment. After such publication, the Secretary of Energy would have at least 60 days to accept or reject the recommendation and publish a statement in the Federal Register regarding the recommendation and why it was accepted or rejected. If a recommendation is rejected, the DNFSB may transmit a letter to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. If a recommendation is accepted, the Secretary would be required to submit an implementation plan to the DNFSB within 120 days. Further, if the DNFSB submits a recommendation regarding an imminent or severe threat to public health and safety, the Secretary of Energy would have 15 days to provide comments to the President on the recommendation.

Finally, this section would require certain reports of the DNFSB to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, and the DNFSB to enter into an agreement with a Federal agency to procure the services of the Inspector General of that agency for the DNFSB.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $14.9 million for fiscal year 2013 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2013

This section would authorize appropriations for the national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal year 2013.

Section 3502—Application of the Federal Acquisition Regulation

This section would clarify that the appropriate version of the Federal Acquisition Regulations would be applied to a contract for purchase of recycling services is the version in effect at the time the contract is awarded.

Section 3503—Procurement of Ship Disposal

This section would include ship disposal and ship disposal related contracts in the Maritime Administration's exemption from Federal procurement law, and would eliminate the word "merchant" before the word "vessels", making it consistent with the disposal authority for merchant vessels and vessels capable of being converted to merchant use.

Section 3504—Limitation of National Defense Reserve Fleet Vessels to Those Over 1,500 Gross Tons

This section would clarify that vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet are to be 1,500 gross tons or greater and those vessels the Secretary of Transportation determines are appropriate to be included in the National Defense Reserve Fleet. This section would also provide the Maritime Administration the flexibility to more efficiently dispose of vessels smaller than 1,500 gross tons through the vessel sales process provided by the General Services Administration, and give the Secretary the option of determining the best practical options for the disposal of smaller vessels.

Section 3505—Donation of Excess Fuel to Maritime Academies

This section would authorize the Maritime Administration, with the concurrence of the owner of the fuel or excess equipment, to donate excess fuel on National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels to the State Maritime Academies to carry out training. In the case of Ready Reserve Force vessels, the owner of the vessels and the fuel would be the Secretary of the Navy.

Section 3506—Clarification of Heading

This section would change the title of section 57103 of title 46, United States Code, from "Sale of Obsolete Vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet" to "Donation of Non-Retention Vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet". This would be a purely technical correction.

Section 3507—Transfer of Vessels into the National Defense Reserve Fleet

This section would clarify the Maritime Administration's authority to receive vessels from the Armed Forces and other Federal entities, enhancing the Administration's ability to efficiently dispose of obsolete Government vessels.

Section 3508—Amendments Relating To the National Defense Reserve Fleet

This section would provide the Maritime Administration the flexibility in determining when to conduct activations and sea trials of vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, while still ensuring readiness in accordance with Department of Defense readiness requirements.

Section 3509—Extension of Maritime Security Fleet Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to extend existing operating agreements in the Maritime Security Program through September 30, 2025. For those agreements where the contractor does not wish to enter into an extension, the Secretary would be authorized to award the operating agreement to a new contractor, on the basis of military need, for the new vessel in coordination with the Secretary of Defense. This section would include periodic increases to the stipend for participants through fiscal year 2025 to account for inflation.

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.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
1	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	2	18,639			2	18,639
3	MQ–1 UAV	19	518,088			19	518,088
4	RQ–11 (RAVEN)	234	25,798			234	25,798
	ROTARY						
6	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	34	271,983			34	271,983
7	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	40	577,115			40	577,115
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		107,707				107,707
9	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	8	153,993			8	153,993
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		146,121				146,121
13	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	59	1,107,087			59	1,107,087
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		115,113				115,113
15	CH–47 HELICOPTER	38	1,076,036			38	1,076,036
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		83,346				83,346
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
18	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS		231,508				231,508
20	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		16,272				16,272
21	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		4,294				4,294
22	AH–64 MODS		178,805				178,805

23	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		39,135			39,135
24	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		24,842			24,842
26	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		73,804			73,804
27	KIOWA WARRIOR MODS		192,484			192,484
29	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		190,789			190,789
30	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		133,191			133,191
31	GATM ROLLUP		87,280			87,280
32	RQ–7 UAV MODS		104,339			104,339
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS					
34	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		34,037			34,037
36	CMWS		127,751			127,751
	OTHER SUPPORT					
37	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,886			4,886
38	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		82,511			82,511
39	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		77,381			77,381
40	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		47,235			47,235
41	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,643			1,643
42	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		516			516
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**434**	**5,853,729**		**434**	**5,853,729**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM					
1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	84	646,590	50,000	84	696,590
	Additional PAC–3 missiles			[50,000]		
2	MSE MISSILE		12,850			12,850
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM					
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		1,401	10,000		11,401
	Program increase			[10,000]		
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS					
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	400	81,121		400	81,121
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,403	64,712		1,403	64,712
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,931			19,931

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,608	218,679			1,608	218,679
9	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,430	18,767			2,430	18,767
10	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		12,051				12,051
	MODIFICATIONS						
11	PATRIOT MODS		199,565				199,565
13	MLRS MODS		2,466				2,466
14	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		6,068				6,068
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
16	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		7,864				7,864
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
17	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,864				3,864
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MISSILES)		1,560				1,560
19	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		5,200				5,200
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**5,925**	**1,302,689**		**60,000**	**5,925**	**1,362,689**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	STRYKER VEHICLE	58	286,818			58	286,818
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
3	STRYKER (MOD)		60,881				60,881
4	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		57,257				57,257
5	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		148,193		140,000		288,193
	Program increase				[140,000]		
6	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		10,341				10,341
7	PALADIN PIM MOD IN SERVICE	17	206,101			17	206,101
8	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	31	107,909	20	62,000	51	169,909

	Program increase			[20]	[62,000]		
9	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	10	50,039			10	50,039
10	M88 FOV MODS		29,930				29,930
11	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		129,090				129,090
12	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		74,433		181,000		255,433
	Program increase				[181,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
13	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		1,145				1,145
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
14	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY		506		–506		0
	XM25 funding ahead of need				[–506]		
17	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	610	25,183			610	25,183
19	MORTAR SYSTEMS		8,104				8,104
21	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	2,280	14,096			2,280	14,096
24	CARBINE	12,000	21,272			12,000	21,272
25	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	2,107	6,598			2,107	6,598
26	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	240	56,725			240	56,725
27	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)		13,827				13,827
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
29	M777 MODS		26,843				26,843
30	M4 CARBINE MODS		27,243				27,243
31	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		39,974				39,974
32	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		4,996				4,996
33	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		6,806				6,806
34	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		14,113				14,113
35	M119 MODIFICATIONS		20,727				20,727
36	M16 RIFLE MODS		3,306				3,306
37	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		3,072				3,072
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
38	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (WOCV-WTCV)		2,026				2,026
39	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		10,115				10,115
40	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		442				442

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
41	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		2,378				2,378
	SPARES						
42	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)		31,217				31,217
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**17,353**	**1,501,706**	**20**	**382,494**	**17,373**	**1,884,200**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		158,313		–34,800		123,513
	Unit cost savings				[–34,800]		
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		91,438				91,438
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		8,954				8,954
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		109,604				109,604
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES		4,041				4,041
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		12,654				12,654
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		72,154		–18,000		54,154
	Pricing adjustments for target practice round and light-weight dual-purpose round.				[–18,000]		
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		60,138				60,138
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		44,375				44,375
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		27,471				27,471
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		87,811				87,811
	TANK AMMUNITION						
12	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES		112,380				112,380
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
13	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP		50,861				50,861

14	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	26,227		26,227
15	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982	110,329	–55,000	55,329
	Excalibur I-b round schedule delay		[–55,000]	
16	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	43,924		43,924
	MINES			
17	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES	3,775		3,775
	NETWORKED MUNITIONS			
18	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	17,408		17,408
	ROCKETS			
19	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	1,005		1,005
20	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	123,433		123,433
	OTHER AMMUNITION			
21	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	35,189		35,189
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	33,477		33,477
23	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	9,991		9,991
24	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	10,388		10,388
	MISCELLANEOUS			
25	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	19,383		19,383
26	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	7,336		7,336
27	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	6,641		6,641
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	15,092		15,092
29	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	15,692		15,692
30	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	14,107		14,107
31	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	106		106
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT			
32	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	220,171		220,171
33	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL	182,461		182,461
34	ARMS INITIATIVE	3,377		3,377
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**1,739,706**	**–107,800**	**1,631,906**

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

TACTICAL VEHICLES

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
1	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	27	7,097			27	7,097
2	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	1,248	346,115			1,248	346,115
3	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		19,292				19,292
4	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	1,534	52,933			1,534	52,933
5	PLS ESP		18,035				18,035
9	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	12	3,619			12	3,619
10	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	60	26,859			60	26,859
12	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	950	69,163			950	69,163
13	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		91,754				91,754
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
18	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,548				2,548
19	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		16,791				16,791
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
20	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM	7,038	10,061			7,038	10,061
21	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	2,166	892,635		–20,000	2,166	872,635
	Program adjustment				[–20,000]		
22	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		45,626				45,626
23	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,143				5,143
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
24	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	23	151,636			23	151,636
25	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		6,822				6,822
26	SHF TERM		9,108				9,108
28	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	3,592	27,353			3,592	27,353
29	SMART-T (SPACE)		98,656				98,656
31	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS		47,131				47,131
32	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	39	23,281			39	23,281

	COMM—C3 SYSTEM					
34	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		10,848			10,848
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS					
35	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		979			979
36	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	11,059	556,250	–35,000	11,059	521,250
	Program adjustment			[–35,000]		
37	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)		86,219	–10,000		76,219
	Program adjustment			[–10,000]		
38	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		7,798			7,798
39	SINCGARS FAMILY		9,001			9,001
40	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	108	24,601		108	24,601
41	TRACTOR DESK		7,779			7,779
43	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		34,365	–15,000		19,365
	Program delay			[–15,000]		
44	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		1,833			1,833
45	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM		12,984			12,984
47	GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM (GDS)	46	2,332		46	2,332
48	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		1,132			1,132
49	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	2,535	22,899		2,535	22,899
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM					
51	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,564			1,564
52	RESERVE CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	1,540	28,781		1,540	28,781
	INFORMATION SECURITY					
53	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	6,087	23,432		6,087	23,432
54	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	2,469	43,897		2,469	43,897
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS					
56	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		2,891			2,891
57	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		13,872			13,872
58	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		9,595			9,595
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS					
59	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		142,133			142,133
61	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		57,727			57,727

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
62	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		5,000				5,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
65	JTT/CIBS-M		1,641				1,641
66	PROPHET GROUND	13	48,797			13	48,797
69	DCGS-A (MIP)	1,743	184,007			1,743	184,007
70	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	5	2,680			5	2,680
71	TROJAN (MIP)		21,483				21,483
72	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		2,412				2,412
73	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRINTING AND COLLECTION		7,077				7,077
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
75	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	43	72,594			43	72,594
76	CREW		15,446				15,446
78	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		1,470				1,470
79	CI MODERNIZATION		1,368				1,368
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
80	FAAD GBS		7,980				7,980
81	SENTINEL MODS	70	33,444			70	33,444
82	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)		6,212				6,212
83	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	8,687	166,516			8,687	166,516
85	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		82,162				82,162
86	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF		20,717				20,717
89	GREEN LASER INTERDICTION SYSTEM (GLIS)		1,014				1,014
90	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS		29,881				29,881
91	PROFILER	136	12,482			136	12,482
92	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		3,075				3,075
94	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	1,032	141,385			1,032	141,385

96	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)		22,403		22,403
98	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		29,505		29,505
99	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	13	244,409	13	244,409
100	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM (WMD)		2,426		2,426
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
101	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	133	30,196	133	30,196
102	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	1,642	58,903	1,642	58,903
103	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM	445	8,111	445	8,111
104	FAAD C2		5,031		5,031
105	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	12	64,144	12	64,144
106	KNIGHT FAMILY		11,999		11,999
107	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,853		1,853
108	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		14,377		14,377
111	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		59,821		59,821
112	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	721	51,228	721	51,228
113	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)	5,976	176,901	5,976	176,901
114	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET		15,209		15,209
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION				
115	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		8,866		8,866
116	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		129,438		129,438
117	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYS FAM		9,184		9,184
118	CSS COMMUNICATIONS	2,062	20,639	2,062	20,639
119	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		35,493		35,493
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)				
120	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (A/V)		8,467		8,467
121	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	89	5,309	89	5,309
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT				
122	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		586		586
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
124A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,435		3,435
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	1,562	3,960	1,562	3,960

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	637	4,374			637	4,374
128	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	219	9,259			219	9,259
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
130	TACTICAL BRIDGING	7	35,499			7	35,499
131	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	68	32,893			68	32,893
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
134	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		29,106				29,106
135	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	522	25,459			522	25,459
136	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	364	8,044			364	8,044
137	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		3,698				3,698
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
138	HEATERS AND ECU'S	1,332	12,210			1,332	12,210
139	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		6,522				6,522
140	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)		11,222				11,222
141	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	5,226	103,317			5,226	103,317
144	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	228	27,417			228	27,417
145	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	8,891	52,065			8,891	52,065
146	MORTUARY AFFAIRS SYSTEMS		2,358				2,358
147	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	266	31,573			266	31,573
148	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	818	14,093			818	14,093
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
149	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	208	36,266			208	36,266
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
150	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	1,938	34,101			1,938	34,101
151	MEDEVAC MISSON EQUIPMENT PACKAGE (MEP)		20,540				20,540
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						

152	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	20	2,495	20	2,495
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT				
154	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,028		2,028
156	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	9	6,146	9	6,146
157	MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING	40	31,200	40	31,200
161	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	61	20,867	61	20,867
162	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	1	4,003	1	4,003
163	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	1	3,679	1	3,679
164	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	76	30,042	76	30,042
165	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPA	182	13,725	182	13,725
166	CONST EQUIP ESP	47	13,351	47	13,351
167	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (CONST EQUIP)		9,134		9,134
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT				
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (FLOAT/RAIL)		10,552		10,552
	GENERATORS				
171	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	2,074	60,302	2,074	60,302
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
173	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	64	5,895	64	5,895
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
175	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	339	104,649	339	104,649
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		125,251		125,251
177	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	8	19,984	8	19,984
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		10,977		10,977
179	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		4,056		4,056
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)				
180	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	3	10,494	3	10,494
181	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	1,674	45,508	1,674	45,508
182	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	2,786	24,334	2,786	24,334
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
183	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,078		5,078
184	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		46,301		46,301
185	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,373		1,373

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
186	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	248	59,141			248	59,141
187	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,446				2,446
188	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	206	12,920			206	12,920
189	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	1,141	19,180			1,141	19,180
190	TRACTOR YARD		7,368				7,368
191	UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE	311	83,937			311	83,937
	OPA2						
193	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	34	64,507			34	64,507
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**94,966**	**6,326,245**		**–80,000**	**94,966**	**6,246,245**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
04	OPERATIONS		227,414		–227,414		0
	Transfer of funds to title 15				[–227,414]		
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**227,414**		**–227,414**		**0**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	EA–18G	12	1,027,443		–30,000	12	997,443
	Cost growth-CFE electronics, non-recurring costs				[–30,000]		
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				45,000		45,000
	Program increase				[45,000]		
3	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	26	2,035,131		–46,000	26	1,989,131
	Cost growth-CFE electronics, support costs				[–46,000]		
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30,296				30,296
5	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	4	1,007,632			4	1,007,632

6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		65,180				65,180
7	JSF STOVL	6	1,404,737			6	1,404,737
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		106,199				106,199
9	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	17	1,303,120			17	1,303,120
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		154,202				154,202
11	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	27	720,933			27	720,933
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,658				69,658
13	MH–60S (MYP)	18	384,792			18	384,792
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,277				69,277
15	MH–60R (MYP)	19	656,866	5	170,000	24	826,866
	Cruiser Retention—Restore 5 helicopters			[5]	[170,000]		
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		185,896				185,896
17	P–8A POSEIDON	13	2,420,755			13	2,420,755
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		325,679				325,679
19	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	5	861,498			5	861,498
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		123,179				123,179
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
22	JPATS	33	278,884			33	278,884
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
23	KC–130J		3,000				3,000
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		22,995				22,995
25	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		51,124				51,124
26	MQ–8 UAV	6	124,573			6	124,573
27	STUASLO UAV	5	9,593			5	9,593
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
28	EA–6 SERIES		30,062				30,062
29	AEA SYSTEMS		49,999				49,999
30	AV–8 SERIES		38,703				38,703
31	ADVERSARY		4,289				4,289
32	F–18 SERIES		647,306				647,306
33	H–46 SERIES		2,343				2,343
34	AH–1W SERIES		8,721				8,721

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
35	H–53 SERIES		45,567				45,567
36	SH–60 SERIES		83,527				83,527
37	H–1 SERIES		6,508				6,508
38	EP–3 SERIES		66,374				66,374
39	P–3 SERIES		148,405				148,405
40	E–2 SERIES		16,322				16,322
41	TRAINER A/C SERIES		34,284				34,284
42	C–2A		4,743				4,743
43	C–130 SERIES		60,302				60,302
44	FEWSG		670				670
45	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		26,311				26,311
46	E–6 SERIES		158,332				158,332
47	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		58,163				58,163
48	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		12,421				12,421
49	T–45 SERIES		64,488				64,488
50	POWER PLANT CHANGES		21,569				21,569
51	JPATS SERIES		1,552				1,552
52	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		2,473				2,473
53	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		114,690				114,690
54	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		96,183				96,183
56	ID SYSTEMS		39,846				39,846
57	P–8 SERIES		5,302				5,302
58	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		34,127				34,127
59	RQ–7 SERIES		49,324				49,324
60	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		95,856				95,856
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

61	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,166,430		–40,000		1,126,430
	Spares cost growth—F–35C, F–35B, E–2D				[–40,000]		
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
62	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		387,195				387,195
63	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		23,469				23,469
64	WAR CONSUMABLES		43,383				43,383
65	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		3,399				3,399
66	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		32,274				32,274
67	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,742				1,742
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**191**	**17,129,296**	**5**	**99,000**	**196**	**17,228,296**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
1	TRIDENT II MODS		1,224,683				1,224,683
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		5,553				5,553
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
3	TOMAHAWK	196	308,970			196	308,970
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
4	AMRAAM	67	102,683		10,000	67	112,683
	Program increase				[10,000]		
5	SIDEWINDER	150	80,226			150	80,226
6	JSOW	280	127,609		10,200	280	137,809
	Program increase				[10,200]		
7	STANDARD MISSILE	94	399,482			94	399,482
8	RAM	62	66,769			62	66,769
9	HELLFIRE	998	74,501		17,400	998	91,901
	Program increase				[17,400]		
11	AERIAL TARGETS		61,518				61,518
12	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,585				3,585
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
13	ESSM	37	58,194			37	58,194

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
14	HARM MODS	100	86,721			100	86,721
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
16	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,014				2,014
17	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		21,454				21,454
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		54,945				54,945
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
19	SSTD		2,700				2,700
20	ASW TARGETS		10,385				10,385
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
21	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	75	74,487			75	74,487
22	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	94	54,281			94	54,281
23	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		6,852				6,852
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
24	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		46,402				46,402
25	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		11,927				11,927
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
26	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,614				3,614
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
27	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		12,594				12,594
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
28	CIWS MODS		59,303				59,303
29	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		19,072				19,072
30	GUN MOUNT MODS		54,706				54,706
31	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		1,591		18,031		19,622
	Cruiser retention—5″/62 Upgrade				[18,031]		

32	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		20,607			20,607
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
34	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		60,150			60,150
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**2,153**	**3,117,578**	**55,631**	**2,153**	**3,173,209**
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY					
	OTHER WARSHIPS					
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1	608,195		1	608,195
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,217,601		2	3,217,601
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		874,878	778,000		1,652,878
	Advance procurement			[778,000]		
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	1,613,392		1	1,613,392
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		70,010			70,010
8	DDG 1000		669,222			669,222
9	DDG–51	2	3,048,658		2	3,048,658
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		466,283	115,000		581,283
	Advance procurement			[115,000]		
11	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	4	1,784,959		4	1,784,959
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS					
15	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL	1	189,196		1	189,196
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST					
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		307,300			307,300
18	OUTFITTING		309,648			309,648
20	LCAC SLEP	2	47,930		2	47,930
21	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		372,573			372,573
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	**13**	**13,579,845**	**893,000**	**13**	**14,472,845**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC					
	NAVY AMMUNITION					
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		27,024			27,024
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		56,575			56,575
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		21,266			21,266

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
4	PRACTICE BOMBS		34,319				34,319
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		53,755				53,755
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		61,693				61,693
7	JATOS		2,776				2,776
8	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE		7,102				7,102
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		48,320				48,320
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		25,544				25,544
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		41,624				41,624
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		65,893				65,893
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		11,176				11,176
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,116				4,116
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		83,733				83,733
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		24,645				24,645
17	40MM, ALL TYPES		16,201				16,201
19	81MM, ALL TYPES		13,711		–10,000		3,711
	Excess to need				[–10,000]		
20	120MM, ALL TYPES		12,557				12,557
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		7,634		–500		7,134
	Excess to need				[–500]		
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		27,528				27,528
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		93,065				93,065
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		2,047		–2,047		0
	Excess to need				[–2,047]		
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES		5,297				5,297
27	NON LETHALS		1,362				1,362

28	AMMO MODERNIZATION	4,566		4,566
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,010		6,010
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**759,539**	**–12,547**	**746,992**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY			
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT			
1	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE	10,658		10,658
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	8,469		8,469
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT			
3	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	23,392		23,392
	PERISCOPES			
4	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	53,809		53,809
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT			
5	DDG MOD	452,371		452,371
6	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	16,958		16,958
7	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,492		2,492
8	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	20,707		20,707
9	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	12,046		12,046
10	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	79,870		79,870
11	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	19,865		19,865
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	41,522		41,522
13	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	30,543		30,543
14	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	16,257		16,257
15	DSSP EQUIPMENT	3,630		3,630
16	CG MODERNIZATION	101,000	83,972	184,972
	Cruiser retention		[83,972]	
17	LCAC	16,645		16,645
18	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	35,446		35,446
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	65,998		65,998
20	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	4,359		4,359
21	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	10,218		10,218
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT			

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
22	REACTOR POWER UNITS		286,859				286,859
23	REACTOR COMPONENTS		278,503				278,503
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
24	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		8,998				8,998
	SMALL BOATS						
25	STANDARD BOATS		30,131				30,131
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
26	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		29,772				29,772
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
27	OPERATING FORCES IPE		64,346				64,346
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
28	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		154,652				154,652
29	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT		31,319				31,319
30	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES		38,392				38,392
31	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES		32,897				32,897
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
32	LSD MIDLIFE		49,758				49,758
	SHIP SONARS						
34	SPQ–9B RADAR		19,777				19,777
35	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		89,201				89,201
36	SSN ACOUSTICS		190,874				190,874
37	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		17,035				17,035
38	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		13,410				13,410
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
40	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		21,489				21,489
41	SSTD		10,716				10,716

42	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	98,896		98,896
43	SURTASS	2,774		2,774
44	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISSANCE FORCE	18,428		18,428
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT			
45	AN/SLQ–32	92,270		92,270
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT			
46	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	107,060	1,125	108,185
	Cruiser Retention		[1,125]	
47	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	914		914
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT			
48	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	34,050		34,050
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
49	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	27,881		27,881
50	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	448		448
51	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	35,732		35,732
53	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	9,533		9,533
54	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	60,111		60,111
55	SHALLOW WATER MCM	6,950		6,950
56	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	9,089		9,089
57	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	7,768		7,768
58	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	3,614		3,614
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
59	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	42,911		42,911
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
60	MATCALS	5,861		5,861
61	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	8,362		8,362
62	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	15,685		15,685
63	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	16,919		16,919
64	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	6,828		6,828
65	LANDING SYSTEMS	7,646		7,646
66	ID SYSTEMS	35,474		35,474
67	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	9,958		9,958

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
68	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT		9,064				9,064
69	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM		16,026				16,026
70	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS		11,886				11,886
71	DCGS-N		11,887				11,887
72	CANES		341,398		3,450		344,848
	Cruiser Retention				[3,450]		
73	RADIAC		8,083				8,083
74	CANES-INTELL		79,427				79,427
75	GPETE		6,083				6,083
76	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,495				4,495
77	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		4,767				4,767
78	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		81,755				81,755
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
80	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		56,870		1,153		58,023
	Cruiser Retention				[1,153]		
81	MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA)		1,063				1,063
82	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		28,522				28,522
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
83	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		4,183				4,183
84	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		69,025				69,025
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
85	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		49,294				49,294
86	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)		184,825		1,715		186,540
	Cruiser Retention				[1,715]		
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						

87	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	2,180	2,180
88	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,354	1,354
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		
90	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	144,104	144,104
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		
91	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	12,604	12,604
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		
92	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	6,680	6,680
	SONOBUOYS		
95	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	104,677	104,677
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
96	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	70,753	70,753
97	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	8,678	8,678
98	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	11,349	11,349
99	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	82,618	82,618
100	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	18,339	18,339
101	DCRS/DPL	1,414	1,414
102	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	40,475	40,475
103	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	61,552	61,552
104	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	18,771	18,771
105	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS	7,954	7,954
106	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,023	10,023
107	AUTONOMIC LOGISTICS INFORMATION SYSTEM (ALIS)	3,826	3,826
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT		
108	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	3,472	3,472
109	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	4,528	4,528
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
110	NATO SEASPARROW	8,960	8,960
111	RAM GMLS	1,185	1,185
112	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	55,371	55,371
113	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	81,614	81,614
114	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	77,767	77,767

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
115	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		754				754
116	MARITIME INTEGRATED PLANNING SYSTEM-MIPS		4,965				4,965
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
117	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		181,049				181,049
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
118	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		71,316				71,316
119	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,018				4,018
120	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,465				6,465
121	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		47,930				47,930
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
122	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		3,579				3,579
123	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,125				3,125
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
124	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		31,743		11,238		42,981
	Cruiser Retention				[1,238]		
	Program increase for NULKA decoys				[10,000]		
125	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		34,174				34,174
126	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		23,450				23,450
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
127	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		7,158				7,158
128	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		3,325				3,325
129	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		8,692				8,692
130	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,533				14,533
131	TACTICAL VEHICLES		15,330				15,330
132	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		10,803				10,803
133	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		7,265				7,265

134	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	15,252		15,252
135	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,161		1,161
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
136	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	15,204		15,204
137	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,330		6,330
138	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	6,539		6,539
139	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	34,804		34,804
	TRAINING DEVICES			
140	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	25,444		25,444
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
141	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	43,165		43,165
142	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,251		2,251
143	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,148		3,148
146	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,502		3,502
148	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,696		15,696
149	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	4,344		4,344
150	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	19,492		19,492
151	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	177,149		177,149
152	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	183,995		183,995
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
152A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,063		13,063
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
153	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	250,718		250,718
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**6,169,378**	**102,653**	**6,272,031**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS			
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES			
1	AAV7A1 PIP	16,089		16,089
2	LAV PIP	186,216	–140,900	45,316
	Budget adjustment per USMC		[–140,900]	
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS			
3	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,502		2,502

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
4	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		17,913				17,913
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		47,999				47,999
6	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		17,706				17,706
	OTHER SUPPORT						
7	MODIFICATION KITS		48,040				48,040
8	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		4,537				4,537
	GUIDED MISSILES						
9	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		11,054				11,054
11	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		19,650				19,650
12	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		20,708				20,708
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS						
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		1,420				1,420
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
15	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		25,127				25,127
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
16	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		25,822				25,822
17	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831				2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
18	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		5,498				5,498
19	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		11,290				11,290
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
20	RADAR SYSTEMS		128,079				128,079
21	RQ–21 UAS	5	27,619			5	27,619
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
22	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		7,319				7,319
23	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,466				7,466

25	RQ–11 UAV		2,318		2,318
26	DCGS-MC		18,291		18,291
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
29	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		48,084		48,084
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
30	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		206,708		206,708
31	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		35,190		35,190
32	RADIO SYSTEMS		89,059		89,059
33	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		22,500		22,500
34	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		42,625		42,625
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
035A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,290		2,290
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES				
35	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		2,877		2,877
36	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		13,960		13,960
	TACTICAL VEHICLES				
37	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)		8,052		8,052
38	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		50,269		50,269
40	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	8	37,262	8	37,262
41	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		48,160		48,160
	OTHER SUPPORT				
43	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,705		6,705
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
44	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		13,576		13,576
45	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		16,869		16,869
46	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		19,108		19,108
47	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		56,253		56,253
48	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,089		13,089
49	EOD SYSTEMS		73,699		73,699
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
50	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		3,510		3,510
51	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		11,490		11,490

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
52	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		20,659				20,659
53	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		132				132
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
54	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		31,068				31,068
55	TRAINING DEVICES		45,895				45,895
56	CONTAINER FAMILY		5,801				5,801
57	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		23,939				23,939
60	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		8,365				8,365
	OTHER SUPPORT						
61	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,077				7,077
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
62	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		3,190				3,190
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**13**	**1,622,955**		**–140,900**	**13**	**1,482,055**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
1	F–35	19	3,124,302			19	3,124,302
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		293,400		–64,000		229,400
	Excess advance procurement				[–64,000]		
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
5	C–130J		68,373				68,373
7	HC–130J	1	152,212			1	152,212
9	MC–130J	4	374,866			4	374,866
12	C–27J				115,000		115,000
	C–27J buy-back				[115,000]		
	HELICOPTERS						

15	HH–60 LOSS REPLACEMENT/RECAP		60,596				60,596
17	CV–22 (MYP)	4	294,220			4	294,220
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		15,000				15,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
19	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	5	2,498			5	2,498
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
24	TARGET DRONES	15	129,866			15	129,866
26	RQ–4		75,000		105,200		180,200
	Sustain current force structure				[105,200]		
28	AC–130J	2	163,970			2	163,970
30	MQ–9	24	553,530	12	158,900	36	712,430
	Additional aircraft			[12]	[158,900]		
31	RQ–4 BLOCK 40 PROC		11,654				11,654
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
32	B–2A		82,296				82,296
33	B–1B		149,756				149,756
34	B–52		9,781				9,781
35	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		28,800				28,800
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
36	A–10		89,919				89,919
37	F–15		148,378				148,378
38	F–16		6,896				6,896
39	F–22A		283,871				283,871
40	F–35 MODIFICATIONS		147,995				147,995
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
41	C–5		6,967				6,967
43	C–5M		944,819				944,819
44	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		175,800				175,800
46	C–17A		205,079				205,079
47	C–21		199				199
48	C–32A		1,750				1,750
49	C–37A		445				445

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
51	GLIDER MODS		126				126
52	T–6		15,494				15,494
53	T–1		272				272
54	T–38		20,455				20,455
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
56	U–2 MODS		44,477				44,477
57	KC–10A (ATCA)		46,921				46,921
58	C–12		1,876				1,876
59	MC–12W		17,054				17,054
60	C–20 MODS		243				243
61	VC–25A MOD		11,185				11,185
62	C–40		243				243
63	C–130		67,853				67,853
65	C–130J MODS		70,555				70,555
66	C–135		46,707				46,707
67	COMPASS CALL MODS		50,024				50,024
68	RC–135		165,237				165,237
69	E–3		193,099				193,099
70	E–4		47,616				47,616
71	E–8		59,320				59,320
72	H–1		5,449				5,449
73	H–60		26,227				26,227
74	RQ–4 MODS		9,257				9,257
75	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		22,326				22,326
76	OTHER AIRCRAFT		18,832				18,832

77	MQ–1 MODS		30,861				30,861
78	MQ–9 MODS		238,360				238,360
79	MQ–9 UAS PAYLOADS		93,461				93,461
80	CV–22 MODS		23,881				23,881
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
81	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		729,691		–1,400		728,291
	Premature request for deployment spares packages for F–35				[–23,000]		
	Support additional MQ–9 aircraft				[21,600]		
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
82	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		56,542				56,542
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
83	A–10		5,100				5,100
84	B–1		965				965
86	B–2A		47,580				47,580
88	KC–10A (ATCA)		13,100				13,100
89	C–17A		181,703				181,703
90	C–130		31,830				31,830
91	C–135		13,434				13,434
92	F–15		2,363				2,363
93	F–16		8,506				8,506
96	OTHER AIRCRAFT		9,522				9,522
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
97	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		20,731				20,731
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
98	WAR CONSUMABLES		89,727				89,727
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
99	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		842,392				842,392
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
103A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		20,164				20,164
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**74**	**11,002,999**	**12**	**313,700**	**86**	**11,316,699**

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS		8,927				8,927
	CARTRIDGES						
2	CARTRIDGES		118,075				118,075
	BOMBS						
3	PRACTICE BOMBS		32,393				32,393
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		163,467				163,467
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,259	101,921			3,259	101,921
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B						
6	CAD/PAD		43,829				43,829
7	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		7,515				7,515
8	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,003				1,003
9	MODIFICATIONS		5,321				5,321
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,066				5,066
	FUZES						
11	FLARES		46,010				46,010
12	FUZES		36,444				36,444
	SMALL ARMS						
13	SMALL ARMS		29,223				29,223
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**3,259**	**599,194**			**3,259**	**599,194**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		56,906				56,906
	TACTICAL						
2	JASSM	157	240,399			157	240,399

3	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	164	88,020		164	88,020
4	AMRAAM	113	229,637	15,000	113	244,637
	Program increase			[15,000]		
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	413	47,675		413	47,675
6	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	144	42,000		144	42,000
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES					
7	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		744			744
	CLASS IV					
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS		54,794			54,794
10	AGM–65D MAVERICK		271			271
11	AGM–88A HARM		23,240			23,240
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		13,620			13,620
13	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		5,000			5,000
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
14	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		74,373			74,373
	SPACE PROGRAMS					
15	ADVANCED EHF		557,205			557,205
17	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		36,835			36,835
19	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	2	410,294		2	410,294
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		82,616			82,616
21	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		10,554			10,554
22	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		58,147			58,147
23	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		89,022			89,022
24	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	4	1,679,856		4	1,679,856
25	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	2	454,251		2	454,251
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS					
30	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		138,904			138,904
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
030A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,097,483			1,097,483
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**999**	**5,491,846**	**15,000**	**999**	**5,506,846**

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,905				1,905
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES						
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		18,547				18,547
3	CAP VEHICLES		932				932
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,699				1,699
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		10,850				10,850
6	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,246				9,246
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		23,148				23,148
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
8	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		18,323				18,323
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		1,685				1,685
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		17,014				17,014
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
12	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		166,559				166,559
13	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		1,133				1,133
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
14	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,749				2,749
15	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		32,876				32,876
16	ADVANCE TECH SENSORS		877				877
17	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		15,295				15,295
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
18	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		21,984				21,984

19	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	30,698	30,698
20	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	17,368	17,368
21	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	23,483	23,483
22	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	17,864	17,864
23	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	53,995	53,995
24	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	14,578	14,578
25	TAC SIGINT SPT	208	208
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
27	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	69,743	69,743
28	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	15,829	15,829
29	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	11,023	11,023
30	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	64,521	64,521
31	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	18,217	18,217
32	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	11,899	11,899
33	GCSS-AF FOS	13,920	13,920
34	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	9,365	9,365
35	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	33,907	33,907
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
36	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	52,464	52,464
38	AFNET	125,788	125,788
39	VOICE SYSTEMS	16,811	16,811
40	USCENTCOM	32,138	32,138
	DISA PROGRAMS		
41	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	47,135	47,135
42	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	2,031	2,031
43	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	5,564	5,564
44	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	44,219	44,219
45	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	109,545	109,545
46	MILSATCOM SPACE	47,592	47,592
47	SPACE MODS SPACE	47,121	47,121
48	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	20,961	20,961
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
49	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		126,131				126,131
50	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER		23,707				23,707
51	RADIO EQUIPMENT		12,757				12,757
52	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		10,716				10,716
53	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		74,528				74,528
	MODIFICATIONS						
54	COMM ELECT MODS		43,507				43,507
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
55	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		22,693				22,693
56	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		30,887				30,887
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ						
57	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		2,850				2,850
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
58	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		8,387				8,387
59	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		10,358				10,358
60	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		3,473				3,473
62	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		14,471				14,471
63	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,894				1,894
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
65	DARP RC135		24,176				24,176
66	DCGS-AF		142,928				142,928
68	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		479,446				479,446
69	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		39,155				39,155
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
069A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		14,331,312				14,331,312
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

71	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		14,663				14,663
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**16,720,848**				**16,720,848**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD						
42	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		45,938				45,938
43	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		17,582				17,582
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
41	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		6,770				6,770
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
45	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		26,550				26,550
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
12	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		12,708				12,708
14	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,002				3,002
15	TELEPORT PROGRAM		46,992				46,992
16	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		108,462				108,462
17	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		2,865				2,865
18	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		116,906				116,906
19	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,827				1,827
21	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		10,319				10,319
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
22	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		9,575				9,575
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
26	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,522				2,522
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
02	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,486				1,486
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
44	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		21,878				21,878
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						
30	THAAD	36	460,728	12	127,000	48	587,728
	Procure 12 additional interceptors			[12]	[127,000]		
31	AEGIS BMD	29	389,626			29	389,626

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
32	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS	1	217,244	1	170,000	2	387,244
	Procure additional AN/TPY–2 radar			[1]	[170,000]		
33	RADAR SPARES		10,177				10,177
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
05	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		6,147				6,147
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
27	VEHICLES	1	50			1	50
28	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	13,096			3	13,096
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA						
24	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,458				1,458
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
03	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,129				2,129
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT						
23	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	6	15,179			6	15,179
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
045A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		555,787				555,787
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
46	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		74,832				74,832
48	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		126,780				126,780
49	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	7	99,776		–62,800	7	36,976
	Transfer to Line 051—Mission Shift				[–62,800]		
51	U–28		7,530		109,400		116,930
	Program increase				[46,600]		
	Transfer from Line 049—Mission Shift				[62,800]		
52	MH–47 CHINOOK	7	134,785			7	134,785
53	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		2,062				2,062

54	CV–22 MODIFICATION	4	139,147		4	139,147
55	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,963	23,000		26,963
	Program increase			[23,000]		
56	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,952	35,400		39,352
	Program increase			[35,400]		
58	STUASL0		12,945			12,945
59	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE		73,013			73,013
60	AC/MC–130J		51,484			51,484
62	C–130 MODIFICATIONS		25,248			25,248
63	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		5,314			5,314
	SHIPBUILDING					
64	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		23,037			23,037
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS					
66	ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		113,183			113,183
67	ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		36,981			36,981
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
68	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS		99,838	3,900		103,738
	Program increase			[3,900]		
69	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		71,428			71,428
70	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		27,108			27,108
71	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		12,767			12,767
74	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		42,348			42,348
75	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		600			600
77	TACTICAL VEHICLES		37,421			37,421
78	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS		36,949	5,000		41,949
	Program increase			[5,000]		
79	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		20,255			20,255
80	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT		17,590			17,590
82	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS		66,573			66,573
83	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		6,549			6,549
84	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		32,335			32,335
85	SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS		15,153			15,153

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
86	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS		33,920				33,920
87	TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS		75,132				75,132
90	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		6,667				6,667
91	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		217,972		25,300		243,272
	Program increase				[25,300]		
92	MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS		27,417				27,417
	CBDP						
93	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		24,025				24,025
94	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		73,720				73,720
95	DECONTAMINATION		506				506
96	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)		32,597				32,597
97	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		3,144				3,144
98	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		164,886				164,886
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**94**	**4,187,935**	**13**	**436,200**	**107**	**4,624,135**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
01	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		99,477		–99,477		0
	Program reduction				[–99,477]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**99,477**		**–99,477**		**0**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**125,474**	**97,432,379**	**50**	**1,689,540**	**125,524**	**99,121,919**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ROTARY						
9	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	2	71,000			2	71,000
12	KIOWA WARRIOR (OH–58F) WRA	16	183,900			16	183,900
15	CH–47 HELICOPTER	6	231,300			6	231,300
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**24**	**486,200**			**24**	**486,200**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	161	29,100			161	29,100
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	186	20,553			186	20,553
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**347**	**49,653**			**347**	**49,653**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
36	M16 RIFLE MODS		15,422				15,422
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**15,422**				**15,422**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		1,500				1,500
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		80,000		–19,000		61,000

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Pricing adjustments for target practice round and light-weight dual purpose round.				[–19,000]		
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		14,000				14,000
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		6,000				6,000
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		56,000				56,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
13	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP		29,956				29,956
14	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		37,044				37,044
15	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		12,300				12,300
16	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		17,000				17,000
	MINES						
17	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES		12,000				12,000
	ROCKETS						
20	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		63,635				63,635
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
23	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		16,858				16,858
	MISCELLANEOUS						
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,200				1,200
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**357,493**		**–19,000**		**338,493**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
2	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	223	28,247			223	28,247
4	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		2,050				2,050
11	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	2,128	271,000			2,128	271,000

14	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		927,400		927,400
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM				
52	RESERVE CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT		8,000		8,000
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS				
61	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		25,000		25,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)				
69	DCGS–A (MIP)	960	90,355	960	90,355
73	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRINTING AND COLLECTION		6,516		6,516
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)				
75	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		27,646		27,646
77	FMLY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES		52,000		52,000
78	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		205,209		205,209
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)				
92	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		14,600		14,600
99	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	4	54,585	4	54,585
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
102	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		22,430		22,430
103	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,400		2,400
112	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		6,400		6,400
113	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		5,160		5,160
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		15,000		15,000
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	7,193	66,100	7,193	66,100
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT				
135	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		3,565		3,565
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
143	FORCE PROVIDER	1	39,700	1	39,700
145	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	15	650	15	650
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT				
149	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	13	2,119	13	2,119
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT				
152	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	4	428	4	428

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MAINT EQ)		30				30
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
175	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		7,000				7,000
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	1,275	27,250			1,275	27,250
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		1,000				1,000
179	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		5,900				5,900
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
183	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		98,167		–38,000		60,167
	Rapid equipping force delayed execution rates				[–38,000]		
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**11,816**	**2,015,907**		**–38,000**	**11,816**	**1,977,907**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK		950,500				950,500
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		400,000				400,000
	FORCE TRAINING						
3	TRAIN THE FORCE		149,500				149,500
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
4	OPERATIONS		175,400		227,400		402,800
	Transfer from title 1				[227,400]		
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**1,675,400**		**227,400**		**1,902,800**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
11	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	1	29,800			1	29,800

	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				
30	AV–8 SERIES		42,238		42,238
32	F–18 SERIES		41,243		41,243
35	H–53 SERIES		15,870		15,870
38	EP–3 SERIES		13,030		13,030
43	C–130 SERIES		16,737		16,737
48	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		2,714		2,714
54	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		570		570
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES				
62	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		2,380		2,380
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**1**	**164,582**	**1**	**164,582**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
	TACTICAL MISSILES				
9	HELLFIRE	212	17,000	212	17,000
10	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	50	6,500	50	6,500
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**262**	**23,500**	**262**	**23,500**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC				
	NAVY AMMUNITION				
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		18,000		18,000
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		80,200		80,200
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		21,500		21,500
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		20,303		20,303
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		532		532
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		2,643		2,643
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		2,322		2,322
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,308		6,308
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION				
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		10,948		10,948
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		9,940		9,940
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES		5,963		5,963

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
20	120MM, ALL TYPES		11,605				11,605
21	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,831				2,831
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		2,359				2,359
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		3,051				3,051
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		54,886				54,886
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		1,391				1,391
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES		30,945				30,945
27	NON LETHALS		8				8
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		12				12
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**285,747**				**285,747**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
70	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS		3,603				3,603
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
97	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		58,200				58,200
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
127	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		3,901				3,901
128	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		852				852
129	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		2,436				2,436
130	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		3,798				3,798
131	TACTICAL VEHICLES		13,394				13,394
134	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		375				375
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
149	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		3,000				3,000
151	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		9,323				9,323

	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**98,882**		**98,882**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS				
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
2	LAV PIP		10,000		10,000
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS				
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		108,860		108,860
	GUIDED MISSILES				
10	JAVELIN		29,158		29,158
	OTHER SUPPORT				
13	MODIFICATION KITS		41,602		41,602
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
15	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		13,632		13,632
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)				
17	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831		2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)				
19	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	51	15,575	51	15,575
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
20	RADAR SYSTEMS		8,015		8,015
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
23	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		35,310		35,310
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
29	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	332	652	332	652
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
30	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	25	19,807	25	19,807
32	RADIO SYSTEMS	74	36,482	74	36,482
33	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	4	41,295	4	41,295
	TACTICAL VEHICLES				
39	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	32	10,466	32	10,466
41	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		7,642		7,642
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
45	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		18,239		18,239

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
46	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		51,359				51,359
47	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		20,247				20,247
49	EOD SYSTEMS	207	362,658			207	362,658
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
50	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		55,500				55,500
52	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		19,100				19,100
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
54	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		15,751				15,751
55	TRAINING DEVICES		3,602				3,602
57	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		15,900				15,900
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**725**	**943,683**			**725**	**943,683**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
35	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		139,800				139,800
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
55	U–2 MODS		46,800				46,800
63	C–130		11,400				11,400
67	COMPASS CALL MODS		14,000				14,000
68	RC–135		8,000				8,000
75	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		4,700				4,700
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
81	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		21,900				21,900
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
99	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		59,000				59,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**305,600**				**305,600**

	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE				
	CARTRIDGES				
2	CARTRIDGES		13,592		13,592
	BOMBS				
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		23,211		23,211
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,419	53,923	1,419	53,923
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B				
6	CAD/PAD		2,638		2,638
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,600		2,600
	FUZES				
11	FLARES		11,726		11,726
12	FUZES		8,513		8,513
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**1,419**	**116,203**	**1,419**	**116,203**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	TACTICAL				
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	304	34,350	304	34,350
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**304**	**34,350**	**304**	**34,350**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES				
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		2,010		2,010
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,675		2,675
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES				
6	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,557		2,557
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
8	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,329		4,329
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT				
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		984		984
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,120		9,120
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS				

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
22	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		5,600				5,600
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
27	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		11,157				11,157
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
49	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		7,000				7,000
53	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		10,654				10,654
	MODIFICATIONS						
54	COMM ELECT MODS		8,000				8,000
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
55	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		902				902
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
59	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		60,090				60,090
62	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		9,400				9,400
63	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,175				9,175
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
069A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,672,317				2,672,317
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
71	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		2,300				2,300
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**2,818,270**				**2,818,270**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
15	TELEPORT PROGRAM		5,260				5,260
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
045A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		126,201				126,201
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						

61	MQ–8 UAV		16,500			16,500
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
68	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	4	151		4	151
69	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	41	30,528		41	30,528
77	TACTICAL VEHICLES	54	1,843		54	1,843
82	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	1	1,000		1	1,000
86	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	12	108		12	108
91	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	31	14,758		31	14,758
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**143**	**196,349**		**143**	**196,349**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
1	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		100,000	–50,000		50,000
	Program reduction			[–50,000]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**100,000**	**–50,000**		**50,000**
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT					
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
999	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT			500,000		500,000
	Program increase			[500,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT			**500,000**		**500,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**15,041**	**9,687,241**	**620,400**	**15,041**	**10,307,641**

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 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	20,860		20,860
2	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	219,180		219,180
3	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	80,986		80,986
4	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	123,045		123,045
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**444,071**		**444,071**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
5	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	29,041	10,250	39,291
		Advanced coating technologies for corrosion mitigation		[10,250]	
6	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	45,260		45,260
7	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	22,439		22,439
8	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	51,607		51,607
9	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	15,068		15,068
10	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	49,383		49,383
11	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	25,999		25,999
12	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	23,507		23,507

13	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	69,062		69,062
14	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	60,823		60,823
15	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	4,465		4,465
16	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,169		7,169
17	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	35,218		35,218
18	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	60,300		60,300
19	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	53,244		53,244
20	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	18,850		18,850
21	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	19,872		19,872
22	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,095		20,095
23	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	28,852		28,852
24	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	9,830		9,830
25	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	70,693		70,693
26	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	17,781		17,781
27	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	28,281		28,281
28	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	107,891		107,891
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**874,730**	**10,250**	**884,980**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
29	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,359		39,359
30	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	69,580		69,580
31	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,215		64,215
32	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	67,613		67,613
33	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	104,359		104,359
34	0603006A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,157		4,157
35	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,856		9,856
36	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,661		50,661
37	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	9,126		9,126
38	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	17,257		17,257
39	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	9,925		9,925
40	0603105A	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,984		6,984
41	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	9,716		9,716

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
42	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	3,487		3,487
43	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,323		2,323
44	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	21,683		21,683
45	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	71,111		71,111
46	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	10,902		10,902
47	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	180,582		180,582
48	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	27,204		27,204
49	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,095		6,095
50	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,217		37,217
51	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	13,626		13,626
52	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,458		28,458
53	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	25,226		25,226
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**890,722**		**890,722**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
54	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	14,505		14,505
55	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	9,876		9,876
56	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	5,054		5,054
57	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS—ADV DEV	2,725		2,725
58	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,560		30,560
59	0603653A	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	14,347		14,347
60	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	10,073		10,073
61	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	8,660		8,660
62	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,715		10,715
63	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	4,631		4,631
64	0603782A	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL—DEM/VAL	278,018		278,018
65	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,961		4,961

66	0603801A	AVIATION—ADV DEV	8,602		8,602
67	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	14,605		14,605
68	0603805A	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	5,054		5,054
69	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	24,384		24,384
70	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	32,050		32,050
71	0603850A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	96		96
72	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	24,868		24,868
73	0604131A	TRACTOR JUTE	59		59
75	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2–INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	76,039		76,039
77	0604785A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE (BUDGET ACTIVITY 4)	4,043		4,043
78	0305205A	ENDURANCE UAVS	26,196		26,196
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**610,121**		**610,121**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
79	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	78,538		78,538
80	0604220A	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS	90,494		90,494
81	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	181,347	–5,000	176,347
		Program adjustment		[–5,000]	
83	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	12,636		12,636
84	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	5,694		5,694
85	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	32,095		32,095
86	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	96,478	–3,400	93,078
		XM25 funding ahead of need		[–3,400]	
87	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,006		3,006
89	0604611A	JAVELIN	5,040		5,040
90	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,077		3,077
91	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,769		9,769
92	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	13,141		13,141
99	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	32,621		32,621
100	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,132		2,132
101	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	44,787		44,787
102	0604716A	TERRAIN INFORMATION—ENG DEV	1,008		1,008

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
103	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	73,333		73,333
104	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,937		28,937
105	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	10,815		10,815
106	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	13,926		13,926
107	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	17,797		17,797
108	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	214,270		214,270
109	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	14,581		14,581
110	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	43,706		43,706
111	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	20,776		20,776
112	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	43,395		43,395
113	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	104,983		104,983
114	0604814A	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS—EMD	4,346		4,346
116	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	77,223		77,223
117	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	3,486		3,486
118	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	9,963		9,963
119	0604823A	FIREFINDER	20,517		20,517
120	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	51,851		51,851
121	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	167,797		167,797
122	0604869A	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	400,861	–400,861	
		Prohibition of funds for MEADS		[–400,861]	
123	0604870A	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	7,922		7,922
124	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	51,463		51,463
125	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	158,646		158,646
126	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	10,000		10,000
128	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	69,029		69,029
129	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	277,374		277,374
130	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	639,874		639,874

131	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	47,426		47,426
132	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	72,295		72,295
133	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	4,232		4,232
134	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	13,942		13,942
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**3,286,629**	**–409,261**	**2,877,368**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
135	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	18,090		18,090
136	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	14,034		14,034
137	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	37,394		37,394
138	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	21,026		21,026
139	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	176,816		176,816
140	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	27,902		27,902
142	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	369,900		369,900
143	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	69,183		69,183
144	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	44,753		44,753
146	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	5,762		5,762
147	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,402		7,402
148	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	19,954		19,954
149	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	5,535		5,535
150	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	67,789		67,789
151	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	62,765		62,765
152	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	1,545		1,545
153	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	83,422		83,422
154	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	50,820		50,820
155	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	46,763		46,763
156	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	4,601		4,601
157	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	18,524		18,524
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,153,980**		**1,153,980**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
159	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	143,005		143,005

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
161	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	109,978		109,978
162	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	190,422	–19,000	171,422
		Program adjustment		[–19,000]	
164	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	32,556		32,556
165	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	253,959		253,959
166	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	68,325		68,325
167	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	280,247	–54,100	226,147
		Ahead of need		[–54,100]	
168	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	898		898
169	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	35,180		35,180
171	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	20,733		20,733
172	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	63,243		63,243
173	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	31,738		31,738
174	0208058A	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	35		35
176	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	7,591		7,591
177	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	15,961		15,961
178	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	120,927		120,927
179	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	15,756		15,756
180	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	14,443		14,443
182	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	31,303		31,303
183	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	40,876		40,876
184	0305219A	MQ–1 SKY WARRIOR A UAV	74,618		74,618
185	0305232A	RQ–11 UAV	4,039		4,039
186	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	31,158		31,158
187	0305235A	VERTICAL UAS	2,387		2,387
188	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	15,248		15,248
189	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	59,908		59,908

189A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,628		4,628
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,669,162**	**–73,100**	**1,596,062**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**8,929,415**	**–472,111**	**8,457,304**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	113,690	10,000	123,690
		Increase Defense University Research Instrumentation Program		[10,000]	
2	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,261		18,261
3	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	473,070		473,070
003A	0601XXXN	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY		3,450	3,450
		Transfer from PE 0205658N		[3,450]	
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**605,021**	**13,450**	**618,471**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
4	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	89,189		89,189
5	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	143,301		143,301
6	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	46,528		46,528
7	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	41,696		41,696
8	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	44,127		44,127
9	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	78,228		78,228
10	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	49,635		49,635
11	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	5,973		5,973
12	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	96,814		96,814
13	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	162,417		162,417
14	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	32,394		32,394
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**790,302**		**790,302**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
15	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	56,543		56,543
16	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	18,616		18,616

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
19	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	54,858		54,858
20	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	130,598		130,598
21	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,706		11,706
22	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	256,382		256,382
23	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,880		3,880
25	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	51,819		51,819
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**584,402**		**584,402**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
28	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	34,085		34,085
29	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	8,783		8,783
30	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,773		3,773
31	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	24,512		24,512
32	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,090		8,090
33	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,301		5,301
34	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,506		1,506
35	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	190,622		190,622
36	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	93,346		93,346
37	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	108,871		108,871
39	0603525N	PILOT FISH	101,169		101,169
40	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	74,312		74,312
41	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	90,730		90,730
42	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	777		777
43	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	6,704		6,704
44	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	555,123	374,400	929,523
		Program increase		[374,400]	
45	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	9,368		9,368

46	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	24,609	24,609
47	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	13,710	13,710
48	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	249,748	249,748
49	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	29,897	29,897
50	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	509,988	509,988
51	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	429,420	429,420
52	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	56,551	56,551
53	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,342	7,342
54	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	95,182	95,182
55	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	10,496	10,496
56	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	52,331	52,331
57	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	56,512	56,512
58	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,029	7,029
59	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	21,080	21,080
60	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	55,324	55,324
61	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	3,401	3,401
62	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	45,966	45,966
63	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,811	3,811
64	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	341,305	341,305
65	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	181,220	181,220
66	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	174,014	174,014
68	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	68,654	68,654
69	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	44,487	44,487
70	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,389	9,389
71	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	16,132	16,132
72	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	44,994	44,994
73	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	137,369	137,369
76	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	73,934	73,934
77	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	711	711
78	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	71,300	71,300
79	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	5,654	5,654
80	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	31,549	31,549

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
82	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	86,801		86,801
83	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	44,500		44,500
84	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	13,172		13,172
86	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	643		643
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,335,297**	**374,400**	**4,709,697**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
87	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	33,978		33,978
88	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	32,789		32,789
89	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	84,988		84,988
90	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	6,866		6,866
91	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,060		4,060
92	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,451		3,451
93	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	13,071		13,071
94	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	71,645		71,645
95	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	119,065		119,065
96	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	31,105		31,105
97	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	34,299		34,299
98	0604262N	V–22A	54,412		54,412
99	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	2,717		2,717
100	0604269N	EA–18	13,009		13,009
101	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	51,304		51,304
102	0604273N	VH–71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	61,163		61,163
103	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	187,024		187,024
104	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	337,480		337,480
105	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	260,616	250,000	510,616
		Cruiser Retention		[250,000]	

106	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	824		824
107	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	31,064		31,064
108	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	63,891		63,891
109	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	73,246		73,246
110	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	10,568		10,568
111	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	39,974		39,974
112	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM	122,481	–75,000	47,481
		Transfer from RDN 112 to RDN 167		[–75,000]	
113	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	255,516		255,516
114	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	82,620		82,620
115	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	5,633		5,633
116	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	55,826		55,826
117	0604518N	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	918		918
118	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	165,230		165,230
119	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	49,141		49,141
120	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	196,737		196,737
121	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,889		3,889
122	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	8,335		8,335
123	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	49,818		49,818
124	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,099		10,099
125	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,348		7,348
126	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	5,518		5,518
127	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	87,662		87,662
128	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	64,079		64,079
129	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	151,489	1,125	152,614
		Cruiser Retention		[1,125]	
131	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	12,707		12,707
132	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	47,764		47,764
133	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	737,149		737,149
134	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	743,926		743,926
135	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,143		12,143
136	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	72,209		72,209

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
138	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	606,204		606,204
140	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	421,102		421,102
141	0204202N	DDG–1000	124,655		124,655
142	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	1,170		1,170
144	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	23,255		23,255
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,747,232**	**176,125**	**5,923,357**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
146	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	30,790		30,790
147	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	59,221		59,221
148	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	35,894		35,894
149	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	7,573		7,573
150	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	20,963		20,963
151	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	46,856		46,856
153	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	796		796
154	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	32,782		32,782
155	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,306		3,306
156	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	70,302		70,302
157	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	144,033		144,033
158	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	342,298		342,298
159	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,399		16,399
160	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	4,579		4,579
161	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	8,000		8,000
162	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	18,490		18,490
163	0305885N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	2,795		2,795
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**845,077**		**845,077**

		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
167	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT.	142,282	75,000	217,282
		Transfer from RDN 112 to RDN 167		[75,000]	
170	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	105,892		105,892
171	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,729		34,729
172	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,434		1,434
173	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	19,208		19,208
174	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	25,566		25,566
175	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	188,299		188,299
176	0204152N	E–2 SQUADRONS	8,610		8,610
177	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	15,695		15,695
178	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	4,171		4,171
179	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	11,265		11,265
180	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	45,922		45,922
181	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	8,435		8,435
182	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	75,088		75,088
183	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	20,229		20,229
184	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,756		1,756
185	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	19,843		19,843
186	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	11,477		11,477
187	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	118,818		118,818
188	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	27,342		27,342
189	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	28,717		28,717
190	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	89,157		89,157
191	0205658N	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,450	–3,450	
		Transfer to Science and Technology (RDN 003A)		[–3,450]	
192	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	86,435		86,435
193	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	219,054		219,054
194	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	181,693		181,693
195	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	58,393		58,393
196	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	22,966		22,966

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
197	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,107		21,107
198	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,857		2,857
199	0208058N	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	1,932		1,932
204	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	188,482		188,482
205	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	16,749		16,749
206	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	26,307		26,307
207	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	500		500
210	0305149N	COBRA JUDY	17,091		17,091
211	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	810		810
212	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	8,617		8,617
213	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	9,066		9,066
215	0305207N	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	30,654		30,654
216	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	25,917		25,917
217	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	14,676		14,676
218	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	657,483		657,483
219	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	99,600		99,600
220	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	495		495
221	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	863		863
223	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	9,734		9,734
225	0305239M	RQ–21A	22,343		22,343
226	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	5,908		5,908
227	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	27,391		27,391
229	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	54,879		54,879
230	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	5,000		5,000
230A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,151,159	200,000	1,351,159
		Program increase		[200,000]	
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,975,546**	**271,550**	**4,247,096**

		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**16,882,877**	**835,525**	**17,718,402**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	361,787		361,787
2	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	141,153		141,153
3	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,094		13,094
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**516,034**		**516,034**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
4	0602102F	MATERIALS	114,166		114,166
5	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	120,719		120,719
6	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	89,319		89,319
7	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	232,547		232,547
8	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	127,637		127,637
9	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	98,375		98,375
10	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	77,175		77,175
11	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	106,196		106,196
12	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	104,362		104,362
13	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	38,557		38,557
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,109,053**		**1,109,053**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
14	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	47,890	10,000	57,890
		Increase Materials Affordability Initiative program		[10,000]	
15	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	6,565		6,565
16	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	37,657		37,657
17	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	81,376		81,376
18	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	151,152		151,152
19	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	32,941		32,941
20	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	64,557		64,557

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
21	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	29,256		29,256
22	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	21,523		21,523
23	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	36,352		36,352
24	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,004		19,004
25	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	37,045		37,045
26	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	31,419		31,419
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**596,737**	**10,000**	**606,737**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
28	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,866		3,866
29	0603287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,704		3,704
30	0603430F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	229,171	–1,500	227,671
		Project decrease		[–1,500]	
31	0603432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	120,676		120,676
32	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	25,144	–2,000	23,144
		Project decrease		[–2,000]	
33	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	32,243		32,243
34	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,507		4,507
35	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	652		652
36	0603830F	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP)	10,429		10,429
37	0603850F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE—DEM/VAL	19,938		19,938
38	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	71,181		71,181
39	0603854F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE)	12,027		12,027
40	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL	2,054		2,054
41	0603860F	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	57,975		57,975
42	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	291,742		291,742
43	0604283F	BATTLE MGMT COM & CTRL SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	114,417		114,417

44	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,576		2,576
45	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	16,711		16,711
47	0604337F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,343		16,343
48	0604422F	WEATHER SATELLITE FOLLOW-ON	2,000		2,000
50	0604635F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	9,423		9,423
54	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE		25,000	25,000
		Operationally Responsive Space		[25,000]	
55	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	37,558	–3,000	34,558
		Project decrease		[–3,000]	
56	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	96,840		96,840
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,181,177**	**18,500**	**1,199,677**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
58	0603840F	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	14,652		14,652
59	0604222F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	25,713		25,713
60	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	6,583		6,583
61	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,975		1,975
62	0604280F	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	2,594		2,594
63	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	24,534		24,534
64	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	51		51
65	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	143,000		143,000
66	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	28,797		28,797
67	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	267,252		267,252
68	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	4,118		4,118
69	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	448,594	–2,000	446,594
		Project decrease		[–2,000]	
70	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	9,951		9,951
71	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,567		2,567
72	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	13,059		13,059
73	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	9,720		9,720
74	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	9,222		9,222
76	0604750F	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	803		803

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
77	0604800F	F–35—EMD	1,210,306		1,210,306
78	0604851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—EMD	135,437		135,437
79	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	7,980		7,980
80	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	2,004		2,004
81	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	73,512		73,512
82	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	140,100		140,100
83	0605221F	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT	1,815,588		1,815,588
84	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	123,210		123,210
85	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	19,039		19,039
86	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	281,056		281,056
87	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	80,200		80,200
89	0207604F	READINESS TRAINING RANGES, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	310		310
90	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	14,861		14,861
91	0305230F	MC–12	19,949		19,949
92	0401138F	C–27J AIRLIFT SQUADRONS		25,000	25,000
		Joint Cargo Aircraft		[25,000]	
93	0401318F	CV–22	28,027		28,027
94	0401845F	AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S)	1,960		1,960
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**4,966,724**	**23,000**	**4,989,724**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
95	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	22,812		22,812
96	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,236		42,236
97	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	25,579		25,579
99	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	16,197		16,197
100	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	722,071		722,071
101	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	16,200		16,200

102	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	10,051	34,950	45,001
		Program increase		[34,950]	
103	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	42,597		42,597
104	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,301		27,301
105	0606323F	MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE	13,964		13,964
106	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	203,766		203,766
107	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	42,430		42,430
108	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,294		1,294
111	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,851		3,851
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,190,349**	**34,950**	**1,225,299**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
112	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	371,595	–1,500	370,095
		Project decrease		[–1,500]	
114	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF–IPPS)	91,697		91,697
115	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	17,037		17,037
117	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	53,208		53,208
118	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	431		431
119	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	16,265		16,265
120	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	35,970		35,970
121	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	30,889		30,889
122	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	10		10
124	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	5,609		5,609
126	0203761F	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND	15,098		15,098
127	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	147,971		147,971
128	0207040F	MULTI-PLATFORM ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT	49,848		49,848
129	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS	13,538		13,538
130	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	190,257		190,257
131	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	192,677		192,677
132	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	13,683		13,683
133	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	371,667		371,667
134	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	8,117		8,117

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
135	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	8,234		8,234
136	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	87,041		87,041
137	0207170F	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	1,472		1,472
138	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	2,095		2,095
139	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	1,119		1,119
140	0207247F	AF TENCAP	63,853		63,853
141	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,063		1,063
142	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	12,094		12,094
143	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	187,984		187,984
145	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	7,950		7,950
146	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	76,315		76,315
147	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	8,653		8,653
148	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	65,200		65,200
149	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,767		5,767
152	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	5,756		5,756
154	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	16,226		16,226
156	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,633		1,633
157	0207449F	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	18,086		18,086
158	0207452F	DCAPES	15,690		15,690
159	0207581F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	24,241		24,241
160	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	22,654		22,654
161	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	15,501		15,501
162	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,699		5,699
163	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,425		4,425
164	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	69,377		69,377
165	0208021F	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	7,159		7,159
166	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	66,888		66,888

174	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	12,056	12,056
175	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	4,159	4,159
176	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	20,124	20,124
177	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	69,133	69,133
178	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	6,512	6,512
179	0303150F	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	4,316	4,316
180	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	107,237	107,237
182	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	129,106	129,106
185	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,461	4,461
186	0305103F	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,055	2,055
187	0305105F	DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER	285	285
188	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	33,773	33,773
189	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	29,048	29,048
190	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	43,187	43,187
191	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	50,496	50,496
194	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	354	354
195	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	4,000	4,000
196	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	342	342
198	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	29,621	29,621
199	0305165F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	14,335	14,335
201	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,680	3,680
202	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,430	2,430
203	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	8,760	8,760
205	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	23,644	23,644
206	0305205F	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	21,000	21,000
207	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	96,735	96,735
208	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,316	13,316
209	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	63,501	63,501
210	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	9,122	9,122
211	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	236,265	236,265
212	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	7,367	7,367
213	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)	38,094	38,094

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
214	0305238F	NATO AGS	210,109		210,109
215	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	24,500		24,500
216	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	318,992		318,992
217	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	54,645		54,645
218	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	4,007		4,007
219	0305887F	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	13,357		13,357
220	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	64,965		64,965
221	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	19,586		19,586
223	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,175		1,175
224	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	5,000		5,000
225	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	35,115		35,115
226	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	99,225		99,225
227	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	30,652		30,652
228	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	7,758		7,758
229	0401139F	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT (LIMA)	100		100
231	0401219F	KC–10S	24,022		24,022
232	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	7,471		7,471
234	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS/COMBAT CONTROL	4,984		4,984
235	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,588		1,588
236	0708012F	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	577		577
237	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	119,327		119,327
238	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	15,873		15,873
240	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	349		349
242	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	117		117
243	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	2,018		2,018
244	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,561		1,561
245	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	7,634		7,634

246	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,175		1,175
247	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	3,491		3,491
248	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	100,160		100,160
249A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,172,183		11,172,183
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**15,867,972**	**–1,500**	**15,866,472**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**25,428,046**	**84,950**	**25,512,996**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	45,071		45,071
2	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	309,051		309,051
3	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	19,405		19,405
4	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	39,676		39,676
5	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	87,979		87,979
6	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	50,566		50,566
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**551,748**		**551,748**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
7	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	20,615		20,615
8	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	110,900		110,900
9	0602228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE		10,000	10,000
		Program increase		[10,000]	
10	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	36,826		36,826
11	0602250D8Z	SYSTEMS 2020 APPLIED RESEARCH	7,898		7,898
12	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	392,421		392,421
13	0602304E	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	30,424		30,424
15	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	19,236		19,236
16	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	223,269		223,269
17	0602663D8Z	DATA TO DECISIONS APPLIED RESEARCH	13,753		13,753
18	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	18,985		18,985
19	0602670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH	6,771		6,771

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
20	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	233,209		233,209
21	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	166,067		166,067
22	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	222,416		222,416
23	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	172,352		172,352
24	1160401BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	28,739		28,739
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,703,881**	**10,000**	**1,713,881**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)			
25	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,612		25,612
26	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	26,324		26,324
27	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	77,144		77,144
28	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	275,022		275,022
29	0603175C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	79,975		79,975
31	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	20,032		20,032
32	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	3,892		3,892
33	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	36,685		36,685
34	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	174,316	–25,000	149,316
		Program decrease		[–25,000]	
35	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	159,704		159,704
36	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	234,280		234,280
37	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,983		6,983
38	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	158,263		158,263
39	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	25,393		25,393
40	0603663D8Z	DATA TO DECISIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,754		13,754
42	0603668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH	19,935		19,935
43	0603670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,235		8,235
44	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	21,966		21,966

45	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,662		24,662
47	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	24,605		24,605
48	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	30,678		30,678
49	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	65,282		65,282
50	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	72,234	10,000	82,234
		Program increase		[10,000]	
51	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	8,403		8,403
52	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	111,008		111,008
54	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	237,859	–25,000	212,859
		Program reduction		[–25,000]	
55	0603765E	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	3,000		3,000
56	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	236,883		236,883
57	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	299,438		299,438
58	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,195		12,195
59	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	30,036		30,036
60	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	107,002		107,002
62	0603828J	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	21,230		21,230
63	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	47,433		47,433
64	0603901C	DIRECTED ENERGY RESEARCH	46,944	30,000	76,944
		Program increase		[30,000]	
65	0603902C	NEXT GENERATION AEGIS MISSILE	224,077		224,077
66	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	92,602		92,602
68	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	26,244		26,244
69	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	53,946		53,946
70	1160402BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	45,317		45,317
71	1160422BB	AVIATION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	861		861
72	1160472BB	SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,959		4,959
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)	**3,194,413**	**–10,000**	**3,184,413**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
73	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	33,234		33,234
74	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	21,023		21,023

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
75	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	94,624		94,624
77	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	16,958		16,958
78	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	75,941		75,941
79	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	316,929		316,929
80	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	903,172	460,000	1,363,172
		East Coast site planning and development, and EIS work		[103,000]	
		Program increase		[357,000]	
81	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	179,023		179,023
82	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	347,012		347,012
84	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	362,711		362,711
85	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	272,387		272,387
86	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	992,407		992,407
87	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	51,313		51,313
88	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	6,912		6,912
89	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION.	366,552		366,552
90	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	55,550		55,550
91	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	63,043		63,043
92	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	11,371		11,371
93	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	9,730		9,730
94	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	99,836	168,000	267,836
		Increase to DSWS, ASIP, Arrow-3 cooperative programs		[168,000]	
95	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	454,400		454,400
96	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	435,747		435,747
97	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	13,231		13,231
98	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	11,398		11,398
99	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	3,283		3,283

100	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	12,368		12,368
101	0604670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING	5,131		5,131
104	0604787J	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	3,273		3,273
106	0604828J	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	7,364		7,364
107	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	276,338		276,338
108	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	420,630		420,630
109	0604883C	PRECISION TRACKING SPACE SENSOR RDT&E	297,375	–247,375	50,000
		Project decrease to support technology development		[–247,375]	
111	0604886C	ADVANCED REMOTE SENSOR TECHNOLOGY (ARST)	58,742		58,742
113	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,158		3,158
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**6,282,166**	**380,625**	**6,662,791**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)			
115	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	6,817		6,817
116	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	110,383		110,383
117	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	311,071		311,071
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS–JPO)	25,787		25,787
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	20,688		20,688
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	5,749		5,749
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,699		12,699
125	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	387		387
126	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	1,859		1,859
127	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	7,010		7,010
128	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	133,104		133,104
129	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	25,269		25,269
131	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	10,238		10,238
132	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,670		19,670
133	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	3,556		3,556
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)	**694,287**		**694,287**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
135	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	6,383		6,383

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
136	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,845		3,845
137	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	144,109		144,109
138	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	2,419		2,419
139	0604943D8Z	THERMAL VICAR	8,214		8,214
140	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	19,380		19,380
141	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	32,266		32,266
142	0605110D8Z	USD(A&T)—CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	840		840
143	0605117D8Z	FOREIGN MATERIEL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	56,012		56,012
144	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	55,508		55,508
146	0605130D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	18,174		18,174
147	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	43,195		43,195
148	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	6,457		6,457
149	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,901		4,901
150	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	6,307		6,307
151	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	6,601		6,601
152	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	92,849		92,849
159	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (S	1,857		1,857
160	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	12,056		12,056
162	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	55,454		55,454
163	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	16,364		16,364
164	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,110		15,110
166	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	69,767		69,767
167	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,454		4,454
169	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	2,637		2,637
174	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	8,238		8,238
176	0305103E	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	1,801		1,801
177	0305193D8Z	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	16,041		16,041

180	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	77,475		77,475
182	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	34,855		34,855
183	0901598D8W	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS	104		104
184A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	64,255		64,255
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**887,928**		**887,928**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
185	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	8,866		8,866
186	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MGMT	3,238		3,238
187	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	288		288
188	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	14,745		14,745
190	0607828J	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	5,013		5,013
191	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,922		3,922
192	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	72,574		72,574
194	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	6,214		6,214
201	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	499		499
202	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	14,498		14,498
203	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	26,164		26,164
204	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	12,931		12,931
205	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	6,296		6,296
206	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	30,948		30,948
207	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	11,780		11,780
208	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	191,452	50,000	241,452
		Program increase		[50,000]	
211	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	36,575	10,000	46,575
		Program increase		[10,000]	
212	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	24,278		24,278
213	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	2,924		2,924
214	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	1,294		1,294
215	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	6,050		6,050
217	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	17,058		17,058
222	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	4,189		4,189

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
223	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	10,462		10,462
227	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	6,360		6,360
229	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	21,190		21,190
232	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	7,114	600	7,714
		Program increase		[600]	
235	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,247		3,247
237	0305219BB	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	1,355		1,355
240	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,303		2,303
241	0305600D8Z	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES	1,478		1,478
249	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	27,044		27,044
250	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	4,711		4,711
251	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	4,100		4,100
253	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	3,002		3,002
257	1160403BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	97,267		97,267
258	1160404BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	821		821
259	1160405BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	25,935		25,935
260	1160408BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	51,700		51,700
261	1160421BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV–22 DEVELOPMENT	1,822		1,822
262	1160427BB	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	10,131		10,131
263	1160429BB	AC/MC–130J	19,647		19,647
264	1160474BB	SOF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS	2,225		2,225
265	1160476BB	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	3,036		3,036
266	1160477BB	SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	1,511		1,511
267	1160478BB	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	4,263		4,263
268	1160479BB	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	4,448		4,448
269	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	11,325		11,325
270	1160481BB	SOF MUNITIONS	1,515		1,515

271	1160482BB	SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION	24,430		24,430
272	1160483BB	SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	26,405	35,000	61,405
		Program increase		[35,000]	
273	1160484BB	SOF SURFACE CRAFT	8,573		8,573
275	1160489BB	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	7,620		7,620
276	1160490BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	16,386		16,386
276A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,754,516	19,900	3,774,416
		Program increases		[19,900]	
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**4,667,738**	**115,500**	**4,783,238**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**17,982,161**	**496,125**	**18,478,286**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
1	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	72,501	35,000	107,501
		Program increase for DOT&E cyber—range operations		[25,000]	
		Program increase for DOT&E cyber—threat development and assessment		[10,000]	
2	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	49,201		49,201
3	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	63,566		63,566
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**185,268**	**35,000**	**220,268**
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**185,268**	**35,000**	**220,268**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**69,407,767**	**979,489**	**70,387,256**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
60	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	19,860		19,860
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**19,860**		**19,860**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**19,860**		**19,860**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
56	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	4,600		4,600
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,600**		**4,600**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
131	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,173		2,173
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**2,173**		**2,173**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
160	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	5,200		5,200
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**5,200**		**5,200**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
195	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	6,762		6,762
221	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	7,600		7,600
230A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	33,784		33,784
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**48,146**		**48,146**

		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**60,119**		**60,119**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
249A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	53,150		53,150
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**53,150**		**53,150**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**53,150**		**53,150**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
9	0602228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE		10,000	10,000
		Program increase		[10,000]	
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH		**10,000**	**10,000**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)			
27	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT		25,000	25,000
		Program increase		[25,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)		**25,000**	**25,000**
94	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS		680,000	680,000
		Iron Dome		[680,000]	
102	0604775D8Z	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM		200,000	200,000
		Program increase		[200,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		**880,000**	**880,000**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
239	0305231BB	MQ–8 UAV	5,000		5,000
276A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	107,387		107,387
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**112,387**		**112,387**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**112,387**	**915,000**	**1,027,387**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**245,516**	**915,000**	**1,160,516**

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	MANEUVER UNITS	1,223,087		1,223,087
20	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	80,574		80,574
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	723,039		723,039
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	706,974		706,974
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,226,650		1,226,650
60	AVIATION ASSETS	1,319,832		1,319,832
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,447,174		3,447,174
80	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	454,774		454,774
90	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,762,757		1,762,757
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,401,613		7,401,613
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	3,041,074	193,600	3,234,674
	Realignment to Cemeterial Expenses, Army		[–25,000]	
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[218,600]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	410,171		410,171
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	177,819		177,819
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	461,333		461,333
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**22,436,871**	**193,600**	**22,630,471**
	MOBILIZATION			

180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	405,496		405,496
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	195,349		195,349
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,379		6,379
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**607,224**		**607,224**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	112,866		112,866
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	73,265		73,265
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	51,227		51,227
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	443,306		443,306
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	1,099,556		1,099,556
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,130,627		1,130,627
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	191,683		191,683
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	652,095		652,095
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	507,510		507,510
300	EXAMINING	156,964		156,964
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	244,343		244,343
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	212,477		212,477
330	JUNIOR ROTC	182,691		182,691
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**5,058,610**		**5,058,610**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	601,331		601,331
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	741,324		741,324
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	610,136		610,136
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	478,707		478,707
390	ADMINISTRATION	556,307		556,307
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,547,925		1,547,925
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	362,205		362,205
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	220,754		220,754
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,153,556	–3,047	1,150,509
	Army Museum Funding (Early to need)		[–3,047]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	250,970		250,970
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	222,351		222,351
460	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	222,379		222,379
470	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	459,710		459,710
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	25,637		25,637
490	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,052,595		1,052,595
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**8,505,887**	**–3,047**	**8,502,840**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
500	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–350,700	–350,700
	Army Medical Evacuation Paramedic Certification Training		[5,000]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–289,200]	
	Overestimate of Foreign Currency Fluctuation Costs		[–66,500]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–350,700**	**–350,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**36,608,592**	**–160,147**	**36,448,445**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,918,144	9,000	4,927,144
	Cruiser Retention		[9,000]	
20	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,886,825		1,886,825
30	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	44,032		44,032
40	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	101,565		101,565
50	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	374,827		374,827
60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	960,802		960,802
70	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	37,545		37,545

80	AVIATION LOGISTICS	328,805		328,805
90	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	4,686,535	24,650	4,711,185
	Cruiser Retention		[24,650]	
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	769,204		769,204
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,089,981	67,963	5,157,944
	Cruiser Retention		[67,963]	
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,315,366	13,871	1,329,237
	Cruiser Retention		[13,871]	
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	619,909		619,909
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	92,364		92,364
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	174,437		174,437
160	WARFARE TACTICS	441,035		441,035
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	333,554		333,554
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	910,087		910,087
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	167,158		167,158
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	4,183		4,183
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	95,528		95,528
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	204,569		204,569
230	CRUISE MISSILE	111,884		111,884
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,181,038		1,181,038
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	87,606		87,606
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	519,583		519,583
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	300,435		300,435
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	1,077,924		1,077,924
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	2,101,279	54,600	2,155,879
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[54,600]	
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,822,093		4,822,093
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**33,758,297**	**170,084**	**33,928,381**
	MOBILIZATION			
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	334,659		334,659
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,562		6,562

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	1,066,329	–479,000	587,329
	Cruiser Retention		[–9,000]	
	Fiscal year 2013 portion of USS ENTERPRISE Inactivation Costs		[–470,000]	
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	83,901		83,901
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,695		2,695
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	23,502		23,502
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**1,517,648**	**–479,000**	**1,038,648**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	147,807		147,807
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,473		10,473
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	139,220		139,220
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	582,177		582,177
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	5,456		5,456
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	170,746		170,746
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	153,403		153,403
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	241,329	938	242,267
	Naval Sea Cadet Corps		[938]	
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	108,226		108,226
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	105,776		105,776
470	JUNIOR ROTC	51,817		51,817
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,716,430**	**938**	**1,717,368**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	797,177		797,177
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	12,872		12,872
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	120,181		120,181

510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	235,753		235,753
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	263,060		263,060
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	363,213		363,213
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	182,343		182,343
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	282,464		282,464
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,092,123		1,092,123
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	53,560		53,560
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,299		25,299
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	64,418		64,418
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	580,042		580,042
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,984		4,984
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	537,079		537,079
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**4,614,568**		**4,614,568**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
720	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–166,400	–166,400
	Historical unobligated balances		[–166,400]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–166,400**	**–166,400**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**41,606,943**	**–474,378**	**41,132,565**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	OPERATIONAL FORCES	788,055		788,055
20	FIELD LOGISTICS	762,614		762,614
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	168,447		168,447
40	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	100,374		100,374
50	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	825,039	22,800	847,839
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[22,800]	
60	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,188,883		2,188,883
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,833,412**	**22,800**	**4,856,212**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
70	RECRUIT TRAINING	18,251		18,251
80	OFFICER ACQUISITION	869		869
90	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	80,914		80,914
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	42,744		42,744
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	292,150		292,150
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	168,609	10,000	178,609
	Recruiting and advertising		[10,000]	
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	56,865		56,865
140	JUNIOR ROTC	19,912		19,912
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**680,314**	**10,000**	**690,314**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	39,962		39,962
170	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	83,404		83,404
190	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	346,071		346,071
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**469,437**		**469,437**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
200	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–23,900	–23,900
	Historical unobligated balances		[–23,900]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–23,900**	**–23,900**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**5,983,163**	**8,900**	**5,992,063**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			

10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,973,141		2,973,141
20	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,611,032	133,000	1,744,032
	Global Hawk Block 30		[133,000]	
30	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,472,806		1,472,806
40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,545,470		5,545,470
50	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,353,987	215,500	1,569,487
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[215,500]	
60	BASE SUPPORT	2,595,032		2,595,032
70	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	957,040		957,040
80	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	916,200		916,200
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	733,716		733,716
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	314,490		314,490
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	488,762		488,762
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	862,979		862,979
140	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	222,429		222,429
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**20,047,084**	**348,500**	**20,395,584**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,785,379		1,785,379
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	154,049		154,049
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,477,396		1,477,396
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	309,699		309,699
190	BASE SUPPORT	707,574		707,574
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**4,434,097**		**4,434,097**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	115,427		115,427
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	17,619		17,619
220	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	92,949		92,949
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	336,433		336,433
240	BASE SUPPORT	842,441		842,441
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	482,634		482,634

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	750,609		750,609
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	235,114		235,114
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	101,231		101,231
290	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	233,330		233,330
310	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	130,217		130,217
320	EXAMINING	2,738		2,738
330	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	155,170		155,170
340	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	175,147		175,147
350	JUNIOR ROTC	74,809		74,809
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,745,868**		**3,745,868**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
360	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,029,734		1,029,734
370	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	913,843		913,843
390	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	303,610		303,610
400	BASE SUPPORT	1,266,800		1,266,800
410	ADMINISTRATION	587,654		587,654
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	667,910		667,910
430	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,094,509		1,094,509
440	CIVIL AIR PATROL	23,904		23,904
470	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	81,307		81,307
480	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,239,040		1,239,040
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**7,208,311**		**7,208,311**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
490	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–43,700	–43,700
	Historical unobligated balances		[–141,700]	

	Overestimate of Foreign Currency Fluctuation Costs		[–32,000]	
	Retain Air Force Force Structure		[130,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–43,700**	**–43,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**35,435,360**	**304,800**	**35,740,160**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	485,708		485,708
20	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND		5,091,001	5,091,001
	Transfer from line 025		[5,091,001]	
25	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	5,091,001	–5,091,001	
	Transfer to Line 020		[–5,091,001]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,576,709**		**5,576,709**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
30	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	147,210	–2,500	144,710
	Program decrease		[–2,500]	
40	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	84,999	–2,500	82,499
	Program decrease		[–2,500]	
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**232,209**	**–5,000**	**227,209**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
50	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	161,294		161,294
80	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	573,973		573,973
90	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,293,196		1,293,196
100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	17,513		17,513
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	676,186		676,186
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,346,847		1,346,847
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	35,137		35,137
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	431,893		431,893
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	224,013		224,013

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	21,964		21,964
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	557,917		557,917
190	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE		506,662	506,662
	Transfer from Line 280		[506,662]	
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	35,319		35,319
210	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY		443,382	443,382
	Transfer from Line 280		[443,382]	
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,744,971		2,744,971
230	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	259,975		259,975
250	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	253,437		253,437
260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	2,095,362	40,000	2,135,362
	Advancing Diversity and EO		[5,000]	
	Office of Net Assessment		[10,000]	
	Readiness Environmental Protection Initiative		[25,000]	
270	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	521,297		521,297
280	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,933,801	–888,044	14,045,757
	Program increase		[62,000]	
	Transfer to Line 190		[–506,662]	
	Transfer to Line 210		[–443,382]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**26,184,095**	**102,000**	**26,286,095**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
290	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–107,700	–107,700
	DOD Impact Aid		[30,000]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–128,000]	
	Overestimate of Foreign Currency Fluctuation Costs		[–9,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–107,700**	**–107,700**

	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**31,993,013**	**–10,700**	**31,982,313**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	MANEUVER UNITS	1,391		1,391
20	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	20,889		20,889
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	592,724		592,724
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	114,983		114,983
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	633,091		633,091
60	AVIATION ASSETS	76,823		76,823
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	481,997		481,997
80	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	70,118		70,118
90	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	141,205		141,205
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	561,878		561,878
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	287,399	20,700	308,099
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[20,700]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	52,431		52,431
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,034,929**	**20,700**	**3,055,629**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
140	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	12,995		12,995
150	ADMINISTRATION	32,432		32,432
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	4,895		4,895
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	16,074		16,074
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	60,683		60,683
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**127,079**		**127,079**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		1,100	1,100
	Army Medical Evacuation Paramedic Certification Training		[5,000]	
	Deny request of increase for technicians		[–3,900]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**1,100**	**1,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**3,162,008**	**21,800**	**3,183,808**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	616,776		616,776
20	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	15,076		15,076
30	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	1,479		1,479
40	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	107,251		107,251
50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	355		355
60	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	82,186		82,186
70	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	589		589
80	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	48,593		48,593
90	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,274		15,274
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	124,917		124,917
110	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	1,978		1,978
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	43,699		43,699
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	60,646		60,646
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	105,227		105,227
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,224,046**		**1,224,046**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION	3,117		3,117
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	14,337		14,337
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,392		2,392
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,090		3,090

	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**22,936**		**22,936**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**1,246,982**		**1,246,982**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	OPERATING FORCES	89,690		89,690
20	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	16,735		16,735
30	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	37,913		37,913
40	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	103,746		103,746
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**248,084**		**248,084**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
50	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	873		873
60	ADMINISTRATION	14,330		14,330
70	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,998		8,998
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**24,201**		**24,201**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**272,285**		**272,285**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,089,326		2,089,326
20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	112,992		112,992
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	406,101		406,101
40	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	71,564	6,700	78,264
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[6,700]	
50	BASE SUPPORT	364,862		364,862
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,044,845**	**6,700**	**3,051,545**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
60	ADMINISTRATION	78,824		78,824

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
70	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	16,020		16,020
80	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	19,496		19,496
90	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,489		6,489
100	AUDIOVISUAL	808		808
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**121,637**		**121,637**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
110	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		161,617	161,617
	Retain Air Force Reserve Force Structure		[161,617]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**161,617**	**161,617**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**3,166,482**	**168,317**	**3,334,799**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	MANEUVER UNITS	680,206		680,206
20	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	186,408		186,408
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	865,628		865,628
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	112,651		112,651
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	36,091		36,091
60	AVIATION ASSETS	907,011		907,011
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	751,606		751,606
80	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	60,043		60,043
90	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	411,940		411,940
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	995,423		995,423
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	688,189	49,400	737,589
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[49,400]	

120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	953,716		953,716
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,648,912**	**49,400**	**6,698,312**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	11,806		11,806
140	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	1,656		1,656
150	ADMINISTRATION	89,358		89,358
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	39,513		39,513
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,224		7,224
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	310,143		310,143
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**459,700**		**459,700**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–79,700	–79,700
	Army Medical Evacuation Paramedic Certification Training		[5,000]	
	Deny request of increase for technicians		[–95,000]	
	Retain Army National Guard Force Structure		[10,300]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–79,700**	**–79,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**7,108,612**	**–30,300**	**7,078,312**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,559,824	3,505	3,563,329
	Aerospace Control Alert		[3,505]	
20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	721,225		721,225
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	774,875		774,875
40	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	270,709	24,700	295,409
	Restoration and Modernization of Facilities		[24,700]	
50	BASE SUPPORT	624,443		624,443
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,951,076**	**28,205**	**5,979,281**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
60	ADMINISTRATION	32,358		32,358
70	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	32,021		32,021
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**64,379**		**64,379**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
80	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		286,800	286,800
	Retain Air National Guard Force Structure		[286,800]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**286,800**	**286,800**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,015,455**	**315,005**	**6,330,460**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
20	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	108,759		108,759
30	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	519,111		519,111
40	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	274,198		274,198
50	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	335,921		335,921
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,237,989**		**1,237,989**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
60	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	310,594		310,594
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**310,594**		**310,594**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
70	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	529,263		529,263
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**529,263**		**529,263**

	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
10	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,516		13,516
80	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	11,133		11,133
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**24,649**		**24,649**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
90	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	237,543		237,543
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**237,543**		**237,543**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,340,038**		**2,340,038**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**174,938,933**	**143,297**	**175,082,230**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	2,758,162		2,758,162
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	991,396		991,396
60	AVIATION ASSETS	40,300		40,300
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,755,445		1,755,445
80	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	307,244		307,244
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	393,165		393,165
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	250,000		250,000
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	12,524,137	–129,000	12,395,137
	Reduction to Task Force for Business and Stability Operations		[–129,000]	
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	400,000	–200,000	200,000
	Historical underexecution		[–200,000]	
160	RESET	3,687,973	–250,000	3,437,973
	Unexecutable depot-level maintenance		[–250,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**23,107,822**	**–579,000**	**22,528,822**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	3,238,310		3,238,310
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	129,000		129,000
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	78,022		78,022
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	137,277		137,277
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	72,293		72,293
490	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,828,717		1,828,717

	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,483,619**		**5,483,619**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
500	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–179,700	–179,700
	Historical unobligated balances		[–179,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–179,700**	**–179,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**28,591,441**	**–758,700**	**27,832,741**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	937,098		937,098
30	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	1,000		1,000
40	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	15,794		15,794
50	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	19,013		19,013
60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	201,912		201,912
70	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,000		3,000
80	AVIATION LOGISTICS	44,150		44,150
90	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	463,738		463,738
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	24,774		24,774
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,310,010		1,310,010
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	42,965		42,965
160	WARFARE TACTICS	25,970		25,970
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	19,226		19,226
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,668,359		1,668,359
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	7,954		7,954
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	94,655		94,655
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	303,087		303,087
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	3,218		3,218
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	143,442		143,442
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,329,365**		**5,329,365**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	MOBILIZATION			
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	31,395		31,395
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	254,461		254,461
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**285,856**		**285,856**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	50,903		50,903
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**50,903**		**50,903**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	1,377		1,377
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	487		487
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	6,022		6,022
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	3,514		3,514
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	184,864		184,864
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	2,026		2,026
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,425		1,425
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,556		14,556
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**214,271**		**214,271**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
720	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–22,100	–22,100
	Historical unobligated balances		[–22,100]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–22,100**	**–22,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**5,880,395**	**–22,100**	**5,858,295**

	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	OPERATIONAL FORCES	1,921,258		1,921,258
20	FIELD LOGISTICS	1,094,028		1,094,028
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	222,824		222,824
60	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	88,690		88,690
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,326,800**		**3,326,800**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	215,212		215,212
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**215,212**		**215,212**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	512,627		512,627
190	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,701		11,701
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**524,328**		**524,328**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
200	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–15,600	–15,600
	Historical unobligated balances		[–15,600]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–15,600**	**–15,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**4,066,340**	**–15,600**	**4,050,740**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,494,144		1,494,144
20	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	809,531		809,531
30	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	13,095		13,095
40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,403,238		1,403,238
50	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	155,954		155,954
60	BASE SUPPORT	342,226		342,226

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
70	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	15,108		15,108
80	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	271,390		271,390
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	25,400		25,400
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,110		5,110
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	52,173		52,173
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,587,369**		**4,587,369**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,187,211		3,187,211
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	43,509		43,509
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	554,943		554,943
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	4,431		4,431
190	BASE SUPPORT	9,256		9,256
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**3,799,350**		**3,799,350**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	424		424
240	BASE SUPPORT	1,036		1,036
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	10,923		10,923
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	72		72
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	323		323
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	352		352
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**13,130**		**13,130**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
360	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	100,429		100,429
390	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	47,200		47,200

400	BASE SUPPORT	7,242		7,242
410	ADMINISTRATION	1,552		1,552
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	82,094		82,094
430	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	582,977		582,977
480	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	20,270		20,270
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**841,764**		**841,764**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
490	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–34,700	–34,700
	Historical unobligated balances		[–34,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–34,700**	**–34,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**9,241,613**	**–34,700**	**9,206,913**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	2,000		2,000
20	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,503,060		2,503,060
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,505,060**		**2,505,060**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
80	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	30,674		30,674
90	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	69,803		69,803
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	3,334		3,334
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	152,925		152,925
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	102,322		102,322
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	10,823		10,823
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	2,200,000	–650,000	1,550,000
	Program Decrease—Coalition Support Funds		[–650,000]	
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	139,830		139,830
260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	87,805		87,805
280	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,522,003		2,522,003

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**5,319,519**	**–650,000**	**4,669,519**
	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS			
290	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		–29,300	–29,300
	Historical unobligated balances		[–29,300]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS		**–29,300**	**–29,300**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**7,824,579**	**–679,300**	**7,145,279**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	78,600		78,600
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,811		20,811
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,726		20,726
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	34,400		34,400
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**154,537**		**154,537**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**154,537**		**154,537**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	24,834		24,834
20	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	300		300
40	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	13,364		13,364
60	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	8,213		8,213
80	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	929		929
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	8,244		8,244

140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	40	40
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**55,924**	**55,924**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**55,924**	**55,924**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
10	OPERATING FORCES	22,657	22,657
40	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,820	2,820
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**25,477**	**25,477**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**25,477**	**25,477**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	7,600	7,600
30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	106,768	106,768
50	BASE SUPPORT	6,250	6,250
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**120,618**	**120,618**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**120,618**	**120,618**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG		
	OPERATING FORCES		
10	MANEUVER UNITS	38,485	38,485
20	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	1,959	1,959
30	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	20,076	20,076
40	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	2,028	2,028
60	AVIATION ASSETS	183,811	183,811
70	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	43,780	43,780
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	70,237	70,237
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	20,072	20,072

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**380,448**		**380,448**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,000		2,000
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**2,000**		**2,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**382,448**		**382,448**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	19,975		19,975
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**19,975**		**19,975**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**19,975**		**19,975**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
10	SUSTAINMENT	2,523,825		2,523,825
20	INFRASTRUCTURE	190,000		190,000
30	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	241,521		241,521
40	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	758,380		758,380
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**3,713,726**		**3,713,726**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
50	SUSTAINMENT	1,305,950		1,305,950
60	INFRASTRUCTURE	50,000		50,000
70	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	84,859		84,859

80	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	569,868		569,868
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**2,010,677**		**2,010,677**
	RELATED ACTIVITIES			
90	SUSTAINMENT	18,325		18,325
100	INFRASTRUCTUE	1,200		1,200
110	EQUIPMENT & TRANSPORTATION	1,239		1,239
120	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	4,000		4,000
	SUBTOTAL RELATED ACTIVITIES	**24,764**		**24,764**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**5,749,167**		**5,749,167**
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
10	POWER	400,000	–25,000	375,000
	Program Decrease		[–25,000]	
	SUBTOTAL AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND	**400,000**	**–25,000**	**375,000**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND	**400,000**	**–25,000**	**375,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**62,512,514**	**–1,535,400**	**60,977,114**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL	**135,111,799**	**615,056**	**135,726,855**
Army medical evacuation paramedic certification training		2,000	
Basic allowance for housing for members of the National Guard (Section 603)		6,000	
Non-medical attendant travel (Section 621)		2,000	
Reserve Components administrative absence (Section 604)		2,000	
Restore accrual payments to the Medicare eligible health care trust fund		672,000	
Retain 128 Air National Guard AGRs for two air sovereignty alert locations		8,300	
Retain Air Force Force Structure		30,000	
Retain Air Force Reserve Force Structure		20,000	
Retain Air National Guard Force Structure		70,826	
Retain Global Hawk		22,200	
Unobligated balances		[–352,000]	
USMC military personnel in lieu of LAV funding		131,730	

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL	14,060,094		14,060,094

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	60,037		60,037
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**60,037**		**60,037**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (MEDICAL/DENTAL)	45,452		45,452
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**45,452**		**45,452**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	39,135		39,135
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**39,135**		**39,135**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,371,560		1,371,560
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,371,560**		**1,371,560**
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
MPF MLP	38,000		38,000
POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	39,386		39,386
LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	128,819		128,819
DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	26,598		26,598

TAH MAINTENANCE	29,199		29,199
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	42,811		42,811
READY RESERVE FORCE	303,323		303,323
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	**608,136**		**608,136**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
IN-HOUSE CARE	8,625,507		8,625,507
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	16,148,263		16,148,263
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,309,185		2,309,185
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,465,328		1,465,328
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	332,121		332,121
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	722,081		722,081
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,746,794		1,746,794
UNDISTRIBUTED, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		281,900	281,900
Foreign currency flucuation		[–5,100]	
Overfunding in electronic health record		[–30,000]	
Restore estimated savings in TRICARE Prime and Standard enrollment fees and deductibles for TRICARE Standard		[273,000]	
Restore pharmacy co-pay estimated savings		[179,000]	
TRICARE rate adjustments		[90,000]	
Unobligated balances		[–225,000]	
RDT&E	672,977		672,977
PROCUREMENT	506,462	–52,000	454,462
Overfunding in electronic health record		[–52,000]	
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**32,528,718**	**229,900**	**32,758,618**
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	635,843		635,843
RDT&E	647,351		647,351
PROCUREMENT	18,592		18,592
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**1,301,786**		**1,301,786**

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	889,545		889,545
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	109,818		109,818
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**999,363**		**999,363**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	272,821		272,821
PROCUREMENT	1,000		1,000
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**273,821**		**273,821**
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	41,000		41,000
CONSTRUCTION	4,800		4,800
FACILITIES MAINTENANCE		25,000	25,000
Realignment from Operation and Maintenance, Army		[25,000]	
TOTAL CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY	**45,800**	**25,000**	**70,800**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**37,273,808**	**254,900**	**37,528,708**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	42,600		42,600
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**42,600**		**42,600**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
C–17 CLS ENGINE REPAIR	230,400		230,400
TRANSPORTATION FALLEN HEROES	10,000		10,000
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**240,400**		**240,400**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	220,364		220,364
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**220,364**		**220,364**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
IN-HOUSE CARE	483,326		483,326
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	376,982		376,982
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	111,675		111,675
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	4,773		4,773
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	660		660
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	15,370		15,370
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,112		1,112
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**993,898**		**993,898**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES	469,025		469,025
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**469,025**		**469,025**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	10,766		10,766
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**10,766**		**10,766**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**1,977,053**		**1,977,053**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	10,400		10,400
Army	ALASKA	JOINT BASE ELMENDORF-RICHARDSON	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	7,900		7,900
Army	CALIFORNIA	CONCORD	ENGINEERING/HOUSING MAINTENANCE SHOP	3,100		3,100
Army	CALIFORNIA	CONCORD	LIGHTNING PROTECTION SYSTEM	5,800		5,800
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON	CENTRAL ENERGY PLANT	0		0
Army	COLORADO	FORT CARSON, COLORADO	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	18,000		18,000
Army	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	FORT MCNAIR	VEHICLE STORAGE BUILDING, INSTALLATION	7,200		7,200
Army	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	GROUND SOURCE HEAT TRANSFER SYSTEM	16,000		16,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT GORDON	GROUND SOURCE HEAT TRANSFER SYSTEM	12,200		12,200
Army	GEORGIA	FORT GORDON	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	4,000		4,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT GORDON	MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	7,100		7,100
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	AUTOMATED COMBAT PISTOL QUAL CRSE	3,650		3,650
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	22,000		22,000
Army	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE COMPLEX	24,000		24,000
Army	HAWAII	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	AUTOMATED INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE	29,000		29,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BARRACKS	55,000		55,000
Army	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BARRACKS	41,000		41,000
Army	HAWAII	WHEELER ARMY AIR FIELD	COMBAT AVIATION BRIGADE BARRACKS	85,000		85,000
Army	ITALY	CAMP EDERLE	BARRACKS	36,000		36,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	ITALY	VICENZA	SIMULATIONS CENTER	32,000		32,000
Army	JAPAN	OKINAWA	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	78,000		78,000
Army	JAPAN	SAGAMI	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	18,000		18,000
Army	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE COMPLEX	12,200		12,200
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	BATTALION HEADQUARTERS COMPLEX	55,000		55,000
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	LIVE FIRE EXERCISE SHOOTHOUSE	3,800		3,800
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE COMPLEX	23,000		23,000
Army	KENTUCKY	FORT KNOX	AUTOMATED INFANTRY SQUAD BATTLE COURSE	6,000		6,000
Army	KOREA	CAMP HUMPHREYS	BATTALION HEADQUARTERS COMPLEX	45,000		45,000
Army	KWAJALEIN ATOLL	KWAJALEIN ATOLL	PIER	0		0
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	BATTALION COMPLEX FACILITIES	26,000		26,000
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX 3, PH 2	58,000		58,000
Army	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	39,000		39,000
Army	NEW JERSEY	JOINT BASE MCGUIRE-DIX-LAKEHURST	FLIGHT EQUIPMENT COMPLEX	47,000		47,000
Army	NEW JERSEY	PICATINNY ARSENAL	BALLISTIC EVALUATION CENTER	10,200		10,200
Army	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM, NEW YORK	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	95,000		95,000
Army	NEW YORK	U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY	CADET BARRACKS	192,000		192,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE	42,000		42,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	INFRASTRUCTURE	30,000		30,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE COMPLEX	26,000		26,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	FORT SILL	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	4,900		4,900
Army	SOUTH CAROLINA	FORT JACKSON	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX 2, PH 2	24,000		24,000
Army	TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	AIRCRAFT COMPONENT MAINTENANCE SHOP	13,200		13,200
Army	TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	AIRCRAFT PAINT SHOP	24,000		24,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	7,200		7,200
Army	TEXAS	FORT HOOD, TEXAS	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	4,200		4,200

Army	TEXAS	FORT HOOD, TEXAS	TRAINING AIDS CENTER	25,000		25,000
Army	TEXAS	FORT HOOD, TEXAS	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE COMPLEX	22,000		22,000
Army	TEXAS	JOINT BASE SAN ANTONIO	BARRACKS	21,000		21,000
Army	VIRGINIA	ARLINGTON	CEMETERY EXPANSION MILLENNIUM SITE	84,000		84,000
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT BELVOIR	SECURE ADMIN/OPERATIONS FACILITY	94,000		94,000
Army	VIRGINIA	FORT LEE	ADV INDIVIDUAL TRAINING BARRACKS CPLX, PH2	81,000		81,000
Army	WASHINGTON	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	BATTALION COMPLEX	73,000		73,000
Army	WASHINGTON	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT	91,000		91,000
Army	WASHINGTON	YAKIMA	CONVOY LIVE FIRE RANGE	5,100		5,100
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	HOST NATION SUPPORT FY 13	34,000		34,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MINOR CONSTRUCTION FY 13	25,000		25,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN FY13	65,173		65,173
Total Military Construction, Army				**1,923,323**	**0**	**1,923,323**
Navy	ARIZONA	YUMA	COMBAT AIRCRAFT LOADING APRON	15,985		15,985
Navy	ARIZONA	YUMA	SECURITY OPERATIONS COMPLEX	13,300		13,300
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW ASIA	COMBINED DINING FACILITY	9,819	–9,819	0
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW ASIA	TRANSIENT QUARTERS	41,529	–41,529	0
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON, CALIFORNIA	COMM. INFORMATION SYSTEMS OPS COMPLEX	78,897		78,897
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON, CALIFORNIA	MV22 AVIATION SIMULATOR BUILDING	4,139		4,139
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON, CALIFORNIA	SAN JACINTO ROAD EXTENSION	5,074		5,074
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	BACHELOR QUARTERS	76,063		76,063
Navy	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	H–60S SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY	2,478		2,478
Navy	CALIFORNIA	LEMOORE	BAMS MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY	14,843	–14,843	0
Navy	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	HANGAR 5 RENOVATIONS & ADDITION	27,897		27,897
Navy	CALIFORNIA	POINT MUGU	BAMS MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY	0	12,790	12,790
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	ENTRY CONTROL POINT (GATE FIVE)	11,752		11,752
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	LCS TRAINING FACILITY	59,436		59,436
Navy	CALIFORNIA	SEAL BEACH	STRATEGIC SYSTEMS WEAPONS EVAL. TEST LAB	30,594		30,594

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Navy	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA	LAND EXPANSION PHASE 2	47,270		47,270
Navy	DIEGO GARCIA	DIEGO GARCIA	COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE	1,691		1,691
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	CONTAINERIZED LIVING AND WORK UNITS	7,510	–7,510	0
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	FITNESS CENTER	26,960	–26,960	0
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	GALLEY ADDITION AND WAREHOUSE	22,220	–22,220	0
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	JOINT HQ/JOINT OPERATIONS CENTER FACILITY	42,730	–42,730	0
Navy	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	BAMS MISSION CONTROL COMPLEX	21,980		21,980
Navy	GREECE	SOUDA BAY	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON EXPANSION	20,493		20,493
Navy	GREECE	SOUDA BAY	INTERMODAL ACCESS ROAD	4,630		4,630
Navy	GUAM	JOINT REGION MARIANAS	NORTH RAMP PARKING (ANDERSEN AFB)—INC 2	25,904		25,904
Navy	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	AIRCRAFT STAGING AREA	14,680		14,680
Navy	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	MV–22 HANGAR AND INFRASTRUCTURE	82,630		82,630
Navy	JAPAN	IWAKUNI	MAINTENANCE HANGAR IMPROVEMENTS	5,722		5,722
Navy	JAPAN	IWAKUNI	VERTICAL TAKE-OFF AND LANDING PAD NORTH	7,416		7,416
Navy	JAPAN	OKINAWA	BACHELOR QUARTERS	8,206		8,206
Navy	MISSISSIPPI	MERIDIAN	DINING FACILITY	10,926		10,926
Navy	NEW JERSEY	EARLE	COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING BUILDING ADDITION	33,498		33,498
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	BASE ACCESS AND ROAD—PHASE 3	40,904		40,904
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	STAFF NCO ACADEMY FACILITIES	28,986		28,986
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION	ARMORY	11,581		11,581
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION	MARINE AIR SUPPORT SQUADRON COMPOUND	34,310		34,310
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION CENTER	8,525		8,525
Navy	ROMANIA	DEVESELU, ROMANIA	AEGIS ASHORE MISSILE DEFENSE COMPLEX	45,205		45,205
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	42,010		42,010
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	AIRFIELD SECURITY UPGRADES	13,675		13,675

Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT SHOP	9,465		9,465
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	RECYCLING/HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY	3,743		3,743
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	SIMULATED LHD FLIGHT DECK	12,887		12,887
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	PARRIS ISLAND	FRONT GATE ATFP IMPROVEMENTS	10,135		10,135
Navy	SPAIN	ROTA	GENERAL PURPOSE WAREHOUSE	3,378		3,378
Navy	SPAIN	ROTA	HIGH EXPLOSIVE MAGAZINE	13,837		13,837
Navy	VIRGINIA	DAHLGREN	CRUISER/DESTROYER UPGRADE TRAINING FACILITY	16,494		16,494
Navy	VIRGINIA	DAHLGREN	PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	11,734		11,734
Navy	VIRGINIA	OCEANA NAVAL AIR STATION	A SCHOOL BARRACKS	39,086		39,086
Navy	VIRGINIA	PORTSMOUTH	DRYDOCK 8 ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION UPGRADE	32,706		32,706
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	INFRASTRUTURE—WIDEN RUSSELL ROAD	14,826		14,826
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	THE BASIC SCHOOL STUDENT QUARTERS—PHASE 7	31,012		31,012
Navy	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	WEAPONS TRAINING BATTALION MESS HALL	12,876		12,876
Navy	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	ARMORY	4,259		4,259
Navy	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	18,422		18,422
Navy	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	MOTOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITY	6,188		6,188
Navy	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	REGIMENTAL HEADQUARTERS	11,015		11,015
Navy	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	SUPPLY WAREHOUSE FACILITY	8,939		8,939
Navy	WASHINGTON	KITSAP	EXPLOSIVES HANDLING WHARF #2 (INC)	280,041		280,041
Navy	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	EA–18G FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY	6,272		6,272
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MCON DESIGN FUNDS	102,619		102,619
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	16,535		16,535
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	BAMS OPERATIONAL FACILITIES	34,048		34,048
Total Military Construction, Navy				**1,701,985**	**–152,821**	**1,549,164**
AF	ARKANSAS	LITTLE ROCK AFB	C–130J FLIGHT SIMULATOR ADDITION	4,178		4,178
AF	ARKANSAS	LITTLE ROCK AFB	C–130J FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE HANGAR	26,000		26,000
AF	FLORIDA	TYNDALL AFB	F–22 ADAL HANGAR FOR LOW OBSERVABLE/COMPOSITE	14,750		14,750
AF	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	AIR SUPPORT OPERATIONS CENTER (ASOC)	7,250		7,250

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
AF	GEORGIA	MOODY AFB	HC–130J SIMULATOR FACILITY	8,500		8,500
AF	GREENLAND	THULE AB	CONSOLIDATED ENGINEER SHOP AND SUPPLY FACILITY	0		0
AF	GREENLAND	THULE AB	DORMITORY (48 PN)	24,500		24,500
AF	GUAM	ANDERSEN AFB	FUEL SYSTEMS HANGAR	0		0
AF	ITALY	AVIANO AB	F–16 MISSION TRAINING CENTER	9,400		9,400
AF	NEBRASKA	OFFUTT AFB	US STRATCOM REPLACEMENT FACILITY, INCR 2	161,000		161,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	MQ–9 MAINTENANCE HANGAR	25,000		25,000
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	MINOT AFB	B–52 ADD/ALTER MUNITIONS AGE FACILITY	4,600		4,600
AF	TEXAS	JOINT BASE SAN ANTONIO	DORMITORY (144 RM)	18,000		18,000
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	F–35 ADAL BUILDING 118 FOR FLIGHT SIMULATOR	4,000		4,000
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	F–35 ADAL HANGAR 45W/AMU	7,250		7,250
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	F–35 MODULAR STORAGE MAGAZINES	2,280		2,280
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	18,635		18,635
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	SANITARY SEWER LIFT/PUMP STATION	2,000		2,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	TRANSIENT AIRCRAFT HANGARS	15,032		15,032
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	TRANSIENT CONTINGENCY DORMITORY—100 RM	17,625		17,625
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	18,200		18,200
Total Military Construction, Air Force				**388,200**	**0**	**388,200**
Def-Wide	ARIZONA	YUMA	TRUCK UNLOAD FACILITY	1,300		1,300
Def-Wide	BELGIUM	BRUSSELS	NATO HEADQUARTERS FACILITY	26,969		26,969
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF CLOSE QUARTERS COMBAT/DYNAMIC SHOOT FAC	13,969		13,969

Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF INDOOR DYNAMIC SHOOTING FACILITY	31,170	31,170
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF MOBILE COMM DETACHMENT SUPPORT FACILITY	10,120	10,120
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	DEF FUEL SUPPORT POINT—SAN DIEGO	REPLACE FUEL PIER	91,563	91,563
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE	27,500	27,500
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA	MEDICAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	27,400	27,400
Def-Wide	COLORADO	BUCKLEY AIR FORCE BASE	DENVER POWER HOUSE	30,000	30,000
Def-Wide	COLORADO	FORT CARSON, COLORADO	SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS COMPLEX	56,673	56,673
Def-Wide	COLORADO	PIKES PEAK	HIGH ALTITUDE MEDICAL RESEARCH LAB	3,600	3,600
Def-Wide	CONUS CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	SOF PARACHUTE TRAINING FACILITY	6,477	6,477
Def-Wide	DELAWARE	DOVER AFB	REPLACE TRUCK OFF-LOAD FACILITY	2,000	2,000
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	EGLIN AFB	SOF AVFID OPS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	41,695	41,695
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	HURLBURT FIELD	CONSTRUCT FUEL STORAGE FACILITY	16,000	16,000
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	MACDILL AFB	SOF JOINT SPECIAL OPS UNIVERSITY FAC (JSOU)	34,409	34,409
Def-Wide	GERMANY	RHINE ORDNANCE BARRACKS	MEDICAL CENTER REPLACEMENT INCR 2	127,000	127,000
Def-Wide	GERMANY	STUTTGART-PATCH BARRACKS	DISA EUROPE FACILITY UPGRADES	2,413	2,413
Def-Wide	GERMANY	VOGELWEH	REPLACE VOGELWEH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	61,415	61,415
Def-Wide	GERMANY	WEISBADEN	WEISBADEN HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	52,178	52,178
Def-Wide	GUAM	ANDERSEN AFB	UPGRADE FUEL PIPELINE	67,500	67,500
Def-Wide	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY	REPLACE FUEL PIER	37,600	37,600
Def-Wide	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY	REPLACE TRUCK LOAD FACILITY	2,600	2,600
Def-Wide	HAWAII	JOINT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM	SOF SDVT–1 WATERFRONT OPERATIONS FACILITY	24,289	24,289
Def-Wide	ILLINOIS	GREAT LAKES	DRUG LABORATORY REPLACEMENT	28,700	28,700
Def-Wide	ILLINOIS	SCOTT AFB	DISA FACILITY UPGRADES	84,111	84,111
Def-Wide	ILLINOIS	SCOTT AFB	MEDICAL LOGISTICS WAREHOUSE	2,600	2,600
Def-Wide	INDIANA	GRISSOM ARB	REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	26,800	26,800
Def-Wide	JAPAN	CAMP ZAMA	RENOVATE ZAMA HIGH SCHOOL	13,273	13,273
Def-Wide	JAPAN	KADENA AB	REPLACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	71,772	71,772
Def-Wide	JAPAN	KADENA AB	REPLACE STEARLEY HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	71,773	71,773

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	JAPAN	SASEBO	REPLACE SASEBO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	35,733		35,733
Def-Wide	JAPAN	ZUKERAN	REPLACE ZUKERAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	79,036		79,036
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	REPLACE BARKLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	41,767		41,767
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	SOF GROUND SUPPORT BATTALION	26,313		26,313
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	SOF LANDGRAF HANGAR EXTENSION	3,559		3,559
Def-Wide	KOREA	KUNSAN AIR BASE	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC ADDITION	13,000		13,000
Def-Wide	KOREA	OSAN AFB	HOSPITAL ADDITION/ALTERATION	34,600		34,600
Def-Wide	KOREA	OSAN AFB	REPLACE OSAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	42,692		42,692
Def-Wide	LOUISIANA	BARKSDALE AFB	UPGRADE PUMPHOUSE	11,700		11,700
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	ANNAPOLIS	HEALTH CLINIC REPLACEMENT	66,500		66,500
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	BASE INSTALLATION ACCESS./APPEARANCE PLAN	7,000		7,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	ELECTRICAL CAPACITY AND COOLING TOWERS	35,600		35,600
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	TEMPORARY MEDICAL FACILITIES	26,600		26,600
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	FORT DETRICK	USAMRIID STAGE I, INCR 7	19,000		19,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	FORT MEADE	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING CENTER INC 2	300,521		300,521
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	FORT MEADE	NSAW RECAPITALIZE BUILDING #1/SITE M INC 1	25,000		25,000
Def-Wide	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	DENTAL CLINIC	18,100		18,100
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC REPALCEMENT	71,023		71,023
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	SOF AC–130J COMBAT PARKING APRON	22,062		22,062
Def-Wide	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM, NEW YORK	IDT COMPLEX	25,900		25,900
Def-Wide	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM, NEW YORK	SOLDIER SPECIALTY CARE CLINIC	17,300		17,300
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	MEDICAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	21,200		21,200
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	SOF MARINE BATTALION COMPANY/TEAM FACILITIES	53,399		53,399
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	SOF SURVIVAL EVASION RESIST. ESCAPE TNG FAC	5,465		5,465
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS FACILITY	40,481		40,481
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF CIVIL AFFAIRS BATTALION COMPLEX	31,373		31,373
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF SUPPORT ADDITION	3,875		3,875

Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF SUSTAINMENT BRIGADE COMPLEX	24,693		24,693
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB	MEDICAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	53,600		53,600
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB	REPLACE PIPELINE	1,850		1,850
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DISTRIBUTION DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	REPLACE COMMUNICATIONS BUILDING	6,800		6,800
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DISTRIBUTION DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	REPLACE RESERVOIR	4,300		4,300
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DISTRIBUTION DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	REPLACE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	6,300		6,300
Def-Wide	ROMANIA	DEVESELU, ROMANIA	AEGIS ASHORE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM COMPLEX	157,900	–75,000	82,900
Def-Wide	SOUTH CAROLINA	SHAW AFB	MEDICAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	57,200		57,200
Def-Wide	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT INCR 4	207,400		207,400
Def-Wide	TEXAS	JOINT BASE SAN ANTONIO	AMBULATORY CARE CENTER PHASE 3 INCR	80,700		80,700
Def-Wide	TEXAS	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	DFAS FACILITY	16,715		16,715
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	MENWITH HILL STATION	MHS UTILITIES AND ROADS	3,795		3,795
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	MENWITH HILL STATION	REPLACE MENWITH HILL ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL	46,488		46,488
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF FELTWELL	FELTWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION	30,811		30,811
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF MILDENHALL	SOF CV–22 SIMULATOR FACILITY	6,490		6,490
Def-Wide	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	IC CNCI DATA CENTER 1 INC 4	191,414		191,414
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	DAM NECK	SOF MAGAZINES	0		0
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	JOINT EXPEDITIONARY BASE LITTLE CREEK—STORY	SOF COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT FACILITY—EAST	11,132		11,132
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	VETERINARY FACILITY REPLACEMENT	8,500		8,500
Def-Wide	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS FACILITY	46,553		46,553
Def-Wide	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	SOF MILITARY WORKING DOG KENNEL	3,967		3,967
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	10,000	–10,000	0
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM	150,000		150,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	EXERCISE RELATED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	6,440		6,440

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,000		5,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING & DESIGN	5,000		5,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	7,928		7,928
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	105,700		105,700
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	27,620		27,620
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	8,300		8,300
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	47,978		47,978
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	105,569		105,569
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,919		2,919
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,548		4,548
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	SOF OPERATIONS AND SKILLS TRAINING COMPLEX	0		0
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONST	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,254		7,254

Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,091		4,091
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILCON	3,000		3,000
Total Military Construction, Defense-Wide				**3,654,623**	**–85,000**	**3,569,623**
Chem Demil	COLORADO	PUEBLO DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY, PH XIV	36,000		36,000
Chem Demil	KENTUCKY	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION PH XIII	115,000		115,000
Total Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense				**151,000**	**0**	**151,000**
NATO	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	254,163		254,163
Total NATO Security Investment Program				**254,163**	**0**	**254,163**
Army NG	ALABAMA	FORT MC CLELLAN	LIVE FIRE SHOOT HOUSE	5,400		5,400
Army NG	ARKANSAS	SEARCY	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP	6,800		6,800
Army NG	CALIFORNIA	FORT IRWIN	MANEUVER AREA TRAINING & EQUIPMENT SITE PH3	25,000		25,000
Army NG	CONNECTICUT	CAMP HARTELL	COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	32,000		32,000
Army NG	DELAWARE	BETHANY BEACH	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE PH1	5,500		5,500
Army NG	FLORIDA	CAMP BLANDING	COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FAC	9,000		9,000
Army NG	FLORIDA	MIRAMAR	READINESS CENTER	20,000		20,000
Army NG	GUAM	BARRIGADA	JFHQ PH4	8,500		8,500
Army NG	HAWAII	KAPOLEI	ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY PH1	28,000		28,000
Army NG	IDAHO	ORCHARD TRAINIG AREA	ORTC(BARRACKS)PH2	40,000		40,000
Army NG	INDIANA	SOUTH BEND	ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER ADD/ALT	21,000		21,000
Army NG	INDIANA	TERRE HAUTE	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP	9,000		9,000
Army NG	IOWA	CAMP DODGE	URBAN ASSAULT COURSE	3,000		3,000
Army NG	KANSAS	TOPEKA	TAXIWAY, RAMP & HANGAR ALTERATIONS	9,500		9,500
Army NG	KENTUCKY	FRANKFORT	ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	32,000		32,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army NG	MASSACHUSETTS	CAMP EDWARDS	GROUND WATER EXTRACTION, TREATMENT, AND RE-CHARGE SYSTEM.	0		0
Army NG	MASSACHUSETTS	CAMP EDWARDS	UNIT TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE	22,000		22,000
Army NG	MICHIGAN	CAMP GRAYLING	OPERATIONAL READINESS TRAINING COMPLEX (ORTC) BARRACKS.	0		0
Army NG	MINNESOTA	CAMP RIPLEY	SCOUT RECONNAISANCE RANGE	17,000		17,000
Army NG	MINNESOTA	ST PAUL	READINESS CENTER	17,000		17,000
Army NG	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE	18,000		18,000
Army NG	MISSOURI	KANSAS CITY	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	1,900		1,900
Army NG	MISSOURI	MONETT	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	820		820
Army NG	MISSOURI	PERRYVILLE	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	700		700
Army NG	MONTANA	MILES CITY	READINESS CENTER	11,000		11,000
Army NG	NEW JERSEY	SEA GIRT	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE	34,000		34,000
Army NG	NEW YORK	STORMVILLE	COMBINED SUPPORT MAINT SHOP PH1	24,000		24,000
Army NG	OHIO	CHILLICOTHE	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP ADD/ALT	3,100		3,100
Army NG	OHIO	DELAWARE	READINESS CENTER	12,000		12,000
Army NG	OKLAHOMA	CAMP GRUBER	OPERATIONS READINESS TRAINING COMPLEX	25,000		25,000
Army NG	PUERTO RICO	CAMP SANTIAGO	READINESS CENTER	3,800		3,800
Army NG	PUERTO RICO	CEIBA	REFILL STATION BUILDING	2,200		2,200
Army NG	PUERTO RICO	GUAYNABO	READINESS CENTER (JFHQ)	15,000		15,000
Army NG	PUERTO RICO	GURABO	READINESS CENTER	14,700		14,700
Army NG	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	BEQ FACILITY (REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE)	15,000		15,000
Army NG	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE PH2	21,000		21,000
Army NG	VERMONT	NORTH HYDE PARK	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP	0		0
Army NG	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	READINESS CENTER	35,000		35,000
Army NG	WEST VIRGINIA	LOGAN	READINESS CENTER	14,200		14,200
Army NG	WISCONSIN	WAUSAU	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP	10,000		10,000

Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	26,622		26,622
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	15,057		15,057
Total Military Construction, Army National Guard				**613,799**	**0**	**613,799**
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	ACCESS CONTROL POINT	0		0
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	ORTC	64,000		64,000
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	UPH BARRACKS	4,300		4,300
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	TUSTIN	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	27,000		27,000
Army Res	ILLINOIS	FORT SHERIDAN	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	28,000		28,000
Army Res	MARYLAND	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	21,000		21,000
Army Res	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE	ADD/ALT ARMY RESERVE CENTER	10,000		10,000
Army Res	MASSACHUSETTS	DEVENS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	AUTOMATIC RECORD FIRE RANGE	4,800		4,800
Army Res	MASSACHUSETTS	DEVENS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	COMBAT PISTOL/MP FIREARMS QUALIFICATION	3,700		3,700
Army Res	NEVADA	LAS VEGAS	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/AMSA	21,000		21,000
Army Res	NEW JERSEY	JOINT BASE MCGUIRE-DIX-LAKEHURST	AUTOMATED INFANTRY SQUAD BATTLE COURSE	7,400		7,400
Army Res	PENNSYLVANIA	CONNEAUT LAKE	DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD	0		0
Army Res	WASHINGTON	JOINT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	40,000		40,000
Army Res	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	CENTRAL ISSUE FACILITY	12,200		12,200
Army Res	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	DINING FACILITY	8,600		8,600
Army Res	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	ECS TACTICAL EQUIP. MAINT. FACILTY (TEMF)	27,000		27,000
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	15,951		15,951
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	10,895		10,895
Total Military Construction, Army Reserve				**305,846**	**0**	**305,846**
N/MC Res	ARIZONA	YUMA	RESERVE TRAINING FACILITY—YUMA AZ	5,379		5,379

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
N/MC Res	IOWA	FORT DES MOINES	JOINT RESERVE CENTER—DES MOINES IA	19,162		19,162
N/MC Res	LOUISIANA	NEW ORLEANS	TRANSIENT QUARTERS	7,187		7,187
N/MC Res	NEW YORK	BROOKLYN	VEHICLE MAINT. FAC.—BROOKLYN NY	4,430		4,430
N/MC Res	TEXAS	FORT WORTH	COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INSPECTION SITE	11,256		11,256
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,118		2,118
Total Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps Reserve				**49,532**	**0**	**49,532**
Air NG	CALIFORNIA	FRESNO YOSEMITE IAP ANG	F–15 CONVERSION	11,000		11,000
Air NG	HAWAII	JOINT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM	TFI—F–22 COMBAT APRON ADDITION	6,500		6,500
Air NG	NEW MEXICO	KIRTLAND AFB	ALTER TARGET INTELLIGENCE FACILITY	8,500		8,500
Air NG	TENNESSEE	MCGHEE-TYSON AIRPORT	DORMITORY CLASSROOM FACILITY	0		0
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,000		4,000
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,900		5,900
Air NG	WYOMING	CHEYENNE MAP	C–130 FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY	6,486		6,486
Total Military Construction, Air National Guard				**42,386**	**0**	**42,386**
AF Res	CALIFORNIA	MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE	JOINT REGIONAL DEPLOYMENT PROCESSING CENTER	0		0
AF Res	NEW YORK	NIAGARA FALLS IAP	FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY	6,100		6,100
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,879		2,879
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUTION	2,000		2,000
Total Military Construction, Air Force Reserve				**10,979**	**0**	**10,979**

FH Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FAMILY HOUSING P&D	4,641		4,641
Total Family Housing Construction, Army				**4,641**	**0**	**4,641**
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	31,785		31,785
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	LEASING	203,533		203,533
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	109,534		109,534
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	56,970		56,970
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	620		620
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	26,010		26,010
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	SERVICES ACCOUNT	13,487		13,487
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	88,112		88,112
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Army				**530,051**	**0**	**530,051**
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IMPROVEMENTS	79,571		79,571
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	4,253		4,253
Total Family Housing Construction, Air Force				**83,824**	**0**	**83,824**
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	37,878		37,878

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	HOUSING PRIVATIZATION	46,127		46,127
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	LEASING	62,730		62,730
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MAINTENANCE (RPMA RPMC)	201,937		201,937
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	55,002		55,002
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,943		1,943
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	SERVICES ACCOUNT	16,550		16,550
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	75,662		75,662
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Air Force				**497,829**	**0**	**497,829**
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DESIGN	4,527		4,527
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IMPROVEMENTS	97,655		97,655
Total Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps				**102,182**	**0**	**102,182**
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	17,697		17,697
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	LEASING	83,774		83,774

FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	85,254		85,254
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	62,741		62,741
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	491		491
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	27,798		27,798
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	SERVICES ACCOUNT	19,615		19,615
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	80,860		80,860
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps				**378,230**	**0**	**378,230**
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	4,660		4,660
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	66		66
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	20		20
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	LEASING	35,333		35,333
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	LEASING	10,822		10,822
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	567		567
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	73		73
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	371		371
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	SERVICES ACCOUNT	31		31

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	283		283
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	12		12
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide				**52,238**	**0**	**52,238**
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND	1,786		1,786
Total DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund				**1,786**	**0**	**1,786**
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	COMM ADD 3: GALENA FOL, AK	1,337		1,337
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–100: PLANING, DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT	5,038		5,038
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–101: VARIOUS LOCATIONS	4,176		4,176
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–138: NAS BRUNSWICK, ME	4,897		4,897
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–157: MCSA KANSAS CITY, MO	39		39
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–168: NS NEWPORT, RI	1,742		1,742
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–172: NWS SEAL BEACH, CONCORD, CA	2,129		2,129
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–84: JRB WILLOW GROVE & CAMBRIA REG AP	189		189

BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–106: KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, KS	7,280	7,280
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–110: MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMO PLANT, MS	160	160
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–112: RIVER BANK ARMY AMMO PLANT, CA	22,431	22,431
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–119: NEWPORT CHEMICAL DEPOT, IN	197	197
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–122: LONE STAR ARMY AMMO PLANT, TX	11,379	11,379
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MED–2: WALTER REED NMMC, BETHESDA, MD	7,787	7,787
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MED–57: BROOKS CITY BASE, TX	326	326
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	20,453	20,453
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	605	605
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–113: FORT MONROE, VA	12,184	12,184
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–121: FORT GILLEM, GA	4,976	4,976
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–167: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—NE	175	175
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–212: USAR CMD & CNTRL—NEW ENGLAND	222	222
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–222: FORT MCPHERSON, GA	6,772	6,772
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–223: FORT MONMOUTH, NJ	9,989	9,989
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–236: RC TRANSFORMATION IN CT	557	557

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–242: RC TRANSFORMATION IN NY	172		172
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–253: RC TRANSFORMATION IN PA	100		100
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–36: RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	1,385		1,385
Total Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005				**126,697**	**0**	**126,697**
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, AIR FORCE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE	122,552		122,552
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, ARMY	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE	79,893		79,893
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, NAVY	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE	146,951		146,951
Total Base Realignment and Closure Account 1990				**349,396**	**0**	**349,396**
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	BRAC 2005	0	–126,697	–126,697
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	0	–20,000	–20,000
Total Prior Year Savings				**0**	**–146,697**	**–146,697**
Total Military Construction				**11,222,710**	**–384,518**	**10,838,192**

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW ASIA	COMBINED DINING FACILITY	0	9,819	9,819
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW ASIA	TRANSIENT QUARTERS	0	41,529	41,529
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	CONTAINERIZED LIVING AND WORK UNITS	0	7,510	7,510
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	FITNESS CENTER	0	26,960	26,960
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	GALLEY ADDITION AND WAREHOUSE	0	22,220	22,220
Navy	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	JOINT HQ/JOINT OPERATIONS CENTER FACILITY	0	42,730	42,730
Total Military Construction, Navy				**0**	**150,768**	**150,768**
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	112–10 AND TITLE IV OF DIVISION H P.L. 112–74	0	–150,768	–150,768
Total Prior Year Savings				**0**	**–150,768**	**–150,768**
Total Military Construction				**0**	**0**	**0**

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 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs			
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	6,000	0	6,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	7,577,341	323,638	7,900,979
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	2,458,631	27,000	2,485,631
Naval reactors	1,088,635	99,000	1,187,635
Office of the administrator	411,279	–48,000	363,279
Total, National nuclear security administration	**11,535,886**	**401,638**	**11,937,524**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental cleanup	5,472,001	10,000	5,482,001
Other defense activities	735,702	–50,000	685,702
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,207,703**	**–40,000**	**6,167,703**

Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,743,589**	**361,638**	**18,105,227**
Total, Discretionary Funding	**17,749,589**	**361,638**	**18,111,227**
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Infrastructure security & energy restoration	6,000		6,000
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	369,000	66,000	435,000
W76 Life extension program	174,931	81,000	255,931
Total, Life extension programs	**543,931**	**147,000**	**690,931**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	72,364		72,364
W76 Stockpile systems	65,445		65,445
W78 Stockpile systems	139,207	12,000	151,207
W80 Stockpile systems	46,540		46,540
B83 Stockpile systems	57,947		57,947
W87 Stockpile systems	85,689		85,689
W88 Stockpile systems	123,217	5,000	128,217
Total, Stockpile systems	**590,409**	**17,000**	**607,409**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	51,265		51,265
Stockpile services			
Production support	365,405	6,000	371,405
Research and development support	28,103	4,000	32,103
R&D certification and safety	191,632	27,000	218,632
Management, technology, and production	175,844	9,000	184,844

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Plutonium sustainment	141,685	9,000	150,685
Total, Stockpile services	**902,669**	**55,000**	**957,669**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**2,088,274**	**219,000**	**2,307,274**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	44,104	29,500	73,604
Primary assessment technologies	94,000	7,000	101,000
Dynamic materials properties	97,000	9,000	106,000
Advanced radiography	30,000		30,000
Secondary assessment technologies	85,000		85,000
Total, Science campaign	**350,104**	**45,500**	**395,604**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	46,421	8,500	54,921
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	18,983		18,983
Nuclear survivability	21,788		21,788
Enhanced surveillance	63,379	8,000	71,379
Total, Engineering campaign	**150,571**	**16,500**	**167,071**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	81,942		81,942
Ignition	84,172	–30,000	54,172
Support of other stockpile programs	14,817	20,000	34,817
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	6,044		6,044
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,334		8,334
Facility operations and target production	264,691		264,691

Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**460,000**	**–10,000**	**450,000**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	600,000	–30,000	570,000
Readiness Campaign			
Nonnuclear readiness	64,681		64,681
Tritium readiness	65,414		65,414
Total, Readiness campaign	**130,095**	**0**	**130,095**
Total, Campaigns	**1,690,770**	**22,000**	**1,712,770**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	163,602		163,602
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	89,048		89,048
Los Alamos National Laboratory	335,978		335,978
Nevada National Security Site	115,697		115,697
Pantex	172,020		172,020
Sandia National Laboratory	167,384		167,384
Savannah River Site	120,577		120,577
Y–12 National security complex	255,097		255,097
Total, Operations of facilities	**1,419,403**	**0**	**1,419,403**
Science, technology and engineering capability support	166,945		166,945
Nuclear operations capability support	203,346		203,346
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,789,694**	**0**	**1,789,694**
Construction:			
13–D–301 Electrical infrastructure upgrades, LANL/LLNL	23,000		23,000
12–D–301 TRU waste facilities, LANL	24,204		24,204
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project, LANL	8,889		8,889
10–D–501 Nuclear facilities risk reduction Y–12 National security complex, Oakridge, TN	17,909		17,909
09–D–404 Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	11,332		11,332

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
08–D–802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	24,800		24,800
06–D–141 PED/Construction, UPF Y–12 , Oak Ridge, TN	340,000		340,000
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	0	100,000	100,000
Total, Construction	**450,134**	**100,000**	**550,134**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**2,239,828**	**100,000**	**2,339,828**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	114,965		114,965
Program direction	104,396		104,396
Total, Secure transportation asset	**219,361**	**0**	**219,361**
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	247,552		247,552
Site stewardship			
Operations and maintenance	90,001	–17,362	72,639
Total, Site stewardship	**90,001**	**–17,362**	**72,639**
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	643,285		643,285
NNSA CIO activities	155,022		155,022
Legacy contractor pensions	185,000		185,000
National security applications	18,248		18,248
Subtotal, Weapons activities	**7,577,341**	**323,638**	**7,900,979**

Total, Weapons Activities	**7,577,341**	**323,638**	**7,900,979**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance	548,186		548,186
Nonproliferation and international security	150,119		150,119
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	311,000		311,000
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition			
Operations and maintenance			
U.S. plutonium disposition	498,979		498,979
U.S. uranium disposition	29,736		29,736
Total, Operations and maintenance	**528,715**	**0**	**528,715**
Construction:			
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	388,802		388,802
Total, Construction	**388,802**	**0**	**388,802**
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	**917,517**	**0**	**917,517**
Russian surplus fissile materials disposition	3,788		3,788
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**921,305**	**0**	**921,305**
Global threat reduction initiative	466,021	27,000	493,021
Legacy contractor pensions	62,000		62,000
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,458,631**	**27,000**	**2,485,631**
Naval Reactors			

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Naval reactors development	418,072		418,072
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	89,700	97,000	186,700
S8G Prototype refueling	121,100		121,100
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	366,961		366,961
Construction:			
13–D–905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL	8,890		8,890
13–D–904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	2,000		2,000
13–D–903, KS Prototype Staff Building, KSO	14,000		14,000
10–D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	19,000		19,000
08–D–190 Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	5,700		5,700
Total, Construction	**49,590**	**0**	**49,590**
Program direction	43,212	2,000	45,212
Subtotal, Naval Reactors	**1,088,635**	**99,000**	**1,187,635**
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,088,635**	**99,000**	**1,187,635**
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	411,279	–48,000	363,279
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**411,279**	**–48,000**	**363,279**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	1,990		1,990

Hanford site:			
River corridor and other cleanup operations	389,347		389,347
Central plateau remediation	558,820		558,820
Richland community and regulatory support	15,156		15,156
Total, Hanford site	**963,323**	**0**	**963,323**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	396,607		396,607
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,000		3,000
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**399,607**	**0**	**399,607**
NNSA sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,484		1,484
Nuclear facility D & D Separations Process Research Unit	24,000		24,000
Nevada	64,641		64,641
Sandia National Laboratories	5,000		5,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory	239,143		239,143
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**334,268**	**0**	**334,268**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Building 3019	67,525		67,525
OR cleanup and disposition	109,470		109,470
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,500		4,500
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**181,495**	**0**	**181,495**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01–D–416 A-E/ORP-0060 / Major construction	690,000		690,000
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	482,113		482,113
Total, Office of River protection	**1,172,113**	**0**	**1,172,113**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Savannah River sites:			
Savannah River risk management operations	444,089		444,089
SR community and regulatory support	16,584		16,584
Radioactive liquid tank waste:			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	698,294		698,294
Construction:			
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	22,549		22,549
PE&D glass waste storage building #3	0		0
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**720,843**	**0**	**720,843**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,181,516**	**0**	**1,181,516**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	198,010		198,010
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**198,010**	**0**	**198,010**
Program direction	323,504		323,504
Program support	18,279		18,279
Safeguards and Security:			
Oak Ridge Reservation	18,817		18,817
Paducah	8,909		8,909
Portsmouth	8,578		8,578
Richland/Hanford Site	71,746		71,746
Savannah River Site	121,977		121,977
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,977		4,977

West Valley	2,015		2,015
Total, Safeguards and Security	**237,019**	**0**	**237,019**
Technology development	20,000	10,000	30,000
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000		463,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,494,124**	**10,000**	**5,504,124**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	–12,123		–12,123
Use of unobligated balances	–10,000		–10,000
Total, Adjustments	**–22,123**	**0**	**–22,123**
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,472,001**	**10,000**	**5,482,001**
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security			
Health, safety and security	139,325		139,325
Program direction	106,175		106,175
Undistributed adjustment		–50,000	–50,000
Total, Health, safety and security	**245,500**	**–50,000**	**195,500**
Specialized security activities	188,619		188,619
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	164,477		164,477
Program direction	13,469		13,469
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**177,946**	**0**	**177,946**
Defense-related activities			
Defense related administrative support	118,836		118,836
Office of hearings and appeals	4,801		4,801
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**735,702**	**–50,000**	**685,702**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, Other Defense Activities	735,702	–50,000	685,702

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

MARCH 14, 2012.

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 2013", that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 112th Congress.

The purpose of each provision in the proposed bill is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) advises that for section 533, Authority for Acceptance of Gifts and other Private Support for Marine Corps University, because the gift would be deposited into the Navy General Gift Fund under 10 U.S.C. 2601(c), the gift would earn interest under section 2601(g). The payment of this interest does not score for PAYGO purposes. However, the subsequent outlay of any interest earnings would score for PAYGO purposes. Given that the expected gift amounts appear to be relatively small, OMB would score interest earnings and subsequent PAYGO outlays to be negligible.

The PAYGO effect of section 701 (Revisions to TRICARE cost sharing requirements) are:

	Fiscal Years (dollars in millions)									
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Direct Spending Effects	−397	−622	−978	−1,264	−1,563	−1,803	−2,051	−2,339	−2,681	−2,865

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

MARCH 28, 2012.

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 112th Congress. The purpose of each

proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 6, 2012.

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 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 9, 2012.

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 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 18, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 25, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013".

The PAYGO effect of certain proposals is set forth below:

Mandatory Outlays	Fiscal Years (dollars in millions)									
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Reduce Minimum Length of ActiveService as a Commissioned Officer Required for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer	4.6	13.1	15.5	14.2	14.3	12.8	6.4	−2.5	−6.5	−6.7
Time-in-Grade Retirement WaiverLimitation for Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels in Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and Commanders and Captains in Navy	23.7	47.1	45.0	42.8	40.5	13.0	−14.3	−14.7	−15.2	−15.6
Number of Officers for Whom Service-in-Grade Requirements May Be Reduced for Retirement in Grade Upon Voluntary Retirement Upon Voluntary Retirement	0.5	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.4	−0.2	−0.2	−0.2	−0.2
Force Management Enhancements—Subsec. (a) (Enhanced Selective Early Retirement Boards and Early Discharges)	3.9	31.3	70.2	90.2	102.5	79.4	29.2	5.2	−15.3	−31.8
Force Management Enhancements—Subsec. (b) (Reduce Years of Service for Mandatory Retirement for Certain Officers in Pay Grades O–5 and O–6)	0.0	39.3	97.9	87.0	53 .9	35.3	1.1	−17.8	−18.3	−18.8

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

MAY 4, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4310 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This is, of course, conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Science, Space, and Technology Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this and any similar legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest be placed in the legislative report on H.R. 4310 and the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

I look forward to working with you on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

RALPH M. HALL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. RALPH HALL,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing 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 11, 2012.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Natural Resources in matters being considered in H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4310 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. Of particular note, in Section 28XX—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Fort Lee Military Reservation and Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia, the Committee agrees only to a 1.7 acre land exchange. This waiver, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Natural Resources also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing 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 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Veterans' Affairs 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. 4310 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,

JEFF MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. JEFF MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Af-

fairs 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 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. This legislation contains subject matter that falls within the Rule X jurisdiction of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. However, due to our cooperation in working out text prior to your markup, and in order to expedite Floor consideration of this important legislation, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to Floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs takes this action only with the understanding that our jurisdictional interests in this bill, any subsequent amendments, and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The Foreign Affairs 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 your Committee report on the bill, and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4310 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs

is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation which 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 which 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. 4310 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing 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 11, 2012.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: On May 10, 2012, the Committee on Armed Services ordered H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as amended, to be reported to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Judiciary Committee concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, and having made amendments to the bill in consideration thereof, I am able to agree to discharging our committee from further consideration of the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by forgoing consideration of H.R. 4310, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4310, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report on H.R. 4310 and/or in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing 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 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform 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. 4310 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdic-

tion. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 4310 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 4310, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 4310 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 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing 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 11, 2012.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 4310, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013." I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 4310 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction on this or similar legislation. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 4310 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4310 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the "Fiscal Year 2013 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. 4310, 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. 4310. 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 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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 Financial Services in H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the Committee on Financial Services' right to a sequential referral. I make this commitment with the mutual understanding that this will not prejudice the Committee on Financial Services with respect to its prerogatives on this or similar legislation. Further, it is our mutual understanding that the Committee on Financial Services be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any issues relating to the provisions that fall in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support of any such request.

Further, I appreciate your agreement to include this letter and a copy of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest on this matter in your committee report and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 4310.Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to a certain provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Financial

Services is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within Rule X (q) of the Committee on Small Business.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral. 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 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. 4310 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 11, 2012.

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business

is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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 Budget in matters being considered in H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4310 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 forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Budget 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 Budget 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,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Budget is not

waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

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 Homeland Security in matters being considered in H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4310 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over certain sections of 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 forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House. I also ask that you support my request to name members of this committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2012.

Hon. PETER KING,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. 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 forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2013 and each of the following five fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE

MAY 11, 2012.

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. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 9, 2012. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 4310, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

Based on legislative language for H.R. 4310 that was provided to CBO from May 2 through May 10, CBO estimates that enacting this bill would decrease net direct spending by $33 million in 2013, $554 million over the 2013–2017 period, and $44 million over the 2013–2022 period. Because the bill would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. Enacting the bill would not affect revenues.

The largest cost over that 10-year period results from a provision that would limit the ability of the Department of Defense to increase the copayments charged to beneficiaries who use the TRICARE pharmacy program. Those costs would be offset by savings from a provision that would require certain TRICARE beneficiaries to obtain refills of maintenance medications through TRICARE's national mail-order pharmacy.

H.R. 4310 also would increase spending from the Military Retirement Fund for the increased number of military retirements that would result from several new authorities. Additional savings would be achieved by reducing the amount of funds available to be spent from the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Schmit, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

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 2013 and for the ensuring five fiscal years; and

(3) The CBO Estimate does not identify any new budget authority for assistance to state and local governments by this measure at the time that this report was filed.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(2)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Budget Office Estimate included in this report satisfies the requirement for the committee to include an estimate by the committee of the costs incurred in carrying out this bill.

ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

The committee finds that H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, as reported, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

With respect to clause 3(c) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the committee under clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the general goal and objective of H.R. 4310 is to meet the national security needs of a nation at war while preparing our warfighters for the threats of tomorrow wherever and whenever they might emerge. This legislation meets that goal

while taking steps to make the difficult choices of fiscal stewardship incumbent upon Congress in a time of economic stress. Only by providing for the common defense in an efficient, fiscally responsible manner can the nation address our national security challenges.

The bill implements a number of recommendations from the committee's Panel on Defense Financial Management and Auditability Reform. The bill strengthens oversight of the Department's enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems by requiring designation of a senior official to manage data conversion, risk mitigation plans, and an assessment of the Department's information system control needs. These actions are essential to financial management at the Department of Defense and critical for the development of reliable financial statements.

The bill sustains equipment and weapon systems vital to the success of our service men and women while taking steps to provide them more efficiently. The bill strengthens our military depots and arsenals and reinforces the need for competition throughout the life-cycle of weapon systems.

Consistent with the committee's previous efforts to enhance total workforce management at the Department of Defense, with a holistic review of its manpower and elimination of arbitrary cost targets, the bill requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to certify that the Department is implementing existing requirements with regard to inventories of contract services. The committee believes such inventories are a fundamental tool for the Department to determine the appropriate mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to meet the Department's requirements.

The bill establishes new federal procurement goals for the award of prime contracts to small businesses and establishes for the first time, statutory goals for awards of subcontracts to small business. The committee believes that increasing opportunities for small businesses in Federal contracting will spur innovation and ultimately reduce costs by incentivizing greater competition.

The bill takes steps to strengthen the national defense strategic planning process in order to provide a solid basis for future Quadrennial Defense Reviews and to support an independent review of the future of the Army. The committee believes that proper strategic planning can reduce waste while protecting the joint warfighting capability of the Department of Defense from arbitrary cuts.

In recognition of the service and sacrifice of the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families, the bill includes a 1.7 percent increase in military pay. While the bill does allow for modest increases in TRICARE pharmacy co-pay fees in fiscal year 2013, it recognizes the service of our service men and women as a down payment for their healthcare benefits. Therefore, the bill caps future pharmacy co-pay increases to the annual retiree cost of living adjustments. These costs are offset by a 5–year pilot program that requires TRICARE for life recipients to obtain refills of maintenance drugs through the TRICARE mail-order program.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act are created by this legislation.

APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee finds that this legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104–1).

COMMITTEE VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 4310. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 4310 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 56–5, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 13

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 47 Offered by Mr. Turner.

Description: Construction of defense nuclear facilities transfer for DOD.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper			
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**36**	**25**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 14

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 46 Offered by Mr. Turner. Description: Construction of CMRR facility in New Mexico. Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**38**	**24**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 15

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 65 Offered by Mr. Wittman.

Description: Prohibit additional base realignment and closure actions.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**44**	**18**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 16

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 36r1 Offered By Messrs. Conaway and Thornberry.

Description: Limit availability of funds for alternative fuels.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi			
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**32**	**29**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 17

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 35 Offered By Mr. Conaway.
Description: Exempt DOD from Section 526 of 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act.
Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi			
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**36**	**25**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 18

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 84r1 Offered by Mr. Garamendi.

Description: Strike requirement that DOD ensures East coast missile defense base.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree			
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**28**	**33**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 19

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 147r1 Offered By Ms. Sanchez.

Description: Reduce the amount for ground-based midcourse missile defense strategy.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**36**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 20

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 153 Offered By Ms. Sanchez.

Description: Strike funding for nuclear weapons activities in NNSA.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**23**	**39**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 21

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 3r2 Offered By Mr. Lamborn.

Description: Prohibit funds to implement international agreements on space activities.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**37**	**25**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 22

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 141r1 Offered By Mr. Turner.

Description: Add the Turner Maintaining Commitments Act to the NDAA.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**34**	**28**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 23

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 197r1 Offered By Mr. Johnson.

Description: Require Secretary of Defense and CJCS report to defense committees on nuclear weapons reductions in NEW START treaty.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 24

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 127 Offered By Mr. Andrews.

Description: Funds for environmental and atomic energy for NNSA.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 25

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 43 Offered By Mr. Franks.

Description: Report on conventional and nuclear forces in Western Pacific Region.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers				Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn				Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts				Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson			
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**32**	**26**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 26

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 209 Offered By Ms. Sanchez.

Description: Changes to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn				Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts				Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson			
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**33**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 27

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing Amendment No. 54r1 Offered By Mr. Palazzo.

Description: Use of military installations as sites for marriage or marriage-like ceremonies.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**37**	**24**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 28

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 200 Offered By Mr. Aiken.

Description: Establish a conscience protection clause for military chaplains.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**36**	**25**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 29

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 85 Offered By Mr. Garmendi.

Description: Study for cost-effectiveness, readiness issues for transfer of Navy project from Lemoore to Pt. Mugu, CA.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers				Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts				Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**32**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 30

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 128 Offered By Mr. Andrews.

Description: Funds for B-2 EHF radio; ballistic missile defense mid-course segment.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**35**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 31

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 177 Offered By Mr. Kissell.

Description: Berry amendment change regarding uniforms for Afghanistan National Army and National Police.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**41**	**20**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 32

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 208 Offered By Mr. Smith.
Description: Strike Section 1216.
Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**34**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 33

H.R. 4310

On Agreeing to Amendment No. 29 Offered By Mr. Rigell.

Description: Remove moratorium preventing DOD from using OMB A-76 to conduct public-private competitions.

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson		X		Ms. Sutton		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul		X	
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**25**	**36**					

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

112th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 34

H.R. 4310

Description: Final Passage of H.R. 4310, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, As Amended

Wednesday: May 9, 2012.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones				Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Heinrich	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Owens	X		
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Ms. Sutton	X		
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Dr. Heck	X			Ms. Hochul	X		
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Speier		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**56**	**5**					

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee has taken steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and will make the analysis available as soon as possible.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE LORETTA SANCHEZ

I support many important provisions in the mark that promotes a strong national security. However, there are several provisions related to strategic forces that I opposed and continue to be concerned about.

The bill includes several sweeping governance and management reforms of the nuclear security enterprise that will undermine independent oversight related to health, safety, including nuclear safety, for the nuclear weapons complex and lead to weaker or inconsistent standards for protecting workers and the public. These provisions could have profound risks for people's lives.

I am also concerned about the increases in funding for nuclear weapons by over $400 million over the President's budget request. These increases remain unnecessary and squander money on programs that are not needed to maintain a safe, secure and reliable arsenal and do not help address the most urgent threats, including reducing the dangers of nuclear weapons and the risk of terrorists acquiring a crude nuclear weapon.

The bill also unnecessarily increases funding for Ground-Based Midcourse defense program by over $350 million while test failures are still being addressed. It also mandates a costly East Coast missile defense site which is aimed at a threat that does not yet exist, could cost billions of dollars compared to current hedging strategies.

These funding increases are out of step with an environment of fiscal crisis, and do not increase our national security.

LORETTA SANCHEZ.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE HANK JOHNSON

Although I am supportive of H.R. 4310, I remain concerned about some of the provisions in the bill. While I believe that the House Armed Services Committee has produced a bill that streamlines the operations of the Department of Defense and cuts unnecessary and redundant programs, there are still perfections to be made to this legislation.

I am specifically concerned about language in Section 215 of this bill that sends an ambiguous message to the Department of Defense and industry regarding the F–136 propulsion system for the F–35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter.

The Secretary of Defense and senior leadership of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps have repeatedly testified before the House Armed Services Committee that they do not require the F–136 engine and believe it to be an unnecessary and extravagant expense. Congress has also extensively analyzed and debated this issue, ultimately resolving to strip funding for the F–136 program in Feb-

ruary 2011. I believe that this issue has been decided and any provision that sends an unclear message to the Department of Defense on Congress' view on the F–136 program will only cause further unnecessary spending.

I also believe that more should be done to end the outdated and unneeded Selective Service System. I am pleased the committee included an amendment that would require the Comptroller General to conduct a comprehensive study of the System, but I believe that will merely postpone the obvious.

The United States has not had a draft since 1973. In 1979, Jimmy Carter reinstated the requirement for men to register with Selective Service in response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This requirement to register was meant to be for a limited period and has never been used. The Selective Service system has cost the taxpayers over $700 million since it was reinstated, and ending the program will result in annual savings of $25 million that can be used to pay down our national debt.

I will continue to press to end this System, but in the meantime I am confident this Government Accountability Office report will provide more proof that it is the right thing to do.

HANK JOHNSON.

DISSENTING VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN GARAMENDI

As a Member of the House Armed Services Committee (HASC), preserving and strengthening our national security is a foremost priority of mine. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) that was reported out of the HASC on May 10, 2012, is not a responsible bill, and therefore I could not support it.

In its current form, the NDAA is laden with wasteful spending and reckless national security policies. A prime example of waste is the inclusion of a $100 million down payment on a $5.5 billion authorization to advance a third Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) missile site in the United States, which the Defense Department has deemed unnecessary and does not want. The bill also states that such a site should be operational by 2015.

Regarding reckless national security policies, this bill would deviate from the President's strategy in winding down the war in Afghanistan. In doing so, it would support a new U.S. military mission in that country of keeping at least 68,000 troops on the ground beyond December 31, 2014 for the purpose of nation building.

Furthermore, the bill does not rectify a dangerous provision that was included in the FY 2012 NDAA which allows the military to indefinitely detain any person without being charged or tried. Instead, it needlessly guarantees Habeas Corpus rights, but this does nothing to resolve the fact that individuals may still be detained for any length of time. In an attempt to resolve the underlying matter, I offered an amendment to apply Due Process protections to persons in the U.S. However, after seeking a waiver of the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction, my request was denied and I was forced to withdraw my amendment from consideration.

The bill makes illogical changes to our military readiness. It redirects a critical Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) project from Beale Air Force Base, a mission-ready ISR base in Northern California, to a Navy air base in Southern California that does not have a sustained history of operating and maintaining the Global Hawk system. The Navy cited the Air Force's decision to divest of the Global Hawk Block 30 and the resulting lack of synergies and cost savings between the branches as the reason for the transfer. However, the bill does not terminate the Block 30, which should make such a transfer a moot point. Unfortunately, the language in the bill would authorize the transfer anyway. I offered an amendment requiring a GAO study on the cost-effectiveness and readiness implications of the transfer, but it was defeated along party lines.

The NDAA also contains a provision that would weaken health and safety requirements at National Nuclear Security Administration facilities, such as the Lawrence Livermore National Labora-

tory and Sandia National Laboratory. I voted for an amendment that would have removed this dangerous provision and will continue to stand for the highest safety standards at nuclear facilities.

While unfortunately the fiscal irresponsibility and reckless policy decisions included in the bill ultimately caused me to vote against it, there were provisions that I did support. As previously noted, the NDAA preserves the Global Hawk Block 30 program. It also takes steps to preserve our current MC–12 force structure. Both of these critical ISR missions are based at Beale Air Force Base. The NDAA also includes a well-deserved pay increase for our troops.

Providing for the common defense is one of the Government's most important responsibilities, and the NDAA is the legislative vehicle that is the plan for this. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Full House of Representatives and in the Senate to improve the bill.

JOHN GARAMENDI.

○