111TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
111–166

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

---

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 2647

together with

## ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

JUNE 18, 2009.—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 2010

111TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
111–166

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 2647

together with

## ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

JUNE 18, 2009.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

50–440 WASHINGTON : 2009

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana
PATRICK J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
GLENN NYE, Virginia
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
FRANK M. KRATOVIL, Jr., Maryland
ERIC J.J. MASSA, New York
BOBBY BRIGHT, Alabama
SCOTT MURPHY, New York
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN C. FLEMING, Louisiana
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania

ERIN C. CONATON, *Staff Director*

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Explanation of the Committee Amendments | 1 |
| Purpose | 2 |
| Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations | 2 |
| Summary of Authorization in the Bill | 2 |
| Summary Table of Authorizations | 4 |
| Rationale for the Committee Bill | 17 |
| Hearings | 19 |
| DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION | 20 |
| TITLE I—PROCUREMENT | 20 |
| OVERVIEW | 20 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 23 |
| Overview | 23 |
| Items of Special Interest | 27 |
| Hostile fire detection system | 27 |
| Kiowa Warrior | 27 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 27 |
| Overview | 27 |
| Items of Special Interest | 30 |
| Javelin missile system | 30 |
| TOW 2 missile system | 30 |
| Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 30 |
| Overview | 30 |
| Items of Special Interest | 34 |
| Army self-propelled artillery modernization | 34 |
| Stryker vehicles | 34 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 34 |
| Overview | 34 |
| Items of Special Interest | 38 |
| M722 60mm white phosphorus smoke mortar rounds | 38 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 38 |
| Overview | 38 |
| Items of Special Interest | 52 |
| Enhanced night vision goggles production | 52 |
| Hybrid electric powertrains for tactical wheeled vehicles | 52 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 52 |
| Joint tactical radio system hand-held radios | 53 |
| Non-system training device program | 53 |
| Single channel ground and airborne radio system | 54 |
| Tactical combat vehicle egress safety enhancements | 55 |
| Tactical wheeled vehicle fire suppression systems | 55 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 56 |
| Overview | 56 |
| Items of Special Interest | 61 |
| Department of the Navy strike-fighter inventory | 61 |
| Electronic warfare system core depot development | 62 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 62 |
| Overview | 62 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps | 66 |
| Overview | 66 |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy | 69 |
| Overview | 69 |
| Items of Special Interest | 72 |
| Capabilities of the United States Navy | 72 |
| U.S. Navy shipbuilding | 72 |

Page

Aircraft carriers ... 73
Aircraft carrier construction ... 73
Electromagnetic aircraft launch system ... 74
Littoral combat ship ... 74
Next generation cruiser ... 75
Sea-based strategic deterrent ... 75
Surface combatants ... 76
Other Procurement, Navy ... 76
Overview ... 76
Items of Special Interest ... 86
Multi-climate protection system ... 86
Procurement, Marine Corps ... 86
Overview ... 86
Items of Special Interest ... 92
Nitrile rubber collapsible storage units ... 92
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force ... 92
Overview ... 92
Items of Special Interest ... 100
C–130 avionics modernization program ... 100
F–22A modifications ... 100
KC–130J Harvest Hawk ... 100
KC–X ... 100
Report on Air Force plan to address fighter force structure shortfalls ... 101
Strategic airlift force structure ... 101
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force ... 102
Overview ... 102
Missile Procurement, Air Force ... 104
Overview ... 104
Items of Special Interest ... 108
Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle ... 108
Minuteman III Solid Rocket Motor industrial base sustainment ... 108
Other Procurement, Air Force ... 108
Overview ... 108
Items of Special Interest ... 114
Advanced reconfigurable containers ... 114
Eagle vision ... 114
Procurement, Defense-Wide ... 114
Overview ... 114
Rapid Acquisition Fund ... 120
Overview ... 120
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 123
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 123
Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations ... 123
Section 105—National Guard and Reserve Equipment ... 123
Section 106—Rapid Acquisition Fund ... 123
Subtitle B—Army Programs ... 123
Section 111—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for Army Tactical Radios ... 123
Section 112—Procurement of Future Combat Systems Spin Out Early-Infantry Brigade Combat Team Equipment ... 123
Subtitle C—Navy Programs ... 123
Section 121—Littoral Combat Ship Program ... 123
Section 122—Ford-Class Aircraft Carrier Report and Limitation on the Use of Funds ... 124
Section 123—Advance Procurement Funding ... 124
Section 124—Multiyear Procurement Authority for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G Aircraft ... 124
Section 125—Multiyear Procurement Authority for DDG–51 Burke-class Destroyers ... 124
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs ... 124
Section 131—Repeal of Certification Requirement for F–22A Fighter Aircraft ... 124
Section 132—Preservation and Storage of Unique Tooling for F–22 Fighter Aircraft ... 125
Section 133—Report on 4.5 Generation Fighter Procurement ... 125
Section 134—Reports on Strategic Airlift Aircraft ... 125
Section 135—Strategic Airlift Force Structure ... 126

Page

Section 136—Repeal of Requirement to Maintain Certain Retired C–130E Aircraft ... 126
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters ... 126
Section 141—Body Armor Procurement ... 126
Section 142—Unmanned Cargo-Carrying-Capable Aerial Vehicles ... 126
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ... 127
OVERVIEW ... 127
Army Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ... 129
Overview ... 129
Items of Special Interest ... 146
Advanced lightweight opaque ceramic armor ... 146
Advanced nanoscale tungsten kinetic energy composites ... 146
Army vehicle modernization plans ... 146
Autonomous sustainment cargo container ... 148
Body armor requirements and test and evaluation ... 148
Cellulose nanocomposite panels for ballistic protection ... 149
Dual mode mortar semi-active laser integration ... 150
Electric vehicle charging network ... 150
Future Combat Systems ... 150
Future Combat Systems autonomous navigation system ... 153
Future Combat Systems manned ground vehicles ... 153
Future Combat Systems unattended ground sensors ... 153
Heavy duty hybrid electric vehicle demonstration ... 154
Independent assessment of the Human Terrain System ... 154
Joint fires and effects trainer system enhancements ... 155
Joint land attack cruise missile defense elevated netted sensor system ... 155
Landmine warfare/barrier program ... 156
Manned ground vehicle program ... 156
Mid-range munition program ... 156
Non-line of sight cannon ... 157
Optimizing Natural Language Processing of Open Source Intelligence ... 157
PacCom renewable energy security system ... 157
RAND Arroyo Center ... 157
Review of condition-based maintenance architecture ... 158
Tactical metal fabrication ... 158
Warfighter information network—tactical ... 159
Zero waste to landfill demonstration ... 159
Navy Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ... 159
Overview ... 159
Items of Special Interest ... 175
Advanced energy storage technologies for unmanned undersea vehicles ... 175
Advanced linear accelerator facility ... 175
Advanced steam turbine ... 175
Automated fiber optic manufacturing initiative for Navy ships ... 175
Common command and control system module ... 176
Continuous active sonar for torpedo systems ... 176
Deployable autonomous distributed system ... 176
Electronic warfare technology, doctrine and tactics development ... 177
Extended range joint stand-off weapon ... 177
Future generation thinline towed array ... 178
High density power conversion and distribution equipment ... 178
High-Integrity Global Positioning System ... 178
Hybrid electric drive ... 179
Laser module assembly for Navy's acoustic sensors ... 179
Marine Corps assault vehicles ... 179
Marine mammal awareness, alert, and response systems ... 180
Mold-in-place coating development for the U.S. submarine fleet ... 181
Nanoelectronics, nanometrology and nanobiology initiative ... 181
Remote fuel assessment system ... 181
Standoff explosive detection system ... 181
Surface ship advanced capability build ... 182
Trigger and alert sonobuoy system project ... 182
VH–71 Presidential helicopter program ... 182
Wave energy power buoy generating system ... 183

Page
Air Force Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ..... 183
Overview ..... 183
Items of Special Interest ..... 199
Advanced Modular Avionics for Operationally Responsive Space Use . 199
Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center ..... 199
Air Force test and evaluation support ..... 199
Battle Control Center Acquisition Strategy ..... 200
Cyber Boot Camp ..... 200
Department of Defense Cubesat Bus Development ..... 201
F–35 ..... 201
KC–X tanker replacement program ..... 203
Metals Affordability Initiative ..... 203
Multi-Mode Propulsion Phase IIA: High Performance Green Propellant ..... 203
National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System . 204
Operationally Responsive Space ..... 204
Protected military satellite communications ..... 205
Rivet Joint RC–135 Services Oriented Architecture ..... 205
Small Responsive Spacecraft at Low-Cost ..... 206
Third Generation Infrared Surveillance ..... 206
Defense-Wide Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ..... 207
Overview ..... 207
Items of Special Interest ..... 225
Airborne Laser ..... 225
Arrow-3 upper-tier weapons system ..... 225
Center for technology and national security policy at the National Defense University ..... 226
Coordination of energy storage device requirements and investments 226
Counterproliferation analysis and planning system ..... 227
Defense computing challenges ..... 227
Director, Test Resource Management Center ..... 227
Ground-based Midcourse Defense program ..... 228
High Accuracy Network Determination System ..... 229
Hybrid air vehicle technology ..... 229
Implementation of the defense agencies initiative ..... 229
K–12 education in computer sciences and mathematics ..... 230
Kinetic Energy Interceptor and Multiple Kill Vehicle technology applications ..... 231
Missile defense and military operational requirements ..... 231
Missile defense inventory and force structure analysis ..... 232
Missile Defense Agency space support ..... 232
New approaches for national security information sharing ..... 233
Organic social science expertise within the Department of Defense .... 233
Quantum computing research ..... 234
Report on joint wargaming simulation management ..... 234
Report on requirements for non-lethal weapons ..... 235
Short-range ballistic missile defense ..... 236
Solid state technology for non-lethal systems ..... 236
Theater missile defense ..... 237
Operational Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ..... 237
Overview ..... 237
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 239
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 239
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 239
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 239
Section 211—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Navy Next Generation Enterprise Network ..... 239
Section 212—Limitation on Expenditure of Funds for Joint Multi-Mission Submersible Program ..... 239
Section 213—Separate Program Elements Required for Research and Development of Individual Body Armor and Associated Components .. 239
Section 214—Separate Procurement and Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Line Items and Program Elements for the F–35B and the F–35C Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft ..... 240
Section 215—Restriction on Obligation of Funds Pending Submission of Selected Acquisition Reports ..... 240

Page

Section 216—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for Future Combat Systems Program Pending Receipt of Report ..... 240
Section 217—Limitation of the Obligation of Funds for the Net-Enabled Command and Control System ..... 240
Section 218—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for F–35 Lightning II Program ..... 241
Section 219—Programs Required to Provide the Army with Ground Combat Vehicle and Self-Propelled Artillery Capabilities ..... 241
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs ..... 241
Section 221—Integrated Air and Missile Defense System Project ..... 241
Section 222—Ground-based Midcourse Defense Sustainment and Modernization Program ..... 241
Section 223—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Acquisition or Deployment of Missile Defenses in Europe ..... 242
Section 224—Sense of Congress Reaffirming Continued Support for Protecting the United States Against Limited Ballistic Missile Attacks Whether Accidental, Unauthorized, or Deliberate ..... 242
Section 225—Ascent Phase Missile Defense Strategy ..... 242
Section 226—Availability of Funds for a Missile Defense System for Europe and the United States ..... 243
Subtitle D—Reports ..... 243
Section 231—Comptroller General Assessment of Coordination of Energy Storage Device Requirements and Investments ..... 243
Section 232—Annual Comptroller Report on the F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Acquisition Program ..... 243
Section 233—Report on Integration of Department of Defense Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Capabilities ..... 244
Section 234—Report on Future Research and Development of Man-Portable and Vehicle-Mounted Guided Missile Systems ..... 244
Subtitle E—Other Matters ..... 244
Section 241—Access of the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to Department of Defense Information ..... 244
Section 242—Inclusion in Annual Budget Request and Future-Years Defense Program of Sufficient Amounts for Continued Development and Procurement of Competitive Propulsion System for F–35 Lightning II ..... 244
Section 243—Establishment of Program to Enhance Participation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions in Defense Research Programs ..... 245
Section 244—Extension of Authority to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements ..... 247
Section 245—Executive Agent for Advanced Energetics ..... 247
Section 246—Study on Thorium-Liquid Fueled Reactors for Naval Forces ..... 248
Section 247—Visiting National Institutes of Health Senior Neuroscience Fellowship Program ..... 248
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ..... 248
OVERVIEW ..... 248
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 282
Budget Request Adjustments ..... 282
Assessments and Analytical Tools for Implementation of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 ..... 283
Combat Air Forces Restructuring ..... 284
Fee for Service Refueling ..... 284
Navy Depot Maintenance ..... 284
Procurement Technical Assistance Program ..... 284
Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative ..... 285
Security and Stabilization Assistance Authority for Transfers to the U.S. Department of State ..... 285
Energy and Environmental Issues ..... 285
Camp Lejeune Drinking Water ..... 285
Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations ..... 286
Overseas Environmental Standards for Solid Waste Disposal ..... 287
Workplace and Depot Issues ..... 287
Air Force Civil Engineer Supply Functions ..... 287
Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities ..... 288
Corrosion Control and Prevention ..... 289

Page

Corrosion Evaluation of F–35 Joint Strike Fighter ..... 289
Impact of Contractor Support on Operational Readiness ..... 290
Insourcing New and Contracted-out Functions ..... 291
Lifecycle Operations, Maintenance, and Supply Mission Simulation ..... 292
Repair Capability for Low-Observable Technology ..... 292
Other Matters ..... 293
Accessibility of Military Historical Information ..... 293
Air Force Combat Support Forces ..... 293
Combat Skills Training for Support Units ..... 293
Critical Infrastructure Interdependencies Vulnerability Assessments ..... 294
Defense Travel System ..... 294
Evaluation of Readiness of U.S. Forces ..... 295
Facilitation of Strategic Deployment ..... 296
Medical Care Provided by the Military for Contractors in Combat Zones ..... 296
Remediation of Cybersecurity System Vulnerabilities ..... 297
Report on Navy Training ..... 297
Secure Telework Center Pilot Project ..... 298
Security Clearance Reform ..... 298
Ship Material Readiness ..... 299
Strategic Port Optimization ..... 300
Tire Privatization ..... 300
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 301
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 301
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding ..... 301
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions ..... 301
Section 311—Clarification of Requirement for Use of Available Funds for Department of Defense Participation in Conservation Banking Programs ..... 301
Section 312—Reauthorization of Title I of Sikes Act ..... 301
Section 313—Authority of Secretary of a Military Department to Enter into Interagency Agreements for Land Management on Department of Defense Installations ..... 301
Section 314—Reauthorization of Pilot Program for Invasive Species Management for Military Installations in Guam ..... 301
Section 315—Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia ..... 302
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues ..... 302
Section 321—Public-Private Competition Required Before Conversion of Any Department of Defense Function Performed by Civilian Employees to Contractor Performance ..... 302
Section 322—Time Limitation on Duration of Public-Private Competitions ..... 302
Section 323—Inclusion of Installation of Major Modifications in Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair ..... 302
Section 324—Modification of Authority for Army Industrial Facilities to Engage in Cooperative Activities with Non-Army Entities ..... 303
Section 325—Cost-Benefit Analysis of Alternatives for Performance of Planned Maintenance Interval Events and Concurrent Modifications Performed on the AV–8B Harrier Weapons System ..... 303
Section 326—Termination of Certain Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Performance by a Contractor ..... 303
Section 327—Temporary Suspension of Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Performance by a Contractor ..... 304
Section 328—Requirement for Debriefings Related to Conversion of Functions from Performance by Federal Employees to Performance by Contractor ..... 304
Section 329—Amendments to Bid Protest Procedures by Federal Employees and Agency Officials in Conversion of Functions from Performance by Federal Employees to Performance by a Contractor ..... 304
Subtitle D—Energy Security ..... 304
Section 331—Authorization of Appropriations for Director of Operational Energy ..... 304

Page

Section 332—Report on Implementation of Comptroller General Recommendations on Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations ..... 304
Section 333—Consideration of Renewable Fuels ..... 305
Section 334—Department of Defense Goal Regarding Procurement of Renewable Aviation Fuels ..... 305
Subtitle E—Reports ..... 305
Section 341—Annual Report on Procurement of Military Working Dogs 305
Subtitle F—Other Matters ..... 305
Section 351—Authority for Airlift Transportation at Department of Defense Rates for Non-Department of Defense Federal Cargoes ..... 305
Section 352—Requirements for Standard Ground Combat Uniform ..... 305
Section 353—Restriction on Use of Funds for Counterthreat Finance Efforts ..... 306
Section 354—Limitation on Obligation of Funds Pending Submission of Classified Justification Material ..... 306
Section 355—Condition-Based Maintenance Demonstration Programs ... 307
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 307
OVERVIEW ..... 307
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 308
Subtitle A—Active Forces ..... 308
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces ..... 308
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels ..... 308
Section 403—Additional Authority for Increases of Army Active Duty End Strengths for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012 ..... 308
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces ..... 308
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve ..... 308
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves ..... 309
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) ..... 309
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2010 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians ..... 310
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support ..... 310
Section 416—Submission of Options for Creation of Trainees, Transients, Holdees, and Students Account for Army National Guard ..... 311
Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations ..... 311
Section 421—Military Personnel ..... 311
Section 422—Repeal of Delayed One-Time Shift of Military Retirement Payments ..... 313
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY ..... 313
OVERVIEW ..... 313
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 314
Addressing the Shortage of Company Grade Officers within the Army National Guard and Army Reserve ..... 314
Joint Duty Assignment Credit for Military JPME Faculty Members ..... 315
Recognizing Service Women Who Have Participated as "Lionesses" during Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan ..... 315
Report on Medal of Honor Award Process ..... 316
Restricted Reporting Requirements for Sexual Assault Victims ..... 317
Social Networking in Recruiting ..... 317
Stars and Stripes Newspaper ..... 317
The Awarding of the Purple Heart for Traumatic Brain Injuries ..... 318
Virtual Army Experience ..... 318
Wounded Warriors and Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps ..... 318
Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program Improvements ..... 319
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 319
Subtitle A—Military Personnel Policy Generally ..... 319
Section 501—Extension of Temporary Increase in Maximum Number of Days' Leave Members May Accumulate and Carryover ..... 319
Section 502—Rank Requirement for Officer Serving as Chief of the Navy Dental Corps to Correspond to Army and Air Force Requirements ..... 320
Section 503—Computation of Retirement Eligibility for Enlisted Members of the Navy Who Complete the Seaman to Admiral (STA–21) Officer Candidate Program ..... 320

Page
Subtitle B—Joint Qualified Officers and Requirements ..... 320
Section 511—Revisions to Annual Reporting Requirement on Joint Officer Management ..... 320
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities ..... 320
Section 521—Medical Examination Required before Separation of Members Diagnosed with or Asserting Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Traumatic Brain Injury ..... 320
Section 522—Evaluation of Test of Utility of Test Preparation Guides and Education Programs in Improving Qualifications of Recruits for the Armed Forces ..... 321
Section 523—Inclusion of Email Address on Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) ..... 321
Subtitle D—Education and Training ..... 321
Section 531—Appointment of Persons Enrolled in Advanced Course of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Military Junior Colleges as Cadets in Army Reserve or Army National Guard of the United States ..... 321
Section 532—Increase in Number of Private Sector Civilians Authorized for Admission to the National Defense University ..... 321
Section 533—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by Delegate from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands ..... 322
Section 534—Pilot Program to Establish and Evaluate Language Training Centers for Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense ..... 322
Section 535—Use of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program to Increase Number of Health Professionals with Skills to Assist in Providing Mental Health Care .. 322
Section 536—Establishment of Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps Units for Students in Grades above Sixth Grade ..... 322
Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education ..... 323
Section 551—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees ..... 323
Section 552—Determination of Number of Weighted Student Units for Local Educational Agencies for Receipt of Basic Support Payments under Impact Aid ..... 323
Section 553—Permanent Authority for Enrollment in Defense Dependents' Education System of Dependents of Foreign Military Members Assigned to Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe ..... 323
Subtitle F—Missing or Deceased Persons ..... 323
Section 561—Additional Requirements for Accounting for Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees Listed as Missing in Conflicts Occurring before Enactment of New System for Accounting for Missing Persons ..... 323
Section 562—Clarification of Guidelines Regarding Return of Remains and Media Access at Ceremonies for the Dignified Transfer of Remains at Dover Air Force Base ..... 324
Subtitle G—Decorations and Awards ..... 324
Section 571—Award of Vietnam Service Medal to Veterans Who Participated in Mayaguez Rescue Operation ..... 324
Section 572—Authorization and Request for Award of Medal of Honor to Anthony T. Koho'ohanohano for Acts of Valor during the Korean War ..... 324
Section 573—Authorization and Request for Award of Distinguished-Service Cross to Jack T. Stewart for Acts of Valor during the Vietnam War ..... 324
Section 574—Authorization and Request for Award of Distinguished-Service Cross to William T. Miles, Jr., for Acts of Valor during the Korean War ..... 324
Subtitle H—Military Families ..... 325
Section 581—Pilot Program to Secure Internships for Military Spouses with Federal Agencies ..... 325
Section 582—Report on Progress Made in Implementing Recommendations to Reduce Domestic Violence in Military Families ..... 325

Page

Section 583—Modification of Servicemembers Civil Relief Act Regarding Termination or Suspension of Service Contracts and Effect of Violation of Interest Rate Limitation ..... 325
Section 584—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces Deployed in Support of a Contingency Operation ..... 325
Section 585—Definitions in Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 Related to Active Duty Servicemembers, and Related Matters ..... 325
Subtitle I—Other Matters ..... 326
Section 591—Navy Grants to Naval Sea Cadet Corps ..... 326
Section 592—Improved Response and Investigation of Allegations of Sexual Assault Involving Members of the Armed Forces ..... 326
Section 593—Modification of Matching Fund Requirements under National Guard Youth Challenge Program ..... 327
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS ..... 327
OVERVIEW ..... 327
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 328
Exchange Dividend Payments to the Puerto Rico National Guard ..... 328
Review of Policy and Cost Considerations by Which National Guard Military Technicians are Treated for Overtime Work ..... 328
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 329
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances ..... 329
Section 601—Fiscal Year 2010 Increase in Military Basic Pay ..... 329
Section 602—Special Monthly Compensation Allowance for Members with Combat-Related Catastrophic Injuries or Illnesses Pending Their Retirement or Separation for Physical Disability ..... 329
Section 603—Stabilization of Pay and Allowances for Senior Enlisted Members and Warrant Officers Appointed as Officers and Officers Reappointed in a Lower Grade ..... 329
Section 604—Report on Housing Standards Used to Determine Basic Allowance for Housing ..... 329
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays ..... 330
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces ..... 330
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals ..... 330
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers ..... 330
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities ..... 330
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pay ..... 330
Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses ..... 331
Section 617—Technical Corrections and Conforming Amendments to Reconcile Conflicting Amendments Regarding Continued Payment of Bonuses and Similar Benefits for Certain Members ..... 331
Section 618—Proration of Certain Special and Incentive Pays to Reflect Time During Which a Member Satisfies Eligibility Requirements for the Special or Incentive Pay ..... 331
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances ..... 331
Section 631—Transportation of Additional Motor Vehicle of Members on Change of Permanent Station to or from Nonforeign Areas Outside the Continental United States ..... 331
Section 632—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Designated Individuals of Wounded, Ill, or Injured Members for Duration of Inpatient Treatment ..... 331
Section 633—Authorized Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Very Seriously and Seriously Wounded, Ill, or Injured Members ..... 332
Section 634—Increased Weight Allowance for Transportation of Baggage and Household Effects for Certain Enlisted Members ..... 332
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits ..... 332
Section 641—Recomputation of Retired Pay and Adjustment of Retired Grade of Reserve Retirees to Reflect Service after Retirement ..... 332

Page

Section 642—Election to Receive Retired Pay for Non-Regular Service upon Retirement for Service in an Active Reserve Status Performed after Attaining Eligibility for Regular Retirement ..... 332
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations ..... 333
Section 651—Additional Exception to Limitation on Use of Appropriated Funds for Department of Defense Golf Courses ..... 333
Section 652—Limitation on Department of Defense Entities Offering Personal Information Services to Members and Their Dependents ..... 333
Section 653—Report on Impact of Purchasing from Local Distributors All Alcoholic Beverages for Resale on Military Installations on Guam 333
Subtitle F—Other Matters ..... 333
Section 661—Limitations on Collection of Overpayments of Pay and Allowances Erroneously Paid to Members ..... 333
Section 662—Army Authority to Provide Additional Recruitment Incentives ..... 334
Section 663—Benefits under Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence Program for Certain Periods Before Implementation of Program ..... 334
Section 664—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Compensation, Retirement, and Other Military Personnel Programs ..... 334
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS ..... 334
OVERVIEW ..... 334
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 335
Active Duty Dental Care ..... 335
Arthritis ..... 336
Availability of Proper and Comprehensive Medical Care for Victims of Sexual Assault ..... 336
Human Systems Integration ..... 336
Internet-Based Interactive Mental Health Technology ..... 337
Long-Term Tracking for Blast Exposures ..... 337
Mental Health and Traumatic Brain Injury ..... 337
Military Mental Health Providers ..... 338
Pulse!! ..... 339
Reserve Dental Readiness ..... 339
Trauma Training Technology ..... 340
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 340
Subtitle A—Improvements to Health Benefits ..... 340
Section 701—Prohibition on Conversion of Military Medical and Dental Positions to Civilian Medical and Dental Positions ..... 340
Section 702—Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty ..... 340
Section 703—Expansion of Survivor Eligibility under TRICARE Dental Program ..... 340
Section 704—TRICARE Standard Coverage for Certain Members of the Retired Reserve Who Are Qualified for a Non-Regular Retirement But Are Not Yet Age 60 ..... 340
Section 705—Cooperative Health Care Agreements between Military Installations and Non-Military Health Care Systems ..... 341
Section 706—Health Care for Members of the Reserve Components ..... 341
Section 707—National Casualty Care Research Center ..... 341
Subtitle B—Reports ..... 341
Section 711—Report on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Efforts ..... 341
Section 712—Report on the Feasibility of TRICARE Prime in Certain Commonwealths and Territories of the United States ..... 342
Section 713—Report on the Health Care Needs of Military Family Members ..... 342
Section 714—Report on Stipends for Members of Reserve Components for Health Care for Certain Dependents ..... 342
Section 715—Report on the Required Number of Military Mental Health Providers ..... 342
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS ..... 342
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 343
Contingency Contracting ..... 343
Contingency Contracting Planning, Oversight, and Visibility ..... 343
Serious Corrective Action Measures in Department of Defense Contracts ..... 344

Page
Third-Party Certification of Private Security Contractors ..... 344
War Zone Contractor Communications Safety ..... 345
Other Matters ..... 346
Acquisition Workforce ..... 346
Industrial Security ..... 347
Report on Small Business Concerns with Defense Policy Review Initiative Acquisition Strategy ..... 347
Service Contracting ..... 348
Service Contractor Inventory ..... 349
Strategic Materials ..... 350
Use of Non-Traditional Defense Contractors for Information Technology Programs ..... 351
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 352
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management ..... 352
Section 801—Enhanced Authority to Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan ..... 352
Section 802—Assessment of Improvements in Service Contracting ..... 352
Section 803—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Procurement of Contract Services and Related Clarifying Technical Amendments .. 353
Section 804—Demonstration Authority for Alternative Acquisition Process for Defense Information Technology Programs ..... 353
Section 805—Limitation on Performance of Product Support Integrator Functions ..... 354
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations ..... 354
Section 811—Revision of Defense Supplement Relating to Payment of Costs Prior to Definitization ..... 354
Section 812—Revisions to Definitions Relating to Contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan ..... 354
Section 813—Amendment to Notification Requirements for Awards of Single Source Task or Delivery Orders ..... 355
Section 814—Clarification of Uniform Suspension and Debarment Requirement ..... 355
Section 815—Extension of Authority for Use of Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Certain Commercial Items ..... 355
Section 816—Revision to Definitions of Major Defense Acquisition Program and Major Automated Information System ..... 355
Section 817—Small Arms Production Industrial Base ..... 356
Section 818—Publication of Justification for Bundling of Contracts of the Department of Defense ..... 356
Section 819—Contract Authority for Advanced Component Development or Prototype Units ..... 356
Subtitle C—Other Matters ..... 356
Section 821—Enhanced Expedited Hiring Authority for Defense Acquisition Workforce Positions ..... 356
Section 822—Acquisition Workforce Development Fund Amendments ... 357
Section 823—Reports to Congress on Full Deployment Decisions for Major Automated Information System Programs ..... 357
Section 824—Requirement for Secretary of Defense to Deny Award and Incentive Fees to Companies Found to Jeopardize Health or Safety of Government Personnel ..... 358
Section 825—Authorization for Actions to Correct the Industrial Resource Shortfall for High-Purity Beryllium Metal in Amounts Not in Excess of $85,000,000 ..... 358
Section 826—Review of Post-Employment Restrictions Applicable to the Department of Defense ..... 358
Section 827—Requirement to Buy Military Decorations, Ribbons, Badges, Medals, Insignia, and Other Uniform Accouterments Produced in the United States ..... 359
Section 828—Findings and Report on the Usage of Rare Earth Materials in the Defense Supply Chain ..... 359
Section 829—Furniture Standards ..... 360
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT ..... 360
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 360
Biometrics-Enabled Intelligence Analysis ..... 360

Page

Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, or High-Yield Explosive Consequence Management Forces ..... 361
Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs ..... 361
Financial Crisis ..... 362
Implementation of Strategy for Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction: Counterproliferation ..... 362
Interagency Coordination ..... 363
Organizing for Cyber Operations ..... 364
Special Operations Command Strategic Communications ..... 364
Special Operations Forces Overhead Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Support ..... 365
Temporary Reconfiguration of USAFCENT/9th Air Force Headquarters 365
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 366
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management ..... 366
Section 901—Role of Commander of Special Operations Command Regarding Personnel Management Policy and Plans Affecting Special Operations Forces ..... 366
Section 902—Special Operations Activities ..... 366
Section 903—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps ..... 366
Section 904—Authority to Allow Private Sector Civilians to Receive Instruction at Defense Cyber Investigations Training Academy of the Defense Cyber Crime Center ..... 366
Section 905—Organizational Structure of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and the TRICARE Management Activity ..... 367
Section 906—Requirement for Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs to Report Directly to Secretary of Defense ..... 367
Section 907—Increased Flexibility for Combatant Commander Initiative Fund ..... 367
Section 908—Repeal of Requirement for a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy ..... 367
Section 909—Recommendations to Congress by Members of Joint Chiefs of Staff ..... 368
Subtitle B—Space Activities ..... 368
Section 911—Submission and Review of Space Science and Technology Strategy ..... 368
Section 912—Converting the Space Surveillance Network Pilot Program to a Permanent Program ..... 368
Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related Matters ..... 368
Section 921—Plan to Address Foreign Ballistic Missile Intelligence Analysis ..... 368
Subtitle D—Other Matters ..... 369
Section 931—Joint Program Office for Cyber Operations Capabilities ..... 369
Section 932—Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System Transition Council ..... 369
Section 933—Department of Defense School of Nursing Revisions ..... 369
Section 934—Report on Special Operations Command Organization, Manning, and Management ..... 370
Section 935—Study on the Recruitment, Retention and Career Progression of Uniformed and Civilian Military Cyber Operations Personnel . 371
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 371
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 371
Counter-Drug Activities ..... 371
Overview ..... 371
Items of Special Interest ..... 371
Budget requests ..... 371
Department of Defense efforts to combat drug-related cartel activity along the United States border with Mexico ..... 372
International support ..... 372
Obligating 1033/1004 CN funds for Baluchistan, Pakistan ..... 374
Other Activities ..... 374
Analysis of the Strategic Communications Workforce ..... 374
Assessment of Defense Information Technology Systems for Financial Management ..... 375

Page

Government Accountability Office Review of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Capabilities ..... 376
Information Programs ..... 376
Institute for Analysis ..... 377
Interagency Responsibility for Detection, Monitoring and Information Sharing in the Maritime Domain ..... 377
Joint Cargo Aircraft Force Structure Requirements and Basing Plan ..... 378
Military Aircraft Industrial Base ..... 380
Report of the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review ..... 380
Report on Military Public Diplomacy Activities ..... 381
Study of the Effective Use of Aerial Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Systems in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan ..... 382
Undersea and Off-Shore Critical Infrastructure ..... 383
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 384
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ..... 384
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority ..... 384
Section 1002—Incorporation of Funding Decisions into Law ..... 384
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug and Counter-Terrorism Activities ..... 384
Section 1011—One-Year Extension of Department of Defense Counter-Drug Authorities and Requirements ..... 384
Section 1012—Joint Task Forces Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-Terrorism Activities ..... 385
Section 1013—Border Coordination Centers in Afghanistan and Pakistan ..... 385
Section 1014—Comptroller General Report on Effectiveness of Accountability Measures for Assistance from Counter-Narcotics Central Transfer Account ..... 386
Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations ..... 386
Section 1021—Operational Procedures for Experimental Military Prototypes ..... 386
Section 1022—Temporary Reduction in Minimum Number of Operational Aircraft Carriers ..... 386
Section 1023—Limitation on Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba ..... 387
Section 1024—Charter for the National Reconnaissance Office ..... 387
Subtitle D—Studies and Reports ..... 387
Section 1031—Report of Statutory Compliance of the Report on the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review ..... 387
Section 1032—Report on the Force Structure Findings of the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review ..... 387
Section 1033—Sense of Congress and Amendment Relating to the Quadrennial Defense Review ..... 389
Section 1034—Strategic Review of Basing Plans for United States European Command ..... 389
Section 1035—National Defense Panel ..... 389
Section 1036—Report Required on Notification of Detainees of Rights of Miranda v. Arizona ..... 390
Section 1037—Annual Report on the Electronic Warfare Strategy of the Department of Defense ..... 390
Section 1038—Studies to Analyze Alternative Models for Acquisition and Funding of Technologies Supporting Network-centric Operations 390
Subtitle E—Other Matters ..... 390
Section 1041—Prohibition Relating to Propaganda ..... 390
Section 1042—Extension of Certain Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism ..... 390
Section 1043—Technical and Clerical Amendments ..... 391
Section 1044—Repeal of Pilot Program on Commercial Fee-for-Service Air Refueling Support for the Air Force ..... 391
Section 1045—Extension of Sunset for Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States ..... 391
Section 1046—Authorization of Appropriations for Payments to Portuguese Nationals Employed by the Department of Defense ..... 392
Section 1047—Combat Air Forces Restructuring ..... 392
Section 1048—Sense of Congress Honoring the Honorable Ellen O. Tauscher ..... 393

Page

Section 1049—Sense of Congress Concerning the Disposition of Submarine NR–1 ..... 393
Section 1050—Compliance with Requirement for Plan on the Disposition of Detainees at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba ..... 393
Section 1051—Sense of Congress Regarding Carrier Air Wing Force Structure ..... 393
Section 1052—Sense of Congress on Department of Defense Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness; Plan ..... 393
Section 1053—Justice for Victims of Torture and Terrorism ..... 394
Section 1054—Repeal of Certain Laws Pertaining to the Joint Committee for the Review of Counterproliferation Programs of the United States ..... 394
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS ..... 394
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 394
Civilian Expeditionary Workforce ..... 394
National Security Personnel System ..... 395
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 396
Section 1101—Authority to Employ Individuals Completing the National Security Education Program ..... 396
Section 1102—Authority for Employment by Department of Defense of Individuals Who Have Successfully Completed the Requirements of the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) Defense Scholarship Program ..... 396
Section 1103—Authority for the Employment of Individuals Who Have Successfully Completed the Department of Defense Information Assurance Scholarship Program ..... 396
Section 1104—Additional Personnel Authorities for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction ..... 397
Section 1105—One Year Extension of Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas ..... 397
Section 1106—Extension of Certain Benefits to Federal Civilian Employees on Official Duty in Pakistan ..... 397
Section 1107—Authority to Expand Scope of Provisions Relating to Unreduced Compensation for Certain Reemployed Annuitants ..... 397
Section 1108—Requirement for Department of Defense Strategic Workforce Plans ..... 398
Section 1109—Adjustments to Limitations on Personnel and Requirement for Annual Manpower Reporting ..... 398
Section 1110—Modification to the Department of Defense Laboratory Personnel Authority ..... 399
Section 1111—Pilot Program for the Temporary Exchange of Information Technology Personnel ..... 399
Section 1112—Provisions Relating to the National Security Personnel System ..... 400
Section 1113—Provisions Relating to the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System ..... 400
Section 1114—Sense of Congress on Pay Parity for Federal Employees Service at Joint Base McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst ..... 400
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS ..... 401
OVERVIEW ..... 401
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 402
Building Partnership Capacity ..... 402
Donated Helicopters for the Afghan National Army ..... 402
Employment for Resettled Iraqis ..... 403
Increased Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism ..... 403
Increasing the Size of the Afghan National Security Forces and Accelerating the Growth of These Forces ..... 404
The North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Coordination Center ..... 405
Piracy Off the Somali Coast and Within Somalia ..... 406
Planning for Logistical Challenges in Iraq and Afghanistan ..... 407
Report on Department of Defense Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund ..... 408
Security Cooperation and Security Assistance ..... 408
Security Concerns Involving North Korea ..... 409
Security Developments in Pakistan and Implications for Afghanistan ..... 410

Page

Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction and Women .. 411
Train and Equip Authorities ..... 411
U.S.-China Maritime Issues ..... 412
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 413
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training ..... 413
Section 1201—Modification and Extension of Authority for Security and Stabilization Assistance ..... 413
Section 1202—Increase of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism ..... 413
Section 1203—Modification of Report on Foreign-Assistance Related Programs Carried Out by the Department of Defense ..... 413
Section 1204—Report on Authorities to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces and Related Matters ..... 414
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan ..... 414
Section 1211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Purposes Relating to Iraq ..... 414
Section 1212—Reauthorization of Commanders' Emergency Response Program ..... 414
Section 1213—Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations ..... 415
Section 1214—Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund ..... 415
Section 1215—Program to Provide for the Registration and End-Use Monitoring of Defense Articles and Defense Services Transferred to Afghanistan and Pakistan ..... 416
Section 1216—Report on Campaign Plans for Iraq and Afghanistan ..... 417
Section 1217—Required Assessments of United States Efforts in Afghanistan ..... 417
Section 1218—Report on Responsible Redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq ..... 417
Section 1219—Report on Afghan Public Protection Program ..... 418
Section 1220—Updates of Report on Command and Control Structure for Military Forces Operating in Afghanistan ..... 418
Section 1221—Report on Payments Made by United States Armed Forces to Residents of Afghanistan as Compensation for Losses Caused by United States Military Operations ..... 418
Section 1222—Assessment and Report on United States-Pakistan Military Relations and Cooperation ..... 419
Section 1223—Required Assessments of Progress toward Security and Stability in Pakistan ..... 419
Section 1224—Repeal of GAO War-Related Reporting Requirement ..... 420
Section 1225—Plan to Govern the Disposition of Specified Defense Items in Iraq ..... 420
Section 1226—Civilian Ministry of Defense Advisor Program ..... 420
Section 1227—Report on the Status of Interagency Coordination in the Afghanistan and Operation Enduring Freedom Theater of Operations ..... 421
Section 1228—Sense of Congress Supporting United States Policy for Afghanistan ..... 421
Section 1229—Analysis of Required Force Levels and Types of Forces Needed to Secure Southern and Eastern Regions of Afghanistan ..... 422
Subtitle C—Other Matters ..... 422
Section 1231—NATO Special Operations Coordination Center ..... 422
Section 1232—Annual Report on Military Power of the Islamic Republic of Iran ..... 422
Section 1233—Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China ..... 423
Section 1234—Report on Impacts of Drawdown Authorities on the Department of Defense ..... 423
Section 1235—Risk Assessment of United States Space Export Control Policy ..... 424
Section 1236—Patriot Air and Missile Defense Battery in Poland ..... 424
Section 1237—Report on Potential Foreign Military Sales of the F–22A Fighter Aircraft to Japan ..... 424
Section 1238—Expansion of United States-Russian Federation Joint Center to Include Exchange of Data on Missile Defense ..... 425
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION ..... 425

Page
OVERVIEW ..... 425
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 426
Biological Threat Reduction ..... 426
Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Contracting Procedures and Agreements ..... 427
New Initiatives for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ..... 427
Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Project ..... 427
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 428
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds ..... 428
Section 1302—Funding Allocations ..... 428
Section 1303—Utilization of Contributions to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ..... 428
Section 1304—National Academy of Sciences Study of Metrics for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ..... 429
Section 1305—Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Authority for Urgent Threat Reduction Activities ..... 429
Section 1306—Cooperative Threat Reduction Defense and Military Contacts Program ..... 429
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 430
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 430
Defense Working Capital Fund Cash Balance ..... 430
Subtitle A—Military Programs ..... 430
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds ..... 430
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund ..... 430
Section 1403—Defense Health Program ..... 430
Section 1404—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense ..... 431
Section 1405—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide ..... 431
Section 1406—Defense Inspector General ..... 431
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile ..... 431
Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds ..... 431
Section 1412—Extension of Previously Authorized Disposal of Cobalt from National Defense Stockpile ..... 432
Section 1413—Report on Implementation of Reconfiguration of the National Defense Stockpile ..... 432
Subtitle C—Armed Forces Retirement Home ..... 432
Section 1421—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home ..... 432
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS ..... 437
OVERVIEW ..... 437
SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 437
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 483
Defense Advanced GPS Receivers ..... 483
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund ..... 483
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund ..... 484
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 484
Section 1501—Purpose ..... 484
Section 1502—Army Procurement ..... 484
Section 1503—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund ..... 484
Section 1504—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization Pending Report to Congress ..... 484
Section 1505—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement ..... 485
Section 1506—Air Force Procurement ..... 485
Section 1507—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement ..... 485
Section 1508—Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund ..... 485
Section 1509—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ..... 486
Section 1510—Operation and Maintenance ..... 486
Section 1511—Working Capital Funds ..... 486
Section 1512—Military Personnel ..... 486
Section 1513—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund ..... 486
Section 1514—Iraq Freedom Fund ..... 486
Section 1515—Other Department of Defense Programs ..... 486
Section 1516—Limitations on Iraq Security Forces Fund ..... 486
Section 1517—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq ..... 486

Page
Section 1518—Special Transfer Authority ..... 487
Section 1519—Treatment as Additional Authorizations ..... 487
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 487
PURPOSE ..... 487
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW ..... 487
Section 2001—Short Title ..... 512
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law ..... 512
Section 2003—Effective Date ..... 512
TITLE XXI—ARMY ..... 512
SUMMARY ..... 512
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 512
Castner Range Complex at Fort Bliss ..... 512
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 512
Planning and Design ..... 513
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 513
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 513
Section 2102—Family Housing ..... 514
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 514
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army ..... 514
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project ..... 514
Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects ..... 514
TITLE XXII—NAVY ..... 514
SUMMARY ..... 514
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 514
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head Division, Indian Head, Maryland ..... 514
Navy-State Partnership for Improving Infrastructure at Naval Installations ..... 515
Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range ..... 515
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 515
Planning and Design ..... 516
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 517
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 517
Section 2202—Family Housing ..... 517
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 517
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy ..... 517
Section 2205—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Project ..... 517
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE ..... 517
SUMMARY ..... 517
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 517
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station ..... 517
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 518
Planning and Design ..... 518
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 518
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 518
Section 2302—Family Housing ..... 518
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 519
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force ..... 519
Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects ..... 519
Section 2306—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects ..... 519
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES ..... 519
SUMMARY ..... 519
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 519
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 519
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 520
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations ..... 520
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 520

Page
Section 2402—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies ..... 520
Section 2403—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project ..... 520
Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project ..... 520
Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Project ..... 521
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations ..... 521
Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide ..... 521
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM ..... 521
SUMMARY ..... 521
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 521
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 521
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ..... 521
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ..... 521
SUMMARY ..... 521
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 522
Virginia National Guard Headquarters ..... 522
Planning and Design, Army National Guard ..... 522
Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard ..... 522
Planning and Design, Air National Guard ..... 523
Unspecified Minor Construction, Air National Guard ..... 523
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 523
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 523
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 523
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 524
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 524
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 524
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve ..... 524
Section 2607—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects ..... 524
Section 2608—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Project ..... 524
TITLE XXVII—BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACTIVITIES ..... 524
SUMMARY ..... 524
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 532
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 532
Ft Bragg/Pope Air Field BRAC Force Structure ..... 532
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 533
Subtitle A—Authorizations ..... 533
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 ..... 533
Section 2702—Authorized Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 .. 533
Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 ..... 533
Subtitle B—Amendments to Base Closure and Related Laws ..... 533
Section 2711—Use of Economic Development Conveyances to Implement Base Closure and Realignment Property Recommendations ..... 533
Subtitle C—Other Matters ..... 534
Section 2721—Sense of Congress on Ensuring Joint Basing Recommendations Do Not Adversely Affect Operational Readiness ..... 534
Section 2722—Modification of Closure Instructions Regarding Paul Doble Army Reserve Center, Portsmouth, New Hampshire ..... 534
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 534
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 534

Page

Acquisition of Land in the Clear Zone and Accident Potential Zones ..... 534
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funding for Department of Defense Energy Initiatives ..... 534
Annual Installation Energy Report ..... 535
Army Ammunition Plant Infrastructure ..... 535
Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives ..... 536
Comptroller General Assessment of Military Basing Decision Process ... 537
Economic Impact of Brigade Combat Team Stationing Plan ..... 538
Installation Energy Strategy and Management Assessment ..... 538
Installation Master Plans ..... 540
Military Construction Future Years Defense Program ..... 541
Report on Implementation of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Standards ..... 541
Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport 2003 Property Disposal ..... 542
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 542
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes ..... 542
Section 2801—Modification of Unspecified Minor Construction Authorities ..... 542
Section 2802—Congressional Notification of Facility Repair Projects Carried out Using Operation and Maintenance Funds ..... 542
Section 2803—Authorized Scope of Work Variations for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects ..... 543
Section 2804—Imposition of Requirement that Acquisition of Reserve Component Facilities be Authorized by Law ..... 543
Section 2805—Report on Department of Defense Contributions to States for Acquisition, Construction, Expansion, Rehabilitation, or Conversion of Reserve Component Facilities ..... 543
Section 2806—Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects inside the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility ..... 543
Section 2807—Expansion of First Sergeants Barracks Initiative ..... 543
Section 2808—Reports on Privatization Initiatives for Military Unaccompanied Housing ..... 544
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration ..... 544
Section 2811—Imposition of Requirement that Leases of Real Property to the United States with Annual Rental Costs of More than $750,000 be Authorized by Law ..... 544
Section 2812—Consolidation of Notice-and-Wait Requirements Applicable to Leases of Real Property Owned by the United States ..... 544
Section 2813—Clarification of Authority of Military Departments to Acquire Low-Cost Interests in Land and Interests in Land when Need is Urgent ..... 544
Section 2814—Modification of Utility Systems Conveyance Authority .... 544
Section 2815—Decontamination and Use of Former Bombardment Area on Island of Culebra ..... 544
Section 2816—Disposal of Excess Property of Armed Forces Retirement Home ..... 545
Section 2817—Acceptance of Contributions to Support Cleanup Efforts at Former Almaden Air Force Station, California ..... 545
Section 2818—Limitation on Establishment of Navy Outlying Landing Fields ..... 545
Section 2819—Prohibition on Outlying Landing Field at Sandbanks or Hale's Lake, North Carolina, for Oceana Naval Air Station ..... 545
Section 2820—Selection of Military Installations to Serve as Locations of Brigade Combat Teams ..... 545
Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Guam Realignment ..... 545
Section 2831—Role of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in Management and Coordination of Department of Defense Activities Relating to Guam Realignment ..... 545
Section 2832—Clarifications Regarding Use of Special Purpose Entities to Assist with Guam Realignment ..... 546
Section 2833—Workforce Issues Related to Military Construction and Certain Other Transactions on Guam ..... 546
Section 2834—Composition of Workforce for Construction Projects Funded Through the Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account ..... 546

Page

Section 2835—Interagency Coordination Group of Inspector Generals for Guam Realignment ..... 547
Section 2836—Compliance with Naval Aviation Safety Requirements as Condition on Acceptance of Replacement Facility for Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa ..... 547
Section 2837—Report and Sense of Congress on Marine Corps Training Requirements in Asia-Pacific Region ..... 547
Subtitle D—Energy Security ..... 548
Section 2841—Adoption of Unified Energy Monitoring and Management System Specification for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Activities ..... 548
Section 2842—Department of Defense Use of Electric and Hybrid Motor Vehicles ..... 548
Section 2843—Department of Defense Goal Regarding Use of Renewable Energy Sources to Meet Facility Electricity Needs ..... 548
Section 2844—Comptroller General Report on Department of Defense Renewable Energy Initiatives ..... 548
Section 2845—Study on Development of Nuclear Power Plants on Military Installations ..... 549
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances ..... 549
Section 2851—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Port Chicago Naval Magazine, California ..... 549
Section 2852—Land Conveyances, Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii ..... 549
Section 2853—Modification of Land Conveyance, Former Griffiss Air Force Base, New York ..... 549
Section 2854—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania ..... 549
Section 2855—Land Conveyance, Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia ... 549
Section 2856—Land Conveyance, Haines Tank Farm, Haines, Alaska ... 550
Section 2857—Completion of Land Exchange and Consolidation, Fort Lewis, Washington ..... 550
Subtitle F—Other Matters ..... 550
Section 2871—Revised Authority to Establish National Monument to Honor United States Armed Forces Working Dog Teams ..... 550
Section 2872—Naming of Child Development Center at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, in Honor of Mr. S. Lee Kling ..... 550
Section 2873—Conditions on Establishment of Cooperative Security Location in Palanquero, Colombia ..... 550
Section 2874—Military Activities at United States Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center ..... 551
TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 551
SUMMARY ..... 551
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 557
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ..... 557
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 557
Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 557
Section 2902—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 557
Section 2903—Construction Authorization for Facilities for Office of Defense Representative-Pakistan ..... 557
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 558
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ..... 558
OVERVIEW ..... 558
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 575
National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 575
Overview ..... 575
Weapons Activities ..... 575
Stockpile Stewardship Program ..... 575
Directed Stockpile Work—Stockpile Services—Research and Development Certification and Safety ..... 576
Science Campaign—Advanced Certification ..... 576
Engineering Campaign ..... 576

Page

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign ..... 577
Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign ..... 577
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities—Pantex Plant ..... 577
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities—Sandia National Laboratories ..... 578
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities—Y–12 National Security Complex ..... 578
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Construction ..... 578
National Nuclear Security Administration Budget Categories ..... 579
National Nuclear Security Administration Governance ..... 579
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation ..... 580
Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development ..... 581
Radiation Detection Technology ..... 582
Nonproliferation and International Security ..... 582
Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention ..... 582
Global Nuclear Energy Partnership ..... 582
International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation ..... 583
Second Line of Defense ..... 583
Fissile Materials Disposition ..... 583
United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition ..... 583
Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition ..... 583
Global Threat Reduction Initiative ..... 584
Office of the United States Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism ..... 584
Office of the Administrator ..... 584
Environmental and Other Defense Activities ..... 585
Overview ..... 585
Defense Environmental Cleanup ..... 585
Defense Environmental Cleanup Program Funding ..... 585
Consideration of Lifecycle Cleanup Costs During Definition Phase of New Nuclear Facilities ..... 586
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ..... 587
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 587
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations ..... 587
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 587
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup ..... 587
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities ..... 587
Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ..... 587
Section 3105—Energy Security and Assurance ..... 588
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 588
Section 3111—Stockpile Stewardship Program ..... 588
Section 3112—Stockpile Management Program ..... 588
Section 3113—Plan for Execution of Stockpile Stewardship and Stockpile Management Programs ..... 589
Section 3114—Dual Validation of Annual Weapons Assessment and Certification ..... 590
Section 3115—Annual Long-Term Plan for the Modernization and Refurbishment of the Nuclear Security Complex ..... 590
Subtitle C—Reports ..... 591
Section 3121—Comptroller General Review of Management and Operations Contract Costs for National Security Laboratories ..... 591
Section 3122—Plan to Ensure Capability to Monitor, Analyze, and Evaluate Foreign Nuclear Weapons Activities ..... 591
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ..... 592
OVERVIEW ..... 592
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 592
Section 3201—Authorization ..... 592
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ..... 592
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 592
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 592
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ..... 592
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 592
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2010 ..... 592
Section 3502—Liquidation of Unused Leave Balance at the United States Merchant Marine Academy ..... 593
Section 3503—Adjunct Professors ..... 593

Page

Section 3504—Maritime Loan Guarantee Program ..... 593
Section 3505—Defense Measures Against Unauthorized Seizures of Maritime Security Fleet Vessels ..... 593
Section 3506—Technical Corrections to State Maritime Academies Student Incentive Program ..... 593
Section 3507—Limitation on Disposal of Interest in Certain Vessels ..... 594
Departmental Data ..... 594
Department of Defense Authorization Request ..... 594
Committee Position ..... 597
Communications From Other Committees ..... 597
Fiscal Data ..... 609
Congressional Budget Office Estimate ..... 609
Committee Cost Estimate ..... 610
Compliance with House Rule XXI ..... 610
Oversight Findings ..... 649
General Performance Goals and Objectives ..... 649
Constitutional Authority Statement ..... 651
Statement of Federal Mandates ..... 651
Roll Call Votes ..... 651
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported ..... 666
Additional and Supplemental Views ..... 667
Additional views of Rick Larsen, James R. Langevin, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Brad Ellsworth, Larry Kissell, Chellie Pingree, Joe Sestak, Hank Johnson, Loretta Sanchez, Martin Heinrich, Niki Tsongas, Susan A. Davis, Jim Cooper, John Spratt, Solomon P. Ortiz, Adam Smith, Ellen O. Tauscher, Robert Andrews, Gene Taylor ..... 667
Additional views of Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Mac Thornberry, W. Todd Akin, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Miller, Joe Wilson, Frank A. LoBiondo, Rob Bishop, Michael Turner, John Kline, Michael Rogers, Trent Franks, Bill Shuster, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, K. Michael Conaway, Doug Lamborn, Rob Wittman, Mary Fallin, Duncan Hunter, John Fleming, Mike Coffman, Tom Rooney, Todd Russell Platts ..... 669
Additional views of Silvestre Reyes ..... 675
Additional views of Rob Bishop ..... 677
Additional views of John Kline ..... 680
Supplemental views of Gabrielle Giffords ..... 681
Supplemental views of Gabrielle Giffords ..... 682

111TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 111–166

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

JUNE 18, 2009.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

## R E P O R T

together with

## ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2647]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 2647) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2010, 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.

## EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 2647. 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.

## PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2010: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the armed forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for increased costs due to overseas contingency operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for the Maritime Administration.

## 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 $680.2 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee for fiscal year 2010. Of this amount, $533.8 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $130.0 billion was requested for the overseas contingency operations requirements covering the entire fiscal year, and $16.4 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 $680.4 billion, including $130.0 billion for overseas contingency operations. The base committee authorization of $550.5 billion is an $8.0 billion increase above the levels provided for in the

Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

The following table summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account and compares these amounts to the President's request. An error during the mark up of this bill increased the 050 figure by $120.0 million, which the committee intends to rectify prior to House passage.

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE** | | | |
| **Department of Defense (051) Authorizations -- Base Bill** | | | |
| **Title I -- PROCUREMENT** | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 5,315,991 | -487,359 | 4,828,632 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 1,370,109 | -50,000 | 1,320,109 |
| Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 2,451,952 | 49,000 | 2,500,952 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 2,051,895 | 18,200 | 2,070,095 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 9,907,151 | -144,612 | 9,762,539 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 564,850 | -564,850 | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 18,378,312 | -276,200 | 18,102,112 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 3,453,455 | | 3,453,455 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps | 840,675 | | 840,675 |
| Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy | 13,776,867 | 10,000 | 13,786,867 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 5,661,176 | 28,000 | 5,689,176 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,600,638 | 111,500 | 1,712,138 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 11,966,276 | 25,715 | 11,991,991 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 6,300,728 | -89,100 | 6,211,628 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 822,462 | | 822,462 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 17,293,141 | 6,700 | 17,299,841 |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 3,984,352 | 166,210 | 4,150,562 |
| National Guard and Reserve Equipment, Army | | 600,000 | 600,000 |
| Rapid Acquisition Fund | 79,300 | -24,300 | 55,000 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Defense Production Act Purchases /1 | [38,246] | [38,246] | [38,246] |
| **Subtotal, PROCUREMENT** | **105,819,330** | **-621,096** | **105,198,234** |

*1/ Defense Production Act Purchases are not in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee (see Budget Authority Implication).*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION** | | | |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army | 10,438,218 | 68,513 | 10,506,731 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy | 19,270,932 | 351,596 | 19,622,528 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force | 27,992,827 | 515,734 | 28,508,561 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide | 20,741,542 | 84,360 | 20,825,902 |
| Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense | 190,770 | | 190,770 |
| **Subtotal, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION** | **78,634,289** | **1,020,203** | **79,654,492** |
| | | | |
| **Title III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** | | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | 31,274,882 | 123,550 | 31,398,432 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | 35,070,346 | 260,651 | 35,330,997 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 5,536,223 | 34,600 | 5,570,823 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | 34,748,159 | -296,505 | 34,451,654 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide | 28,357,246 | 659,286 | 29,016,532 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve | 2,620,196 | -48,000 | 2,572,196 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 1,278,501 | 14,000 | 1,292,501 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 228,925 | | 228,925 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 3,079,228 | 9,300 | 3,088,528 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard | 6,257,034 | 11,850 | 6,268,884 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard | 5,885,761 | 33,700 | 5,919,461 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| US Court Of Appeals For The Armed Forces, Defense | 13,932 | | 13,932 |
| Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster And Civic Aid | 109,869 | | 109,869 |
| Cooperative Threat Reduction | 404,093 | 30,000 | 434,093 |
| Environmental Restoration, Army | 415,864 | | 415,864 |
| Environmental Restoration, Navy | 285,869 | | 285,869 |
| Environmental Restoration, Air Force | 494,276 | | 494,276 |
| Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide | 11,100 | | 11,100 |
| Environmental Restoration Formerly Used Sites | 267,700 | | 267,700 |
| Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| **Subtotal, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** | **156,444,204** | **832,432** | **157,276,636** |
| | | | |
| **Title IV -- MILITARY PERSONNEL** | **136,016,281** | **-292,500** | **135,723,781** |
| | | | |
| **Title XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 141,388 | | 141,388 |
| Defense Commissary Agency | 1,313,616 | | 1,313,616 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,642,758 | 60,000 | 1,702,758 |
| Defense Coalition Support Fund | 22,000 | -22,000 | |
| Defense Health Program | 27,903,163 | -939,976 | 26,963,187 |
| Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Defense | 1,560,760 | | 1,560,760 |
| Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense | 1,058,984 | -8,000 | 1,050,984 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 272,444 | 6,780 | 279,224 |
| **Subtotal, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | **33,915,113** | **-903,196** | **33,011,917** |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Division B: Military Construction Authorization** | | | |
| **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION** | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 3,660,779 | -30,357 | 3,630,422 |
| Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps | 3,763,264 | -57,654 | 3,705,610 |
| Military Construction, Air Force | 1,145,434 | 213,737 | 1,359,171 |
| Military Construction, Defense-Wide | 3,097,526 | -43,400 | 3,054,126 |
| Chemical Demilitarization Construction | 146,541 | | 146,541 |
| NATO Security Investment Program | 276,314 | | 276,314 |
| Military Construction, Army National Guard | 426,491 | 102,638 | 529,129 |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve | 374,862 | 57,654 | 432,516 |
| Military Construction, Naval Reserve | 64,124 | 108,053 | 172,177 |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard | 128,261 | 97,865 | 226,126 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve | 27,476 | 75,693 | 103,169 |
| **Subtotal, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION** | **13,111,072** | **524,229** | **13,635,301** |
| **FAMILY HOUSING** | | | |
| Family Housing Construction, Army | 273,236 | | 273,236 |
| Family Housing O&M, Army | 523,418 | | 523,418 |
| Family Housing Construction, Navy & Marine Corps | 146,569 | | 146,569 |
| Family Housing O&M, Navy & Marine Corps | 368,540 | | 368,540 |
| Family Housing Construction, Air Force | 66,101 | | 66,101 |
| Family Housing O&M, Air Force | 502,936 | | 502,936 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide | 2,859 | | 2,859 |
| Family Housing O&M, Defense-Wide | 49,214 | | 49,214 |
| Homeowners Assistance Fund | 23,225 | | 23,225 |
| DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| **Subtotal, FAMILY HOUSING** | **1,958,698** | | **1,958,698** |
| **BRAC** | | | |
| Base Realignment and Closure Account 1990 | 396,768 | 140,000 | 536,768 |
| Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005 | 7,479,498 | -350,000 | 7,129,498 |
| **Subtotal, BRAC** | **7,876,266** | **-210,000** | **7,666,266** |
| Prior Year Savings | | -85,300 | -85,300 |
| **Subtotal, MILITARY CON, FAMILY HOUSING & BRAC** | **22,946,036** | **228,929** | **23,174,965** |
| General Transfer Authority (non-add) | [5,000,000] | | [5,000,000] |
| **TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)** | **533,775,253** | **264,772** | **534,040,025** |
| **Division C: Atomic Energy Defense Authorization** | | | |
| **Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability** | **6,188** | | **6,188** |
| **NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION** | | | |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Weapons Activities | 6,384,431 | 132,000 | 6,516,431 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 2,136,709 | 402,600 | 2,539,309 |
| Naval Reactors | 1,003,133 | | 1,003,133 |
| Office of the Administrator | 420,754 | | 420,754 |
| **Subtotal NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMIN** | **9,945,027** | **534,600** | **10,479,627** |
| | | | |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup | 5,495,831 | -471,340 | 5,024,491 |
| Other Defense Activities | 852,468 | 20,000 | 872,468 |
| Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | 98,400 | | 98,400 |
| **Subtotal ENVIRON AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTS** | **6,446,699** | **-451,340** | **5,995,359** |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY** | **16,397,914** | **83,260** | **16,481,174** |
| | | | |
| **Independent Federal Agency Authorization** | | | |
| | | | |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 26,086 | | 26,086 |
| **Subtotal, DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD** | **26,086** | | **26,086** |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)** | **16,424,000** | **83,260** | **16,507,260** |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTH (050) -- BASE BILL** | **550,199,253** | **348,032** | **550,547,285** |
| | | | |
| **Department of Defense, Overseas Contingency Operations** | | | |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Title XV -- OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS** | | | |
| **PROCUREMENT** | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 1,636,229 | 340,245 | 1,976,474 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 531,570 | | 531,570 |
| Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 759,466 | 115,000 | 874,466 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 370,635 | | 370,635 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 6,225,966 | -204,180 | 6,021,786 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 1,535,000 | -100,000 | 1,435,000 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 916,553 | | 916,553 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 73,700 | | 73,700 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and MC | 710,780 | | 710,780 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 318,018 | | 318,018 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,164,445 | | 1,164,445 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 936,441 | 215,335 | 1,151,776 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 36,625 | | 36,625 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 256,819 | | 256,819 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 2,321,549 | | 2,321,549 |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 491,430 | 308,400 | 799,830 |
| Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund | 5,456,000 | | 5,456,000 |
| **Subtotal, PROCUREMENT** | **23,741,226** | **674,800** | **24,416,026** |
| **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION** | | | |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| RDT&E, Army | 57,962 | | 57,962 |
| RDT&E, Navy | 107,180 | | 107,180 |
| RDT&E, Air Force | 29,286 | | 29,286 |
| RDT&E, Defense-Wide | 115,826 | 100,000 | 215,826 |
| **Subtotal, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL** | **310,254** | **100,000** | **410,254** |
| | | | |
| **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** | | | |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army | 52,170,661 | -200,000 | 51,970,661 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy | 6,219,583 | | 6,219,583 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps | 3,701,600 | | 3,701,600 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force | 10,026,868 | 125,200 | 10,152,068 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide | 7,578,300 | | 7,578,300 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve | 204,326 | | 204,326 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 68,059 | | 68,059 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 86,667 | | 86,667 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 125,925 | | 125,925 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard | 321,646 | | 321,646 |
| Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard | 289,862 | | 289,862 |
| **Subtotal, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** | **80,793,497** | **-74,800** | **80,718,697** |
| | | | |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL** | **13,586,341** | | **13,586,341** |
| | | | |
| **OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 396,915 | | 396,915 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan Security Forces Fund | 7,462,769 | | 7,462,769 |
| Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund | 700,000 | -700,000 | |
| Defense Health Program | 1,155,235 | | 1,155,235 |
| Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense | 324,603 | | 324,603 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 8,876 | | 8,876 |
| Iraq Freedom Fund | 115,300 | | 115,300 |
| **Subtotal, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | **10,163,698** | **-700,000** | **9,463,698** |
| | | | |
| Special Transfer Authority (non-add) | [4,000,000] | | [4,000,000] |
| | | | |
| **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION** | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 923,884 | | 930,484 |
| Military Construction, Air Force | 474,500 | | 474,500 |
| Military Construction, Defense-Wide | 6,600 | | |
| **Subtotal, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION** | **1,404,984** | | **1,404,984** |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL, OTHER CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS** | **130,000,000** | | **130,000,000** |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE** | **680,199,253** | **348,032** | **680,547,285** |
| | | | |
| **MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS** | | | |
| Title IV -- Armed Forces Retirement Hm (Function 600) | 134,000 | | 134,000 |
| Title XXXIV -- Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270) | 23,627 | | 23,627 |
| Title XXXV -- Maritime Administration (Function 400) | 152,900 | | 152,900 |

## BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2010 is $693.1 billion, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. In addition to funding for programs addressed in this bill, the total 050 request includes discretionary funding for national defense programs not in the committee's jurisdiction, discretionary funding for programs that do not require additional authorization in fiscal year 2010, and mandatory programs.

The following table details changes to all aspects of the national defense budget function. The committee could not support the concurrent receipt proposal as requested in the President's budget, since the proposed offsets to this increase were not within the jurisdiction of this committee.

## BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | Amounts Applicable to Request | House Change to Request | Amounts Applicable to House NDAA |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee** | | | |
| **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)** | **533,775,253** | **264,772** | **534,040,025** |
| **ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)** | **16,424,000** | **83,260** | **16,507,260** |
| **NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION (050) -- BASE BILL** | **550,199,253** | **348,032** | **550,547,285** |
| **OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (OCO) (051)** | **130,000,000** | | **130,000,000** |
| **Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Comn** | **680,199,253** | **348,032** | **680,547,285** |
| | | | |
| **Base National Defense Discretionary Programs** | | | |
| **Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, or** | | | |
| **Not Requiring Additional Authorization** | | | |
| Defense Production Act Purchases | 38,246 | | 38,246 |
| National Science Center, Army (051) | 25 | | 25 |
| Disposal Of DOD Real Property (051) | 10,393 | | 10,393 |
| Lease Of DOD Real Property (051), | 8,856 | | 8,856 |
| DOD Overseas Mil Facility Investment Recovery (051) | 1,227 | | 1,227 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051** | **58,747** | | **58,747** |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (053) | 134,000 | | 134,000 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053** | **134,000** | | **134,000** |
| Other Discretionary Programs (054) | 6,751,000 | | 6,751,000 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054** | **6,751,000** | | **6,751,000** |
| **Total Base Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)** | **6,943,747** | | **6,943,747** |

## BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | Amounts Applicable to Request | House Change to Request | Amounts Applicable to House NDAA |
|---|---|---|---|
| **OCO National Defense Discretionary Programs** | | | |
| **Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, or** | | | |
| **Not Requiring Additional Authorization** | | | |
| Other Discretionary Programs (054) | 101,066 | | 101,066 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054** | **101,066** | | **101,066** |
| **Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050) -- OCO** | **101,066** | | **101,066** |
| **Summary, National Defense Discretionary (050), Budget Authority Implication** | | | |
| Department of Defense--Military (051) | 663,834,000 | 264,772 | 664,098,772 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) | 16,558,000 | 83,260 | 16,641,260 |
| Defense-Related Activities (054) | 6,852,066 | | 6,852,066 |
| **Total National Defense Discretionary (050), Budget Authority Implication** | **687,244,066** | **348,032** | **687,592,098** |
| **National Defense Mandatory Programs** | | | |
| Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund | 4,376,000 | | 4,376,000 |
| Concurrent receipt policy proposal (see Blueprint, p. 124) | 330,000 | -330,000 | |
| Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory | 1,240,000 | | 1,240,000 |
| Offsetting receipts | -1,741,000 | | -1,741,000 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051** | **4,205,000** | **-330,000** | **3,875,000** |
| Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other | 1,377,000 | | 1,377,000 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053** | **1,377,000** | | **1,377,000** |

## BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | Amounts Applicable to Request | House Change to Request | Amounts Applicable to House NDAA |
|---|---|---|---|
| Radiation exposure compensation trust fund | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| Payment to CIA retirement fund and other | 291,000 | | 291,000 |
| **Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054** | **323,000** | | **323,000** |
| **Total National Defense Mandatory (050)** | **5,905,000** | **-330,000** | **5,575,000** |
| | | | |
| **Base National Defense (050), Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication** | | | |
| Department of Defense--Military (051) | 668,039,000 | -65,228 | 667,973,772 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) | 17,935,000 | 83,260 | 18,018,260 |
| Defense-Related Activities (054) | 7,175,066 | | 7,175,066 |
| **Total Base National Defense (050), Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implicatio** | **693,149,066** | **18,032** | **693,167,098** |

## RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, is a key mechanism through which the Congress of the United States fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense (DOD) generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the House Committee on Armed Services. The committee bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence. The committee remains steadfast in its continued and unwavering support for the men and women of the armed forces, the civilian employees of the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration. The armed forces continue to be deeply engaged in a number of ongoing military operations around the world, most significantly, the wars in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. 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 promotes the committee's main policy objectives: restoring military readiness; taking care of our troops and their families; focusing on our strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan and on redeployment from Iraq; eliminating waste and recovering savings through acquisition reform; supporting the President's initiative to secure all loose nuclear materials around the world; and maintaining robust oversight.

*Restoring readiness*

After more than seven years of war, the committee believes it is essential to sustain our efforts to restore military readiness in order to meet current military challenges and prepare for the future. The committee bill provides $11 billion for Army reset, $2 billion for Marine Corps reset, and $6.9 billion to address equipment shortfalls in the National Guard and Reserve. The committee bill adds $450 million for Army barracks improvements and $762 million to fully meet sustainment requirements for base facilities and infrastructure to address urgent issues such as dilapidated military barracks and to keep defense facilities in good working order.

*Taking care of service members and their families*

The committee continues to be committed to reducing the strain on the armed forces by increasing the size of the Army and Marine Corps, and halting the reduction in the size of the Air Force. The committee bill increases the size of the military by 15,000 Army troops, 8,000 Marines, 14,650 Air Force personnel, and 2,477 Navy

sailors, supporting DOD's requested end strengths. The committee bill recommends a 3.4 percent pay raise for all service members, continuing our efforts to reduce the pay raise gap between the uniformed services and the private sector. The committee bill extends the authority for the Department of Defense to offer bonuses and incentive pay, expands TRICARE health coverage to reserve component members and their families for 180 days prior to mobilization, and also provides $1.95 billion for family housing programs to support and expand the quality housing our military families deserve.

The committee bill provides travel and transportation for three designated persons, including non-family members, to visit hospitalized service members to continue to improve the benefits available to wounded warriors. The committee bill also enables seriously injured service members to use a non-medical attendant for help with daily living or during travel for medical treatment. To meet the changing needs of today's service members and their families, the committee bill establishes an internship pilot program for military spouses in order to offer federal government career opportunities that are portable when the time comes to relocate. The committee bill also authorizes Impact Aid funding to assist schools with large enrollments of military children, and establishes a DOD School of Nursing to address the critical nursing shortage in our military services.

*Policy toward Afghanistan and Pakistan*

The war in Afghanistan is a critical mission that is finally gaining the attention it demands. The committee believes that the President's new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, which calls for an increase in military and civilian resources and also recognizes the vital importance of Pakistan in the region, is a welcome development. To ensure our strategy in both countries is effective and achieves the intended goals, the committee bill requires the President to assess U.S. efforts and report on progress. The committee bill provides funds to train and equip the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) and authorizes the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund to improve the counterinsurgency capabilities of Pakistan's security forces. The committee bill improves accountability and oversight of U.S. assistance by requiring the President to establish a system to register and track all U.S. defense articles provided to the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan.

*Redeployment of forces from Iraq*

The committee has focused on issues relating to the redeployment of forces from Iraq and the build up of forces in Afghanistan, and recognized that the Department of Defense must manage many difficult logistical challenges in this process. To ensure plans are sound, use realistic assumptions, and carefully assess risk, the committee bill requires the Department of Defense to report on its efforts to prioritize resources and capabilities between Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee bill also directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to provide Congress with separate reports assessing the strategic plans for Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition, the committee bill calls for a report to help Congress monitor our redeployment from Iraq and requires the Department of Defense to

develop a detailed plan for the disposition of U.S. military equipment in Iraq.

*Acquisition reform*

Defense acquisition reform is a top priority for the committee, which this year has already established a panel to examine the issue and passed the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23). Building on these efforts, the committee bill supports the Secretary of Defense's plan to increase the size of the civilian acquisition workforce, to reduce the Department of Defense's reliance on contractors for critical acquisition functions, and to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse through better contract oversight.

*Nonproliferation*

The committee believes that efforts to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to reduce the risk that these weapons could fall into terrorists' hands are critical to our national security. In the area of nonproliferation, the bill increases funding and creates new authorities to strengthen the Department of Defense's Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program. The committee bill also fully supports and increases funding for the Department of Energy's nonproliferation programs, which includes funding for the President's plan to secure and remove all known vulnerable nuclear materials that can be used for weapons.

*Quadrennial Defense Review*

Next year, the Department of Defense will deliver the report of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), which was established to help Congress develop our national security priorities. Because reports from previous QDRs have not always provided the information expected by Congress, the committee bill encourages the Department of Defense to closely follow the QDR requirements written in law. Upon completion of the QDR, the committee bill directs the Government Accountability Office to assess the degree to which the Department of Defense has complied with the law, and requires the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on any shortcomings identified. The committee bill also creates a Congressionally-appointed National Defense Panel to conduct an independent review of the QDR's effectiveness and issue recommendations on how to improve the decision making process for determining national security objectives. The committee bill also requires the Department of Defense to report on the force structure requirements used to guide the QDR process so that Congress may better understand the foundation of the QDR's analysis. Finally, the committee believes that the QDR process provides an opportunity for the Department of Defense to balance its urgent near term priorities with its longer term requirements and rethink its global posture. The committee bill in a range of areas requires the Department to provide analysis of these issues concurrent with the completion of the QDR process.

## HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 results from hearings that began on January 22, 2009, and that were completed on June 4, 2009. The full

committee conducted 19 sessions. In addition, a total of 55 sessions were conducted by 7 different subcommittees and 1 special oversight panel.

# DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

## TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

### OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $105.8 billion for procurement. This represents a $1.9 billion increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends authorization of $104.5 billion, a decrease of $1.3 billion from the fiscal year 2010 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 procurement program are identified in the table below. Major issues are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Title | FY 2010 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| **FY 2010 Procurement Program** | | | | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 818 | 5,315,991 | -24 | -487,359 | 794 | 4,828,632 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 6,685 | 1,370,109 | 0 | -50,000 | 6,685 | 1,320,109 |
| Procurement Of W&TCV, Army | 35,096 | 2,451,952 | 0 | 49,000 | 35,096 | 2,500,952 |
| Procurement Of Ammunition, Army | 0 | 2,051,895 | 0 | 18,200 | 0 | 2,070,095 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 14,516 | 9,907,151 | 0 | -144,612 | 14,516 | 9,762,539 |
| JIEDDO | 0 | 564,850 | 0 | -564,850 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total, Department Of The Army** | 57,115 | 21,661,948 | -24 | -1,179,621 | 57,091 | 20,482,327 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 214 | 18,378,312 | -11 | -276,200 | 203 | 18,102,112 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 1,911 | 3,453,455 | 0 | 0 | 1,911 | 3,453,455 |
| Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy | 9 | 13,776,867 | 0 | 10,000 | 9 | 13,786,867 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps | 0 | 840,675 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 840,675 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 0 | 5,661,176 | 0 | 28,000 | 0 | 5,689,176 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,138 | 1,600,638 | 0 | 111,500 | 1,138 | 1,712,138 |
| **Total, Department Of The Navy** | 3,272 | 43,711,123 | -11 | -126,700 | 3,261 | 43,584,423 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 81 | 11,966,276 | -11 | 25,715 | 70 | 11,991,991 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 3,554 | 6,300,728 | -1 | -89,100 | 3,553 | 6,211,628 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 3,592 | 822,462 | 0 | 0 | 3,592 | 822,462 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Title | FY 2010 Request | | House Change | | House Authorized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost | Qty | Cost |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 0 | 17,293,141 | 0 | 6,700 | 0 | 17,299,841 |
| **Total, Department Of The Air Force** | 7,227 | 36,382,607 | -12 | -56,685 | 7,215 | 36,325,922 |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 27 | 3,984,352 | 0 | 166,210 | 27 | 4,150,562 |
| Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell | 0 | 79,300 | 0 | -24,300 | 0 | 55,000 |
| National Guard & Reserve Equip | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600,000 | 0 | 600,000 |
| Defense Production Act Purchases | 0 | [38,246] | 0 | 0 | 0 | [38,246] |
| **Total, Defense-Wide** | 27 | 4,063,652 | 0 | 741,910 | 27 | 4,805,562 |
| **Total, FY 2010 Procurement Program** | **67,641** | **105,819,330** | -47 | **-621,096** | **67,594** | **105,198,234** |

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $5.3 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $4.8 billion, a decrease of $487.4 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **FIXED WING** | | | | | | |
| 001 | JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 002 | UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 003 | MQ-1 UAV | 24 | 401,364 | -24 | -401,364 | 0 | 0 |
| | Program Requested Not Executable | | | [-12] | [-163,375] | | |
| | Transfer to Title XV | | | [-12] | [-237,989] | | |
| 004 | RQ-11 (RAVEN) | 618 | 35,008 | | | 618 | 35,008 |
| 004A | C-12A | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **ROTARY WING** | | | | | | |
| 006 | ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 008 | HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH) | 54 | 326,040 | | | 54 | 326,040 |
| 009 | AH-64 APACHE BLOCK III | 8 | 161,280 | | | 8 | 161,280 |
| 010 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 57,890 | | | 0 | 57,890 |
| 011 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | 79 | 1,258,374 | | | 79 | 1,258,374 |
| 012 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 98,740 | | | 0 | 98,740 |
| 013 | CH-47 HELICOPTER | 35 | 860,087 | | 22,000 | 35 | 882,087 |
| | Transfer From APA 22 | | | | [22,000] | | |
| 014 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 50,676 | | | 0 | 50,676 |
| 015 | HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING | 0 | 19,639 | | -19,639 | 0 | 0 |
| | Program Not Justified | | | | [-19,639] | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 016 | MQ-1 PAYLOAD - UAS | 0 | 87,424 | | -87,424 | 0 | 0 |
| | Transfer to Title XV | | | | [-87,424] | | |
| 017 | MQ-1 WEAPONIZATION - UAS | 0 | 14,832 | | -14,832 | 0 | 0 |
| | Transfer to Title XV | | | | [-14,832] | | |
| 018 | GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP) | 0 | 61,517 | | | 0 | 61,517 |
| 019 | MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) | 0 | 21,457 | | | 0 | 21,457 |
| 020 | AH-64 MODS | 0 | 426,415 | | 2,000 | 0 | 428,415 |
| | Air Filtration Systems | | | | [2,000] | | |
| 021 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 022 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP) | 0 | 102,876 | | -16,000 | 0 | 86,876 |
| | Common Avionics Architecture System | | | | [2,000] | | |
| | Vibration Management Enhancement Program | | | | [4,000] | | |
| | Transfer to APA 13 | | | | [-22,000] | | |
| 023 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 024 | UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS | 0 | 39,547 | | | 0 | 39,547 |
| 025 | AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS | 0 | 823 | | | 0 | 823 |
| 026 | UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS | 0 | 66,682 | | 25,400 | 0 | 92,082 |
| | UH-60A to UH-60L Conversion-ARNG | | | | [20,400] | | |
| | UH-60 ARNG Rewiring Program | | | | [5,000] | | |
| 027 | KIOWA WARRIOR | 0 | 140,768 | | | 0 | 140,768 |
| 028 | AIRBORNE AVIONICS | 0 | 241,287 | | | 0 | 241,287 |
| 029 | GATM ROLLUP | 0 | 103,142 | | | 0 | 103,142 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 030 | RQ-7 UAV MODS | 0 | 283,012 | | 2,500 | 0 | 285,512 |
| | Shadow TUAS Training Aids, Devices, Simulators, and Simulations (TADSS) for Army National Guard | | | | [2,500] | | |
| 030A | C-12A | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 031 | SPARE PARTS (AIR) | 0 | 7,083 | | | 0 | 7,083 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| | **GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS** | | | | | | |
| 032 | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT | 0 | 25,975 | | | 0 | 25,975 |
| 033 | ASE INFRARED CM | 0 | 186,356 | | | 0 | 186,356 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 034 | AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 4,933 | | | 0 | 4,933 |
| 035 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | 0 | 87,682 | | | 0 | 87,682 |
| 036 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | 0 | 52,725 | | | 0 | 52,725 |
| 037 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 0 | 76,999 | | | 0 | 76,999 |
| 038 | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 0 | 1,533 | | | 0 | 1,533 |
| 039 | LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET | 0 | 2,716 | | | 0 | 2,716 |
| 040 | AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS | 0 | 11,109 | | | 0 | 11,109 |
| | **TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **818** | **5,315,991** | **-24** | **-487,359** | **794** | **4,828,632** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Hostile fire detection system*

The committee notes that the United States Army Aviation Center of Excellence (USAACE) has placed significant focus on the need for an effective hostile fire detection system on AH–64 aircraft. Advances in small arms hostile fire detection for Army Aviation have recently been achieved and demonstrated which may lead to improvements in survivability and improvements in reaction to hostile fire. The committee applauds these advancements and encourages the Army Aviation community to continue plans for the development and acquisition of flight proven technologies, which improve situational awareness, and the targeting of hostile threat systems.

*Kiowa Warrior*

The committee agrees that the Department of Army has a critical need to extend the life of the Kiowa Warrior due to the termination of both the Comanche helicopter program in 2004 and its replacement, the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter (ARH), in 2008. The committee notes that the Department of Army is in the process of completing a study on the future of the Kiowa Warrior as part of the analysis of alternatives for the ARH replacement. The committee also understands that the Department of Army is initiating "Life Support 2020" for the Kiowa Warrior, to address obsolescence concerns and to incorporate weight reduction initiatives to increase the useful life of these platforms.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2010, on program requirements to upgrade the power train for the Kiowa Warrior. This report should include the following:

(1) Options to extend the operational life including hover out of ground effect and vertical maneuver equal to or greater than the original ARH requirement;

(2) Review of operational and safety power margin requirements;

(3) Consideration of existing mature commercial and military development efforts; and

(4) Estimated schedule and associated cost to implement findings.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $1.37 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.32 billion, a decrease of $50.0 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | |
| 001 | PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY | 59 | 348,351 | | | 59 | 348,351 |
| 002 | PATRIOT/MEADS CAP SYSTEM SUMMARY | 0 | 16,406 | | | 0 | 16,406 |
| 003 | SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY: | 13 | 72,920 | | | 13 | 72,920 |
| 004 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | |
| 005 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | 240 | 31,154 | | | 240 | 31,154 |
| | **ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | |
| 006 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | 470 | 148,649 | | -25,000 | 470 | 123,649 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | [-25,000] | | |
| 007 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | 1,165 | 108,066 | | -25,000 | 1,165 | 83,066 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | [-25,000] | | |
| 008 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 2,628 | 293,617 | | | 2,628 | 293,617 |
| 009 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) | 2,064 | 15,663 | | | 2,064 | 15,663 |
| 010 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS | 46 | 209,061 | | | 46 | 209,061 |
| 011 | ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 012 | PATRIOT MODS | 0 | 44,775 | | | 0 | 44,775 |
| 013 | ITAS/TOW MODS | 0 | 6,983 | | | 0 | 6,983 |
| 014 | MLRS MODS | 0 | 3,662 | | | 0 | 3,662 |
| 015 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 38,690 | | | 0 | 38,690 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 016 | HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 10 | | | 0 | 10 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 017 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 22,338 | | | 0 | 22,338 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 018 | AIR DEFENSE TARGETS | 0 | 4,188 | | | 0 | 4,188 |
| 019 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES) | 0 | 1,178 | | | 0 | 1,178 |
| 020 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | 0 | 4,398 | | | 0 | 4,398 |
| | **TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **6,685** | **1,370,109** | **0** | **-50,000** | **6,685** | **1,320,109** |

### Items of Special Interest

*Javelin missile system*

The budget request contained $289.6 million for 1,334 Javelin missile rounds.

The committee notes that the Army received $377.9 million in fiscal year 2009 for 1,320 Javelin missiles, which will continue maximum rate production of Javelin missiles through mid–2012. The committee further notes that only 83 Javelin missiles were expended in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom combined in fiscal year 2008, and that only 40 have been expended in fiscal year 2009. Therefore, the committee does not believe that the total amount requested in fiscal year 2010 is required for operational needs.

The committee recommends $264.6 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, for Javelin missile rounds.

*TOW 2 missile system*

The budget request contained $167.3 million for 2,459 tube-launched, optically-tracked, wire-guided (TOW 2) missile rounds.

The committee notes that the Army received $426.4 million in fiscal year 2009 for 8,400 TOW 2 missiles, which will continue maximum rate production of TOW 2 missiles through 2011. The committee further notes that only 262 TOW 2 missiles were expended in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom combined in fiscal year 2008, and that fiscal year 2009 expenditure rates are not expected to be significantly above these levels. Therefore, the committee does not believe that the total amount requested in fiscal year 2010 is required for operational needs.

The committee recommends $142.3 million, a decrease of $25.0 million, for TOW 2 missile rounds.

## PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $2.45 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.40 billion, a decrease of $51.0 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS & TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| | **TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 001 | BRADLEY PROGRAM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 002 | BRADLEY TRAINING DEVICES (MOD) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 003 | ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 004 | STRYKER VEHICLE | 0 | 388,596 | | -54,000 | 0 | 334,596 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | [-54,000] | | |
| 005 | FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 006 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 007 | FCS SPIN OUTS | 0 | 285,920 | | | 0 | 285,920 |
| 008 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 42,001 | | | 0 | 42,001 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 009 | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) | 0 | 34,192 | | | 0 | 34,192 |
| 010 | BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) | 0 | 526,356 | | | 0 | 526,356 |
| 011 | HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD) | 0 | 96,503 | | | 0 | 96,503 |
| 012 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES) | 12 | 96,814 | | | 12 | 96,814 |
| 013 | ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE | 0 | 63,250 | | | 0 | 63,250 |
| 014 | JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE | 0 | 70,637 | | | 0 | 70,637 |
| 015 | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | 0 | 183,829 | | | 0 | 183,829 |
| 016 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | 22 | 185,611 | | | 22 | 185,611 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 017 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 018 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) | 0 | 6,601 | | | 0 | 6,601 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 019 | HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119 | 70 | 95,631 | | | 70 | 95,631 |
| 020 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM) | 2,010 | 32,919 | | | 2,010 | 32,919 |
| 021 | MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL | 4,825 | 84,588 | | | 4,825 | 84,588 |
| 022 | LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN | 0 | 977 | | | 0 | 977 |
| 023 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM) | 1,550 | 7,535 | | | 1,550 | 7,535 |
| 024 | MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM) | 349 | 7,700 | | | 349 | 7,700 |
| 025 | MORTAR SYSTEMS | 315 | 14,779 | | | 315 | 14,779 |
| 026 | M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE | 0 | 224 | | | 0 | 224 |
| 027 | XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) | 4,740 | 16,023 | | | 4,740 | 16,023 |
| 028 | M110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS) | 448 | 6,223 | | | 448 | 6,223 |
| 029 | M4 CARBINE | 12,000 | 20,500 | | | 12,000 | 20,500 |
| 030 | SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS) | 3,738 | 6,945 | | | 3,738 | 6,945 |
| 031 | COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO | 0 | 0 | | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [100,000] | | |
| 032 | HANDGUN | 5,000 | 3,389 | | | 5,000 | 3,389 |
| 033 | HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T) | 17 | 49,572 | | | 17 | 49,572 |
| | **MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH** | | | | | | |
| 034 | MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS | 0 | 8,164 | | | 0 | 8,164 |
| 035 | M4 CARBINE MODS | 0 | 31,472 | | | 0 | 31,472 |
| 036 | M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS | 0 | 7,738 | | | 0 | 7,738 |
| 037 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS | 0 | 7,833 | | | 0 | 7,833 |
| 038 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS | 0 | 17,964 | | | 0 | 17,964 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 039 | PHALANX MODS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 040 | M119 MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 25,306 | | | 0 | 25,306 |
| 041 | M16 RIFLE MODS | 0 | 4,186 | | | 0 | 4,186 |
| 041A | M14 7.62 RIFLE MODS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 042 | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | 0 | 6,164 | | | 0 | 6,164 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 043 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | 0 | 551 | | | 0 | 551 |
| 044 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) | 0 | 9,855 | | 3,000 | 0 | 12,855 |
| | Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI) at Rock Island Arsenal | | | | [3,000] | | |
| 045 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 0 | 392 | | | 0 | 392 |
| 046 | SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG) | 0 | 5,012 | | | 0 | 5,012 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF WTCV, ARMY** | **35,096** | **2,451,952** | 0 | **49,000** | **35,096** | **2,500,952** |

### Items of Special Interest

*Army self-propelled artillery modernization*

The committee acknowledges the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program provides more modern capabilities for the M109A6 Paladin, and will eventually result in an M109A7. At the same time, the committee notes the need for a future cannon to address the potential 300 cannon shortfall that the PIM is not intended to address. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to develop a plan for a future self-propelled artillery piece as part of the next generation of ground combat vehicles, and to provide a report on this plan to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2010.

*Stryker vehicles*

The budget request contained $388.6 million for Stryker vehicle upgrades and program support activities.

The committee notes that of the total amount requested, only $101.7 million is for survivability upgrades to current Stryker vehicles. The remaining funds are requested for program management support, testing, system technical support, and other administrative program activities. The committee notes that contractor program management support, contractor logistics support, and system technical support show significant increases over fiscal year 2009 levels, even though no new production vehicles are requested in fiscal year 2010. In addition, the committee notes that the fiscal year 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations Appropriations Act provided additional funds for Stryker vehicles not requested or required by the Army. Therefore, the committee does not believe increased contractor funding in fiscal year 2010 is necessary, and that any increased costs could be covered using the additional funds provided by Congress in fiscal year 2009.

The committee recommends $334.6 million, a decrease of $54.0 million, for the Stryker vehicle program.

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $2.05 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.07 billion, an increase of $18.2 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL/MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 001 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 207,752 | | | 0 | 207,752 |
| 002 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 77,602 | | | 0 | 77,602 |
| 003 | CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES | 0 | 5,120 | | | 0 | 5,120 |
| 004 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | 0 | 162,342 | | | 0 | 162,342 |
| 005 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 17,054 | | | 0 | 17,054 |
| 006 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 96,572 | | -6,000 | 0 | 90,572 |
| | Unjustified Cost Growth | | | | [-6,000] | | |
| 007 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 172,675 | | 3,000 | 0 | 175,675 |
| | Additional 40mm Mortar Rounds - Milan AAP | | | | [3,000] | | |
| | **MORTAR AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 008 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | 0 | 23,607 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 26,607 |
| | M722 60mm White Phosphorous Smoke Mortar Rounds | | | | [3,000] | | |
| 009 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | 0 | 28,719 | | | 0 | 28,719 |
| 010 | CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 104,961 | | | 0 | 104,961 |
| | **TANK AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 011 | CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES | 0 | 7,741 | | | 0 | 7,741 |
| 012 | CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 113,483 | | | 0 | 113,483 |
| | **ARTILLERY AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 013 | CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES | 0 | 5,229 | | | 0 | 5,229 |
| 014 | CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES | 0 | 90,726 | | | 0 | 90,726 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 015 | CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 54,546 | | | 0 | 54,546 |
| 016 | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982 | 0 | 62,292 | | | 0 | 62,292 |
| 017 | MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T | 0 | 33,441 | | | 0 | 33,441 |
| | **ARTILLERY FUZES** | | | | | | |
| 018 | ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 19,870 | | | 0 | 19,870 |
| | **MINES** | | | | | | |
| 019 | MINES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 815 | | | 0 | 815 |
| 020 | MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 021 | ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES | 0 | 56,387 | | | 0 | 56,387 |
| 022 | INTELLIGENT MUNITIONS SYSTEM (IMS), ALL TYPES | 0 | 19,507 | | | 0 | 19,507 |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | |
| 023 | SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 45,302 | | | 0 | 45,302 |
| 024 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | 0 | 99,904 | | | 0 | 99,904 |
| | **OTHER AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 025 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 18,793 | | | 0 | 18,793 |
| 026 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 49,910 | | | 0 | 49,910 |
| 027 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 83,094 | | | 0 | 83,094 |
| 028 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 12,081 | | | 0 | 12,081 |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS** | | | | | | |
| 029 | AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 17,968 | | | 0 | 17,968 |
| 030 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | 0 | 7,378 | | | 0 | 7,378 |
| 031 | CAD/PAD ALL TYPES | 0 | 3,353 | | | 0 | 3,353 |
| 032 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 8,826 | | | 0 | 8,826 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 033 | AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT | 0 | 11,187 | | | 0 | 11,187 |
| 034 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO) | 0 | 14,354 | | | 0 | 14,354 |
| 035 | CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES | 0 | 99 | | | 0 | 99 |
| | **AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| | **PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 036 | PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 0 | 151,943 | | 18,200 | 0 | 170,143 |
| | Additional Mobile Ammunition Processing Facilities | | | | [7,400] | | |
| | Bomb Line Modernization at McAlester Ammunition Plant | | | | [5,000] | | |
| | Iowa Army Ammunition Plant Energy Infrastructure Project | | | | [5,800] | | |
| 037 | LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 0 | 9,529 | | | 0 | 9,529 |
| 038 | MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES | 0 | 8,772 | | | 0 | 8,772 |
| 039 | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL | 0 | 145,777 | | | 0 | 145,777 |
| 040 | ARMS INITIATIVE | 0 | 3,184 | | | 0 | 3,184 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | **0** | **2,051,895** | 0 | **18,200** | **0** | **2,070,095** |

### Items of Special Interest

*M722 60mm white phosphorus smoke mortar rounds*

The budget request contained $23.6 million for 60mm mortar, all types, but included no funds for additional M722 60mm white phosphorus smoke mortar rounds.

The committee understands overseas contingency operations in the Republic of Iraq and Islamic Republic of Afghanistan have increased demand for M722 60mm white phosphorus smoke mortar rounds. The committee also recognizes the specialized capability inherent at the Pine Bluff Arsenal for production of M722 60mm white phosphorus smoke mortar rounds.

The committee recommends $26.6 million, an increase of $3.0 million, for additional M722 60mm white phosphorus smoke mortar rounds.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $9.9 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $9.7 billion, a decrease of $236.2 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 001 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | 8,037 | 95,893 | | | 8,037 | 95,893 |
| 002 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED: | 290 | 20,870 | | | 290 | 20,870 |
| 003 | SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS | 70 | 13,217 | | | 70 | 13,217 |
| 004 | HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) | 1,770 | 281,123 | | 5,000 | 1,770 | 286,123 |
| | Fire Suppression Systems | | | | [5,000] | | |
| 005 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | 3,889 | 1,158,522 | | | 3,889 | 1,158,522 |
| 006 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN | 0 | 17,575 | | | 0 | 17,575 |
| 007 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | 0 | 812,918 | | | 0 | 812,918 |
| 008 | PLS ESP | 0 | 18,973 | | | 0 | 18,973 |
| 009 | ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) | 150 | 136,605 | | | 150 | 136,605 |
| 010 | MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY | 0 | 402,517 | | | 0 | 402,517 |
| 011 | FAMILY OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTEC (MRAP) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 012 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916 | 310 | 74,703 | | | 310 | 74,703 |
| 013 | HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P | 0 | 180,793 | | | 0 | 180,793 |
| 014 | HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM | 0 | 2,904 | | | 0 | 2,904 |
| 015 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | 0 | 10,314 | | | 0 | 10,314 |
| 016 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH) | 0 | 298 | | | 0 | 298 |
| 017 | TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL | 0 | 414 | | | 0 | 414 |
| | **NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 018 | HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN | 0 | 1,980 | | | 0 | 1,980 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 019 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 0 | 269 | | | 0 | 269 |
| 020 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER | 0 | 3,052 | | | 0 | 3,052 |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **COMM-JOINT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 021 | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 022 | JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM | 0 | 11,868 | | | 0 | 11,868 |
| 023 | WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK | 0 | 544,202 | | | 0 | 544,202 |
| 024 | JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) | 0 | 4,868 | | | 0 | 4,868 |
| | **COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 025 | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS (S | 0 | 145,108 | | | 0 | 145,108 |
| 026 | SHF TERM | 0 | 90,918 | | | 0 | 90,918 |
| 027 | SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE) | 0 | 653 | | | 0 | 653 |
| 028 | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) | 0 | 72,735 | | | 0 | 72,735 |
| 029 | SMART-T (SPACE) | 0 | 61,116 | | | 0 | 61,116 |
| 030 | SCAMP (SPACE) | 0 | 1,834 | | | 0 | 1,834 |
| 031 | GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS | 0 | 6,849 | | | 0 | 6,849 |
| 032 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) | 0 | 2,862 | | | 0 | 2,862 |
| | **COMM - COMBAT SUPPORT COMM** | | | | | | |
| 032A | MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **COMM - C3 SYSTEM** | | | | | | |
| 033 | ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS) | 0 | 22,996 | | | 0 | 22,996 |
| | **COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 034 | ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO) | 0 | 1,705 | | | 0 | 1,705 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 035 | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM | 0 | 90,204 | | -55,200 | 0 | 35,004 |
| | JTRS Program Reduction | | | | [-55,200] | | |
| 036 | RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2) | 0 | 8,549 | | | 0 | 8,549 |
| 037 | SINCGARS FAMILY | 0 | 6,812 | | -6,812 | 0 | 0 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | [-6,812] | | |
| 038 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS - OPA2 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 038A | SINCGARS - GROUND | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 039 | MULTI-PURPOSE INFO OP SYS (CLASS) | 0 | 6,164 | | | 0 | 6,164 |
| 040 | BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 041 | COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 042 | SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT | 0 | 21,820 | | | 0 | 21,820 |
| 043 | IMS REMOTE CONTROL UNIT | 0 | 9,256 | | | 0 | 9,256 |
| 044 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS | 0 | 4,646 | | | 0 | 4,646 |
| 045 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL) | 0 | 2,367 | | | 0 | 2,367 |
| 046 | RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY | 0 | 6,555 | | | 0 | 6,555 |
| 047 | MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4) | 0 | 18,583 | | | 0 | 18,583 |
| | **COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM** | | | | | | |
| 048 | CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE (MIP) | 0 | 1,414 | | | 0 | 1,414 |
| | **INFORMATION SECURITY** | | | | | | |
| 049 | TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS) | 0 | 29,525 | | | 0 | 29,525 |
| 050 | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP | 0 | 33,189 | | | 0 | 33,189 |
| | **COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 051 | TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION | 0 | 1,890 | | 44,800 | 0 | 46,690 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Information Security System COMSEC | | | | [44,800] | | |
| 052 | BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS | 0 | 25,525 | | | 0 | 25,525 |
| 053 | ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 054 | WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP) | 0 | 31,256 | | | 0 | 31,256 |
| | **COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 055 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS | 0 | 216,057 | | | 0 | 216,057 |
| 056 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS) | 0 | 6,203 | | | 0 | 6,203 |
| 057 | INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM( | 0 | 147,111 | | | 0 | 147,111 |
| 058 | PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM | 0 | 39,906 | | | 0 | 39,906 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)** | | | | | | |
| 061 | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (MIP) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 062 | JTT/CIBS-M (MIP) | 0 | 3,279 | | | 0 | 3,279 |
| 063 | PROPHET GROUND (MIP) | 0 | 64,498 | | | 0 | 64,498 |
| 064 | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)MIP | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 065 | SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 066 | DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 067 | DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 068 | TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (MIP) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 069 | DCGS-A (MIP) | 0 | 85,354 | | | 0 | 85,354 |
| 070 | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS) | 0 | 6,703 | | | 0 | 6,703 |
| 071 | TROJAN (MIP) | 0 | 26,659 | | | 0 | 26,659 |
| 072 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP) | 0 | 7,021 | | | 0 | 7,021 |
| 073 | CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) (MIP | 0 | 4,509 | | | 0 | 4,509 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 074 | SEQUOYAH FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM | 0 | 6,420 | | | 0 | 6,420 |
| 075 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP) | 0 | 17,053 | | | 0 | 17,053 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)** | | | | | | |
| 076 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR | 0 | 31,661 | | | 0 | 31,661 |
| 077 | WARLOCK | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 078 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | 0 | 1,284 | | | 0 | 1,284 |
| 079 | CI MODERNIZATION (MIP) | 0 | 1,221 | | | 0 | 1,221 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)** | | | | | | |
| 080 | SENTINEL MODS | 0 | 25,863 | | | 0 | 25,863 |
| 081 | SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW) | 0 | 25,352 | | | 0 | 25,352 |
| 082 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | 0 | 366,820 | | -200,000 | 0 | 166,820 |
| | Enhanced Night Vision Goggle Production Delay | | | | [-200,000] | | |
| 083 | LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 0 | 133,836 | | 46,800 | 0 | 180,636 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [46,800] | | |
| 084 | NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT | 0 | 313,237 | | | 0 | 313,237 |
| 085 | SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF | 0 | 9,179 | | | 0 | 9,179 |
| 086 | RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS | 0 | 2,198 | | | 0 | 2,198 |
| 087 | COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 088 | BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 089 | ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP | 0 | 5,838 | | | 0 | 5,838 |
| 090 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 091 | ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE | 0 | 1,178 | | | 0 | 1,178 |
| 092 | PROFILER | 0 | 4,766 | | | 0 | 4,766 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 093 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS) | 0 | 2,801 | | | 0 | 2,801 |
| 094 | FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2) | 0 | 271,979 | | | 0 | 271,979 |
| 095 | JOINT BATTLE COMMAND - PLATFORM (JBC-P) | 0 | 17,242 | | | 0 | 17,242 |
| 096 | LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD | 0 | 59,080 | | | 0 | 59,080 |
| 097 | COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 098 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | 0 | 15,520 | | | 0 | 15,520 |
| 099 | COUNTERFIRE RADARS | 0 | 194,665 | | | 0 | 194,665 |
| 100 | INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - MIP | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 101 | ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM | 0 | 1,944 | | | 0 | 1,944 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS** | | | | | | |
| 102 | TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS | 0 | 29,934 | | | 0 | 29,934 |
| 103 | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY | 0 | 39,042 | | | 0 | 39,042 |
| 104 | BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC | 0 | 31,968 | | | 0 | 31,968 |
| 105 | FAAD C2 | 0 | 8,289 | | | 0 | 8,289 |
| 106 | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD | 0 | 62,439 | | | 0 | 62,439 |
| 107 | KNIGHT FAMILY | 0 | 80,831 | | | 0 | 80,831 |
| 108 | LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) | 0 | 1,778 | | | 0 | 1,778 |
| 109 | AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | 0 | 31,542 | | | 0 | 31,542 |
| 110 | TC AIMS II | 0 | 11,124 | | | 0 | 11,124 |
| 111 | JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 112 | TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE | 0 | 53,898 | | | 0 | 53,898 |
| 114 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | 0 | 77,646 | | | 0 | 77,646 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 115 | SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE) | 0 | 46,861 | | | 0 | 46,861 |
| 116 | RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET | 0 | 11,118 | | | 0 | 11,118 |
| 117 | MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCOTM) | 0 | 926 | | | 0 | 926 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION** | | | | | | |
| 118 | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM | 0 | 85,801 | | | 0 | 85,801 |
| 119 | ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION | 0 | 12,823 | | | 0 | 12,823 |
| 120 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | 0 | 254,723 | | -10,000 | 0 | 244,723 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | [-10,000] | | |
| 121 | CSS COMMUNICATIONS | 0 | 33,749 | | | 0 | 33,749 |
| 122 | RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) | 0 | 39,675 | | | 0 | 39,675 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)** | | | | | | |
| 123 | AFRTS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 124 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V) | 0 | 2,709 | | | 0 | 2,709 |
| 125 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) | 0 | 5,172 | | | 0 | 5,172 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - MODS TACTICAL SYS/EQ** | | | | | | |
| 126 | WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (UAS) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 127 | ITEMS UNDER $5M (SSE) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 128 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) | 0 | 518 | | | 0 | 518 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 2,522 | | | 0 | 2,522 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 129 | PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS / BAIS | 0 | 2,081 | | | 0 | 2,081 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 130 | CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION | 0 | 108,334 | | | 0 | 108,334 |
| 131 | SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM) | 0 | 7,135 | | | 0 | 7,135 |
| | **BRIDGING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 132 | TACTICAL BRIDGING | 0 | 58,509 | | | 0 | 58,509 |
| 133 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | 0 | 135,015 | | | 0 | 135,015 |
| | **ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 134 | HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST | 0 | 42,264 | | | 0 | 42,264 |
| 135 | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS | 0 | 56,123 | | 7,000 | 0 | 63,123 |
| | FIDO Explosive Detector | | | | [7,000] | | |
| 136 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) | 0 | 49,333 | | | 0 | 49,333 |
| 137 | < $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT | 0 | 3,479 | | | 0 | 3,479 |
| 138 | AERIAL DETECTION / ASTAMIDS | 0 | 11,200 | | | 0 | 11,200 |
| | **COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 139 | HEATERS AND ECU'S | 0 | 11,924 | | | 0 | 11,924 |
| 140 | LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 141 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT | 0 | 4,071 | | | 0 | 4,071 |
| 142 | LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 142A | LAND WARRIOR | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 143 | PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS) | 0 | 6,981 | | | 0 | 6,981 |
| 144 | GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM | 0 | 1,809 | | | 0 | 1,809 |
| 145 | MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM | 0 | 1,085 | | | 0 | 1,085 |
| 146 | FORCE PROVIDER | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 147 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 57,872 | | | 0 | 57,872 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 148 | CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM | 0 | 66,381 | | | 0 | 66,381 |
| 149 | MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM: | 0 | 16,585 | | | 0 | 16,585 |
| 150 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT) | 0 | 25,531 | | | 0 | 25,531 |
| | **PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 151 | QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 152 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER | 0 | 84,019 | | | 0 | 84,019 |
| | **WATER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 153 | WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS | 0 | 7,173 | | | 0 | 7,173 |
| | **MEDICAL EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 154 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | 0 | 33,694 | | 3,000 | 0 | 36,694 |
| | Life Support for Trauma and Transport (LSTAT) | | | | [3,000] | | |
| | **MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 155 | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS | 0 | 137,002 | | | 0 | 137,002 |
| 156 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ) | 0 | 812 | | | 0 | 812 |
| | **CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 157 | GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) | 0 | 50,897 | | | 0 | 50,897 |
| 158 | SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM | 0 | 18,387 | | | 0 | 18,387 |
| 159 | SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 160 | DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 161 | MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING | 0 | 44,420 | | | 0 | 44,420 |
| 162 | LOADERS | 0 | 20,824 | | | 0 | 20,824 |
| 163 | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR | 0 | 18,785 | | | 0 | 18,785 |
| 164 | TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED | 0 | 50,102 | | | 0 | 50,102 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 165 | CRANES | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 166 | PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING | 0 | 12,915 | | | 0 | 12,915 |
| 167 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS | 0 | 36,451 | | | 0 | 36,451 |
| 168 | CONST EQUIP ESP | 0 | 8,391 | | | 0 | 8,391 |
| 169 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | 0 | 12,562 | | | 0 | 12,562 |
| | **RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 170 | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV) | 0 | 183,666 | | | 0 | 183,666 |
| 171 | HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER (HCCC | 0 | 10,962 | | | 0 | 10,962 |
| 172 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | 0 | 6,785 | | | 0 | 6,785 |
| | **GENERATORS** | | | | | | |
| 173 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | 0 | 146,067 | | | 0 | 146,067 |
| | **MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 174 | ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH) | 0 | 41,239 | | | 0 | 41,239 |
| 175 | ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM | 0 | 44,898 | | | 0 | 44,898 |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 176 | COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT | 0 | 22,967 | | | 0 | 22,967 |
| 177 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | 0 | 261,348 | | 20,800 | 0 | 282,148 |
| | Basic Rifle and Pistol Marksmanship Program - U.S. Army Reserve | | | | [2,500] | | |
| | Marksmanship Skills Trainer - TX ARNG | | | | [2,200] | | |
| | Mobile Firing Range - TX ARNG | | | | [1,500] | | |
| | Training Aid Enhancements - VT ARNG | | | | [1,300] | | |
| | Virtual Door Gunner - TX ARNG | | | | [1,100] | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (V.I.C.E.) Training System - VA ARNG | | | | [4,900] | | |
| | Immersive Group Simulation Virtual Training Systems for the Hawaii ARNG | | | | [2,500] | | |
| | Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (V.I.C.E.) Training System - Ft. Jackson | | | | [4,800] | | |
| 178 | CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER | 0 | 65,155 | | | 0 | 65,155 |
| 179 | AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA | 0 | 12,794 | | | 0 | 12,794 |
| 180 | GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING | 0 | 7,870 | | | 0 | 7,870 |
| | **TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)** | | | | | | |
| 181 | CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT | 0 | 16,844 | | | 0 | 16,844 |
| 182 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | 0 | 101,320 | | | 0 | 101,320 |
| 183 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) | 0 | 15,526 | | | 0 | 15,526 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 184 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 21,770 | | | 0 | 21,770 |
| 185 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) | 0 | 49,758 | | | 0 | 49,758 |
| 186 | BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT | 0 | 1,303 | | | 0 | 1,303 |
| 187 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) | 0 | 53,884 | | | 0 | 53,884 |
| 188 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) | 0 | 3,050 | | | 0 | 3,050 |
| 189 | BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 190 | SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING | 0 | 45,516 | | | 0 | 45,516 |
| 191 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3 | 0 | 12,232 | | | 0 | 12,232 |
| 192 | MA8975 (CLASSIFIED) | 0 | 4,492 | | | 0 | 4,492 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| | **OPA2** | | | | | | |
| 193 | INITIAL SPARES - C&E | 0 | 25,867 | | | 0 | 25,867 |
| 194 | WIN-T INCREMENT 2 SPARES | 0 | 9,758 | | | 0 | 9,758 |
| | **TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **14,516** | **9,907,151** | 0 | **-144,612** | **14,516** | **9,762,539** |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND** | | | | | | |
| | **NETWORK ATTACK** | | | | | | |
| 001 | ATTACK THE NETWORK | 0 | 203,100 | | -203,100 | 0 | 0 |
| | Transfer to Title II and Title III | | | | [-203,100] | | |
| | **JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT** | | | | | | |
| 002 | DEFEAT THE DEVICE | 0 | 199,100 | | -199,100 | 0 | 0 |
| | Transfer to Title II and Title III | | | | [-199,100] | | |
| | **FORCE TRAINING** | | | | | | |
| 003 | TRAIN THE FORCE | 0 | 41,100 | | -41,100 | 0 | 0 |
| | Transfer to Title II and Title III | | | | [-41,100] | | |
| | **STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE** | | | | | | |
| 004 | OPERATIONS | 0 | 121,550 | | -121,550 | 0 | 0 |
| | Transfer to Title II and Title III | | | | [-121,550] | | |
| | **TOTAL - JOINT IED DEFEAT FUND** | **0** | **564,850** | 0 | **-564,850** | **0** | **0** |

Items of Special Interest

*Enhanced night vision goggles production*

The budget request contained $366.8 million for night vision devices, of which $250.6 million was for 19,072 AN/PSQ–20 enhanced night vision goggles (ENVG).

The committee understands ENVG production has suffered continuing delays and that the delivery schedule has shifted at least three months into calendar year 2010. Further, the committee is aware the Army has obligated only one percent of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2009 for ENVGs. The committee notes the Army initially intended to receive 9,081 ENVGs from January through December 2009, but now expects to receive only 1,938 ENVGs during this same timeframe. The committee believes the ENVG funding profile should be realigned to accurately reflect realistic production schedules.

The committee recommends $166.8 million for night vision devices, a decrease of $200.0 million, for ENVG procurement.

*Hybrid electric powertrains for tactical wheeled vehicles*

The committee commends the Army for its efforts to reduce its logistical footprint and costs by reducing fuel consumption as well as considering the fully burdened cost of fuel in trade-off analysis for all tactical systems to include tactical wheeled vehicles (TWV). The committee is encouraged by recent commercial and government funded advances in hybrid electric powertrain technology for TWVs and believes these advances could improve fuel consumption and long-term cost savings over the economic useful life of the vehicle.

The committee understands the Army is recapitalizing its TWV fleets, to include the M915 heavy tactical wheeled vehicle platform, in an effort to extend service life and improve capability through technology insertions as part of its "resetting the force" initiative. The committee is concerned hybrid electric powertrains would not be considered a viable powertrain option in these TWV recapitalization efforts.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study as to the advisability and feasibility of installing hybrid electric power trains as part of any service life extension program for tactical wheeled vehicle programs to include new start programs. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the report on the study to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2010.

*Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund*

The budget request contained $564.9 million in Army procurement for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF).

The committee recognizes that JIEDDO (Joint Improvised Explosive Defeat Organization) responds to rapidly changing requirements from combatant commanders to counter the threat of improvised explosive devices (IED), which continue to be the primary threat to U.S. military forces in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee also understands that in responding to these requirements, JIEDDO is unable to plan in advance how it will obligate all of its funds in any fiscal

year. However, the committee believes that JIEDDO has become a sufficiently mature and established organization to allow it to plan in advance for continuing and enduring costs, such as staff and infrastructure, multiple-year initiatives, training support, and information fusion support. The committee notes that the Department has decided to institutionalize JIEDDO and understands that the base budget request represents the enduring costs of the organization. The committee believes the budget for these enduring costs should be requested through the appropriate accounts.

The committee recommends $327.1 million, an increase of $327.1 million, in Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) for JIEDDO RDT&E, and $237.8 million, an increase of $237.8 million, in Army operation and maintenance, for JIEDDO operations and information fusion support, for the Joint Center of Excellence, and for staff and infrastructure. The committee recommends $0.0 million, a decrease of $564.9 million, in Army procurement for JIEDDF.

*Joint tactical radio system hand-held radios*

The budget request contained $90.2 million in other procurement, Army, for joint tactical radio system (JTRS) radios. Of this amount, $35.0 million was requested for 5,270 JTRS small form factor "c" hand-held radios.

The committee notes that despite this request, the Army plans to equip the first four spin-out early infantry brigade combat teams (E–IBCT) with legacy RT–1922 enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS) radios. The committee is concerned that the Army is committing to the purchase of more than 5,000 JTRS hand-held radios at the same time it continues to plan to invest in legacy EPLRS systems. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2010, specifying the combination of radios and waveforms with which it intends to field the seven E–IBCT sets of equipment. This report should also include separate cost estimates for fielding these brigade sets with JTRS radios and EPLRS radios.

The committee recommends $35.1 million, a decrease of $55.1 million, for joint tactical radio system radios.

*Non-system training device program*

The budget request contained $261.3 million to continue the non-system training device (NSTD) program, but included no funds to procure the following NSTD programs: basic rifle and pistol marksmanship programs for the Army Reserve; marksmanship skills trainers for the Texas National Guard; mobile firing ranges for the Texas National Guard; training aid enhancements for the Vermont National Guard; virtual door gunner trainers for the Texas National Guard; Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (VICE) training systems for the Virginia National Guard; immersive group simulation virtual training systems for the Hawaii Army National Guard; and VICE training systems for Ft. Jackson.

The Army's NSTD program is an initiative used to introduce realistic and effective training devices into individual and unit training settings. The committee understands there is an emphasis on training military personnel in urban operations and asymmetric

tactical situations similar to those being experienced by soldiers in overseas contingency operations in The Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee understands these devices provide capabilities that allow soldiers and units to train tasks and missions that would be unsafe or too resource intensive to conduct with actual weapons, weapons systems, and ammunitions. The committee supports this initiative and believes these programs could significantly improve soldier survivability and performance.

The committee recommends $282.0 million for the NSTD program for a total increase of $20.8 million, including: an increase of $2.5 million for basic rifle and pistol marksmanship programs for the Army Reserve; $2.2 million for marksmanship skills trainers for the Texas National Guard; $1.5 million for mobile firing ranges for the Texas National Guard; $1.3 million for training aid enhancements for the Vermont National Guard; $1.1 million for virtual door gunner trainers for the Texas National Guard; $4.9 million for Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (VICE) training systems for the Virginia National Guard; $2.5 million for immersive group simulation virtual training systems for the Hawaii Army National Guard, and $4.8 million for VICE training systems at Ft. Jackson.

*Single channel ground and airborne radio system*

The budget request contained $135.0 million for single channel ground and airborne radio (SINCGARS) fielding support.

Section 113 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) restricted obligation of funds for Army tactical radio systems, pending delivery of a report on the Army's radio fielding and network strategy. The committee requested this report because of the following committee concerns: significant Army revisions to radio procurement funding requests; outdated and unclear requirements; non-competitive contract awards for radios; and unexplained increases in unit cost for radios being acquired.

While the report submitted by the Department of Defense laid out many aspects of the Army's plan to build its future battlefield network, it neither explained nor justified the Army's plans to continue to procure SINCGARS. Specifically, the report did not: support the Army's current acquisition objective for SINCGARS radios; clearly explain how the Army will deal with SINCGARS cryptology expiration; or explain how the SINCGARS radio will support a joint tactical radio system (JTRS) based battlefield network using modern data waveforms. As a result, the committee does not believe the funding requested for SINCGARS in the fiscal year 2010 budget request is justified.

In addition, the committee believes that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics should review the Army's SINCGARS acquisition plans to determine if it should be considered an Acquisition Category (ACAT) I program. The committee further believes that the only way to ensure that all of the services are procuring radios compatible with the future JTRS-based network is to reinstate the JTRS Joint Program Office (JPEO) as the review and waiver authority for the Army and Marine Corps to procure tactical radios. The committee notes that the

previous waiver process, which was canceled in fiscal year 2005, has already been partially reinstated for hand-held radio acquisition. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to provide a report by September 30, 2009, to the congressional defense committees, with his recommendations regarding the appropriate acquisition category for the Army SINCGARS program and whether or not the JTRS JPEO should have review and waiver authority over all service tactical radio procurement actions, as was the case prior to 2005, and what changes have occurred in the Army's SINCGARS procurement plans since delivery of the Army Tactical Radio Fielding Plan in April 2009.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $135.0 million, for SINCGARS procurement.

*Tactical combat vehicle egress safety enhancements*

The committee recognizes that safety and survivability are of utmost importance in the design of tactical combat vehicles such as the mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicle. The committee notes that the heavy armor doors that are associated with these tactical combat vehicles could, in certain operational environments, pose a potential threat to the safety and survivability to the military personnel who operate them. The committee is aware that, in some cases, the armor door can weigh in excess of 400 pounds, making it very difficult for the warfighter to rapidly egress the vehicle during emergencies such as vehicle rollovers. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to pursue mature technologies that provide some level of armor door power-assist, to allow military personnel to quickly egress tactical combat vehicles in emergencies.

*Tactical wheeled vehicle fire suppression systems*

The budget request contained $10.3 million for modification of in-service equipment, but included no funds to procure tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) fire suppression systems.

The committee is aware TWV fire suppression systems are currently installed on fuel tank, tire, engine, and crew compartments of the TWVs. These systems provide a proven capability for force protection against improvised explosive devices that use fire accelerants to increase lethality and injury to the warfighter. The committee is aware fire suppression systems are currently operating in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom with success against the current threats. The committee understands that fire suppression systems are a required performance specification for some TWV platforms but for others they are not required.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a capability-based performance assessment of fire suppression system technology for TWVs. The assessment should consider fuel tank, tire, engine, and crew compartment fire suppression systems. The assessment should also consider results and conclusions from previous analysis of alternatives and trade studies regarding the application of fire suppression systems. The Secretary should determine the advisability and feasibility of requiring fire suppression systems on all current and future tactical wheeled vehicle plat-

forms and provide relative cost assessments. The report should be submitted to the defense committees by March 15, 2010.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $18.4 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $18.1 billion, a decrease of $276.2 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 001 | AV-8B (V/STOL) HARRIER | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 002 | EA-18G | 22 | 1,611,837 | | 56,000 | 22 | 1,667,837 |
| | Aircraft Support Equipment | | | | [56,000] | | |
| 003 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 20,559 | | | 0 | 20,559 |
| 004 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET | 9 | 1,009,537 | | | 9 | 1,009,537 |
| 005 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 51,431 | | 108,000 | 0 | 159,431 |
| | EOQ for MYP III | | | | [108,000] | | |
| 006 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER | 20 | 3,997,048 | -1 | -122,000 | 19 | 3,875,048 |
| | Program Reduction | | | [-1] | [-164,000] | | |
| | F136 Procurement | | | | [42,000] | | |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 481,000 | | 5,000 | 0 | 486,000 |
| | F136 Procurement | | | | [5,000] | | |
| 008 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | 30 | 2,215,829 | | | 30 | 2,215,829 |
| 009 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 84,342 | | | 0 | 84,342 |
| 010 | UH-1Y/AH-1Z | 28 | 709,801 | -10 | -282,900 | 18 | 426,901 |
| | UH-1Y/AH-1Z Program Reduction | | | [-10] | [-282,900] | | |
| 011 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 70,550 | | | 0 | 70,550 |
| 012 | MH-60S (MYP) | 18 | 414,145 | | | 18 | 414,145 |
| 013 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 78,830 | | | 0 | 78,830 |
| 014 | MH-60R | 24 | 811,781 | | | 24 | 811,781 |
| 015 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 131,504 | | | 0 | 131,504 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 016 | P-8A POSEIDON | 6 | 1,664,525 | | | 6 | 1,664,525 |
| 017 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 160,526 | | | 0 | 160,526 |
| 018 | E-2D ADV HAWKEYE | 2 | 511,245 | | | 2 | 511,245 |
| 019 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 94,924 | | | 0 | 94,924 |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 020 | C-40A | 1 | 74,381 | | | 1 | 74,381 |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 021 | T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 022 | JPATS | 38 | 266,539 | | | 38 | 266,539 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 023 | KC-130J | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 024 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 025 | RQ-7 UAV | 11 | 56,797 | | | 11 | 56,797 |
| 026 | MQ-8 UAV | 5 | 77,616 | | | 5 | 77,616 |
| 027 | OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 028 | EA-6 SERIES | 0 | 39,977 | | | 0 | 39,977 |
| 029 | AV-8 SERIES | 0 | 35,668 | | | 0 | 35,668 |
| 030 | F-18 SERIES | 0 | 484,129 | | | 0 | 484,129 |
| 031 | H-46 SERIES | 0 | 35,325 | | | 0 | 35,325 |
| 032 | AH-1W SERIES | 0 | 66,461 | | | 0 | 66,461 |
| 033 | H-53 SERIES | 0 | 68,197 | | | 0 | 68,197 |
| 034 | SH-60 SERIES | 0 | 82,253 | | | 0 | 82,253 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 035 | H-1 SERIES | 0 | 20,040 | | | 0 | 20,040 |
| 036 | EP-3 SERIES | 0 | 92,530 | | | 0 | 92,530 |
| 037 | P-3 SERIES | 0 | 485,171 | | -50,000 | 0 | 435,171 |
| | P-3 Series Program Reduction | | | | [-50,000] | | |
| 038 | S-3 SERIES | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 039 | E-2 SERIES | 0 | 22,853 | | | 0 | 22,853 |
| 040 | TRAINER A/C SERIES | 0 | 20,907 | | | 0 | 20,907 |
| 041 | C-2A | 0 | 21,343 | | | 0 | 21,343 |
| 042 | C-130 SERIES | 0 | 22,449 | | | 0 | 22,449 |
| 043 | FEWSG | 0 | 9,486 | | | 0 | 9,486 |
| 044 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | 0 | 19,429 | | | 0 | 19,429 |
| 045 | E-6 SERIES | 0 | 102,646 | | | 0 | 102,646 |
| 046 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES | 0 | 42,456 | | | 0 | 42,456 |
| 047 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | 0 | 14,869 | | | 0 | 14,869 |
| 048 | T-45 SERIES | 0 | 51,484 | | | 0 | 51,484 |
| 049 | POWER PLANT CHANGES | 0 | 26,395 | | | 0 | 26,395 |
| 050 | JPATS SERIES | 0 | 4,922 | | | 0 | 4,922 |
| 051 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS | 0 | 5,594 | | | 0 | 5,594 |
| 052 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | 0 | 47,419 | | 8,300 | 0 | 55,719 |
| | Crane Integrated Defensive Countermeasures (IDECM) Depot Capability | | | | [8,300] | | |
| 053 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | 0 | 151,112 | | | 0 | 151,112 |
| 054 | COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 055 | ID SYSTEMS | 0 | 24,125 | | | 0 | 24,125 |
| 056 | V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | 0 | 24,502 | | | 0 | 24,502 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 057 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS/CLASSIFIED | 0 | 1,264,012 | | -2,000 | 0 | 1,262,012 |
| | F-35 Spares Reduction | | | | [-4,000] | | |
| | F136 Spares | | | | [2,000] | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 058 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | 0 | 363,588 | | 3,400 | 0 | 366,988 |
| | Engine Intallation & Removal Vehicle (EIRV) | | | | [3,400] | | |
| 059 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 0 | 11,075 | | | 0 | 11,075 |
| 060 | WAR CONSUMABLES | 0 | 55,406 | | | 0 | 55,406 |
| 061 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | 0 | 23,861 | | | 0 | 23,861 |
| 062 | SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 42,147 | | | 0 | 42,147 |
| 063 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 0 | 1,734 | | | 0 | 1,734 |
| 064 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **214** | **18,378,312** | **-11** | **-276,200** | **203** | **18,102,112** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Department of the Navy strike-fighter inventory*

The budget request contained $2.7 billion for procurement of 22 EA–18G and 9 F/A–18E/F aircraft, and $4.5 billion for procurement of 20 F–35B/C aircraft for the Department of the Navy. This represents a reduction from the fiscal year 2009 program of record of nine F/A–18E/F aircraft and an increase of two F–35B/C aircraft.

The committee is concerned regarding the current and forecasted strike-fighter aircraft inventory of the Department of the Navy. The committee understands that the Department of the Navy has a fiscal year 2009 strike-fighter inventory shortfall of 110 aircraft and predicts a fiscal year 2010 shortfall of 152 aircraft, with a potential peak strike-fighter shortfall of 312 aircraft by fiscal year 2018. The committee believes such drastic shortfalls in strike fighter-inventory are unacceptable.

The committee understands that a variety of factors cause the current and projected strike-fighter shortfall. Those factors include a fiscal year 2002 decision to reduce F/A–18A through D inventory by 88 aircraft, a reduction in the program of record quantity for F–35B/C by 409 aircraft, delays in development of the F–35B/C program, and F/A 18A through D aircraft reaching forecasted service life sooner than expected.

The committee remains unconvinced that naval strike-fighter shortfalls should be viewed against the totality of Department of Defense strike-fighter inventory. The capabilities of the naval strike-fighter force are inherent in the capability of the aircraft carrier as a strike platform and, as such, force structure requirements for naval aviation must be viewed as those required to support sufficient carrier air wings (CVW) to match the number of statutorily mandated aircraft carriers.

The committee supports procurement of additional F/A–18E/F aircraft to mitigate the naval strike-fighter inventory shortfall and believes that procurement of additional F/A–18E/F aircraft through a multi-year procurement contract is more cost effective and prudent than procuring new aircraft through an annual contract or applying $25.6 million of additional fiscal resources per aircraft to extend the service life of the F/A–18A through D fleet. Therefore, the committee includes a provision in title I of this Act that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multi-year procurement contract for the purchase of additional F/A–18E/F and EA–18G aircraft and also includes a provision in title X of this Act that expresses a sense of Congress that the Department of the Navy should maintain no less than ten carrier air wings with no less than 44 strike-fighters each. Additionally, the committee directs the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 2, 2010, that evaluates the operational effectiveness and costs of extending and modernizing the service-life of F/A–18A through D aircraft to 10,000 flight hours versus procuring, either through an annual or multi-year procurement contract, additional F/A–18E/F aircraft beyond the current program of record.

The committee recommends an increase of $108.0 million for advanced procurement of economic order quantity items in order to achieve the benefits associated with a multi-year procurement con-

tract and also recommends an increase of $56.0 million for support items associated with the EA–18G aircraft. Lastly, the committee fully expects the Secretary of the Navy to promptly negotiate and enter into a multi-year procurement contract for additional F/A–18E/F and EA–18G aircraft to mitigate the naval strike-fighter shortfall.

*Electronic warfare system core depot development*

The budget request contained $310.8 million for common electronic counter-measures equipment, but contained no funds for establishing a core depot maintenance capability for the ALQ–214 electronic counter-measures (ECM) system employed on Navy and Marine Corps tactical aircraft.

The committee notes that depot maintenance repair for the ALQ–214 ECM system is experiencing a 180 to 240 day repair turnaround time, and establishing an organic depot maintenance capability should significantly reduce the turnaround time. The committee understands that section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, provides that a core depot maintenance capability must be established no later than four years after initial operational capability (IOC) is achieved for mission-essential weapons systems designated by the Secretary of Defense. The committee understands that IOC was achieved for the ALQ–214 ECM system in March, 2006, and that core depot maintenance capability should be established by March, 2010.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.3 million for common electronic counter-measures equipment to begin establishment of core depot maintenance capability for the ALQ–214 ECM system.

## WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $3.5 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.5 billion, the amount of the budget request, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| 001 | TRIDENT II MODS | 24 | 1,060,504 | | | 24 | 1,060,504 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 002 | MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 0 | 3,447 | | | 0 | 3,447 |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| 003 | TOMAHAWK | 196 | 283,055 | | | 196 | 283,055 |
| | **TACTICAL MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| 004 | AMRAAM | 79 | 145,506 | | | 79 | 145,506 |
| 005 | SIDEWINDER | 161 | 56,845 | | | 161 | 56,845 |
| 006 | JSOW | 430 | 145,336 | | | 430 | 145,336 |
| 007 | SLAM-ER | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 008 | STANDARD MISSILE/SM-2&6 | 62 | 249,233 | | | 62 | 249,233 |
| 009 | RAM | 90 | 74,784 | | | 90 | 74,784 |
| 010 | HELLFIRE | 818 | 59,411 | | | 818 | 59,411 |
| 011 | AERIAL TARGETS | 0 | 47,003 | | | 0 | 47,003 |
| 012 | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | 0 | 3,928 | | | 0 | 3,928 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| 013 | ESSM | 50 | 51,388 | | | 50 | 51,388 |
| 014 | HARM MODS | 0 | 47,973 | | | 0 | 47,973 |
| 015 | STANDARD MISSILES MODS | 0 | 81,451 | | | 0 | 81,451 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 016 | WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 0 | 3,211 | | | 0 | 3,211 |
| 017 | FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON | 1 | 487,280 | | | 1 | 487,280 |
| 018 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 28,847 | | | 0 | 28,847 |
| | **ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 019 | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 48,883 | | | 0 | 48,883 |
| | **TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.** | | | | | | |
| 020 | SSTD | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 021 | ASW TARGETS | 0 | 9,288 | | | 0 | 9,288 |
| | **MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP** | | | | | | |
| 022 | MK-46 TORPEDO MODS | 0 | 94,159 | | | 0 | 94,159 |
| 023 | MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS | 0 | 61,608 | | | 0 | 61,608 |
| 024 | QUICKSTRIKE MINE | 0 | 4,680 | | | 0 | 4,680 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 025 | TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 39,869 | | | 0 | 39,869 |
| 026 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT | 0 | 10,044 | | | 0 | 10,044 |
| | **DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION** | | | | | | |
| 027 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 0 | 3,434 | | | 0 | 3,434 |
| | **OTHER WEAPONS** | | | | | | |
| | **GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS** | | | | | | |
| 028 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | 0 | 12,742 | | | 0 | 12,742 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 029 | CIWS MODS | 0 | 158,896 | | | 0 | 158,896 |
| 030 | COAST GUARD WEAPONS | 0 | 21,157 | | | 0 | 21,157 |
| 031 | GUN MOUNT MODS | 0 | 30,761 | | | 0 | 30,761 |
| 032 | LCS MODULE WEAPONS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 033 | CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS | 0 | 51,227 | | | 0 | 51,227 |
| 034 | AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS | 0 | 12,309 | | | 0 | 12,309 |
| | **OTHER** | | | | | | |
| 035 | MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 036 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 037 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 65,196 | | | 0 | 65,196 |
| | **TOTAL - WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **1,911** | **3,453,455** | **0** | **0** | **1,911** | **3,453,455** |

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $840.7 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $840.7 million, the amount requested, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in the table below.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS** | | | | | | |
| | **PROC AMMO, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **NAVY AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 001 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | 0 | 75,227 | | | 0 | 75,227 |
| 002 | JDAM | 0 | 1,968 | | | 0 | 1,968 |
| 003 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 38,643 | | | 0 | 38,643 |
| 004 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | 0 | 19,622 | | | 0 | 19,622 |
| 005 | PRACTICE BOMBS | 0 | 33,803 | | | 0 | 33,803 |
| 006 | CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES | 0 | 50,600 | | | 0 | 50,600 |
| 007 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | 0 | 79,102 | | | 0 | 79,102 |
| 008 | JATOS | 0 | 3,230 | | | 0 | 3,230 |
| 009 | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | 0 | 27,483 | | | 0 | 27,483 |
| 010 | INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION | 0 | 25,974 | | | 0 | 25,974 |
| 011 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | 0 | 35,934 | | | 0 | 35,934 |
| 012 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | 0 | 43,490 | | | 0 | 43,490 |
| 013 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | 0 | 10,623 | | | 0 | 10,623 |
| 014 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 3,214 | | | 0 | 3,214 |
| | **PROC AMMO, MC** | | | | | | |
| | **MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 015 | SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION | 0 | 87,781 | | | 0 | 87,781 |
| 016 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 23,582 | | | 0 | 23,582 |
| 017 | 40 MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 57,291 | | | 0 | 57,291 |
| 018 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 22,037 | | | 0 | 22,037 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 019 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 54,869 | | | 0 | 54,869 |
| 020 | 120MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 29,579 | | | 0 | 29,579 |
| 021 | CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 2,259 | | | 0 | 2,259 |
| 022 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 10,694 | | | 0 | 10,694 |
| 023 | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 13,948 | | | 0 | 13,948 |
| 024 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | 0 | 57,948 | | | 0 | 57,948 |
| 025 | EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 026 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 14,886 | | | 0 | 14,886 |
| 027 | FUZE, ALL TYPES | 0 | 575 | | | 0 | 575 |
| 028 | NON LETHALS | 0 | 3,034 | | | 0 | 3,034 |
| 029 | AMMO MODERNIZATION | 0 | 8,886 | | | 0 | 8,886 |
| 030 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 4,393 | | | 0 | 4,393 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS** | **0** | **840,675** | 0 | **0** | **0** | **840,675** |

## SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $13.78 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $13.79 billion, an increase of $10.0 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER WARSHIPS** | | | | | | |
| 001 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | 0 | 739,269 | | | 0 | 739,269 |
| 002 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 484,432 | | | 0 | 484,432 |
| 003 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | 1 | 1,964,317 | | | 1 | 1,964,317 |
| 004 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 1,959,725 | | | 0 | 1,959,725 |
| 005 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | 0 | 1,563,602 | | | 0 | 1,563,602 |
| 006 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 211,820 | | | 0 | 211,820 |
| 007 | SSBN ERO | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 008 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 009 | DDG 1000 | 0 | 1,084,161 | | | 0 | 1,084,161 |
| 010 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 011 | DDG-51 | 1 | 1,912,267 | | | 1 | 1,912,267 |
| 012 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 328,996 | | 100,000 | 0 | 428,996 |
| | Program Increase - EOQ Quantity | | | | [100,000] | | |
| 013 | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP | 3 | 1,380,000 | | | 3 | 1,380,000 |
| | **AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS** | | | | | | |
| 014 | LPD-17 | 0 | 872,392 | | | 0 | 872,392 |
| 015 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 184,555 | | 60,000 | 0 | 244,555 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [60,000] | | |
| 016 | LHA REPLACEMENT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 017 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 018 | INTRATHEATER CONNECTOR | 1 | 177,956 | | | 1 | 177,956 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST** | | | | | | |
| 019 | OUTFITTING | 0 | 391,238 | | | 0 | 391,238 |
| 020 | SERVICE CRAFT | 0 | 3,694 | | | 0 | 3,694 |
| 021 | LCAC SLEP | 3 | 63,857 | | | 3 | 63,857 |
| 022 | COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS | 0 | 454,586 | | -150,000 | 0 | 304,586 |
| | Completion of Prior Year Shipbuilding (DDG 1000) | | | | [-150,000] | | |
| 022 | SSN-774 (MEMO NON ADD) | 0 | 45,608 | | | 0 | 45,608 |
| 022 | DDG-1000 (MEMO NON ADD) | 0 | 309,636 | | [-150,000] | 0 | 159,636 |
| 022 | LPD 17 (MEMO NON ADD) | 0 | 99,342 | | | 0 | 99,342 |
| | **TOTAL - SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY** | **9** | **13,776,867** | **0** | **10,000** | **9** | **13,786,867** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Capabilities of the United States Navy*

The committee believes the U.S. Navy fleet should be balanced in both capability of ships and quantity of ships, but that quantity should have priority over spending excessive resources for marginal increases in capability. The committee supports the re-start of the DDG 51 class and believes that a minimum of two of these vessels should be requested per year. The committee maintains cautious support for the Littoral Combat Ship and believes a minimum of three of these vessels should be requested per year. The committee believes that two Virginia class submarines is the minimum that should be funded annually. The committee believes that the operational availability of aircraft carriers is more important than the total number of aircraft carriers in the inventory; however, the committee is not convinced that a total inventory of fewer than 11 carriers will support the required operational availability. The committee supports the ongoing efforts to develop the next generation cruiser. The committee believes that the next generation cruiser must meet the challenge of emerging ballistic missile technology and that an integrated nuclear power system is required to achieve maximum capability of the vessel. The committee supports the revised Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) and the capability of the Maritime Landing Platform vessel to resupply logistic support from a sea base. The committee is also supportive of continuing procurement of amphibious assault ships (LHA/LHD) but recommends the construction of a modified LHD variant for increased amphibious capability if such modification can be accomplished with minimal non-recurring costs. Finally, the committee recommends that the Navy consider combining acquisition efforts with the U.S. Coast Guard in procurement of the National Security Cutter vessel for use as a Navy frigate.

*U.S. Navy shipbuilding*

The budget request contained $13.8 billion for the construction of 8 Navy ships and completes funding for the 3rd and final Zumwalt class destroyer (DDG 1000) and the 10th San Antonio class amphibious transport, dock (LPD 17). The request also contains advance procurement for long-lead material and equipment for seven additional vessels, including two Virginia class submarines, for which full funding is expected in fiscal year 2011. Overall, the committee considers this budget request a positive step in restoring the fleet to a level of at least 313 battle force vessels.

The committee is encouraged that the Department of the Navy has requested funding to complete the last two of the Lewis and Clark dry cargo ammunition ships (T–AKE) and the final LPD 17 ship. The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense has decided to truncate the DDG 1000 program to three ships and restart the Burke class destroyer (DDG 51) program. The committee agrees with this decision and understands the agreement reached between the Department and the prime shipbuilding contractors for construction of the three DDG 1000 ships and the re-start of the first three DDG 51 ships will ensure industrial stability at both of the surface combatant construction shipyards while the Depart-

ment plans for future surface combatant capability and force structure.

*Aircraft carriers*

The committee includes a provision in title X of this Act that would provide a temporary waiver to the requirement in section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code, to maintain 10 operational aircraft carriers. This waiver would be in effect for the time period between the inactivation of USS Enterprise (CVN 65) and the delivery of USS Ford (CVN 78). The committee agrees with the Navy's determination that the cost to conduct a depot level maintenance availability for USS Enterprise (CVN 65) which would allow for only one additional deployment is excessive. The committee further understands that conducting such a maintenance period will decrease the actual operational availability of the aircraft carrier fleet by delaying the complex refueling overhaul of USS Lincoln (CVN 72) with cascading delays for other Nimitz class carriers. The committee understands that with the commissioning of the USS Ford (CVN 78) in fiscal year 2015, the aircraft carrier force structure will return to 11 carriers.

However, the committee continues to have serious reservations regarding the Navy's force planning, transparency with Congress, and the risk to the national security of the United States. During consideration of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee was assured that the Navy supported the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report, which concluded that 11 aircraft carriers are needed to meet the combat capability requirements of the National Military Strategy (NMS). Yet, less than one year later, the Navy proposed the inactivation of the USS Enterprise as part of the consideration of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2008 and submitted such a proposal again for fiscal years 2009 and 2010. In addition, the Navy failed to program the funds required to maintain the USS Enterprise, in accordance with their statutory obligation. The Secretary of Defense has also announced plans to permanently reduce the carrier force structure in the out-years. The committee believes that it is most appropriate to consider aircraft carrier force structure within the context of a new QDR and NMS and not as part of a budgetary process. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary to revisit this issue as part of the ongoing QDR and does not intend this temporary waiver to reflect the committee's approval of the Secretary's recommendation to permanently reduce the aircraft carrier force structure.

*Aircraft carrier construction*

On April 6, 2009, the Secretary of Defense stated, ". . . the healthy margin of dominance at sea provided by America's existing battle fleet makes it possible and prudent to slow production of several major surface combatants and other maritime programs. We will shift the Navy aircraft carrier program to a five-year build cycle, placing it on a more fiscally sustainable path. This will result in 10 carriers after 2040." The committee recognizes that aircraft carrier construction is a significant investment and consistently represents a large portion of the President's budget request for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee also acknowl-

edges that shifting from the planned four-year build cycle to a five-year build cycle will reduce the annual funding required for aircraft carrier construction.

However, the committee has not been provided with a cost-benefit analysis justifying the plan to extend carrier construction schedules. Lacking such an analysis, the committee is concerned that this shift may increase the total funding required for aircraft carrier construction and other shipbuilding programs in the aircraft carrier construction yard, such as Virginia-class submarines and refueling and complex overhaul of the current aircraft carrier fleet. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to take a holistic view of shipbuilding affordability, to optimize the construction of aircraft carriers for greater efficiency and retention of skilled labor, and to re-evaluate his decision following the completion of the aircraft carrier construction report required by a provision in title I of this Act.

*Electromagnetic aircraft launch system*

The committee is monitoring the progress of the development efforts of the electromagnetic aircraft launch system (EMALS) and the detrimental effect on cost and schedule that this one system could have on the delivery of the USS Ford (CVN 78). The committee concurs with the decision made by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition to continue with development of EMALS and avoid the cost and delay associated with a return to steam catapults. However, because of the enormity of the impact that a failure of this program to deliver on time would have on delivery of the USS Ford (CVN 78), the committee believes that it is imperative that a single officer or civilian official oversee key development, production, and integration efforts. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to retain the current program manager in his position throughout the completion of the system design and development efforts, including production of the first ship-set of components. Additionally, the Secretary is encouraged to identify and assign to the program office the relief for the current program officer at least six months prior to the detachment of the current program manager. The Secretary is directed to maintain the relieving program manager in position until completion of EMALS shipboard installation, integration, and testing on USS Ford (CVN 78). The committee directs the secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not less than 30 days prior to any planned change of the program manager, and as soon as practicable for any emergent change of the program manager.

*Littoral combat ship*

This program was envisioned as the affordable way to deliver significant capability to the fleet in the shortest time possible. Neither affordability nor timeliness has resulted from this troubled program. As of this report, only one vessel has been delivered to the Navy, significantly over target cost, with a second due to be delivered later in calendar year 2009, also significantly over target cost.

While the committee is aware that the cost and schedule problems associated with this program are shared by both the contractors and the government, the fact remains that the costs of the first

vessels are too high. The committee is encouraged by recent actions taken by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition to restore competition for quantity between the two prime contractors by combining the request for proposals of the fiscal year 2009 and fiscal year 2010 ships. The committee is also aware that the Navy now more fully understands the costs associated with construction of these vessels. Therefore, the committee includes a provision elsewhere in this Act that would modify the structure of the existing cost cap for the littoral combat ship (LCS) program similar to the requirements of cost caps on other ship programs. The provision would also allow, for fiscal year 2010, the Secretary of the Navy to use funds authorized and appropriated to the program to develop a technical data package of each vessel if the Secretary is unable to enter into contracts for LCS vessels within the requirements of the cost cap. These technical data packages would be for use in bidding construction of the vessels to other contractors.

The committee expects the Navy, in moving forward with this program over the next few years, to transition the current acquisition program, which currently requires performance specifications for the ships to a program where the government either supplies, as government furnished equipment (GFE), or specifies the weapons system, communication system, and the propulsion system. To the greatest extent possible, the committee expects that those systems would be common between the two versions of the LCS vessels. The committee additionally expects that when the Navy is in a position to make that transition, that domestically produced major equipment will be specifically specified or supplied to the shipbuilder as GFE.

*Next generation cruiser*

The committee supports Navy research efforts to develop a radar system for the next generation cruiser (CGN(X)). The committee understands that ongoing analysis to determine radar sensitivity, power requirements, physical structure, and weight will dictate the size of the hull necessary for the vessel.

Therefore the committee supports accelerated development of the combat system along with efforts to begin detailed design and construction of the vessel.

The committee remains committed to the direction of section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which requires the use of an integrated nuclear propulsion system for the CGN(X).

*Sea-based strategic deterrent*

The committee believes that it is in the national interest to maintain the submarine design industrial capacity to begin development efforts for a new class of submarines which could either continue the mission of the current Ohio-class strategic submarines (SSBN) or serve as the next generation of tactical guided missile submarines (SSGN). The committee is also aware that the United States has agreements with the United Kingdom to jointly design and develop a common missile compartment (CMC) module which would be used by both countries for construction of next generation submarines.

The committee supports both the development of the CMC and the cooperative manner in which research and design costs are being shared by the United States and the United Kingdom. However, the committee is aware of the combatant commanders' desire for increased presence of the recently converted SSBN to SSGN submarines due to the significant tactical strike and special operations capability those platforms can deliver. Therefore, the committee strongly encourages the design of the CMC module account for a non-strategic use with minimal back-fitting.

*Surface combatants*

The committee will closely monitor the costs to complete the DDG 1000 class. The committee is encouraged by the robustness of design completion prior to the start of fabrication of the first ship. The committee expects the extra effort to complete design prior to the start of construction and the significant investment in infrastructure at the construction yard will set a new standard for first of class vessels in meeting target cost. However, the committee notes that approximately $1.5 billion in research and development efforts still need to be completed to realize the full combat capability of the ship.

The committee supports the re-start of procurement of DDG 51 class destroyers. The committee supports the views of the Chief of Naval Operations that these vessels are required to counter emerging ballistic missile threats and for the conduct of deep ocean anti-submarine warfare. Therefore, the committee includes in title I of this Act, a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multi-year procurement contract for additional DDG 51 destroyers.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $5.66 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $5.69 billion, an increase of $28.0 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Other Procurement, Navy programs are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 001 | LM-2500 GAS TURBINE | 0 | 8,014 | | | 0 | 8,014 |
| 002 | ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE | 0 | 9,162 | | | 0 | 9,162 |
| 003 | OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 004 | OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | 0 | 34,743 | | | 0 | 34,743 |
| | **PERISCOPES** | | | | | | |
| 005 | SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP | 0 | 75,127 | | | 0 | 75,127 |
| | **OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 006 | DDG MOD | 0 | 142,262 | | | 0 | 142,262 |
| 007 | FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 11,423 | | | 0 | 11,423 |
| 008 | COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD | 0 | 4,383 | | | 0 | 4,383 |
| 009 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | 0 | 24,992 | | | 0 | 24,992 |
| 010 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 16,867 | | | 0 | 16,867 |
| 011 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 103,153 | | | 0 | 103,153 |
| 012 | SUBMARINE BATTERIES | 0 | 51,482 | | | 0 | 51,482 |
| 013 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | 0 | 15,672 | | | 0 | 15,672 |
| 014 | DSSP EQUIPMENT | 0 | 10,641 | | | 0 | 10,641 |
| 015 | CG MODERNIZATION | 0 | 315,323 | | | 0 | 315,323 |
| 016 | LCAC | 0 | 6,642 | | | 0 | 6,642 |
| 017 | MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 018 | UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS | 0 | 19,232 | | | 0 | 19,232 |
| 019 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 127,554 | | 4,000 | 0 | 131,554 |
| | M952 Weapon Light | | | | [4,000] | | |
| 020 | CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS | 0 | 8,899 | | | 0 | 8,899 |
| 021 | SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 0 | 14,721 | | | 0 | 14,721 |
| | **REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 022 | REACTOR POWER UNITS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 023 | REACTOR COMPONENTS | 0 | 262,354 | | | 0 | 262,354 |
| | **OCEAN ENGINEERING** | | | | | | |
| 024 | DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT | 0 | 5,304 | | | 0 | 5,304 |
| | **SMALL BOATS** | | | | | | |
| 025 | STANDARD BOATS | 0 | 35,318 | | 5,000 | 0 | 40,318 |
| | Barrier Boat Craft | | | | [5,000] | | |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 026 | OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 15,113 | | | 0 | 15,113 |
| | **PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 027 | OPERATING FORCES IPE | 0 | 47,172 | | | 0 | 47,172 |
| | **OTHER SHIP SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 028 | NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS | 0 | 136,683 | | | 0 | 136,683 |
| 029 | LCS MODULES | 0 | 137,259 | | | 0 | 137,259 |
| | **LOGISTIC SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 030 | LSD MIDLIFE | 0 | 117,856 | | | 0 | 117,856 |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SHIP RADARS** | | | | | | |
| 031 | RADAR SUPPORT | 0 | 9,968 | | | 0 | 9,968 |
| 032 | SPQ-9B RADAR | 0 | 13,476 | | | 0 | 13,476 |
| 033 | AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM | 0 | 111,093 | | | 0 | 111,093 |
| 034 | SSN ACOUSTICS | 0 | 299,962 | | | 0 | 299,962 |
| 035 | UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 38,705 | | | 0 | 38,705 |
| 036 | SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS | 0 | 13,537 | | | 0 | 13,537 |
| | **ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 037 | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM | 0 | 20,681 | | | 0 | 20,681 |
| 038 | SSTD | 0 | 2,184 | | | 0 | 2,184 |
| 039 | FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 0 | 63,017 | | | 0 | 63,017 |
| 040 | SURTASS | 0 | 24,108 | | | 0 | 24,108 |
| 041 | TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER | 0 | 22,464 | | | 0 | 22,464 |
| | **ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 042 | AN/SLQ-32 | 0 | 34,264 | | | 0 | 34,264 |
| | **RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 043 | SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT | 0 | 105,883 | | | 0 | 105,883 |
| | **SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 044 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG | 0 | 98,645 | | | 0 | 98,645 |
| | **OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 045 | NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM | 0 | 0 | | 3,000 | 0 | 3,000 |
| | AN/USQ-167 COMSEC Upgrade | | | | [3,000] | | |
| 046 | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY | 0 | 30,522 | | | 0 | 30,522 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 047 | GCCS-M EQUIPMENT | 0 | 13,594 | | | 0 | 13,594 |
| 048 | NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS) | 0 | 35,933 | | | 0 | 35,933 |
| 049 | ADVANCED TACTICAL DATA LINK | 0 | 7,314 | | | 0 | 7,314 |
| 050 | MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT | 0 | 79,091 | | | 0 | 79,091 |
| 051 | SHALLOW WATER MCM | 0 | 7,835 | | | 0 | 7,835 |
| 052 | NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) | 0 | 10,845 | | | 0 | 10,845 |
| 053 | ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV | 0 | 3,333 | | | 0 | 3,333 |
| 054 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | 0 | 4,149 | | | 0 | 4,149 |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 055 | OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 36,784 | | | 0 | 36,784 |
| | **AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 056 | MATCALS | 0 | 17,468 | | | 0 | 17,468 |
| 057 | SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 0 | 7,970 | | | 0 | 7,970 |
| 058 | AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM | 0 | 18,878 | | | 0 | 18,878 |
| 059 | NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM | 0 | 28,988 | | | 0 | 28,988 |
| 060 | AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 8,203 | | | 0 | 8,203 |
| 061 | MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM | 0 | 10,526 | | | 0 | 10,526 |
| 062 | ID SYSTEMS | 0 | 38,682 | | | 0 | 38,682 |
| 063 | TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS) | 0 | 9,102 | | | 0 | 9,102 |
| | **OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 064 | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT | 0 | 8,719 | | 4,000 | 0 | 12,719 |
| | Shelter Upgrade Program | | | | [4,000] | | |
| 065 | TADIX-B (IBS) | 0 | 793 | | | 0 | 793 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 066 | GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE | 0 | 11,820 | | | 0 | 11,820 |
| 067 | DCGS-N | 0 | 27,632 | | | 0 | 27,632 |
| 068 | CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORKS | 0 | 1,181 | | | 0 | 1,181 |
| 069 | RADIAC | 0 | 5,990 | | | 0 | 5,990 |
| 070 | GPETE | 0 | 3,737 | | | 0 | 3,737 |
| 071 | INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY | 0 | 4,423 | | | 0 | 4,423 |
| 072 | EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION | 0 | 4,778 | | | 0 | 4,778 |
| 073 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 65,760 | | | 0 | 65,760 |
| | **SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 074 | SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 075 | PORTABLE RADIOS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 076 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | 0 | 310,605 | | | 0 | 310,605 |
| 077 | AN/URC-82 RADIO | 0 | 4,913 | | | 0 | 4,913 |
| 078 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M | 0 | 25,314 | | | 0 | 25,314 |
| | **SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 079 | SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT | 0 | 105 | | | 0 | 105 |
| 080 | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT | 0 | 48,729 | | | 0 | 48,729 |
| | **SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 081 | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 0 | 50,172 | | | 0 | 50,172 |
| 082 | NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT) | 0 | 72,496 | | | 0 | 72,496 |
| | **SHORE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 083 | JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | 0 | 2,322 | | | 0 | 2,322 |
| 084 | ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS | 0 | 1,293 | | | 0 | 1,293 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 085 | NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | 0 | 2,542 | | | 0 | 2,542 |
| | **CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 086 | INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | 0 | 119,054 | | | 0 | 119,054 |
| 087 | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | 0 | 16,839 | | | 0 | 16,839 |
| | **OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 088 | COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT | 0 | 18,892 | | | 0 | 18,892 |
| | **DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 089 | OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **SONOBUOYS** | | | | | | |
| 090 | SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES | 0 | 91,976 | | | 0 | 91,976 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 091 | WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 75,329 | | | 0 | 75,329 |
| 092 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | 0 | 8,343 | | | 0 | 8,343 |
| 093 | AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 12,850 | | | 0 | 12,850 |
| 094 | AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT | 0 | 48,670 | | | 0 | 48,670 |
| 095 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | 0 | 21,458 | | | 0 | 21,458 |
| 096 | OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | 0 | 1,582 | | | 0 | 1,582 |
| 097 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT | 0 | 27,367 | | 5,000 | 0 | 32,367 |
| | Multi Climate Protection System | | | | [5,000] | | |
| 098 | AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 0 | 55,408 | | | 0 | 55,408 |
| 099 | LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | 0 | 23,694 | | | 0 | 23,694 |
| 100 | PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS | 0 | 9,710 | | | 0 | 9,710 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 101 | OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 16,541 | | | 0 | 16,541 |
| | **ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 102 | NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM | 0 | 1,391 | | | 0 | 1,391 |
| 103 | GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT | 0 | 7,891 | | | 0 | 7,891 |
| | **SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 104 | NATO SEASPARROW | 0 | 13,556 | | | 0 | 13,556 |
| 105 | RAM GMLS | 0 | 7,762 | | | 0 | 7,762 |
| 106 | SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM | 0 | 34,079 | | | 0 | 34,079 |
| 107 | AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 108,886 | | | 0 | 108,886 |
| 108 | TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 88,475 | | | 0 | 88,475 |
| 109 | VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS | 0 | 5,513 | | | 0 | 5,513 |
| | **FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 110 | STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP | 0 | 155,579 | | | 0 | 155,579 |
| | **ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 111 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | 0 | 118,528 | | | 0 | 118,528 |
| 112 | SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 5,200 | | | 0 | 5,200 |
| 113 | SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 13,646 | | | 0 | 13,646 |
| 114 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 7,256 | | | 0 | 7,256 |
| | **OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 115 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | 0 | 54,069 | | | 0 | 54,069 |
| 116 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 3,478 | | | 0 | 3,478 |
| | **OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 117 | ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM | 0 | 37,128 | | | 0 | 37,128 |
| 118 | SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | 0 | 7,430 | | | 0 | 7,430 |
| 119 | SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | 0 | 25,271 | | | 0 | 25,271 |
| | **CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 120 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 0 | 4,139 | | | 0 | 4,139 |
| 121 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | 0 | 1,731 | | | 0 | 1,731 |
| 122 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | 0 | 12,931 | | | 0 | 12,931 |
| 123 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 12,976 | | | 0 | 12,976 |
| 124 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 0 | 25,352 | | | 0 | 25,352 |
| 125 | AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT | 0 | 2,950 | | | 0 | 2,950 |
| 126 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | 0 | 5,097 | | | 0 | 5,097 |
| 127 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION | 0 | 23,787 | | | 0 | 23,787 |
| 128 | PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES | 0 | 1,115 | | 5,000 | 0 | 6,115 |
| | LRAD (Long Range Acoustical Device) Anti-Terrorism Force Protection Equipment for USN Assets | | | | [5,000] | | |
| | **SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 129 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 17,153 | | | 0 | 17,153 |
| 130 | OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 6,368 | | | 0 | 6,368 |
| 131 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 0 | 6,217 | | | 0 | 6,217 |
| 132 | SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEM/JWAC ( C ) | 0 | 71,597 | | | 0 | 71,597 |
| | **PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **TRAINING DEVICES** | | | | | | |
| 133 | TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 12,944 | | | 0 | 12,944 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 134 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 55,267 | | 2,000 | 0 | 57,267 |
| | Man Overboard Indicator | | | | [2,000] | | |
| 135 | EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 2,084 | | | 0 | 2,084 |
| 136 | MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 5,517 | | | 0 | 5,517 |
| 137 | NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 1,537 | | | 0 | 1,537 |
| 139 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 12,250 | | | 0 | 12,250 |
| 140 | C4ISR EQUIPMENT | 0 | 5,324 | | | 0 | 5,324 |
| 141 | ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 18,183 | | | 0 | 18,183 |
| 142 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 0 | 128,921 | | | 0 | 128,921 |
| 143 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 0 | 79,747 | | | 0 | 79,747 |
| | **OTHER** | | | | | | |
| 144 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 19,463 | | | 0 | 19,463 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 145 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 247,796 | | | 0 | 247,796 |
| | **TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **0** | **5,661,176** | 0 | **28,000** | **0** | **5,689,176** |

### Items of Special Interest

*Multi-climate protection system*

The budget request contained $45.3 million for aviation life support equipment, but only contained $0.3 million for procurement of 187 multi-climate protection (MCP) systems.

The committee understands the MCP system is an abbreviated acquisition program intended to develop a modular protective clothing system which provides flame protection, thermal protection, and sufficient insulation while reducing heat stress and bulk commonly associated with cold weather clothing systems. The committee notes that the Navy requirement is for 25,000 MCP systems but has only been appropriated funding thus far to procure and field 10,388 MCP systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for aviation life support equipment to procure 3,148 additional MCP systems.

## PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $1.60 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.61 billion, an increase of $11.1 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | | | | | | |
| | **WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| | **TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 001 | AAV7A1 PIP | 0 | 9,127 | | | 0 | 9,127 |
| 002 | LAV PIP | 0 | 34,969 | | | 0 | 34,969 |
| 003 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 004 | M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS** | | | | | | |
| 005 | EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 20 | 19,591 | | | 20 | 19,591 |
| 006 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | 0 | 7,420 | | | 0 | 7,420 |
| 007 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM | 0 | 71,476 | | | 0 | 71,476 |
| 008 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION | 0 | 25,949 | | | 0 | 25,949 |
| | **WEAPONS** | | | | | | |
| 009 | MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 010 | MODIFICATION KITS | 0 | 33,990 | | | 0 | 33,990 |
| 011 | WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | 0 | 22,238 | | | 0 | 22,238 |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| 012 | GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE | 0 | 11,387 | | | 0 | 11,387 |
| 013 | JAVELIN | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 014 | FOLLOW ON TO SMAW | 0 | 25,333 | | | 0 | 25,333 |
| 015 | ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H) | 0 | 71,225 | | | 0 | 71,225 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 016 | MODIFICATION KITS | 0 | 2,114 | | | 0 | 2,114 |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS** | | | | | | |
| 017 | UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER | 0 | 19,832 | | | 0 | 19,832 |
| | **REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 018 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | 0 | 31,087 | | | 0 | 31,087 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 019 | COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 0 | 11,368 | | | 0 | 11,368 |
| 020 | MODIFICATION KITS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 021 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | 0 | 3,531 | | | 0 | 3,531 |
| 022 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | 0 | 45,084 | | | 0 | 45,084 |
| | **RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 023 | RADAR SYSTEMS | 0 | 7,428 | | | 0 | 7,428 |
| | **INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 024 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 0 | 2,580 | | | 0 | 2,580 |
| 025 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 37,581 | | 10,500 | 0 | 48,081 |
| | Tier I Unmanned Aircraft Systems | | | | [10,500] | | |
| 026 | RQ-11 UAV | 517 | 42,403 | | | 517 | 42,403 |
| | **OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 027 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | 0 | 10,360 | | | 0 | 10,360 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 028 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | 0 | 115,263 | | | 0 | 115,263 |
| 029 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | 0 | 49,820 | | | 0 | 49,820 |
| 030 | RADIO SYSTEMS | 0 | 61,954 | | | 0 | 61,954 |
| 031 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | 0 | 98,254 | | | 0 | 98,254 |
| 032 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | 0 | 15,531 | | | 0 | 15,531 |
| | **SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| | **ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 033 | COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES | 0 | 1,265 | | | 0 | 1,265 |
| 034 | COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES | 0 | 13,610 | | 3,000 | 0 | 16,610 |
| | Mountain Terrain Support Vehicles | | | | [3,000] | | |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 035 | 5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP) | 54 | 9,796 | | | 54 | 9,796 |
| 036 | MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 6,111 | | | 0 | 6,111 |
| 037 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | 0 | 10,792 | | 28,900 | 0 | 39,692 |
| | Medium Tactical Vehicle Replacement Trailers | | | | [28,900] | | |
| 038 | LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP | 495 | 217,390 | | | 495 | 217,390 |
| 039 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | 0 | 26,497 | | | 0 | 26,497 |
| 040 | TRAILERS | 0 | 18,122 | | | 0 | 18,122 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 041 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 5,948 | | | 0 | 5,948 |
| | **ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 042 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | 0 | 5,121 | | | 0 | 5,121 |
| 043 | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT | 0 | 13,035 | | | 0 | 13,035 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 044 | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS | 0 | 35,059 | | 5,100 | 0 | 40,159 |
| | Nitrile Rubber Collapsible Storage Units | | | | [5,100] | | |
| 045 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | 0 | 21,033 | | | 0 | 21,033 |
| 046 | AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 39,876 | | | 0 | 39,876 |
| 047 | EOD SYSTEMS | 0 | 93,335 | | | 0 | 93,335 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 048 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 0 | 12,169 | | | 0 | 12,169 |
| 049 | GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE) | 0 | 11,825 | | | 0 | 11,825 |
| 050 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | 0 | 41,430 | | 64,000 | 0 | 105,430 |
| | Tractors, Rubber Tired, Articulated Steering, Multi-purpose (TRAM) | | | | [21,000] | | |
| | Light Rough Terrain Forks (LRTF) | | | | [13,000] | | |
| | Millennia Military Vehicle/Extendable Boom Fork Lift (MMV/EBFL) | | | | [30,000] | | |
| 051 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 0 | 5,301 | | | 0 | 5,301 |
| | **GENERAL PROPERTY** | | | | | | |
| 052 | FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | 0 | 6,811 | | | 0 | 6,811 |
| 053 | TRAINING DEVICES | 0 | 14,854 | | | 0 | 14,854 |
| 054 | CONTAINER FAMILY | 0 | 3,770 | | | 0 | 3,770 |
| 055 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | 0 | 37,735 | | | 0 | 37,735 |
| 056 | FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV) | 52 | 10,360 | | | 52 | 10,360 |
| 057 | BRIDGE BOATS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 058 | RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN | 0 | 2,159 | | | 0 | 2,159 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 059 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 8,792 | | | 0 | 8,792 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 060 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 41,547 | | | 0 | 41,547 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | **1,138** | **1,600,638** | **0** | **111,500** | **1,138** | **1,712,138** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Nitrile rubber collapsible storage units*

The budget request contained $35.1 million for tactical fuel systems, but included no funds for additional nitrile rubber collapsible storage units.

The committee understands that extreme environmental conditions in Operation Iraqi Freedom have caused premature degradation of polyurethane collapsible systems used in storing, receiving, transferring, and dispensing fuel and liquid bulk in support of Marine Air-Ground Task Forces (MAGTF) operations. The committee is aware that nitrile rubber collapsible storage units would alleviate failure risk and fill capacity limitations associated with current polyurethane collapsible systems involved in MAGTF overseas contingency operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.1 million for additional nitrile rubber collapsible storage units.

# Aircraft Procurement, Air Force

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $12.0 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $11.6 billion, a decrease of $343.1 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL FORCES** | | | | | | |
| 001 | F-35 | 10 | 2,048,830 | -1 | 67,000 | 9 | 2,115,830 |
| | Program Reduction | | | [-1] | [-131,000] | | |
| | Spares Decrease | | | | [-9,000] | | |
| | F136 Engine Procurement | | | | [57,000] | | |
| | F136 Engine Spares | | | | [21,000] | | |
| | F-35 Spares and Support Equipment | | | | [129,000] | | |
| 002 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 300,600 | | 13,000 | 0 | 313,600 |
| | F136 Advance Procurement | | | | [13,000] | | |
| 003 | F-22A | 0 | 95,163 | | | 0 | 95,163 |
| 004 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | 368,800 | 0 | 368,800 |
| | Program Increase | | | | [368,800] | | |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL AIRLIFT** | | | | | | |
| 005 | C-17A (MYP) | 0 | 88,510 | | | 0 | 88,510 |
| | **OTHER AIRLIFT** | | | | | | |
| 006 | C-130J | 3 | 285,632 | | | 3 | 285,632 |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 108,000 | | -12,000 | 0 | 96,000 |
| | Excess AP Based on FY09 Projections | | | | [-12,000] | | |
| 008 | HC/MC-130 RECAP | 9 | 879,231 | | | 9 | 879,231 |
| 009 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 137,360 | | -50,000 | 0 | 87,360 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Excess AP Based on FY09 Projections | | | | [-50,000] | | |
| 010 | JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT | 8 | 319,050 | | | 8 | 319,050 |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **UPT TRAINERS** | | | | | | |
| 011 | USAFA POWERED FLIGHT PROGRAM | 13 | 4,144 | | | 13 | 4,144 |
| | **OPERATIONAL TRAINERS** | | | | | | |
| 012 | JPATS | 0 | 15,711 | | | 0 | 15,711 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **HELICOPTERS** | | | | | | |
| 013 | V22 OSPREY | 5 | 437,272 | | | 5 | 437,272 |
| 014 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 13,835 | | | 0 | 13,835 |
| | **MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 015 | C-29A FLIGHT INSPECTION ACFT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 016 | C-12 A | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 017 | C-40 | 3 | 154,044 | 1 | 105,250 | 4 | 259,294 |
| | Program Increase | | | [1] | [105,250] | | |
| 018 | CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C | 0 | 2,426 | | | 0 | 2,426 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 020 | TARGET DRONES | 0 | 78,511 | | | 0 | 78,511 |
| 021 | C-37A | 1 | 66,400 | | | 1 | 66,400 |
| 022 | GLOBAL HAWK | 5 | 554,775 | | | 5 | 554,775 |
| 023 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 113,049 | | | 0 | 113,049 |
| 024 | MQ-1 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 025 | MQ-9 | 24 | 489,469 | -11 | -215,335 | 13 | 274,134 |
| | Transfer to Title XV | | | [-11] | [-215,335] | | |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 3,608 | | | 0 | 3,608 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 026 | B-2A | 0 | 283,955 | | | 0 | 283,955 |
| 027 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 028 | B-1B | 0 | 107,558 | | | 0 | 107,558 |
| 029 | B-52 | 0 | 78,788 | | | 0 | 78,788 |
| | **TACTICAL AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 030 | A-10 | 0 | 252,488 | | 67,100 | 0 | 319,588 |
| | AAR-47 Kits/Installations | | | | [67,100] | | |
| 031 | F-15 | 0 | 92,921 | | 50,500 | 0 | 143,421 |
| | 5 AESA Radars | | | | [50,500] | | |
| 032 | F-16 | 0 | 224,642 | | | 0 | 224,642 |
| 033 | F-22A | 0 | 350,735 | | -338,000 | 0 | 12,735 |
| | FY 09 Funds Available to Meet Requirement | | | | [-338,000] | | |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 034 | C-5 | 0 | 606,993 | | | 0 | 606,993 |
| 035 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 108,300 | | | 0 | 108,300 |
| 036 | C-9C | 0 | 10 | | | 0 | 10 |
| 037 | C-17A | 0 | 469,731 | | | 0 | 469,731 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 038 | C-21 | 0 | 562 | | | 0 | 562 |
| 039 | C-32A | 0 | 10,644 | | | 0 | 10,644 |
| 040 | C-37A | 0 | 4,336 | | | 0 | 4,336 |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 041 | GLIDER MODS | 0 | 119 | | | 0 | 119 |
| 042 | T-6 | 0 | 33,074 | | | 0 | 33,074 |
| 043 | T-1 | 0 | 35 | | | 0 | 35 |
| 044 | T-38 | 0 | 75,274 | | | 0 | 75,274 |
| 045 | T-43 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 046 | KC-10A (ATCA) | 0 | 9,441 | | | 0 | 9,441 |
| 047 | C-12 | 0 | 472 | | | 0 | 472 |
| 048 | MC-12W | 0 | 63,000 | | | 0 | 63,000 |
| 049 | C-20 MODS | 0 | 734 | | | 0 | 734 |
| 050 | VC-25A MOD | 0 | 15,610 | | | 0 | 15,610 |
| 051 | C-40 | 0 | 9,162 | | | 0 | 9,162 |
| 052 | C-130 | 0 | 354,421 | | -200,100 | 0 | 154,321 |
| | Scathe View Hyper-Spectral Imagery Upgrade | | | | [5,400] | | |
| | Senior Scout COMINT Capability Upgrade | | | | [4,000] | | |
| | Program Excess | | | | [-209,500] | | |
| 053 | C130J MODS | 0 | 13,627 | | | 0 | 13,627 |
| 054 | C-135 | 0 | 150,425 | | | 0 | 150,425 |
| 055 | COMPASS CALL MODS | 0 | 29,187 | | 78,000 | 0 | 107,187 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Baseline 1 Group B Kits | | | | [78,000] | | |
| 056 | DARP (CLASSIFIED) | 0 | 107,859 | | | 0 | 107,859 |
| 057 | E-3 | 0 | 79,263 | | | 0 | 79,263 |
| 058 | E-4 | 0 | 73,058 | | | 0 | 73,058 |
| 059 | E-8 | 0 | 225,973 | | | 0 | 225,973 |
| 060 | H-1 | 0 | 18,280 | | | 0 | 18,280 |
| 061 | H-60 | 0 | 14,201 | | 81,000 | 0 | 95,201 |
| | HH-60G AAQ-29 FLIR | | | | [81,000] | | |
| 062 | GLOBAL HAWK MODS | 0 | 134,864 | | | 0 | 134,864 |
| 063 | HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 1,964 | | | 0 | 1,964 |
| 064 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | 0 | 103,274 | | | 0 | 103,274 |
| 065 | MQ-1 MODS | 0 | 123,889 | | | 0 | 123,889 |
| 066 | MQ-9 MODS | 0 | 48,837 | | | 0 | 48,837 |
| 067 | CV-22 MODS | 0 | 24,429 | | | 0 | 24,429 |
| 067A | CAF Restructure | 0 | 0 | | 10,500 | 0 | 10,500 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 068 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 418,604 | | | 0 | 418,604 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| | **COMMON SUPPORT EQUIP** | | | | | | |
| 069 | AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP | 0 | 105,820 | | | 0 | 105,820 |
| | **POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 070 | B-1 | 0 | 3,929 | | | 0 | 3,929 |
| 071 | B-2A | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 072 | B-2A | 0 | 24,481 | | | 0 | 24,481 |
| 073 | C-5 | 0 | 2,259 | | | 0 | 2,259 |
| 074 | C-5 | 0 | 11,787 | | | 0 | 11,787 |
| 075 | KC-10A (ATCA) | 0 | 4,125 | | | 0 | 4,125 |
| 076 | C-17A | 0 | 91,400 | | | 0 | 91,400 |
| 077 | C-130 | 0 | 28,092 | | | 0 | 28,092 |
| 078 | EC-130J | 0 | 5,283 | | | 0 | 5,283 |
| 079 | F-15 | 0 | 15,744 | | | 0 | 15,744 |
| 080 | F-16 | 0 | 19,951 | | | 0 | 19,951 |
| 081 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | 0 | 51,980 | | | 0 | 51,980 |
| 082 | T-1 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS** | | | | | | |
| 083 | INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS | 0 | 25,529 | | | 0 | 25,529 |
| | **WAR CONSUMABLES** | | | | | | |
| 084 | WAR CONSUMABLES | 0 | 134,427 | | | 0 | 134,427 |
| | **OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES** | | | | | | |
| 085 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | 0 | 490,344 | | | 0 | 490,344 |
| | **OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF** | | | | | | |
| 087 | CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **DARP** | | | | | | |
| 088 | DARP (CLASSIFIED) | 0 | 15,323 | | | 0 | 15,323 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 19,443 | | | 0 | 19,443 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **81** | **11,966,276** | -11 | **25,715** | **70** | **11,991,991** |

Items of Special Interest

*C–130 avionics modernization program*

The budget request contained $565.2 million for C–130 modifications, of which $209.5 million was included for the avionics modernization program (AMP).

The C–130 AMP is established to modernize 221 C–130H aircraft with a common avionics suite and a standardized cockpit configuration. The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports that delays in the start of AMP production will result in the Department of the Air Force executing the AMP funding provided for both fiscal years 2008 and 2009 in fiscal year 2010, and that since the AMP is now approximately one year behind the planned procurement schedule, AMP procurement funds planned for fiscal year 2010 will not be needed until fiscal year 2011.

The committee recommends $355.7 million, a decrease of $209.5 million, for C–130 modifications.

*F–22A modifications*

The budget request contained $350.7 million for procurement of F–22A modifications.

The committee notes that $523.0 million was authorized and appropriated for the advance procurement of 20 F–22As for fiscal year 2009, that the Department of the Air Force will procure only four additional F–22As, and that the Department of the Air Force plans to obligate only $185.0 million of that amount, leaving $338.0 million that could be applied to meet fiscal year 2010 F–22A modification requirements.

The committee recommends $12.7 million, a decrease of $338.0 million, for F–22A modifications.

*KC–130J Harvest Hawk*

The committee is aware that the Marine Corps has developed a roll-on, roll-off technology that expands capability of the KC–130J. The committee notes that the Harvest Hawk program will enable the KC–130J to fulfill multiple missions individually or simultaneously from refueling mission, including fire support missions and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) missions. The committee understands the challenging environment that our military is operating in and notes that the KC–130J Harvest Hawk could provide persistent manned ISR support both day and night while also providing high precise close air support. The committee is encouraged by the Marine Corps' work with Harvest Hawk and their plan to increase the capability of this aircraft in order to take advantage of the extended endurance of the KC–130J. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to consider the Harvest Hawk concept in order to determine if such capability could be of benefit if also incorporated into the Department of the Air Force fleet of C–130J aircraft, and provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the findings by February 1, 2010.

*KC–X*

The committee notes that the KC–X program is planned to replace the Department of the Air Force's KC–135 aerial refueling tanker fleet, which now has an average aircraft age of 47 years.

The committee also notes that the KC–X program has been subject to delays resulting from contractor protests to the Government Accountability Office, and believes that further delay in the acquisition of the KC–X aerial refueling tanker could jeopardize Department of Defense requirements for global mobility.

Accordingly, the committee strongly urges the Department to include the necessary funds in its Future Years Defense Program to rapidly conduct source selection and to award a KC–X aerial refueling tanker contract as expeditiously as possible.

*Report on Air Force plan to address fighter force structure shortfalls*

The committee notes that for the past year, the Department of the Air Force has informed Congress that it requires 2,200 fighter aircraft, and that the Department projects a shortfall in its fighter aircraft inventory that would begin in fiscal year 2017 and grow to approximately 800 aircraft by 2024. The committee believes that such a shortfall will adversely affect the ability of the active duty forces and air reserve forces to meet future requirements for both air expeditionary forces and for the air sovereignty alert mission in the United States.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Chief of the Air National Guard and the Chief of the Air Force Reserve, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010. The report should include statements from both the Chief of the Air National Guard and the Chief of the Air Force Reserve describing their separate and independent views to Congress, as applicable. The report should address the so-called "fighter gap" issue in the long- and short-term with alternative solutions including but not limited to: accelerated procurement of fifth generation fighters such as the F–22 and F–35; an interim procurement of so-called "4.5 generation" fighters; and fleet management options such as service life extension programs. The report must include a detailed analysis of the effect that any shortfalls will have on the Air National Guard and the air sovereignty alert mission specifically, including the loss of Air National Guard flying missions throughout the United States and the resultant loss of Air National Guard pilot and maintenance capability.

*Strategic airlift force structure*

The committee notes that the current Mobility Capabilities Study 2005 (MCS–05) identified a range of 292–383 strategic airlift aircraft to meet global mobility requirements with moderate risk. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces on February 25, 2009, the commander of the United States Transportation Command testified that a force structure of 205 C–17s, 52 C–5Ms, and 59 C–5As modified with the avionics modernization program, a total of 316 strategic airlift aircraft, meets the requirement to transport 33.95 million ton-miles per day. Additionally, the committee notes that the previous commander of the United States Transportation Command and now current Air Force Chief of Staff, in his letter to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services on November 6, 2007, also identified 316 strategic airlift aircraft as the "sweet spot" to meet global mobility requirements.

The committee further notes that MCS–05 did not consider the combined Army and Marine Corps increase of 92,000 soldiers and Marines, a potential increase in strategic airlift necessary to transport the Army's future combat systems, or the prospect that future strategic mobility aircraft would be utilized to conduct intra-theater airlift missions to move outsized and oversized equipment as they are now being used in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and believes that the results of MCRS–16 should more accurately identify the inventory of strategic airlift aircraft necessary to meet future strategic airlift mobility requirements.

Accordingly, the committee believes that the long-term strategic airlift force structure inventory required to meet global mobility requirements may be subject to future adjustment based on the results of the Mobility Capability Requirement Study 2016 (MCRS–16) scheduled for completion in December 2009, and encourages a continued dialogue between the Office of the Secretary of Defense, senior uniformed military officials, and the congressional defense committees. The committee also recommends a provision elsewhere in this title that would amend subsection (g)(1) of section 8062, United States Code, by striking "299" and inserting "316."

## PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $822.5 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $822.5 million, the requested amount, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force program are identified in the table below.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | |
| 001 | ROCKETS | 0 | 43,461 | | | 0 | 43,461 |
| | **CARTRIDGES** | | | | | | |
| 002 | CARTRIDGES | 0 | 123,886 | | | 0 | 123,886 |
| | **BOMBS** | | | | | | |
| 003 | PRACTICE BOMBS | 0 | 52,459 | | | 0 | 52,459 |
| 004 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | 0 | 225,145 | | | 0 | 225,145 |
| 005 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 3,592 | 103,041 | | | 3,592 | 103,041 |
| | **FLARE, IR MJU-7B** | | | | | | |
| 006 | CAD/PAD | 0 | 40,522 | | | 0 | 40,522 |
| 007 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) | 0 | 3,302 | | | 0 | 3,302 |
| 008 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 4,582 | | | 0 | 4,582 |
| 009 | MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 1,289 | | | 0 | 1,289 |
| 010 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | 0 | 5,061 | | | 0 | 5,061 |
| | **FUZES** | | | | | | |
| 011 | FLARES | 0 | 152,515 | | | 0 | 152,515 |
| 012 | FUZES | 0 | 61,037 | | | 0 | 61,037 |
| | **WEAPONS** | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL ARMS** | | | | | | |
| 013 | SMALL ARMS | 0 | 6,162 | | | 0 | 6,162 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | **3,592** | **822,462** | 0 | **0** | **3,592** | **822,462** |

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $6.3 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $6.2 billion, a decrease of $88.1 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT-BALLISTIC** | | | | | | |
| 001 | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC | 0 | 58,139 | | | 0 | 58,139 |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL** | | | | | | |
| 002 | JASSM | 0 | 52,666 | | -1,000 | 0 | 51,666 |
| | Program Decrease | | | | [-1,000] | | |
| 003 | SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) | 219 | 78,753 | | | 219 | 78,753 |
| 004 | AMRAAM | 196 | 291,827 | | | 196 | 291,827 |
| 005 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 792 | 79,699 | | | 792 | 79,699 |
| 006 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 2,340 | 134,801 | | | 2,340 | 134,801 |
| | **INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 007 | INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION | 0 | 841 | | | 0 | 841 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **CLASS IV** | | | | | | |
| 008 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | 0 | 32 | | | 0 | 32 |
| 009 | MM III MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 199,484 | | | 0 | 199,484 |
| 010 | AGM-65D MAVERICK | 0 | 258 | | | 0 | 258 |
| 011 | AGM-88A HARM | 0 | 30,280 | | | 0 | 30,280 |
| 012 | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| | **MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 013 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 70,185 | | | 0 | 70,185 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| | **SPACE PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 014 | ADVANCED EHF | 1 | 1,843,475 | | | 1 | 1,843,475 |
| 015 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 016 | WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE) | 0 | 201,671 | | | 0 | 201,671 |
| 017 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 62,380 | | | 0 | 62,380 |
| 018 | SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) | 0 | 9,871 | | | 0 | 9,871 |
| 019 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | 0 | 53,140 | | | 0 | 53,140 |
| 020 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 021 | NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 022 | DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE) | 0 | 97,764 | | | 0 | 97,764 |
| 023 | TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 024 | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE) | 5 | 1,295,325 | -1 | -88,100 | 4 | 1,207,225 |
| | Reduction in Requirement for Launch Vehicles | | | [-1] | [-88,100] | | |
| 025 | MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 026 | SBIR HIGH (SPACE) | 1 | 307,456 | | | 1 | 307,456 |
| 027 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 0 | 159,000 | | | 0 | 159,000 |
| 028 | NATL POLAR-ORBITING OP ENV SATELLITE | 0 | 3,900 | | | 0 | 3,900 |
| | **SPECIAL PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 029 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM | 0 | 105,152 | | | 0 | 105,152 |
| 031 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS | 0 | 311,070 | | | 0 | 311,070 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 853,559 | | | 0 | 853,559 |
| | **TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **3,554** | **6,300,728** | **-1** | **-89,100** | **3,553** | **6,211,628** |

### Items of Special Interest

*Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle*

The budget request contained $1.3 billion for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program, of which $471.4 million is for launch services for five EELVs for satellite launches scheduled to occur in fiscal year 2012.

One of the five launches scheduled for fiscal year 2012 is for the eighth Global Positioning System (GPS) IIF satellite. However, recently the Government Accountability Office was provided documentation from the GPS program office indicating that the launch for the eighth GPS IIF satellite had slipped from fiscal year 2012 to the first quarter of fiscal year 2013. Consequently, funding for this launch is not required in fiscal year 2010. The Air Force estimates that the cost of the launch vehicle is $88.1 million.

The committee recommends $1.2 billion, a decrease of $88.1 million, for procurement of EELVs.

*Minuteman III Solid Rocket Motor industrial base sustainment*

The committee notes that the Administration's fiscal year 2010 budget request includes funding for a Solid Rocket Motor Warm Line program to maintain sufficient industrial capability for solid rocket motors in order to sustain the Minuteman III weapon system through 2030 as directed by Congress. The committee further notes that the fiscal year 2009 Unfunded Requirements List provided to the committee by the Air Force noted that production of six booster sets per year would constitute a low-rate solid rocket motor sustainment production capability while maintaining critical industrial skills, certifications, and supplier base.

The committee has a strong interest in sustaining the strategic deterrence industrial base, but remains concerned that the Air Force to date has failed to develop a plan that will sustain the ability of the service to fulfill the strategic deterrent system.

The committee therefore directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense, no later than February 1, 2010, to provide a report to Congress on the plan to sustain the solid rocket motor industrial base, including capability requirements, solid rocket motor production rates, and a description of how the fiscal year 2010 funds will be allocated.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $17.29 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $17.30 billion, an increase of $6.7 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 002 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | 0 | 25,922 | | | 0 | 25,922 |
| 003 | CAP VEHICLES | 0 | 897 | | | 0 | 897 |
| | **SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 004 | SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES | 0 | 44,603 | | | 0 | 44,603 |
| | **FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 005 | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES | 0 | 27,760 | | | 0 | 27,760 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 006 | HALVERSEN LOADER | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 007 | RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU | 0 | 24,884 | | | 0 | 24,884 |
| 008 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000(VEHICLES) | 0 | 57,243 | | | 0 | 57,243 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 18,163 | | | 0 | 18,163 |
| | **ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| | **COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)** | | | | | | |
| 009 | COMSEC EQUIPMENT | 0 | 209,249 | | | 0 | 209,249 |
| 010 | MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC) | 0 | 1,570 | | | 0 | 1,570 |
| | **INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 011 | INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 4,230 | | | 0 | 4,230 |
| 012 | INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT | 0 | 21,965 | | 6,000 | 0 | 27,965 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Eagle Vision-ANG | | | | [4,000] | | |
| | Eagle Vision Upgrade-ANG | | | | [2,000] | | |
| | **ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 013 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS | 0 | 22,591 | | | 0 | 22,591 |
| 014 | NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM | 0 | 47,670 | | | 0 | 47,670 |
| 015 | THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN | 0 | 56,776 | | | 0 | 56,776 |
| 016 | WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST | 0 | 19,357 | | | 0 | 19,357 |
| 017 | STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL | 0 | 35,116 | | | 0 | 35,116 |
| 018 | CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX | 0 | 28,608 | | | 0 | 28,608 |
| 019 | DRUG INTERDICTION SPT | 0 | 452 | | | 0 | 452 |
| | **SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS** | | | | | | |
| 020 | GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 0 | 111,282 | | 0 | 0 | 111,282 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | [-5,000] | | |
| | Application Software Assurance Center of Excellence | | | | [5,000] | | |
| 021 | AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS | 0 | 15,499 | | | 0 | 15,499 |
| 022 | MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL | 0 | 8,610 | | | 0 | 8,610 |
| 023 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | 0 | 137,293 | | | 0 | 137,293 |
| 024 | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | 0 | 40,633 | | | 0 | 40,633 |
| 025 | C3 COUNTERMEASURES | 0 | 8,177 | | | 0 | 8,177 |
| 026 | GCSS-AF FOS | 0 | 81,579 | | | 0 | 81,579 |
| 027 | THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM | 0 | 29,687 | | | 0 | 29,687 |
| 028 | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS | 0 | 54,093 | | | 0 | 54,093 |
| | **AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 029 | BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE | 0 | 433,859 | | | 0 | 433,859 |
| 030 | USCENTCOM | 0 | 38,958 | | | 0 | 38,958 |
| 031 | AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **DISA PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 032 | SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE | 0 | 34,440 | | | 0 | 34,440 |
| 033 | NAVSTAR GPS SPACE | 0 | 6,415 | | | 0 | 6,415 |
| 034 | NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE | 0 | 15,436 | | | 0 | 15,436 |
| 035 | AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE | 0 | 58,865 | | | 0 | 58,865 |
| 036 | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE | 0 | 100,275 | | | 0 | 100,275 |
| 037 | MILSATCOM SPACE | 0 | 110,575 | | | 0 | 110,575 |
| 038 | SPACE MODS SPACE | 0 | 30,594 | | | 0 | 30,594 |
| 039 | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM | 0 | 29,793 | | | 0 | 29,793 |
| | **ORGANIZATION AND BASE** | | | | | | |
| 040 | TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT | 0 | 240,890 | | -10,000 | 0 | 230,890 |
| | Network Control Center-Deployed Cost Growth | | | | [-10,000] | | |
| 041 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER | 0 | 35,029 | | | 0 | 35,029 |
| 042 | RADIO EQUIPMENT | 0 | 15,536 | | | 0 | 15,536 |
| 043 | TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 044 | CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT | 0 | 12,961 | | | 0 | 12,961 |
| 045 | BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE | 0 | 121,049 | | | 0 | 121,049 |
| | **MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 046 | COMM ELECT MODS | 0 | 64,087 | | | 0 | 64,087 |
| | **OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP** | | | | | | |
| 047 | NIGHT VISION GOGGLES | 0 | 28,226 | | | 0 | 28,226 |
| 048 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SAFETY) | 0 | 17,223 | | | 0 | 17,223 |
| | **DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ** | | | | | | |
| 049 | MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | 0 | 15,449 | | | 0 | 15,449 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 050 | BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT | 0 | 14,300 | | | 0 | 14,300 |
| 051 | CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS | 0 | 22,973 | | | 0 | 22,973 |
| 052 | PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT | 0 | 3,020 | | | 0 | 3,020 |
| 053 | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | 0 | 32,855 | | | 0 | 32,855 |
| 054 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S) | 0 | 8,195 | | 10,700 | 0 | 18,895 |
| | Advanced Reconfigurable Containers | | | | [1,700] | | |
| | Aircrew Body Armor and Load Carriage Vest | | | | [9,000] | | |
| | **SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS** | | | | | | |
| 056 | DARP RC135 ( C ) | 0 | 23,132 | | | 0 | 23,132 |
| 057 | DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS | 0 | 293,640 | | | 0 | 293,640 |
| 059 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM ( C ) | 0 | 471,234 | | | 0 | 471,234 |
| 060 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. ( C ) | 0 | 30,041 | | | 0 | 30,041 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 13,830,722 | | | 0 | 13,830,722 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 061 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 19,460 | | | 0 | 19,460 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 0 | 17,293,141 | 0 | 6,700 | 0 | 17,299,841 |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced reconfigurable containers*

The budget request contained $8.2 million for items less than $5.0 million for base support, but included no funds for advanced reconfigurable containers.

The committee recognizes these funds would be used to procure additional advanced reconfigurable containers that are lightweight, collapsible mobility containers designed to be rapidly deployed with aviation support teams. The committee notes these containers are capable of independent movement and are used extensively in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The committee recommends $9.9 million, an increase of $1.7 million, to procure additional advanced reconfigurable containers for use in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

*Eagle vision*

The budget request contained $22.0 million for intelligence communications equipment, but included no funds to procure a one-meter infra-red imagery system for the South Carolina Air National Guard's (ANG) Eagle Vision program, or for an Eagle Vision III system for the California ANG. The Eagle Vision program is a family of systems that provide commercial imagery data to operational commanders for mission planning and intelligence support purposes.

The committee understands that the Eagle Vision one-meter infra-red imagery system would provides the South Carolina ANG a capability to better plan emergency responses by viewing objective areas through clouds and smoke, and recommends an increase of $2.0 million for an Eagle Vision one-meter infra-red imagery system for the South Carolina ANG.

The committee understands that an Eagle Vision III system would provide the California ANG with a capability to respond to natural or man-made disasters, military contingencies, maritime surveillance and search and rescue operations with high-resolution imagery, and recommends an increase of $4.0 million for an Eagle Vision III system for the California ANG.

The committee recommends $28.0 million for intelligence communications equipment, an increase of $6.0 million.

# PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

## Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $3.98 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $4.15 billion, an increase of $166.2 million, for fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Defense-Wide request are discussed following the table.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS** | | | | | | |
| 001 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA** | | | | | | |
| 002 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA | 0 | 8,858 | | | 0 | 8,858 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA** | | | | | | |
| 003 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 1,489 | | | 0 | 1,489 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA** | | | | | | |
| 004 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 0 | 2,012 | | | 0 | 2,012 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA** | | | | | | |
| 005 | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | 0 | 10,431 | | | 0 | 10,431 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA** | | | | | | |
| 017 | INTERDICTION SUPPORT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 018 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY | 0 | 13,449 | | | 0 | 13,449 |
| 019 | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 0 | 7,053 | | | 0 | 7,053 |
| 020 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 0 | 2,820 | | | 0 | 2,820 |
| 021 | TELEPORT PROGRAM | 0 | 68,037 | | | 0 | 68,037 |
| 022 | MULTI-NATIONAL INFO SHARING | 0 | 196,232 | | | 0 | 196,232 |
| 023 | NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) | 0 | 3,051 | | | 0 | 3,051 |
| 024 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK (DISN) | 0 | 89,725 | | | 0 | 89,725 |
| 025 | PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE | 0 | 1,780 | | | 0 | 1,780 |
| 026 | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM | 0 | 2,835 | | | 0 | 2,835 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 027 | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 0 | 18,188 | | | 0 | 18,188 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA** | | | | | | |
| 028 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 0 | 7,728 | | | 0 | 7,728 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT** | | | | | | |
| 029 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 4 | 10,149 | | | 4 | 10,149 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA** | | | | | | |
| 030 | AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS | 0 | 1,463 | | | 0 | 1,463 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY** | | | | | | |
| 031 | EQUIPMENT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 032 | VEHICLES | 0 | 50 | | | 0 | 50 |
| 033 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 0 | 7,447 | | | 0 | 7,447 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA** | | | | | | |
| 034 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 0 | 436 | | | 0 | 436 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY** | | | | | | |
| 035 | THAAD SYSTEM | 0 | 420,300 | | | 0 | 420,300 |
| 036 | SM-3 | 0 | 168,723 | | | 0 | 168,723 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA** | | | | | | |
| 044 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | 0 | 4,013 | | | 0 | 4,013 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/JCTD/INTELL** | | | | | | |
| 047 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/JCTD/INTELL | 0 | 111,487 | | 144,610 | 0 | 256,097 |
| | Transfer from Title XIV | | | | [144,610] | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS** | | | | | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 048 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS | 0 | 12,065 | | | 0 | 12,065 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS** | | | | | | |
| 049 | WHS MOTOR VEHICLES | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 050 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | 0 | 26,945 | | | 0 | 26,945 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 818,766 | | | 0 | 818,766 |
| | **SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND** | | | | | | |
| | **AVIATION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 051 | ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT | 0 | 101,936 | | | 0 | 101,936 |
| 052 | MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM | 0 | 22,958 | | | 0 | 22,958 |
| 053 | MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 0 | 146,820 | | | 0 | 146,820 |
| 054 | NON-STANDARD AVIATION | 9 | 227,552 | | | 9 | 227,552 |
| 055 | UNMANNED VEHICLES | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 056 | SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION | 0 | 34,200 | | | 0 | 34,200 |
| 057 | SOF U-28 | 0 | 2,518 | | | 0 | 2,518 |
| 058 | MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 059 | CV-22 SOF MOD | 5 | 114,553 | | | 5 | 114,553 |
| 060 | MQ-1 UAV | 0 | 10,930 | | | 0 | 10,930 |
| 061 | MQ-9 UAV | 0 | 12,671 | | | 0 | 12,671 |
| 062 | STUASL0 | 9 | 12,223 | | | 9 | 12,223 |
| 063 | C-130 MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 59,950 | | 6,500 | 0 | 66,450 |
| | Intelligence Broadcast Receiver (IBR) for AFSOC MC-130 | | | | [2,500] | | |
| | LAIRCM for AFSOC MC-130 | | | | [4,000] | | |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 064 | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | 0 | 973 | | | 0 | 973 |
| | **SHIPBUILDING** | | | | | | |
| 065 | ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) | 0 | 5,236 | | | 0 | 5,236 |
| 066 | MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE | 0 | 1,463 | | | 0 | 1,463 |
| | **AMMUNITION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 067 | SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT | 0 | 61,360 | | | 0 | 61,360 |
| 068 | SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION | 0 | 26,791 | | | 0 | 26,791 |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 069 | COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS | 0 | 55,080 | | | 0 | 55,080 |
| 070 | SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | 0 | 72,811 | | | 0 | 72,811 |
| 071 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | 0 | 35,235 | | 4,300 | 0 | 39,535 |
| | Special Operations Forces Combat Assault Rifle (SCAR) | | | | [4,300] | | |
| 072 | MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 791 | | | 0 | 791 |
| 073 | SPEC APPLICATION FOR CONT | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 074 | SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS | 0 | 6,156 | | 10,800 | 0 | 16,956 |
| | Special Operations Craft-Riverine | | | | [10,800] | | |
| 075 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 2,010 | | | 0 | 2,010 |
| 076 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 0 | 18,821 | | | 0 | 18,821 |
| 077 | MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS | 0 | 17,265 | | | 0 | 17,265 |
| 078 | COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS | 0 | 20,000 | | | 0 | 20,000 |
| 079 | MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT | 0 | 6,835 | | | 0 | 6,835 |
| 081 | SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS | 0 | 60,836 | | | 0 | 60,836 |
| 082 | SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES | 0 | 12,401 | | | 0 | 12,401 |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 083 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 0 | 26,070 | | | 0 | 26,070 |
| 084 | SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS | 0 | 550 | | | 0 | 550 |
| 085 | SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SY | 0 | 33,741 | | | 0 | 33,741 |
| 086 | SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | 0 | 53,034 | | | 0 | 53,034 |
| 087 | SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT | 0 | 2,777 | | | 0 | 2,777 |
| 088 | DRUG INTERDICTION | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 089 | MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | 0 | 7,576 | | | 0 | 7,576 |
| 090 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 0 | 273,998 | | | 0 | 273,998 |
| 091 | PSYOP EQUIPMENT | 0 | 43,081 | | | 0 | 43,081 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 5,573 | | | 0 | 5,573 |
| | **CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE** | | | | | | |
| | **CBDP** | | | | | | |
| 092 | INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION | 0 | 65,590 | | | 0 | 65,590 |
| 093 | INDIVIDUAL FORCE PROTECTION | 0 | 92,004 | | | 0 | 92,004 |
| 094 | DECONTAMINATION | 0 | 22,008 | | | 0 | 22,008 |
| 095 | JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL) | 0 | 12,740 | | | 0 | 12,740 |
| 096 | COLLECTIVE PROTECTION | 0 | 27,938 | | | 0 | 27,938 |
| 097 | CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE | 0 | 151,765 | | | 0 | 151,765 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **27** | **3,984,352** | **0** | **166,210** | **27** | **4,150,562** |

## RAPID ACQUISITION FUND

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2010 contained $79.3 million for Rapid Acquisition Fund. The committee recommends authorization of $55.0 million, a decrease of $24.3 million, for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2010 Rapid Acquisition Fund are identified in the table below.

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **RAPID ACQUISITION FUND** | | | | | | |
| 001 | JOINT RAPID ACQUISITION CELL | 0 | 79,300 | | -24,300 | 0 | 55,000 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | [-24,300] | | |
| | **TOTAL - RAPID ACQUISITION FUND** | **0** | **79,300** | 0 | **-24,300** | **0** | **55,000** |

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **RESERVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 001 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | | | 600,000 | | 600,000 |
| | **TOTAL - NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **600,000** | **0** | **600,000** |

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2010 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

### Section 105—National Guard and Reserve Equipment

This section would authorize $600.0 million for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, non-system training devices, logistic automation systems, and other critical dual-use procurement items for the National Guard and Reserves as part of a specific National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account (NGREA). The committee expects National Guard and Reserve forces to use this NGREA funding to procure high-priority equipment that would be used by these units in their critical dual-mission role of full-spectrum combat operations and domestic civil support missions.

### Section 106—Rapid Acquisition Fund

This section would provide $55.0 million for the Rapid Acquisition Fund.

## SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

### Section 111—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for Army Tactical Radios

This section would restrict the obligation of funds for all Army tactical radio sets except for those approved by the joint tactical radio system joint program office and those specifically procured to meet an operational needs statement or joint urgent operational need statement.

### Section 112—Procurement of Future Combat Systems Spin Out Early-Infantry Brigade Combat Team Equipment

This section would limit the Army to procurement of one brigade set of Future Combat Systems Spin Out Early Infantry Brigade Combat Team equipment in order to allow for adequate testing prior to full-rate production. There is an exception for meeting operational need statements.

## SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

### Section 121—Littoral Combat Ship Program

This section would strike section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended, with a restructured cost cap provision that contains similar requirements as cost caps of other ship programs. Additionally, the section would authorize the Secretary to obligate funds authorized and appropriated to the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program to compile a technical data package necessary for competitive bid-

ding of the vessels to other shipbuilding contractors if the Secretary was unable to enter into construction contracts in fiscal year 2010 with the current contractors due to limitations of the cost cap. The changes to the limitation on cost for LCS, made by subsection (a), (c), and (f) are not effective until the Secretary of the Navy accepts delivery of LCS 1 and LCS2 and makes certain certifications to the congressional defense committees.

### Section 122—Ford-Class Aircraft Carrier Report and Limitation on the Use of Funds

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2010 on the effects and cost impacts of using a five-year interval to construct Ford-class aircraft carriers, including the cost to other shipbuilding programs, such as Virginia-class submarines and refueling and complex overhaul of the current aircraft carrier fleet. This section would also limit the use of funds provided in fiscal year 2010 for the aircraft carrier CVN 79, to prohibit the Secretary from taking any action that would impede his ability to begin construction of CVN 79 in 2012 and CVN 80 in 2016, as previously planned.

### Section 123—Advance Procurement Funding

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to use funds authorized and appropriated for advanced procurement in shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, in addition to material procurement, to enter into contracts for production planning and other related support services that reduce overall procurement lead time of the vessel. Additionally, this section would authorize the Secretary to enter into contracts for advance construction efforts for the aircraft carrier designated CVN–79 if the Secretary determines that cost savings, construction efficiencies, or workforce stability would be achieved through the use of such contracts.

### Section 124—Multiyear Procurement Authority for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G Aircraft

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract, beginning in fiscal year 2010, for the procurement of F/A–18E/F and EA–18G aircraft.

### Section 125—Multiyear Procurement Authority for DDG–51 Burke-class Destroyers

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract, beginning in fiscal year 2010, for the procurement of Burke-class DDG 51 destroyers.

## SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

### Section 131—Repeal of Certification Requirement for F–22A Fighter Aircraft

This section would repeal section 134 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

Section 132—Preservation and Storage of Unique Tooling for F–22 Fighter Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a plan for the preservation and storage of unique tooling related to the production of hardware and end items for F–22 fighter aircraft which shall: ensure that the Secretary preserves and stores such tooling in a manner that allows the production of such hardware and end items to be restarted after a period of idleness; identify the costs of restarting production with respect to the supplier base of such hardware and end items; and identify any contract modifications, additional facilities, or funding that the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the plan. This section would also require that none of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2010 for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force be obligated or expended for activities related to disposing of F–22 production tooling until 45 days after the Secretary submits a report to Congress describing the plan for the preservation and storage of unique tooling related to the production of hardware and end items for F–22 fighter aircraft.

Section 133—Report on 4.5 Generation Fighter Procurement

This section would require the Secretary of the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on 4.5 generation fighter aircraft procurement to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act which shall include the following: the number of 4.5 generation fighter aircraft for procurement for fiscal year 2011 through 2025 necessary to fulfill the requirement of the Air Force to maintain not less than 2,200 tactical fighter aircraft; the estimated procurement costs for those aircraft if procured through single-year procurement contracts; the estimated procurement costs for those aircraft if procured through multiyear procurement contracts; the estimated savings that could be derived from the procurement of those aircraft through a multiyear procurement contract, and whether the Secretary determines the amount of those savings to be substantial; a discussion comparing the costs and benefits of obtaining those aircraft through annual procurement contracts with the costs and benefits of obtaining those aircraft through a multiyear procurement contract; a discussion regarding the availability and feasibility of F–35s in fiscal year 2015 through fiscal year 2025 to proportionally and concurrently re-capitalize the Air National Guard; and the recommendations of the Secretary regarding whether Congress should authorize a multiyear procurement contract for 4.5 generation fighter aircraft. This section would also require the Secretary to submit the certifications required under section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, at the time the budget is submitted for fiscal year 2011 under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, if the Secretary recommends that Congress authorize a multiyear contract for 4.5 generation fighter aircraft.

Section 134—Reports on Strategic Airlift Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Director of the Air National Guard, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the proposed

force structure and basing of strategic airlift aircraft at least 120 days before the date on which a C–5 aircraft is retired.

### Section 135—Strategic Airlift Force Structure

This section would amend subsection (g)(1) of section 8062 of title 10, United States Code, by striking "2008" and inserting "2009," and by striking "299" and inserting "316."

### Section 136—Repeal of Requirement to Maintain Certain Retired C–130E Aircraft

This section would amend section 134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 31) by striking subsection (c), by re-designating subsection (d) as subsection (c) and by striking "subsection (d)" and inserting "subsection (c)" in subsection (b).

## SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

### Section 141—Body Armor Procurement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish, within each military service procurement account, a separate procurement budget line item is assigned for body armor investment and funding transparency.

The committee notes the total body armor program has evolved from a $40.0 million program in 1999, to over $5.0 billion through 2009. This represents significant investment by the military services for individual personnel protection and the committee recognizes the importance of this program. The committee believes the establishment of an individual procurement line item beginning in 2011 would generate better accountability and transparency in long-term planning, programming, and investment by the military services for the acquisition of body armor. Further, a long-term investment strategy could better position the body armor industrial base to rapidly respond to new threats or requirements as well as accelerate the amount of investment by industry to further advancements in survivability and weight reduction.

### Section 142—Unmanned Cargo-Carrying-Capable Aerial Vehicles

This section would preclude funds authorized for the Department of Defense from being used for the procurement of Unmanned Cargo-Carrying-Capable Aerial Vehicles until the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics certify to the congressional defense committees that a joint, common, requirement for a Unmanned Cargo Carrying Capable Aerial Vehicle type has been agreed to by the military services, the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

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

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $78.6 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $79.6 billion, an increase of $1.0 billion to the budget request.

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TITLE II – RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION** | | | |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army | 10,438,218 | 68,513 | 10,506,731 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy | 19,270,932 | 351,596 | 19,622,528 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force | 27,992,827 | 515,734 | 28,508,561 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide | 20,741,542 | 84,360 | 20,825,902 |
| Operational Test & Evaluation | 190,770 | 0 | 190,770 |
| **TOTAL RDT&E AUTHORIZATIONS** | 78,634,289 | 1,020,203 | 79,654,492 |

## ARMY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $10.4 billion for Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $10.5 billion, an increase of $100.0 million to the budget request.

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | |
| 001 | 0601101A | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 19,671 | | 19,671 |
| 002 | 0601102A | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 173,024 | | 173,024 |
| 003 | 0601103A | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 88,421 | 4,000 | 92,421 |
| | | Smart Wound Dressing for MRSA-Infected Battle Wounds | | [4,000] | |
| 004 | 0601104A | UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS | 96,144 | 5,000 | 101,144 |
| | | Performance Steel Castings for Improved Weapons Systems Reliability | | [4,000] | |
| | | AEOP eCybermission | | [1,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, ARMY** | **377,260** | **9,000** | **386,260** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | |
| 005 | 0602105A | MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY | 27,206 | 23,370 | 50,576 |
| | | Multi-Scale Modeling of 3-D Damage Tolerant Composite Materials | | [1,000] | |
| | | Dual Stage Variable Energy Absorber | | [4,070] | |
| | | Hardmetal Epidemiology Investigation | | [7,000] | |
| | | Next Generation High Strength Glass Fibers for Ballistic Armor Applications | | [3,300] | |
| | | Ultra Lightweight Metallic Armor | | [3,000] | |
| | | Advanced Nanoscale Tungsten Kinetic Energy Composites | | [2,000] | |
| | | Nanomanufacturing of Multifunctional Sensors | | [3,000] | |
| 006 | 0602120A | SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY | 50,641 | 2,000 | 52,641 |
| | | Electromagnetic Geolocation | | [2,000] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 007 | 0602122A | TRACTOR HIP | 14,324 | | 14,324 |
| 008 | 0602211A | AVIATION TECHNOLOGY | 41,332 | | 41,332 |
| 009 | 0602270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 16,119 | | 16,119 |
| 010 | 0602303A | MISSILE TECHNOLOGY | 50,716 | 3,750 | 54,466 |
| | | Anti-Material Explosive Round for Javelin | | [3,000] | |
| | | CoE in Integrated Sensor Systems | | [750] | |
| 011 | 0602307A | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY/HEL | 19,678 | | 19,678 |
| 012 | 0602308A | MODELING AND SIMULATION | 17,473 | | 17,473 |
| 013 | 0602601A | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY | 55,937 | 9,550 | 65,487 |
| | | Tactical Metal Fabrication Technology | | [4,800] | |
| | | Advanced Lightweight Opaque Ceramic Armor | | [1,250] | |
| | | Digital Engine/Hydraulic Value Actuation Technology | | [3,500] | |
| 014 | 0602618A | BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY | 61,843 | 2,000 | 63,843 |
| | | Beneficial Infrastructure for Rotorcraft Risk Reduction | | [2,000] | |
| 015 | 0602622A | CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY | 5,293 | | 5,293 |
| 016 | 0602623A | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 7,674 | | 7,674 |
| 017 | 0602624A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY | 41,085 | 27,200 | 68,285 |
| | | Highly Integrated Production for Expediting RESET | | [8,200] | |
| | | Hybrid Projectile Program | | [3,000] | |
| | | High Power Electrolytic Conducting Polymer Super-Capacitors | | [9,000] | |
| | | Specialized Compact Automated Mechanical Clearance Platform | | [4,000] | |
| | | Defense Support for Civil Authorities (DSCA) for Key Resource Protection - South Central, PA | | [3,000] | |
| 018 | 0602705A | ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES | 61,404 | 7,500 | 68,904 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Recon Scout Robot | | [3,500] | |
| | | Novel Zinc Air Power Sources for Military | | [4,000] | |
| 019 | 0602709A | NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY | 26,893 | | 26,893 |
| 020 | 0602712A | COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS | 18,945 | | 18,945 |
| 021 | 0602716A | HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 18,605 | 15,000 | 33,605 |
| | | LWI Training-Based Collaborative Research | | [15,000] | |
| 022 | 0602720A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY | 15,902 | 13,850 | 29,752 |
| | | Cluster Bomb Unit & Combined Effects Munitions Demil System | | [1,000] | |
| | | Self-Inerting Munitions | | [4,500] | |
| | | SUNY Cobleskill Biowaste-to-Bioenergy Center | | [4,650] | |
| | | Range Scrap Demil System | | [1,500] | |
| | | Renewable Energy Testing Center | | [2,200] | |
| 023 | 0602782A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY | 24,833 | 2,000 | 26,833 |
| | | Portable Non-Magnetic Compass Positioning and Timing Device | | [2,000] | |
| 024 | 0602783A | COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY | 5,639 | 4,000 | 9,639 |
| | | SIDEP Supporting Project National Shield | | [4,000] | |
| 025 | 0602784A | MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 54,818 | 14,500 | 69,318 |
| | | Cellulose Nanocomposite Panels for Ballistic Protection | | [5,000] | |
| | | Encapsulated Ballistic Protection System | | [5,000] | |
| | | Geosciences Atmospheric Research | | [3,000] | |
| | | Photovoltaic Rooftop Systems | | [1,500] | |
| 026 | 0602785A | MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY | 18,701 | | 18,701 |
| 027 | 0602786A | WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY | 27,109 | | 27,109 |
| 028 | 0602787A | MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 99,027 | 39,050 | 138,077 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Plasma Technologies | | [1,000] | |
| | | Prevention of Compartment Syndrome with Ultrafiltration Catheters | | [1,900] | |
| | | Advanced Functional Nanomaterials for Biological Processes | | [2,500] | |
| | | Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Attention Modification | | [1,250] | |
| | | Locally Delivered Treatments for Noise Induced Hearing Loss | | [1,500] | |
| | | Improving Soldier Recovery from Catastrophic Bone Injuries | | [5,000] | |
| | | Developing Interventions to Repress Viral Replication | | [2,500] | |
| | | Advanced Bio-Engineering for Enhancement of Soldier Survivability | | [3,000] | |
| | | Self-Powered Prosthetic Limb Technology | | [2,000] | |
| | | Center for Vaccine Scale-Up/Process Research | | [1,700] | |
| | | Human Organ and Tissue Preservation Technology | | [3,000] | |
| | | Optical Neural Techniques for Combat and Post Trauma Care | | [4,700] | |
| | | Brain Injury Recovery Clinic | | [6,000] | |
| | | Military Photomedicine Program | | [3,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, ARMY** | **781,197** | **163,770** | **944,967** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 029 | 0603001A | WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 37,574 | 11,190 | 48,764 |
| | | High Pressure Pasteurization & Pressure Assisted Thermal Sterilization | | [4,300] | |
| | | Next Generation Precision Airdrop System | | [3,000] | |
| | | Onyx System Precision Guided Airdropped Equipment | | [3,890] | |
| 030 | 0603002A | MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 72,940 | 37,550 | 110,490 |
| | | Nightengale | | [5,000] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Proton Treatment and Research Center - Northern Illinois | | [2,000] | |
| | | Pediatric Adolescent Trauma and Resuscitation | | [2,900] | |
| | | Wounded Service Member Bioelectrics Research | | [2,000] | |
| | | Malaria Vaccine Development | | [5,000] | |
| | | Regenerative Medicine to Address Astute Hearing Loss | | [3,000] | |
| | | Multi-Dose Closed Loop pH Monitoring System for Platelets | | [1,000] | |
| | | Carbide-Derived Carbon for Treatment of Combat Related Sepsis | | [2,750] | |
| | | Clinical Technology Integration for Military Health | | [8,100] | |
| | | Institute for Simulation and Interprofessional Studies | | [5,800] | |
| 031 | 0603003A | AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 60,097 | 35,000 | 95,097 |
| | | Robust Composite Structural Core for Army Helicopters | | [4,000] | |
| | | Mission Equipment Technology Implementation | | [5,300] | |
| | | Universal Control Program | | [9,000] | |
| | | UH-60 Transmission/Gearbox Galvanic Corrosion Reduction | | [3,800] | |
| | | Advanced Affordable Turbine Engine | | [6,000] | |
| | | Advanced Performance for Military Helicopters | | [1,900] | |
| | | Drive System Composite Structural Component Risk Reduction Program | | [5,000] | |
| 032 | 0603004A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 66,410 | 9,500 | 75,910 |
| | | Dual Mode Mortar SAL Integration | | [7,500] | |
| | | Remote Sighting System | | [2,000] | |
| 033 | 0603005A | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 89,586 | 32,400 | 121,986 |
| | | Unmanned Robotic System Utilizing Hydrocarbon Fueled Solid Oxide Fuel Cell | | [6,000] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Advanced Composites for Light Weight, Low Cost Transportation Systems Using a 3+ Ring Extruder | | [4,000] | |
| | | Advanced Lithium Iron Phosphate Battery | | [3,000] | |
| | | Protective 3-D Armor Structure to Safeguard Military Vehicles and Troops | | [2,000] | |
| | | Automatic Data Organization for Vehicle and Diagnostic Systems | | [1,500] | |
| | | Industry Innovation for Defense Sustainment Program | | [5,000] | |
| | | Fire Shield | | [2,000] | |
| | | Hydraulic Hybrid Vehicle (HHV) for the Tactical Wheeled Fleet | | [3,500] | |
| | | Heavy Duty Hybrid Electric Vehicle | | [3,000] | |
| | | Vehicle Electronics SWaP2-C2 Optimization | | [2,400] | |
| 034 | 0603006A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 8,667 | 7,000 | 15,667 |
| | | Applied Communications and Information Networking (ACIN) | | [7,000] | |
| 035 | 0603007A | MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 7,410 | | 7,410 |
| 036 | 0603008A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 50,458 | | 50,458 |
| 037 | 0603009A | TRACTOR HIKE | 11,328 | | 11,328 |
| 038 | 0603015A | NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS | 19,415 | 3,500 | 22,915 |
| | | Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System Enhancements | | [2,500] | |
| | | HapMed Combat Medic Trainer | | [1,000] | |
| 039 | 0603020A | TRACTOR ROSE | 14,569 | | 14,569 |
| 040 | 0603103A | EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY | 0 | 8,400 | 8,400 |
| | | Propellant Conversion to Fertilizer Program for Tooele Army Depot | | [3,400] | |
| | | Development of Demilitarized Equipment for Cluster Ammunition - MCAAP | | [5,000] | |
| 041 | 0603105A | MILITARY HIV RESEARCH | 6,657 | | 6,657 |
| 042 | 0603125A | COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 11,989 | | 11,989 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 043 | 0603270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 19,192 | 7,000 | 26,192 |
| | | Advanced Ground Electronic Warfare & Signals Intelligence System | | [7,000] | |
| 044 | 0603313A | MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY/NLOS-LS | 63,951 | 800 | 64,751 |
| | | Scenario Generation for Integrated Air and Missile Defense Evaluation | | [800] | |
| 045 | 0603322A | TRACTOR CAGE | 12,154 | | 12,154 |
| 046 | 0603606A | LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 30,317 | | 30,317 |
| 047 | 0603607A | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 8,996 | | 8,996 |
| 048 | 0603710A | NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 40,329 | 18,800 | 59,129 |
| | | Buster/Blacklight UAV Development | | [5,000] | |
| | | Hyper Spectral Sensor for Improved Force Protection System | | [5,400] | |
| | | Brownout Situational Awareness | | [3,000] | |
| | | Infrared Goggle Upgrade System | | [3,200] | |
| | | High Resolution Personal Miniature Thermal Viewer | | [2,200] | |
| 049 | 0603728A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 15,706 | | 15,706 |
| 050 | 0603734A | MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 5,911 | 17,350 | 23,261 |
| | | PacCom Renewable Energy Security System | | [3,500] | |
| | | Electric Vehicle Charging Network | | [2,500] | |
| | | Field Deployable Hologram Production System | | [4,800] | |
| | | Demonstration of Thin Film Solar Modules as a Renewable Energy Source | | [1,000] | |
| | | Renewable Energy Project - Fort Jackson | | [3,550] | |
| | | Nanotechnology for Potable Water and Waste Treatment | | [2,000] | |
| 051 | 0603772A | ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY | 41,561 | 16,500 | 58,061 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Foliage Penetrating, Reconnaissance, Surveillance, Tracking, and Engagement Radar | | [5,000] | |
| | | X Band Interferrometric Radar | | [5,000] | |
| | | Optimizing Natural Language Processing of Open Source Intelligence (OSINT) | | [1,500] | |
| | | Software Lifecycle Affordability Management (SLAM) | | [5,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, ARMY** | **695,217** | **204,990** | **900,207** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | |
| 052 | 0603024A | UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID) | 0 | | 0 |
| 053 | 0603305A | ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 14,683 | 12,500 | 27,183 |
| | | Biological Air Filtering System Technology | | [4,000] | |
| | | Compact Pulsed Power for Military Applications | | [8,500] | |
| 054 | 0603308A | ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 117,471 | | 117,471 |
| 055 | 0603327A | AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 209,531 | -177,474 | 32,057 |
| | | Center for Defense Systems Research | | [1,000] | |
| | | Excessive Project Cost Growth - Integrated Air and Missile Defense | | [-178,474] | |
| 056 | 0603460A | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 0 | | 0 |
| 057 | 0603619A | LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV | 17,536 | | 17,536 |
| 058 | 0603627A | SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV | 4,920 | | 4,920 |
| 059 | 0603639A | TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION | 33,934 | -10,800 | 23,134 |
| | | Funding Ahead of Need for Advanced Kinetic Energy Cartridge | | [-10,800] | |
| 060 | 0603653A | FAMILY OF STRYKER VEHICLES | 90,299 | | 90,299 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 061 | 0603747A | SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY | 31,752 | | 31,752 |
| 062 | 0603766A | TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV | 18,228 | | 18,228 |
| 063 | 0603774A | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| | | Enhanced Threat Imaging | | [10,000] | |
| 064 | 0603779A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY | 4,770 | 6,200 | 10,970 |
| | | Cadmium Emissions Reduction - Letterkenny Army Depot | | [1,000] | |
| | | Vanadium Technology Program | | [4,000] | |
| | | Zero Waste to Landfill Demonstration - Washington State | | [1,200] | |
| 065 | 0603782A | WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL | 180,673 | -15,000 | 165,673 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-15,000] | |
| 066 | 0603790A | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 5,048 | | 5,048 |
| 067 | 0603801A | AVIATION - ADV DEV | 8,537 | | 8,537 |
| 068 | 0603804A | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV | 24,238 | | 24,238 |
| 068a | 0603804A | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE | 32,135 | -10,000 | 22,135 |
| | | Unjustified Cost Growth | | [-10,000] | |
| 069 | 0603805A | COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS | 9,868 | | 9,868 |
| 070 | 0603807A | MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV | 31,275 | 2,200 | 33,475 |
| | | Leishmaniasis Skin Test | | [1,000] | |
| | | Rapid Bone Fracture Reduction and Fixation | | [1,200] | |
| 071 | 0603827A | SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 71,832 | 5,000 | 76,832 |
| | | Acid Alkaline Direct Methanol Fuel Cell | | [5,000] | |
| 072 | 0603850A | INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE | 1,476 | | 1,476 |
| 072A | XXXXXXXA | JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE | 0 | 327,100 | 327,100 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Transfer from Title I | | [327,100] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, ARMY** | **908,206** | **149,726** | **1,057,932** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | |
| 073 | 0604201A | AIRCRAFT AVIONICS | 92,977 | | 92,977 |
| 074 | 0604220A | ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS | 65,515 | | 65,515 |
| 075 | 0604270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 34,710 | | 34,710 |
| 075a | 0604270A | COMMON INFRARED COUTNERMEASURES SYSTEM | 213,753 | | 213,753 |
| 076 | 0604321A | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM | 13,107 | | 13,107 |
| 077 | 0604328A | TRACTOR CAGE | 16,286 | | 16,286 |
| 078 | 0604601A | INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS | 74,814 | | 74,814 |
| 079 | 0604604A | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES | 5,683 | | 5,683 |
| 080 | 0604609A | SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD | 978 | | 978 |
| 081 | 0604622A | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES | 7,477 | | 7,477 |
| 082 | 0604633A | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 7,578 | | 7,578 |
| 083 | 0604646A | NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM | 88,660 | | 88,660 |
| 084 | 0604647A | NON-LINE OF SIGHT CANNON | 58,216 | -58,216 | 0 |
| | | Unjustified Termination Costs | | [-58,216] | |
| 085 | 0604660A | FCS MANNED GRD VEHICLES & COMMON GRD VEHICLE | 368,557 | -268,557 | 100,000 |
| | | Unjustified Termination Costs | | [-268,557] | |
| 086 | 0604661A | FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT | 1,067,191 | | 1,067,191 |
| 087 | 0604662A | FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS | 68,701 | | 68,701 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 088 | 0604663A | FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES | 125,616 | | 125,616 |
| 089 | 0604664A | FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS | 26,919 | | 26,919 |
| 090 | 0604665A | FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D | 749,182 | | 749,182 |
| 091 | 0604666A | SPIN OUT TECHNOLOGY/CAPABILITY INSERTION | 0 | | 0 |
| 092 | 0604710A | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD | 55,410 | | 55,410 |
| 093 | 0604713A | COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT | 2,092 | | 2,092 |
| 094 | 0604715A | NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD | 30,209 | | 30,209 |
| 095 | 0604741A | AIR DEFENSE C2I/C - RAM | 28,936 | | 28,936 |
| 096 | 0604742A | CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (MIP) | 33,213 | | 33,213 |
| 097 | 0604746A | AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 15,320 | | 15,320 |
| 098 | 0604760A | DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - SDD | 15,727 | | 15,727 |
| 099 | 0604778A | POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)/GPS | 9,446 | | 9,446 |
| 100 | 0604780A | COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE | 26,243 | | 26,243 |
| 101 | 0604783A | JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM | 0 | | 0 |
| 102 | 0604802A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD | 34,878 | | 34,878 |
| 103 | 0604804A | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD | 36,018 | 7,500 | 43,518 |
| | | Autonomous Sustainment Cargo Container Sea Truck | | [7,500] | |
| 104 | 0604805A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - SDD | 88,995 | | 88,995 |
| 105 | 0604807A | MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - SDD | 33,893 | 3,300 | 37,193 |
| | | Rotary Valve Pressure Swing Absorption Oxygen Generator | | [2,500] | |
| | | Plasma Sterilizer | | [800] | |
| 106 | 0604808A | LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD | 82,260 | -21,300 | 60,960 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-21,300] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 107 | 0604814A | XM982 PROJECTILE | 42,452 | | 42,452 |
| 108 | 0604817A | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION | 20,070 | | 20,070 |
| 109 | 0604818A | ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE | 90,864 | | 90,864 |
| 110 | 0604820A | RADAR DEVELOPMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| 111 | 0604822A | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS) | 6,002 | | 6,002 |
| 112 | 0604823A | FIREFINDER | 20,333 | | 20,333 |
| 113 | 0604827A | SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR DEM/VAL | 19,786 | | 19,786 |
| 114 | 0604854A | ARTILLERY SYSTEMS | 23,318 | 9,000 | 32,318 |
| | | Paladin Integrated Management, M109A6 | | [9,000] | |
| 115 | 0604869A | PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP) | 569,182 | -1,000 | 568,182 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-5,000] | |
| | | Ultra Low Phase Noise Oscillator | | [4,000] | |
| 116 | 0604870A | NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK | 7,140 | | 7,140 |
| 117 | 0605013A | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 35,309 | | 35,309 |
| 118 | 0605450A | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 127,439 | | 127,439 |
| 119 | 0605625A | MANNED GROUND VEHICLE | 100,000 | -50,000 | 50,000 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-50,000] | |
| 119A | XXXXXXXA | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR | 0 | 210,035 | 210,035 |
| | | Transfer from RDA 170 | | [210,035] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, ARMY** | **4,640,455** | **-169,238** | **4,471,217** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | |
| 120 | 0604256A | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 22,222 | | 22,222 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 121 | 0604258A | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 13,615 | | 13,615 |
| 122 | 0604759A | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 51,846 | | 51,846 |
| 123 | 0605103A | RAND ARROYO CENTER | 16,305 | 4,000 | 20,305 |
| | | Program Increase | | [4,000] | |
| 124 | 0605301A | ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL | 163,514 | | 163,514 |
| 125 | 0605326A | CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM | 23,445 | | 23,445 |
| 126 | 0605502A | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 127 | 0605601A | ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES | 354,693 | | 354,693 |
| 128 | 0605602A | ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS | 72,911 | 1,200 | 74,111 |
| | | MOTS All Sky Imager | | [1,200] | |
| 129 | 0605604A | SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS | 45,016 | | 45,016 |
| 130 | 0605605A | DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY | 2,891 | | 2,891 |
| 131 | 0605606A | AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION | 3,766 | | 3,766 |
| 132 | 0605702A | METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES | 8,391 | | 8,391 |
| 133 | 0605706A | MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS | 19,969 | | 19,969 |
| 134 | 0605709A | EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS (MIP) | 5,432 | | 5,432 |
| 135 | 0605712A | SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING | 77,877 | | 77,877 |
| 136 | 0605716A | ARMY EVALUATION CENTER | 66,309 | | 66,309 |
| 137 | 0605718A | ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG | 5,357 | | 5,357 |
| 138 | 0605801A | PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES | 77,823 | | 77,823 |
| 139 | 0605803A | TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES | 51,620 | | 51,620 |
| 140 | 0605805A | MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY | 45,053 | | 45,053 |
| 141 | 0605857A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT | 5,191 | | 5,191 |
| 142 | 0605898A | MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D | 15,866 | | 15,866 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 143 | 0909999A | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | | 0 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, ARMY** | **1,149,112** | **5,200** | **1,154,312** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 144 | 0603778A | MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 27,693 | | 27,693 |
| 145 | 0603820A | WEAPONS CAPABILITY MODIFICATIONS UAV | 0 | | 0 |
| 146 | 0102419A | AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE | 360,076 | -122,000 | 238,076 |
| | | JLENS Program Reduction | | [-122,000] | |
| 147 | 0203726A | ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM | 23,727 | 2,500 | 26,227 |
| | | AFATDS Voice Recognition and Cross Platform Speech Interface System | | [2,500] | |
| 148 | 0203735A | COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 190,301 | | 190,301 |
| 149 | 0203740A | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM | 21,394 | | 21,394 |
| 150 | 0203744A | AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 209,401 | 3,600 | 213,001 |
| | | Boned Cellular Aluminum Tail Rotor Blades | | [3,600] | |
| 151 | 0203752A | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 792 | | 792 |
| 152 | 0203758A | DIGITIZATION | 10,692 | | 10,692 |
| 153 | 0203759A | FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2) | 0 | | 0 |
| 154 | 0203801A | MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 39,273 | | 39,273 |
| 155 | 0203802A | OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| | | Javelin Warhead Improvement Plan | | [10,000] | |
| 156 | 0203808A | TRACTOR CARD | 20,035 | | 20,035 |
| 157 | 0208010A | JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC) | 0 | | 0 |
| 158 | 0208053A | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM | 13,258 | | 13,258 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 159 | 0208058A | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV) | 3,082 | | 3,082 |
| 160 | 0301359A | SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| 161 | 0303028A | SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 2,144 | | 2,144 |
| 162 | 0303140A | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 74,355 | | 74,355 |
| 163 | 0303141A | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 144,733 | | 144,733 |
| 164 | 0303142A | SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE) | 40,097 | | 40,097 |
| 165 | 0303150A | WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 12,034 | | 12,034 |
| 166 | 0303158A | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | 20,365 | | 20,365 |
| 167 | 0305204A | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 202,521 | | 202,521 |
| 168 | 0305208A | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 188,414 | 16,000 | 204,414 |
| | | Joint STARS Surveillance and Control Data Link (SCDL) Technology Refresh | | [5,000] | |
| | | Adaptive Defense High-Speed IP Packet Inspection Engine on a Chip | | [6,000] | |
| | | Asymmetric Threat Response and Analysis | | [5,000] | |
| 169 | 0305287A | BASE EXPED TARGETING SURVEILLANCE SYS-COMBINED | 0 | | 0 |
| 170 | 0307207A | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) | 210,035 | -210,035 | 0 |
| | | Transfer to RDA 119A | | [-210,035] | |
| 171 | 0702239A | AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| 172 | 0708045A | END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES | 68,466 | 5,000 | 73,466 |
| | | Lightweight Armored Windows for Airborne Vehicles | | [3,000] | |
| | | Moldable Ceramic Composite for Tactical Vehicle Protection | | [2,000] | |
| 999 | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 3,883 | | 3,883 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, ARMY** | **1,886,771** | **-294,935** | **1,591,836** |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | TOTAL, RDT&E ARMY | 10,438,218 | 68,513 | 10,506,731 |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced lightweight opaque ceramic armor*

The budget request contained $55.9 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funds to develop advanced lightweight opaque ceramic armor solutions.

The committee is aware that current opaque armor systems used on tactical and combat vehicles for protection against large improvised explosive devices and explosively formed penetrators are extremely heavy and impact vehicle performance and decrease vehicle lifecycle. The committee notes that improvements in weight reduction without sacrificing survivability could benefit vehicle platforms that require improvements with balancing critical key performance parameters of payload, protection, and performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.25 million in PE 62601A for advanced opaque glass ceramic armor systems.

*Advanced nanoscale tungsten kinetic energy composites*

The budget request contained $27.2 million in PE 62105A for materials technology, but included no funds for advanced nanoscale tungsten kinetic energy composites.

The committee understands the objective of this project would be to develop partnerships with academia to further research in advanced tungsten kinetic energy munitions. The committee notes these munitions would enable the warfighter to have increased stand-off protection while simultaneously maintaining and enhancing the effectiveness of lethal, kinetic engagements against an enemy in a defilade position. The committee is aware this technology could be used to accelerate the replacement of depleted uranium materials which could be considered a hazardous material.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62105A for research in advanced nanoscale tungsten kinetic energy composites.

*Army vehicle modernization plans*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed its concern that the Army's mid-term and long-term vehicle modernization plans were unrealistic and unaffordable given the Army's many other funding needs. The committee noted that a critical element of this unaffordable plan was the Army's desire to add an entirely new additional fleet of Future Combat Systems (FCS) vehicles to the Army, while also planning to indefinitely upgrade and maintain current force vehicles.

The committee, as a result, supports the Department of Defense's decision to terminate the manned ground vehicle portion of the FCS program, conduct further analysis of the Army's ground combat vehicle needs, and begin a separate Army ground combat vehicle development program in fiscal year 2010. The committee believes that the termination of the FCS vehicles provides the Army with an opportunity to reconcile its desires with available resources and create a vehicle modernization plan that is affordable while also meeting the needs of today and tomorrow. The committee also views the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review as an opportunity for the Army to modify, if necessary, its current mix of brigade combat

teams, which could significantly impact ground combat vehicle requirements.

Last year, the committee also voiced its preference for the Army to pursue low-risk approaches to increasing the capability of ground combat systems in the inventory today, instead of pursuing high-risk, high-cost efforts to prematurely replace the current fleet of ground combat vehicles. The committee still holds this view, and believes that the current fleet of M1 Abrams tanks, M2 Bradley fighting vehicles, M109A6 Paladin artillery systems, M113 personnel carriers, and Stryker vehicles remain effective due to the many billions of dollars spent to upgrade and recapitalize these vehicles since 2003. However, the committee recognizes that continued upgrades for all of these platforms are essential if they are to maintain their battlefield effectiveness against all possible threats.

Of the current fleet of vehicles, the committee believes that the Army should prioritize upgrades to M1 Abrams tanks, M109A6 Paladins, and the Stryker family of vehicles. The committee believes that replacing the M1 Abrams tank with a system that provides equal protection and firepower is too technically challenging in the near- to mid-term. As a result, the committee would support an aggressive program to upgrade the M1 Abrams tank, with a more fuel-efficient engine, an improved digital communications suite, the ability to fire beyond line-of-sight munitions, an active protection system, and other improvements. The committee believes that, given the termination of the non-line of sight cannon element of the FCS program, the Army must accelerate the existing Paladin Integrated Management program in order to ensure that Army indirect fire systems remain fully capable across the full spectrum of conflict. In the case of the Stryker fleet, the committee would support a plan to conduct a fleet-wide upgrade program that integrates, as priority elements, new digital communications, improved vehicle automotive performance, survivability enhancements, and an active protection system.

With regard to the M2 Bradley and M113 fleets, the committee believes that these vehicles are the most appropriate candidates for replacement by the new Army ground combat vehicle program, based on technical feasibility and current capability, and that the M2 Bradley program's current funding for upgrades is adequate to meet requirements in the near-term. However, the committee urges the Army to also consider, in its analysis of alternatives, domestic production of any currently available vehicle that, with selected modifications, provides a significant upgrade in comparison to the M2 Bradley or M113. The committee notes that this approach enabled the Army to rapidly field the Stryker family of vehicles. This approach could save significant time and funds in comparison to embarking upon an entirely new vehicle design, while also expanding the defense industrial base for ground combat vehicle manufacture. The committee also urges the Army to consider, as part of the analysis of alternatives, a mix of modernized Stryker and M2 vehicles as possible replacements for the M113 fleet.

While the committee understands that the Army must conduct significant analysis to make these decisions, the committee requires an understanding of where the Army is heading in order to complete the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army

to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2009, that defines the Army's new ground combat vehicle program, explains all alternatives considered during the analysis of alternatives process, and provides initial cost and schedule estimates.

*Autonomous sustainment cargo container*

The budget request contained $36.0 million in PE 64804A for logistics and engineer equipment, but contained no funds for the development of autonomous sustainment cargo containers (ASCC).

The ASCC system consists of a propulsion module and an optional bow module that would attach to commercial cargo containers that would provide for cargo container self-propulsion, as well as deployment of cargo containers from offshore logistics and commercial vessels. The committee understands the ASCC system would be comprised of 90 percent commercial-off-the-shelf and nondevelopmental technology that would be compatible with current commercial and military supply sustainment systems. The committee notes this technology could improve and streamline joint logistics over-the-shore operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 64804A for the development and demonstration of ASCC systems in joint logistics over-the-shore operations.

*Body armor requirements and test and evaluation*

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

The committee understands the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps have publicly acknowledged the critical importance of lightening the warfighter's load for current operations, specifically in Operation Enduring Freedom, and considers this a high priority issue. The committee believes there should be urgency in tailoring equipment to meet the operational demands in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee is aware most operations in Afghanistan are dismounted operations. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consider establishing and resourcing a temporary Department-wide task force to help accelerate advancements and efforts in weight reduction initiatives for body armor systems that could be readily fielded to the warfighter. The committee notes previous, similar task forces such as the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Task Force and the Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Task Force were established to address high priority joint urgent

operational requirements for Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and have had great success.

The committee also concurs with the Department of Defense Inspector General's recommendation that the Department standardize testing and evaluation of body armor components. The use of common test and evaluation standards by all military departments and functional commands will improve the Department's ability to rapidly procure body armor and increase the Department's confidence in the level of protection provided to the warfighter. The committee believes the use of common test and evaluation standards would also allow commercial ballistic test facilities and body armor component producers to more quickly and more effectively respond to the Department's current, and future, requirements for body armor.

The committee notes that the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) has authority for oversight of body armor testing and is aware that the DOT&E is leading an effort to develop and standardize body armor test procedures for use across the Department. The committee believes it is critical these test procedures ensure that all procured body armor components consistently meet the warfighters' requirements since body armor is the last line of defense for the warfighter. Therefore, the committee recommends DOT&E to seek peer review of the proposed standardized test and evaluation procedures from ballistics experts in other federal agencies and departments before finalizing these procedures. The committee is aware that such expertise resides in the Department of Commerce, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and in the National Institute of Justice. The committee also recommends that representatives from commercial ballistics test facilities be given an opportunity to comment on the draft test and evaluation standards before final versions are issued.

The committee is also aware of the Secretary of the Army's recent policy decision that directs the Army Test and Evaluation Command to conduct all body armor Lot Acceptance Testing (LAT) at the Army's Aberdeen Test Center. The committee believes that this policy decision may be too restrictive and could be discounting validated, cost-effective, and proven surge-capable LAT services. The committee believes that this policy decision should consider the demonstrated capability and proven capacity of both government and commercial ballistic test facilities against rigorous, standardized, comprehensive test protocols and procedures for body armor systems, that guarantees this critical, life saving equipment performs to required specifications and would be delivered in a timely and urgent manner to the warfighter. The committee encourages the Army to allow for DOT&E to finalize its standardized test procedures for the military services before implementing any unilateral policy decisions regarding body armor test and evaluation.

*Cellulose nanocomposite panels for ballistic protection*

The budget request contained $54.8 million in PE 62784A for military engineering technology, but included no funds for the development of cellulose nanocomposite panels for ballistic protection.

The committee understands the purpose of this project would enhance ballistic properties of lightweight, rapidly erectable field structures, as well as class IV construction materials, through the

development of low-cost, high-performance nanocomposites. The committee notes this technology could accelerate the Army's capability in addressing immediate requirements for blast and ballistic modular protective structures to meet different threat levels in overseas contingency operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62784A for the development of cellulose nanocomposite panels for ballistic protection.

*Dual mode mortar semi-active laser integration*

The budget request contained $66.4 million in PE 63004A for weapons and munitions advanced technology, but included no funds for dual mode mortar semi-active laser (SAL) integration.

Dual mode mortar SAL integration is an initiative to develop and produce global position system (GPS)-guided precision mortar rounds, with an integrated semi-active laser technology for increased accuracy and lethality. The committee is aware of an urgent operational needs statement (ONS) from the XVIII Airborne Corps seeking a material solution for a lack of precision indirect fire support in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF).

The committee notes that the Army, in response to this ONS, has initiated the accelerated precision mortar initiative with the objective to expedite a GPS precision-guided mortar capability to the warfighter in OIF and OEF. The committee supports this initiative, and encourages the Army to rapidly field a solution that fully satisfies the requirement specified in the ONS. The committee believes a SAL could provide increased accuracy and even greater precision than a GPS-only solution.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 63004A to further the development of SAL capability for precision-guided mortars.

*Electric vehicle charging network*

The budget request contained $5.9 million in PE 63734A for military engineering advanced technology but contained no funds for the electric vehicle charging network.

The committee is aware that Executive Order 13423 requires federal agencies to use plug in hybrid vehicles when commercially available at a comparable cost and to reduce annual petroleum consumption. The committee supports development of an electric vehicle charging network in Hawaii to help the Department of Defense meet its petroleum reduction goals.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63734A for the electric vehicle charging network.

*Future Combat Systems*

The budget request contained $2.9 billion for the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program. Of this total, approximately $426.8 million was requested to cover contract termination costs related to the pending cancellation of the eight FCS manned ground vehicles (MGV), with the remaining funds requested to continue work on the software, network, and spin-out equipment elements of the program.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 108–106) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, the committee first expressed its support for the overall goal of the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program, stating that "the committee supports the Army's transformational objectives of achieving a more agile, light, and lethal objective force." In the same report, the committee also, for the first time, noted a series of concerns regarding the budget, structure, and schedule for the program, pointing out that "the Army is embarking on a System Development and Demonstration program of major technical complexity, which to date is largely undefined with regard to architecture, requirements, schedule and cost . . . the key performance parameters are of such a general nature, lacking any metrics, that many current Army systems meet the key performance parameters, precluding a need for a new program . . . [and that] layered management overly insulates senior Army management from FCS program managers."

Over the following five years, in authorizing legislation covering fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the committee, while supporting the fundamental ideas behind the FCS program, expressed ever more acute concerns with the specific budget, technology, and schedule of the program. As a result, the committee initiated a series of oversight measures, including an annual review by Government Accountability Office (GAO) experts, independent cost estimates, and other outside analysis, in an effort to encourage the Army to fundamentally reshape the program into a more realistic and affordable effort. The committee also reduced funding for the program by a total of approximately $1.0 billion, which was just six percent of the total $18.0 billion requested over the same time period.

Six years later, the committee believes that the fundamental problems faced by the FCS program in 2003 were, for the most part, never resolved, and have now led the Army into a position where key program elements will be delayed or terminated despite the FCS program consuming more than $18.0 billion in research and development funding between 2003 and 2009. The committee acknowledges that a small number of prototype ground and air robotic platforms have been fielded from the FCS program. However, the committee believes, that overall, the FCS program fell victim to faults common to many troubled Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition programs, including unclear and changing requirements, immature technology, unrealistic cost estimates, and an inability to deliver promised capabilities on time. While the committee commends the many thousands of individual soldiers, Army civilians, and contractors who worked tirelessly to make the FCS program a success, it believes that these efforts were ultimately not properly managed.

Public statements and testimony from Department and Army leaders indicate that before the end of fiscal year 2009, the Army will terminate the FCS brigade combat team program, and what was once the FCS program will devolve into three separate major defense acquisition programs. The committee supports this overall approach to harvesting the work done to date on the FCS program while also placing its derivative elements on realistic schedules, with solid cost estimates, and achievable requirements. However, the committee continues to have specific concerns with how these

three new programs move forward, due in a large degree to the lack of detailed information provided to the committee, in the 2010 budget request, on how the new programs will evolve. The committee's views on the evolution of the terminated FCS manned ground vehicle are specified elsewhere in this report.

With regard to future spin-outs of FCS equipment, the committee continues to support providing any equipment that is ready for combat to troops in the field as soon as possible. The committee understands that the first such spin-out effort will be seven brigade sets of equipment under the early infantry brigade combat team (E–IBCT) program, and that there are initial plans to continue to field FCS equipment to all Army infantry brigade combat teams (IBCT), but that beyond the spin-outs to IBCTs, the Army has yet to develop a plan for fielding FCS equipment to the Army's more than 200 other brigades. The committee encourages the Army to focus the next set of spin-out equipment on Army heavy brigade combat teams or Stryker brigade combat teams. In particular, the committee believes that the active protection system (APS), mast mounted sight (MMS), and platform soldier mission-readiness system (PS–MRS) elements of the FCS program should be prioritized for the next FCS spin-out, or transferred to other vehicle modernization programs that require them, such as the M1E3 Abrams, and Stryker-Mod programs. The committee encourages the Army to protect the work done to date, through reprogrammings or other budget adjustments, on these elements of the FCS program in fiscal year 2009 as the Army restructures the FCS program.

With regard to the network and software elements of the FCS program, the committee believes that this aspect of the program carries both the highest potential payoff in terms of new military capability, and the greatest risk of additional cost overruns if not properly scoped and managed. Since the program's inception, the committee has supported the program's goal of developing a ubiquitous, secure, flexible, and high-capacity wireless battlefield network. The committee continues to believe that, if achieved, this network capability could lead to dramatic increases in the combat capability of all Army forces. However, committee concerns regarding the budget and schedule for this element of the program remain severe, primarily due to the Department's history of software program cost overruns, and the halting progress of critical enabling Army programs such as the joint tactical radio system and the warfighter information network—tactical programs. For example, the committee notes with concern that the network hardware and software element of the FCS request for fiscal year 2010 includes a $415.0 million cost increase. As the Army converts the FCS network and software program into a separate program of record, the committee urges the Army to create a program that fields new network capability in detailed increments, each of which have realistic schedules, cost estimates, and requirements. In addition, the committee believes that the Army must integrate upgrades to its current battlefield network capability into these new increments, to ensure that at the end of the process the Army has one network program, not two or more.

Finally, the committee notes that the completion of the FCS preliminary design review on May 15, 2009, begins the 120-day period at the end of which the Secretary of Defense must provide the con-

gressional defense committees with the milestone review report on the FCS program, as required by section 214 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–354). Absent the termination of the entire FCS program, the committee directs that this report should be delivered by September 13, 2009, and provide, in addition to the content required by statute, a detailed update on the status of the program. This update should include a description of the specific contract actions taken since submission of the fiscal year 2010 budget request, any reprogrammings impacting what remains of the FCS program, the plan for allocation of unexecuted fiscal year 2009 FCS funding, and the specific requirements, updated cost estimates, and schedules for future spin outs or network increments for which fiscal year 2010 FCS funding may be allocated.

*Future Combat Systems autonomous navigation system*

The budget request contained $125.6 million in PE 64663A for autonomous navigation system (ANS) development.

The committee notes that the Army is developing an onboard ANS for Future Combat Systems (FCS) unmanned platforms. The committee believes robotic systems using ANS could provide soldiers enhanced force protection and combat effectiveness. Beyond their role in the FCS program, the committee believes that ANS technologies could also have a direct application to current force operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report, by March 15, 2010, to the congressional defense committees laying out the cost, schedule, and feasibility of implementing ANS technologies and capabilities on existing Army manned and unmanned platforms.

The committee recommends $125.6 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64663A for FCS autonomous vehicle navigation system development.

*Future Combat Systems manned ground vehicles*

The budget request contained $368.6 million in PE 64660A for Future Combat Systems (FCS) manned ground vehicle (MGV) contract termination costs.

The committee notes that $744.6 million in fiscal year 2009 funds for FCS MGVs had not been executed as of April 30, 2009, and that the Secretary of Defense has directed termination of the MGV portion of the FCS program. Therefore, the committee believes that unexecuted fiscal year 2009 funds will be more than adequate to cover any possible termination costs to the government, and that the fiscal year 2010 request for additional termination funds is not justified.

The committee recommends $100.0 million, a decrease of $268.6 million, in PE 64660A for FCS manned ground vehicle development.

*Future Combat Systems unattended ground sensors*

The budget request contained $26.9 million in PE 64664A for Future Combat Systems (FCS) unattended ground sensor (UGS) development.

The committee understands that units will employ UGS to provide remote perimeter defense, surveillance, target acquisition, and

situational awareness. Prototype versions of UGS sensors are currently fielded to the Army Evaluation Task Force, where soldiers are exploring optimizing applications for the sensors in an expanding variety of tactical scenarios. The committee notes that the Army plans to field the UGS capability as rapidly as possible as part of the FCS first "spin-out" effort. The committee continues to support any effort that puts mature enhanced capabilities into our combat units as soon as possible. The committee understands that the current approved acquisition strategy allows for direct procurement of the UGS system outside of the current prime contract. The committee believes the Army should pursue the most cost-effective solution prior to making a full-rate production decision. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 15, 2010, that addresses the potential business case analysis for or against multi-source procurement of FCS UGS prior to making a full-rate production decision. The report should include the viability of integrating existing current force UGS systems into the FCS UGS development program.

The committee recommends $26.9 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64664A for FCS unattended ground sensors development.

*Heavy duty hybrid electric vehicle demonstration*

The budget request contained $89.5 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, but included no funds for the demonstration of low-emission and fuel-efficient hybrid electric engine propulsion systems for heavy tactical wheeled vehicles (TWV).

The committee understands low emission and fuel efficient hybrid electric engine propulsion systems could be used to develop and demonstrate next generation hybrid electric powertrains on up to five heavy tactical wheeled vehicles. The committee is aware that prior year funds have been appropriated for and Air Force first-generation hybrid electric heavy tactical wheeled vehicle program and the committee expects the Army to leverage results from the Air Force Program.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63005A for the continued refinement of system development and demonstration of a low emission and fuel efficient hybrid electric engine propulsion system for the Army's heavy tactical wheeled vehicle fleet.

*Independent assessment of the Human Terrain System*

The committee continues to support the concept behind the Human Terrain Teams (HTT) and the overall Human Terrain System (HTS). In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed support for expansion of the HTT concept, including to other combatant command areas of responsibility.

The committee is aware of anecdotal evidence indicating the benefits of the program supporting operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee also notes that a number of press accounts provide anecdotal evidence indi-

cating problems with management and resourcing. The committee finds it difficult to evaluate either set of information in the absence of reliable, empirical data.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an independent assessment of the Human Terrain System, and submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing that assessment by March 1, 2010. The independent assessment should consider the following elements:

(1) An overview of all of the components of HTS, including related technology development efforts;

(2) The adequacy of the management structure for HTS;

(3) The metrics used to evaluate each of the components of HTS;

(4) The adequacy of human resourcing and recruiting efforts, including the implications of converting some contractor positions to government positions;

(5) An identification of skills that are not resident in government or military positions, and how the Army can leverage academic networks or contracting opportunities to fill those gaps;

(6) An identification of policy or regulatory issues hindering program execution; and

(7) The potential to integrate HTS capabilities into existing exercises.

*Joint fires and effects trainer system enhancements*

The budget request contained $19.4 million in PE 63015A for next generation training and simulation systems, but included no funds for joint fires and effects training system (JFETS) enhancements.

The JFETS call for fire training capability would improve the warfighter's ability to synchronize fires and effects across joint service platforms, to include close air support, precision artillery support, and support from air and missile defense units. The committee is aware the JFETS program has trained over 5,000 soldiers; however, currently only one soldier can be trained at a time. The committee understands the JFETS program could be improved to allow for a single instructor to manage nine concurrent sessions.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63015A, to further the development of training enhancements for the JFETS program to create efficiencies in training.

*Joint land attack cruise missile defense elevated netted sensor system*

The budget request contained $360.1 million in PE 12419A for development of the joint land attack cruise missile defense elevated netted sensor system (JLENS).

The committee notes that the JLENS program recently experienced a schedule and cost breach of its acquisition program baseline due to an Army decision to withhold procurement funding in fiscal year 2011. Therefore, the committee does not believe the program will require the full amount requested for continued system development and demonstration.

The committee recommends $238.1 million, a decrease of $122.0 million, in PE 12419A for the JLENS program.

*Landmine warfare/barrier program*

The budget request contained $82.3 million in PE 64808A for landmine warfare/barrier development. Of this amount, $42.6 million was requested for development of the airborne surveillance, target acquisition, and minefield detection system and the ground standoff mine detection system.

The committee understands that these two sensor packages are primarily designed for use on the Future Combat Systems (FCS) class IV unmanned aerial system and the FCS multi-function utility/equipment logistics unmanned vehicle. The committee notes that the FCS brigade combat team program will soon be terminated, and that these two FCS elements are not part of any planned FCS spin-out. Therefore, the committee does not believe that funding requested for the sensor packages for these FCS elements is properly aligned with what remains of the FCS program.

The committee recommends $61.0 million, a decrease of $21.3 million, in PE 64808A for landmine warfare/barrier development. Of the funds authorized, the committee expects the Army to fully fund the Scorpion—intelligent munitions system, which also has funding in this program element.

*Manned ground vehicle program*

The budget request contained $100.0 million in PE 65625A for a new Army manned ground vehicle (MGV) program.

The committee understands that the funds requested in this line will be used to conduct analysis of alternatives, requirements development, technology assessments, and cost-estimating activities related to a new major defense acquisition program for Army manned ground vehicles. The committee further understands that the Army does not intend to complete the initial conceptual work on this program until September 2009, and that the number, class, and type of vehicles this program will develop have yet to be determined. Therefore, the committee does not believe that the full amount requested is justified or necessary to conduct early, premilestone A work on this program.

The committee recommends $50.0 million, a decrease of $50.0 million, in PE 65625A for Army manned ground vehicle development.

*Mid-range munition program*

The budget request contained $33.9 million in PE 63639A for tank and medium-caliber ammunition research and development. Of this amount, no funds were requested for the mid-range munition (MRM) program.

The committee notes that, although tied to the Future Combat Systems (FCS) manned ground vehicle development program, the MRM round could be integrated into an improved M1 Abrams tank design, and could provide significant beyond-line-of-sight capability the M1 Abrams currently lacks. The committee believes that the MRM program requires funding from the Army in fiscal year 2010 to preserve the work done to date on this program and, if possible, to keep it on its current schedule. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to deliver a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 15, 2010, explaining the Army's future plans for the MRM program.

*Non-line of sight cannon*

The budget request contained $58.2 million in PE 64647A for non-line of sight cannon (NLOS–C) contract termination costs.

The committee notes that $236.5 million in fiscal year 2009 funds for NLOS–C development, procurement, and advanced procurement had not been executed as of April 30, 2009, and that the Secretary of Defense has directed termination of the NLOS–C program. Therefore, the committee believes that unexecuted fiscal year 2009 funds for the NLOS–C program will be more than adequate to cover any possible termination costs to the government, and that the fiscal year 2010 request for additional termination funds is not justified.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $58.2 million, in PE 64647A for NLOS–C development.

*Optimizing Natural Language Processing of Open Source Intelligence*

The budget request contained $41.6 million in PE 63772A for advanced tactical computer science and sensor technology, but contained no funding for the Optimizing Natural Language Processing of Open Source Intelligence (OSINT) project.

The OSINT project would support a cooperative effort between the State University of New York at Buffalo and its partners to design and build a prototype text analytics and extraction tool for use by the Army for more effective intelligence analysis and decision-making in asymmetric warfare situations.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63772A for the Optimizing Natural Language Processing of Open Source Intelligence project.

*PacCom renewable energy security system*

The budget request contained $5.9 million in PE 63734A for military engineering advanced technology but included no funds for the PacCom renewable energy security system.

The committee recognizes that over 90 percent of the energy consumed in Hawaii is imported from out of state and that this creates an inherent energy security risk. The committee supports the PacCom renewable energy security system's collaborative demonstration project to produce renewable fuel and enhance energy security in Hawaii.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63734A for the PacCom renewable energy security system.

*RAND Arroyo Center*

The budget request contained $16.3 million in PE 65103A for the RAND Arroyo Center.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed its concern about reductions in the Army's budget request for the RAND Arroyo Center, and urged the Army to provide stable funding for the RAND Arroyo Center in future budget requests. Unfortunately, the budget request for fiscal year 2010 reduced funding for this program. The committee recognizes the value of rigorous, objective research and analysis produced by the Arroyo Center for the senior leadership of the Army.

Further, the committee believes that the core program of the Arroyo Center must be effectively and efficiently funded, prioritized, and managed.

The committee recommends $20.3 million, an increase of $4.0 million, in PE 65103A for the RAND Arroyo Center.

*Review of condition-based maintenance architecture*

The committee is concerned that as individual condition-based maintenance solutions are being developed for systems, subsystems, and components, the adherence to Department of Defense Instruction 4151.22 for open architectural design has not been consistently implemented. The committee encourages the Department to adopt an industry standard for open system architecture to ensure the implementation of condition-based maintenance programs interfaces to military services, original equipment manufacturers, and third party systems to meet the performance, safety, reliability, availability, and cost-reduction goals. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the Department's condition-based maintenance architecture, and also report the results of the review to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2010. The review should include the following:

(1) A determination if the condition-based maintenance open system architecture requirement stated in the Department of Defense Instruction 4151.22 has been implemented by military services;

(2) The viability of open, standard software architecture to provide diagnostic and prognostic reasoning for systems, subsystems or components;

(3) A process for including open architecture for the system, subsystem and component structures, diagnostics tools, reference models, maintenance and diagnostics reasoner electronic libraries, and user interfaces across the military services; and

(4) An evaluation of industrial open architecture standards for use by the Department.

Further, the committee also encourages the Secretary of Defense to seek a peer review from the International Organization for Standardization and S1000D Organization to ensure the proposed standards would leverage commercial approaches for an open architecture condition-based maintenance programs.

*Tactical metal fabrication*

The budget request contained $55.9 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funds for tactical metal fabrication (TacFab) system.

The TacFab system would demonstrate a tactically-mobile rapid metal fabrication capability that would complement the Army's mobile parts hospital program, as well as provide a unique, standalone capability as a metal casting resource for Army depots and arsenals in support of equipment reset activities. The committee understands this would address a theater requirement for a mobile foundry and could potentially reduce the time required to produce parts by 90 percent.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in PE 62601A for tactical metal fabrication technology.

*Warfighter information network—tactical*

The budget request contained $180.7 million in PE 63782A for warfighter information network—tactical (WIN–T) development. Of this amount, $161.6 million was requested for WIN–T increment 3 development.

The committee understands that a portion of the requirements for the WIN–T increment 3 program are directly related to the manned ground vehicle element of the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program, which will be terminated in 2009. The committee notes that until May 18, 2009, 50 percent of fiscal year 2009 funding for WIN–T increment 3 was not available for obligation pending Department of Defense actions outlined in section 215 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The committee also notes that of the $154.7 million available for obligation on May 18, 2009, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics authorized only $99.0 million for obligation, pending an Army review of WIN–T increment 3 requirements and cost estimates. Therefore, the committee believes that the resulting program delays will reduce funding needed in fiscal year 2010 for WIN–T increment 3 development efforts.

The committee recommends $165.7 million, a decrease of $15.0 million, in PE 63782A for the WIN–T program. The committee expects the Army to prioritize the funding authorized for WIN–T increment 2 development.

*Zero waste to landfill demonstration*

The budget request contained $4.8 million in PE 63779A for environmental quality technology but contained no funds for the Washington State zero waste to landfill demonstration.

The committee believes that the Washington State zero waste to landfill demonstration will further enable the military services to meet their sustainability goals. The demonstration will: perform a waste stream analysis at Fort Lewis to identify materials currently dumped in landfills, which could be used by the military or released to other users for less than the cost of landfill; initiate the reuse of post-consumer materials saved from landfill for use in concrete, asphalt, gypsum, and other green materials; provide a report on data gained from the demonstration to facilitate similar projects at other military installations in Washington State; and validate the viability and technology requirements achieve zero waste to landfill by 2025.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.2 million in PE 63779A for the Washington State zero waste to landfill demonstration.

## NAVY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $19.3 billion for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $19.6 billion, an increase of $351.6 million to the budget request.

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | |
| 001 | 0601103N | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 99,472 | 5,500 | 104,972 |
| | | Gulf of Mexico Geoid Model | | [3,500] | |
| | | Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Options for Military Build-Up | | [2,000] | |
| 002 | 0601152N | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 18,076 | | 18,076 |
| 003 | 0601153N | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 413,743 | 4,000 | 417,743 |
| | | Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology, and Nanobiology Initiative | | [2,000] | |
| | | Development of Cyber Security K-12 Outreach Program | | [2,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, NAVY** | **531,291** | **9,500** | **540,791** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | |
| 004 | 0602114N | POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH | 59,787 | 7,550 | 67,337 |
| | | Multifunctional Materials, their Applications and Devices | | [5,000] | |
| | | Whale and Dolphin Hearing and Echolocation | | [2,550] | |
| 005 | 0602123N | FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH | 91,400 | 14,786 | 106,186 |
| | | Standoff Explosive Detection System | | [2,000] | |
| | | Advanced Energy Storage Technologies for UUVs | | [3,000] | |
| | | Design Optimization of Composite High-Speed Boats Using Advanced Composite and Manufacturing and Non-destructive Evaluation | | [2,000] | |
| | | Lithium Ion Storage Advancement for Aircraft Applications | | [4,200] | |
| | | Non-Traditional Weaving Applications for Aramid Ballistic Fibers and Fabrics | | [3,586] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 006 | 0602131M | MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY | 39,308 | | 39,308 |
| 007 | 0602234N | MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY | 0 | | 0 |
| 008 | 0602235N | COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH | 83,163 | 2,000 | 85,163 |
| | | Coordinated Operation of Unmanned Vehicles for Littoral Defense | | [2,000] | |
| 009 | 0602236N | WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH | 104,169 | 5,000 | 109,169 |
| | | Remote Fuel Assessment System | | [2,000] | |
| | | Managing and Extending DOD Asset Lifecycles (MEDAL) | | [3,000] | |
| 010 | 0602271N | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH | 64,816 | 5,500 | 70,316 |
| | | Photonic Digital Radar for the Next Generation of Electronic Warfare Systems | | [5,500] | |
| 011 | 0602435N | OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH | 48,750 | | 48,750 |
| 012 | 0602651M | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH | 6,008 | | 6,008 |
| 013 | 0602747N | UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH | 55,694 | | 55,694 |
| 014 | 0602782N | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH | 40,880 | | 40,880 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, NAVY** | **593,975** | **34,836** | **628,811** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 015 | 0603114N | POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 107,969 | 10,000 | 117,969 |
| | | Countermine Lidar UAV-Based System (CLUBS) | | [2,600] | |
| | | Detection, Tracking, and Identification for ISRTE of Mobile Asymmetric Targets | | [3,500] | |
| | | Quiet Drive Advanced Rotary Actuator | | [2,000] | |
| | | Tactical High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile Demonstration | | [1,900] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 016 | 0603123N | FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 66,035 | 16,500 | 82,535 |
| | | Euler Turbine for Fuel Cell Energy Recovery | | [2,000] | |
| | | High Speed Power Node Switching and Power Node Control Centers | | [5,000] | |
| | | High-Temperature Radar Dome Materials | | [2,250] | |
| | | ASC-1187 ADV Countermeasures | | [1,250] | |
| | | Pure Hydrogen Supply from Logistic Fuels | | [4,000] | |
| | | Strategic Mobility 21 | | [2,000] | |
| 017 | 0603235N | COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 108,394 | -59,110 | 49,284 |
| | | High-Integrity Global Positioning System | | [-59,110] | |
| 018 | 0603236N | WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 86,239 | 4,000 | 90,239 |
| | | Active Acoustic Analysis and Mitigation System | | [4,000] | |
| 019 | 0603271N | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 65,827 | | 65,827 |
| 020 | 0603640M | USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD) | 107,363 | | 107,363 |
| 021 | 0603651M | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 10,998 | | 10,998 |
| 022 | 0603729N | WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 18,609 | 2,500 | 21,109 |
| | | Navy Special Warfare Performance and Injury Prevention Program for SBT 22 at Stennis Space Center | | [2,500] | |
| 023 | 0603747N | UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 68,037 | 3,500 | 71,537 |
| | | Navy Use of UNOLS Fleet | | [3,500] | |
| 024 | 0603758N | NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS | 52,643 | | 52,643 |
| 025 | 0603782N | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 28,782 | | 28,782 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, NAVY** | **720,896** | **-22,610** | **698,286** |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | |
| 026 | 0603207N | AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS | 116,082 | | 116,082 |
| 027 | 0603216N | AVIATION SURVIVABILITY | 6,505 | 6,000 | 12,505 |
| | | Lighter Than Air Stratospheric UAV for Persistant Communications Relay and Surveillance | | [6,000] | |
| 028 | 0603237N | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL | 6,032 | | 6,032 |
| 029 | 0603254N | ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 16,585 | 12,200 | 28,785 |
| | | Marine Mammal Awareness, Alert, and Response Systems | | [3,500] | |
| | | Trigger and Alert Sonobuoy System Project | | [1,500] | |
| | | Air Deployable ASW Cluster Sensors for Non-Acoustic Detection | | [2,000] | |
| | | Airborne Aquatic Detection Sensor System | | [1,200] | |
| | | NIR Sight (Near-Infra-Red Ranging) | | [4,000] | |
| 030 | 0603261N | TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE | 7,713 | | 7,713 |
| 031 | 0603382N | ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY | 1,677 | | 1,677 |
| 032 | 0603502N | SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 76,739 | | 76,739 |
| 033 | 0603506N | SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE | 57,538 | 5,000 | 62,538 |
| | | Continuous Active Sonar for Torpedo Systems | | [5,000] | |
| 034 | 0603512N | CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 173,594 | | 173,594 |
| 035 | 0603513N | SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT | 1,691 | 13,500 | 15,191 |
| | | Advanced Steam Turbine | | [7,500] | |
| | | Mobile Valve and Flex Hose Maintenance (MVFM) | | [1,000] | |
| | | Next Generation Shipboard Intergrated Power: Fuel Efficiency and Advanced Capability Enhancer | | [5,000] | |
| 036 | 0603525N | PILOT FISH | 79,194 | | 79,194 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 037 | 0603527N | RETRACT LARCH | 99,757 | | 99,757 |
| 038 | 0603536N | RETRACT JUNIPER | 120,752 | | 120,752 |
| 039 | 0603542N | RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL | 1,372 | | 1,372 |
| 040 | 0603553N | SURFACE ASW | 21,995 | | 21,995 |
| 041 | 0603561N | ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 551,836 | 9,400 | 561,236 |
| | | Future Generation Thinline Towed Array | | [4,700] | |
| | | Submarine Fatline Vector Sensor Towed Array | | [3,200] | |
| | | Low-Cost Laser Module Assembly for Navy's Acoustic Sensors (LC-LMA) | | [1,500] | |
| 042 | 0603562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS | 10,172 | | 10,172 |
| 043 | 0603563N | SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN | 22,541 | | 22,541 |
| 044 | 0603564N | SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES | 28,135 | 10,000 | 38,135 |
| | | Support for Naval Ship Hydrodynamics Test Facilities | | [10,000] | |
| 045 | 0603570N | ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS | 259,887 | | 259,887 |
| 046 | 0603573N | ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS | 5,599 | 8,400 | 13,999 |
| | | High Denstiy Power Conversion and Distribution Equipment | | [3,400] | |
| | | Hybrid Electric Drive | | [5,000] | |
| 047 | 0603576N | CHALK EAGLE | 443,555 | | 443,555 |
| 048 | 0603581N | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS) | 360,518 | | 360,518 |
| 049 | 0603582N | COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION | 22,558 | | 22,558 |
| 050 | 0603609N | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 3,458 | | 3,458 |
| 051 | 0603611M | MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES | 293,466 | | 293,466 |
| 052 | 0603612M | USMC MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV | 0 | | 0 |
| 053 | 0603635M | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM | 73,798 | | 73,798 |
| 054 | 0603654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 21,054 | | 21,054 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 055 | 0603658N | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT | 56,586 | | 56,586 |
| 056 | 0603713N | OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 17,328 | | 17,328 |
| 057 | 0603721N | ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION | 20,661 | | 20,661 |
| 058 | 0603724N | NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM | 8,476 | | 8,476 |
| 059 | 0603725N | FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT | 4,002 | 10,000 | 14,002 |
| | | Wave Energy Powerbuoy Generating System | | [3,000] | |
| | | Photovoltaic Rooftop Systems -Navy | | [1,500] | |
| | | Regenerative Fuel Cell Back-Up Power | | [1,700] | |
| | | Testing of Critical Components for Ocean Alternate Energy Options | | [3,800] | |
| 060 | 0603734N | CHALK CORAL | 70,772 | | 70,772 |
| 061 | 0603739N | NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY | 4,301 | 1,200 | 5,501 |
| | | In Transit Visibility System | | [1,200] | |
| 062 | 0603746N | RETRACT MAPLE | 210,237 | | 210,237 |
| 063 | 0603748N | LINK PLUMERIA | 69,313 | | 69,313 |
| 064 | 0603751N | RETRACT ELM | 152,151 | | 152,151 |
| 065 | 0603755N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE | 6,960 | | 6,960 |
| 066 | 0603764N | LINK EVERGREEN | 123,660 | | 123,660 |
| 067 | 0603787N | SPECIAL PROCESSES | 54,115 | | 54,115 |
| 068 | 0603790N | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 10,194 | | 10,194 |
| 069 | 0603795N | LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY | 1,238 | 5,000 | 6,238 |
| | | Land Attack Technology | | [5,000] | |
| 070 | 0603851M | NONLETHAL WEAPONS | 46,971 | | 46,971 |
| 071 | 0603860N | JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS | 150,304 | | 150,304 |
| 072 | 0603879N | SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER (SE) | 52,716 | | 52,716 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 073 | 0603889N | COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS | 0 | | 0 |
| 074 | 0603925N | DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS | 5,003 | 7,000 | 12,003 |
| | | High Energy Density Capacitors for Military Applications | | [3,000] | |
| | | Joint Technology Insertion & Accelerated System Intergration Capability for Electronic Warfare | | [4,000] | |
| 075 | 0604272N | TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM) | 63,702 | | 63,702 |
| 076 | 0604450N | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 0 | | 0 |
| 077 | 0604653N | JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW) | 67,843 | | 67,843 |
| 078 | 0604659N | PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 40,926 | | 40,926 |
| 079 | 0604707N | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT | 42,533 | | 42,533 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, NAVY** | **4,163,795** | **87,700** | **4,251,495** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | |
| 080 | 0604212N | OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT | 54,092 | | 54,092 |
| 081 | 0604214N | AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV | 20,886 | | 20,886 |
| 082 | 0604215N | STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT | 53,540 | 2,000 | 55,540 |
| | | Measurement Standards Research and Development | | [2,000] | |
| 083 | 0604216N | MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT | 81,953 | 4,700 | 86,653 |
| | | USN MH-60S "Close the Lethality Gap" M230 Pylon Qualification | | [4,700] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 084 | 0604218N | AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING | 7,485 | | 7,485 |
| 085 | 0604221N | P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 3,659 | | 3,659 |
| 086 | 0604230N | WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 6,307 | | 6,307 |
| 087 | 0604231N | TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM | 86,462 | | 86,462 |
| 088 | 0604234N | ADVANCED HAWKEYE | 364,557 | | 364,557 |
| 089 | 0604245N | H-1 UPGRADES | 32,830 | | 32,830 |
| 090 | 0604261N | ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS | 56,369 | | 56,369 |
| 091 | 0604262N | V-22A | 89,512 | 3,000 | 92,512 |
| | | MV-22 Satellite Weather Systems Development | | [3,000] | |
| 092 | 0604264N | AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 14,265 | | 14,265 |
| 093 | 0604269N | EA-18 | 55,446 | | 55,446 |
| 094 | 0604270N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 97,635 | 4,000 | 101,635 |
| | | Electronic Warfare Technology, Doctrine, and Tactics Development | | [4,000] | |
| 095 | 0604273N | VH-71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT | 85,240 | | 85,240 |
| 096 | 0604274N | NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) | 127,970 | | 127,970 |
| 097 | 0604280N | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY) | 876,374 | | 876,374 |
| 098 | 0604300N | SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING | 0 | | 0 |
| 099 | 0604307N | SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING | 178,459 | 5,000 | 183,459 |
| | | Surface Ship Advanced Capability Build | | [5,000] | |
| 100 | 0604311N | LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 5,304 | | 5,304 |
| 101 | 0604329N | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) | 43,902 | | 43,902 |
| 102 | 0604366N | STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS | 182,197 | | 182,197 |
| 103 | 0604373N | AIRBORNE MCM | 48,712 | | 48,712 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 104 | 0604378N | NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL - COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 11,727 | | 11,727 |
| 105 | 0604501N | ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS | 236,078 | | 236,078 |
| 106 | 0604503N | SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION | 122,733 | | 122,733 |
| 107 | 0604504N | AIR CONTROL | 6,533 | | 6,533 |
| 108 | 0604512N | SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS | 80,623 | | 80,623 |
| 109 | 0604518N | COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION | 13,305 | | 13,305 |
| 110 | 0604558N | NEW DESIGN SSN | 154,756 | 11,000 | 165,756 |
| | | Common Command and Control System Module | | [9,000] | |
| | | Mold-in-Place Coating for Development of U.S. Submarine Fleet | | [2,000] | |
| 111 | 0604561N | SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS | 0 | | 0 |
| 112 | 0604562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM | 59,703 | | 59,703 |
| 113 | 0604567N | SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E | 89,988 | 5,200 | 95,188 |
| | | Automated Fiber Optic Manufacturing Initiative for Navy Ships | | [5,200] | |
| 114 | 0604574N | NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES | 4,620 | | 4,620 |
| 115 | 0604601N | MINE DEVELOPMENT | 2,249 | | 2,249 |
| 116 | 0604610N | LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT | 21,105 | | 21,105 |
| 117 | 0604654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 10,327 | | 10,327 |
| 118 | 0604703N | PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS | 5,898 | | 5,898 |
| 119 | 0604727N | JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS | 10,022 | 6,500 | 16,522 |
| | | Extended Range Joint Stand-Off Weapon | | [6,500] | |
| 120 | 0604755N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL) | 35,459 | | 35,459 |
| 121 | 0604756N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL) | 34,236 | | 34,236 |
| 122 | 0604757N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW) | 88,895 | | 88,895 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 123 | 0604761N | INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING | 14,438 | | 14,438 |
| 124 | 0604771N | MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT | 9,888 | 23,500 | 33,388 |
| | | Flexible Medical Solutions FlexMedPatch Program | | [2,000] | |
| | | HI-CA Biorepository Consortium for DOD Research | | [2,500] | |
| | | Neurogenesis Therapeutics for PTSD | | [3,000] | |
| | | Strategies to Reduce Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) & Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Burden | | [4,000] | |
| | | U.S. Navy Vaccine Program | | [4,000] | |
| | | U.S. Navy Pandemic Influenza Vaccine Program: Enhancement of Influenza Vaccine Efficacy | | [8,000] | |
| 125 | 0604777N | NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM | 63,184 | | 63,184 |
| 126 | 0604784N | DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 0 | | 0 |
| 127 | 0604800N | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) | 1,741,296 | 153,500 | 1,894,796 |
| | | F136 Development | | [231,500] | |
| | | Program Excess | | [-78,000] | |
| 128 | 0605013M | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 9,868 | | 9,868 |
| 129 | 0605013N | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 69,026 | 3,600 | 72,626 |
| | | Maintenance Planning and Assessment Technology (MPAT) Insertion | | [3,000] | |
| | | Advanced Maintenance and Environmental Monitoring Technologies for Public Shipyards | | [600] | |
| 130 | 0605212N | CH-53K RDTE | 554,827 | | 554,827 |
| 131 | 0605430N | C/KC-130 AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP) | 0 | | 0 |
| 132 | 0605450N | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 81,434 | | 81,434 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 133 | 0605500N | MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) | 1,162,417 | | 1,162,417 |
| 134 | 0204201N | CG(X) | 150,022 | | 150,022 |
| 135 | 0204202N | DDG-1000 | 539,053 | | 539,053 |
| 136 | 0304785N | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS | 19,016 | | 19,016 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, NAVY** | **7,975,882** | **222,000** | **8,197,882** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | |
| 137 | 0604256N | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 25,534 | | 25,534 |
| 138 | 0604258N | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 79,603 | | 79,603 |
| 139 | 0604759N | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 44,844 | | 44,844 |
| 140 | 0605152N | STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY | 11,422 | | 11,422 |
| 141 | 0605154N | CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES | 49,821 | | 49,821 |
| 142 | 0605502N | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 143 | 0605804N | TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES | 735 | 3,000 | 3,735 |
| | | Center for Commercialization of Advanced Technology | | [3,000] | |
| 144 | 0605853N | MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 60,590 | | 60,590 |
| 145 | 0605856N | STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 3,633 | | 3,633 |
| 146 | 0605861N | RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT | 70,942 | | 70,942 |
| 147 | 0605862N | RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION | 0 | | 0 |
| 148 | 0605863N | RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | 193,353 | | 193,353 |
| 149 | 0605864N | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 380,733 | | 380,733 |
| 150 | 0605865N | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY | 12,010 | | 12,010 |
| 151 | 0605866N | NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT | 2,703 | | 2,703 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 152 | 0605867N | SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT | 20,921 | | 20,921 |
| 153 | 0605873M | MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT | 19,004 | | 19,004 |
| 154 | 0305885N | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES | 2,464 | | 2,464 |
| 155 | 0804758N | SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC | 4,197 | | 4,197 |
| 156 | 0909999N | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | | 0 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, NAVY** | **982,509** | **3,000** | **985,509** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 158 | 0604227N | HARPOON MODIFICATIONS | 0 | | 0 |
| 159 | 0604402N | UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT | 311,204 | | 311,204 |
| 160 | 0101221N | STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT | 74,939 | 1,170 | 76,109 |
| | | Advanced LINAC Facility | | [1,170] | |
| 161 | 0101224N | SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 34,479 | | 34,479 |
| 162 | 0101226N | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 7,211 | | 7,211 |
| 163 | 0101402N | NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS | 43,982 | 4,000 | 47,982 |
| | | E-6B Strategic Communications Upgrade Block 1A (VLF-TX & HPTS) | | [4,000] | |
| 164 | 0203761N | RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT) | 39,125 | | 39,125 |
| 165 | 0204136N | F/A-18 SQUADRONS | 127,733 | | 127,733 |
| 166 | 0204152N | E-2 SQUADRONS | 63,058 | | 63,058 |
| 167 | 0204163N | FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL) | 37,431 | | 37,431 |
| 168 | 0204229N | TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC) | 13,238 | | 13,238 |
| 169 | 0204311N | INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 24,835 | 3,600 | 28,435 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Deployable Autonomous Distributed System | | [3,600] | |
| 170 | 0204413N | AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT) | 2,324 | | 2,324 |
| 171 | 0204571N | CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 49,293 | | 49,293 |
| 172 | 0204574N | CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT | 1,609 | | 1,609 |
| 173 | 0204575N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT | 37,524 | | 37,524 |
| 174 | 0205601N | HARM IMPROVEMENT | 30,045 | 1,900 | 31,945 |
| | | AARGM Derivative Program | | [1,900] | |
| 175 | 0205604N | TACTICAL DATA LINKS | 25,003 | | 25,003 |
| 176 | 0205620N | SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION | 41,803 | | 41,803 |
| 177 | 0205632N | MK-48 ADCAP | 28,438 | | 28,438 |
| 178 | 0205633N | AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS | 135,840 | 4,000 | 139,840 |
| | | Reduction of Weapon System Downtime Rapid Repair Structural Adhesives | | [4,000] | |
| 179 | 0205658N | NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM | 3,716 | | 3,716 |
| 180 | 0205675N | OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS | 72,031 | | 72,031 |
| 181 | 0206313M | MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 287,348 | | 287,348 |
| 182 | 0206623M | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS | 120,379 | | 120,379 |
| 183 | 0206624M | MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 17,057 | | 17,057 |
| 184 | 0206625M | USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP) | 30,167 | | 30,167 |
| 185 | 0207161N | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES | 2,298 | | 2,298 |
| 186 | 0207163N | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) | 3,604 | | 3,604 |
| 187 | 0208058N | JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV) | 8,431 | | 8,431 |
| 188 | 0301303N | MARITIME INTELLIGENCE | 0 | | 0 |
| 189 | 0301323N | COLLECTION MANAGEMENT | 0 | | 0 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 190 | 0301327N | TECHNICAL RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEILLANCE | 0 | | 0 |
| 191 | 0301372N | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - GDIP | 0 | | 0 |
| | 0301555N | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | | 0 |
| | 0301556N | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 192 | 0303109N | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE) | 474,009 | | 474,009 |
| 193 | 0303138N | CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES) | 45,513 | | 45,513 |
| 194 | 0303140N | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 24,226 | | 24,226 |
| 195 | 0303158M | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | 2,453 | | 2,453 |
| 196 | 0303158N | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | 4,139 | | 4,139 |
| 197 | 0305149N | COBRA JUDY | 62,061 | | 62,061 |
| 198 | 0305160N | NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC) | 28,094 | | 28,094 |
| 199 | 0305192N | MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES | 4,600 | | 4,600 |
| 200 | 0305204N | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 8,971 | | 8,971 |
| 201 | 0305205N | ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 0 | | 0 |
| 202 | 0305206N | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 46,208 | | 46,208 |
| 203 | 0305207N | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS ( C ) | 22,599 | | 22,599 |
| 204 | 0305208N | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 18,079 | | 18,079 |
| 205 | 0305220N | RQ-4 UAV | 465,839 | | 465,839 |
| 206 | 0305231N | MQ-8 UAV | 25,639 | | 25,639 |
| 207 | 0305232M | RQ-11 UAV | 553 | | 553 |
| 208 | 0305233N | RQ-7 UAV | 986 | | 986 |
| 209 | 0305234M | SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0) | 18,763 | | 18,763 |
| 210 | 0305234N | SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0) | 23,594 | | 23,594 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 211 | 0307207N | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) | 0 | | 0 |
| 212 | 0307217N | EP-3E REPLACEMENT (EPX) | 11,976 | | 11,976 |
| 213 | 0308601N | MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT | 8,028 | | 8,028 |
| 214 | 0702207N | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) | 14,675 | | 14,675 |
| 215 | 0702239N | AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 2,725 | | 2,725 |
| 216 | 0708011N | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 56,691 | 2,500 | 59,191 |
| | | Laser Optimization Remote Lighting Systems | | [2,500] | |
| 217 | 0708730N | MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH) | 0 | | 0 |
| 999 | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 1,258,018 | | 1,258,018 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, RDT&E** | **4,302,584** | **17,170** | **4,319,754** |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E NAVY** | **19,270,932** | **351,596** | **19,622,528** |

Items of Special Interest

*Advanced energy storage technologies for unmanned undersea vehicles*

The budget request contained $91.4 million in PE 62123N for force protection applied research, containing $43.6 million for the development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical technology, but contained no funds for advanced energy storage technologies for unmanned undersea vehicles.

The committee notes the 2004 Navy Unmanned Undersea Vehicle (UUV) Master Plan highlights advanced energy storage as a critical technology necessary for supporting unmanned undersea operational requirements. Additionally, the 2007 naval science and technology strategic plan lists power and energy as a key focus area for energy assurance to improve maritime freedom of action. The committee agrees that to meet growing maritime threats, current and future naval forces' require energy and propulsion capabilities that provide sufficient power for endurance, range, and speed requirements for the next generation of UUVs.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62123N for the development of advanced energy storage and propulsion technologies for use in UUVs.

*Advanced linear accelerator facility*

The budget request contained $74.9 million in PE 11221N for strategic sub and weapons systems support, but included no funds for the Crane linear accelerator (LINAC) facility.

The committee notes that the linear accelerator simulates the high radiation environment in space and is a critical tool for testing the effectiveness of electronic systems that are deployed in space.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.2 million in PE 11221N for the completion of the LINAC facility and urges the Navy to use this research facility in coordination with the goals of the Joint Radiation Hardened Electronics Oversight Council.

*Advanced steam turbine*

The budget request contained $1.7 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development but contained no funding for development of the advanced steam turbine.

The committee supports developing multiple technologies for improved competition in the procurement of major equipment for ships and submarines. Developing improved magnetic bearing assemblies would provide a secondary turbine source for improved competition in Virginia class submarines construction.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 63513N for qualification of magnetic bearing assemblies in advanced steam turbines.

*Automated fiber optic manufacturing initiative for Navy ships*

The budget request contained $90.0 million in PE 64567N for ship contract design and live fire test and evaluation, but included no funds for automated fiber optic manufacturing initiative for Navy ships.

The committee understands the benefits of optical fiber and notes its growing use in a number of current and future defense platforms, including communication components for tactical shipboard applications. The committee further notes that current technology for the manufacture of fiber optic cable assemblies requires a complex process performed manually adding costs to production and field maintenance. The committee applauds the recently completed efforts by the Office of Naval Research manufacturing technology program to develop an automated process to produce high quality factory terminated fiber optic assemblies. The committee understands challenges remain affecting larger scale deployment of fiber optic technology aboard naval ships.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.2 million in PE 64567N for the continued development of automated fiber optic manufacturing initiative for Navy ships.

*Common command and control system module*

The budget request contained $154.8 million in PE 64558N for new design SSN but contained no funding for development of a common command and control system module (CCCS) for advanced submarine construction.

The committee understands that development of a common command and control system module for use on Virginia class submarines (Blk IV/V), SSGN's, and the Ohio class submarine replacement program will allow for rapid integration of new technologies due to the highly reconfigurable CCCS.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 64558N for development of common command and control system module.

*Continuous active sonar for torpedo systems*

The budget request contained $57.5 million in PE 63506N but contained no funding for continuous active sonar (CAS) technology.

The committee understands that CAS technology has been shown to maximize sound energy on target allowing lower source levels than used in current pulsed mid-frequency sonar system. This technology has the potential to significantly enhance the ability to detect, classify, and localize (DCL) incoming hostile torpedoes.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63506N for continuous active sonar technology for torpedo DCL systems.

*Deployable autonomous distributed system*

The budget request contained $24.8 million in PE 24311N for integrated surveillance system but contained no funding for continued development of deployable autonomous distributed system (DADS).

The committee understands that development of a deployable network of acoustic sensors which can be delivered from multiple platforms is essential to combat the threat posed by increasingly quiet diesel electric and nuclear powered submarines in high contact density littoral environments.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.6 million in PE 24311N for continued development and testing of deployable distributed systems.

*Electronic warfare technology, doctrine and tactics development*

The budget request contained $97.6 million in PE 64270N for electronic warfare development.

The committee notes that electronic warfare is one of the many critical components that contribute to successful U.S. military operations. The committee believes that the Department of Defense must be able to jointly exploit the full range of the electromagnetic spectrum while denying the same capability to our enemies. However, given the multiple approaches being implemented within each of the military services regarding electronic warfare, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense, as a whole, lacks a comprehensive and coherent electronic warfare acquisition and implementation strategy.

The committee notes that the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, at the request of the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, directed an Electronic Warfare Capabilities Based Assessment that subsequently identified serious capability gaps that should be addressed by the military departments. The study notes that each of the military departments faces unique challenges in four main areas: sustaining and modernizing legacy electronic warfare equipment and assets; investing in critical electronic warfare technologies to counter emerging and future threats; training and equipping warfighters to conduct electronic warfare operations in any conflict environment; and, coordinating joint electronic warfare capabilities and operations with the other military departments.

For example, the Department of the Army is rebuilding its electronic warfare community and capability and in February 2009 issued a doctrinal manual for electronic warfare operations. However, the Army is years away from reestablishing necessary electronic warfare expertise and the Army did not coordinate or consult with either the Joint Staff or the other military departments prior to the release of its doctrinal manual. The Department of the Air Force has been slow to determine its stand-off jammer requirements to meet established electronic warfare capabilities and has been unable to provide the congressional defense committees its mitigation plan to fulfill that capability gap. The Department of the Navy is successfully replacing the EA–6B Prowler with the EA–18G Growler, but faces challenges in developing its next-generation electronic attack capabilities and upgrading its ship electronic warfare systems. Finally, the Marine Corps is trying to fully integrate electronic warfare throughout its force, but challenges exist regarding required fiscal resources and plans for its next generation of electronic warfare systems.

The committee looks forward to working with the Department of Defense on the recommendations identified in this study and recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64270N for electronic warfare technology. The committee also includes a provision in title X of this Act that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report concerning the electronic warfare strategy of the Department of Defense.

*Extended range joint stand-off weapon*

The budget request contained $10.0 million in PE 64727N for joint stand-off weapon systems, but contained no funds for the extended range joint stand-off weapon (JSOW-ER).

The committee understands the Navy has a requirement for a certain number of aircraft launched weapons to engage targets beyond a range of 70 nautical miles, and that the Navy currently fills that requirement with the Expanded Response Stand-off Land Attack Missile (SLAM–ER), Harpoon missile, and Tomahawk missile. The committee notes that the engine from the Miniature Air-Launched Decoy program could be integrated into a Joint Stand-off Weapon (JSOW) and could engage targets at more than four times the current range of the JSOW missile and be more cost-effective than current long-range stand-off missiles.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in PE 64727N for development of JSOW–ER.

*Future generation thinline towed array*

The budget request contained $560.8 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine development but contained no funding for modernization efforts to produce the future generation thinline towed array.

The committee understands that the TB 29A thinline towed array system is the world's premier undersea acoustic sensor and is in use on all classes of U.S. submarines. The TB 29A delivers unprecedented information to the commander and has unique capability, in concert with the ships' sonar and fire control system, to detect, locate, and classify the most challenging targets in the most challenging acoustic environment. However, the current thinline array is susceptible to failure of telemetry components due to frequent deployment and retrieval. Additional funding is required to redesign electronic connectors in the array to significantly improve array reliability.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.7 million in PE 63561N for development of improved components of the thinline towed array.

*High density power conversion and distribution equipment*

The budget request contained $5.6 million in PE 63573N for advanced surface machinery systems but contained no funding for development of high density power conversion and distribution equipment.

The committee understands that surface ships' electrical distribution systems are being tasked due to the increased demand for electrical energy from new equipment and weapons systems. Increasing voltage and current requirements require advances in switchboard design, current interruptions devices, and distribution systems. Additional funding will allow for proof of concept and prototype development for new systems with the capacity to handle the increased electrical loading of naval surface ships.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.4 million in PE 63573N for development of high density power conversion and distribution equipment.

*High-Integrity Global Positioning System*

The budget request contained $59.1 million in PE 63235N for the High-Integrity Global Positioning System (HIGPS).

HIGPS is designed to develop the technology required to demonstrate the capability to use the existing Iridium satellite con-

stellation to enhance current GPS navigation and timing capabilities. The benefits of this approach have not been sufficiently proven. Therefore, the committee does not recommend funding for this request.

The committee recommends no funds in PE 63235N for the High-Integrity Global Positioning System, a decrease of $59.1 million from the budget request.

*Hybrid electric drive*

The budget request contained $5.6 million in PE 63573N for advanced surface machinery systems but contained no funding for continued development and testing of hybrid electric drive systems for surface combatants.

Hybrid electric drive systems have the potential to realize significant savings in total overall fuel consumption for surface combatants by allowing a much more efficient drive system, coupled directly to the ships' reduction gears, to propel the ship during periods of position keeping, loiter, and low speed patrol. The committee believes the advancement of this promising technology is vital in the effort to reduce operation and maintenance costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63573N for the continued development of hybrid electric drive technology for surface combatants.

*Laser module assembly for Navy's acoustic sensors*

The budget request contained $551.8 million in PE 63561N for advance submarine system development but contained no funding for continued development and test of a low cost laser module assembly for Navy acoustic sensors.

The committee remains concerned with a closing acoustic advantage gap enjoyed by the U.S. submarine force with the advent of increasingly quiet diesel-electric drive submarines proliferating throughout the world. To ensure our forces maintain an acoustic advantage against potential adversaries, the committee supports research and development efforts exploring new technologies in acoustic and non-acoustic detection, classification, and localization. The committee understands the significant increase in capability that would be realized with the maturity of laser technology in acoustic detection systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63561N for the development of a low cost laser module assembly for use with navy acoustic sensors.

*Marine Corps assault vehicles*

The budget request contained $293.5 million in PE 63611M for expeditionary fighting vehicle (EFV) research and development.

The committee recognizes the need for the Marine Corps to develop and field a new amphibious tracked vehicle in support of the national military strategy requirement for amphibious forcible entry capability. In addition, the committee recognizes the potential risk to Navy ships in some contingencies inherent in the limited off-shore range of the Marine Corps' current amphibious assault vehicle, which was first introduced in the early 1970s.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

2009, the committee noted its concern with the level of protection against improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and mine threats provided by the EFV's design. Given the ubiquity of IED attacks in current conflicts, the committee did not believe that a flat-bottom EFV design would provide an adequate level of protection. In response to these concerns, and after conducting a review of protection enhancement options, the Marine Corps committed to developing an armor appliqué kit for EFVs that could significantly enhance the vehicle's protection against IEDs. The committee supports this effort to improve the vehicle's protection against this threat.

Further, the committee believes that the EFV should achieve a protection level against IEDs equivalent to, or better than, the protection level of the heaviest mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles in service today prior to low-rate production beginning for the EFV. Given the high probability that Marines operating EFVs in future conflicts will face the threat of IEDs, the committee believes that achieving this standard of protection for the vehicle should be a major factor in Department of Defense oversight of the EFV program. In addition, the committee is aware that there are design changes, such as a flat-bed engine and other armor solutions, which could afford additional protection when compared to the current EFV appliqué armor kit design. The committee believes that these and other survivability improvements could be implemented as a product improvement program, even if not incorporated in the initial production design.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit, by February 15, 2010, a report to the congressional defense committees on survivability design aspects of the EFV and its level of protection in comparison to MRAP vehicles, against a range of threats, including but not limited to IEDs, mines, rocket propelled grenades, and anti-tank guided missiles. This report should also include analysis of EFV survivability improvement options beyond the armor appliqué kit, and the potential requirements, cost, and schedule implications of EFV improvements that could better protect against mine and IED threats.

The committee recommends $293.5 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63611M for EFV research and development.

*Marine mammal awareness, alert, and response systems*

The budget request contained $16.6 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare systems development but contained no funds for the marine mammal awareness, alert, and response systems.

The committee remains concerned with both the need to protect marine mammals from adverse effects of mid-frequency sonar and the need for the Navy to train using mid-frequency sonar in a realistic environment. The committee understands that development of the marine mammal awareness, alert, and response system would significantly increase the Navy's ability to monitor marine mammal activity in the vicinity of training exercises using mid-frequency sonar.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63254N for the development of the marine mammal awareness, alert, and response system.

*Mold-in-place coating development for the U.S. submarine fleet*

The budget request contained $154.8 million in PE 64558N for new design SSN but contained no additional funding to complete mold-in-place efforts for submarine bow domes.

The committee has consistently supported efforts to qualify a non-autoclave process to produce non-pressure hull structures for submarines. A non-autoclave process to produce composite bow domes for submarines has been developed and has the potential for significant cost reduction savings. Additional funding is required to complete the bow dome system by developing and certifying a mold-in-place process for the manufacture of a rubber boot that will decouple the hydrodynamic flow of the bow dome from the ships' sonar receivers.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64558N for continued development of mold-in-place technology for a rubber isolation boot used in conjunction with a composite bow dome.

*Nanoelectronics, nanometrology and nanobiology initiative*

The budget request contained $413.7 million in PE 61153N for defense research sciences, but included no funds for the nanoelectronics, nanometrology and nanobiology initiative.

The committee believes that a wide range of new fundamental naval capabilities will depend on innovative concepts driven by nanotechnology development. The committee further believes that nanotechnology-based devices developed through merging electronic and biological functionalities will enable critical developments for high-performance sensors and medical capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61153N for the continued integration of nanotechnology-based capabilities through the nanoelectronics, nanometrology and nanobiology initiative.

*Remote fuel assessment system*

The budget request contained $104.1 million in PE 62236N for warfighter sustainment applied research, but included no funds for the development of a remote fuel assessment system (RFAS).

The committee recognizes the RFAS would provide the Marine Corps with a critical field capability to rapidly assess the quality of cached and secure fuel supplies at key distribution nodes without the extensive logistic support presently required in current overseas contingency operations. The committee understands this capability could be developed and demonstrated in a relatively short timeframe and could prove to be a critical combat enabler.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62236N for the rapid development and demonstration of RFAS technology.

*Standoff explosive detection system*

The budget request contained $91.4 million in PE 62123N for force protection applied research, but contained no funds for standoff explosive detection systems.

The standoff explosive detection system program would develop a mobile, vehicle mounted, improvised explosive device (IED) detector that would safely detect explosives in a buried IED from a safe

standoff distance of 20 meters. The committee is aware that IEDs are the primary weapons of choice by the insurgency operating in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee understands that IEDs are used as weapons of strategic and tactical influence and continue to account for the majority of casualties to the warfighter in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee supports rapid advances in IED detection and mitigation and would encourage joint solutions whenever possible.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62123N to begin the development of standoff explosives detection systems.

*Surface ship advanced capability build*

The budget request contained $178.5 million in PE 64307N for surface combatant combat system engineering, but contained no funds for surface ship open architecture advanced capability builds.

The committee understands that additional modeling activities in the current advance capability build will allow for risk mitigation in rapid capability insertion of processes for future combat system upgrades.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64307N for open architecture modeling for surface ship advanced capability builds.

*Trigger and alert sonobuoy system project*

The budget request contained $16.6 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare systems development but contained no funds for the trigger and alert sonobuoy system project.

The committee remains concerned with both the need to protect marine mammals from adverse effects of mid-frequency sonar and the need for the Navy to train using mid-frequency sonar in a realistic environment. The committee understands that the trigger and alert sonobuoy system project would provide invaluable information about marine mammals and their environment that could not be gained by other means and would lead directly to methods to improve the Navy's ability to mitigate impacts on the marine environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63254N for the trigger and alert sonobuoy system project.

*VH–71 Presidential helicopter program*

The budget request contained $85.2 million for cancellation costs of the VH–71 Presidential helicopter recapitalization program recently terminated by the Secretary of Defense.

The committee understands that the Secretary of Defense announced on April 6, 2009 the cancellation of the VH–71 program based on excessive cost growth and schedule delays. The committee is disappointed that the Navy has invested $3.3 billion in this program to date. The committee is also disappointed that the Navy's acquisition system was not provided adequate support, resources, and authority by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the White House Military Office (WHMO) to execute a successful acquisition program. The committee understands that despite the many warnings and expert advice from the Government Accountability Office, Navy acquisition officials were directed by OSD and

WHMO to execute a schedule-driven program and were unable to adequately synchronize and adhere to prudent acquisition practices.

The committee supports a new acquisition plan which may incorporate more than a one platform solution to the needs of the President. The committee notes that a June 5, 2009 Congressional Research Service (CRS) report cites Navy estimates that a new acquisition program would cost $10.0 to $17.0 billion. Therefore, the committee strongly suggests that the Department of Defense consider continuing procurement of the current "increment 1" helicopter for use as the normal transport for the President, and study other alternatives for Presidential transport in other situations. The committee notes that this approach will leverage on the investment already made by the taxpayer in developing a helicopter that would meet all normal requirements of the President.

*Wave energy power buoy generating system*

The budget request contained $4.0 million in PE 63725N for facilities improvement but contained no funds for the wave energy power buoy generating system.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has many goals in place relating to the use of renewable energy for installations. The committee understands that the wave energy power buoy generating system will help the Department meet its renewable energy goals.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63725N for the wave energy power buoy generating system.

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

### Overview

The budget request contained $28.0 billion for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $28.5 billion, an increase of $500.0 million to the budget request.

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | |
| 001 | 0601102F | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 321,028 | | 321,028 |
| 002 | 0601103F | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 132,249 | | 132,249 |
| 003 | 0601108F | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 12,834 | | 12,834 |
| 004 | 0301555F | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 005 | 0301556F | SPECIAL PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, AIR FORCE** | **466,111** | **0** | **466,111** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | |
| 006 | 0602015F | MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| | | AFSOC Injury Prevention and Human Performance Initiative | | [1,000] | |
| 007 | 0602102F | MATERIALS | 127,957 | 5,000 | 132,957 |
| | | Rio Grande Valley Nanotech Institute | | [5,000] | |
| 008 | 0602201F | AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES | 127,129 | 8,500 | 135,629 |
| | | UAV Sensor and Maintenance Development | | [5,500] | |
| | | Unmanned Sense, Track, and Avoid Radar | | [3,000] | |
| 009 | 0602202F | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH | 85,122 | | 85,122 |
| 010 | 0602203F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION | 196,529 | 21,500 | 218,029 |
| | | Integrated Electric Starter | | [3,500] | |
| | | Advanced Lithium Battery Scale-Up and Manufacturing | | [10,000] | |
| | | Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center (AVPC) | | [3,000] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Multi-Mode Propulsion Phase IIA: High Performance Green Propellant | | [5,000] | |
| 011 | 0602204F | AEROSPACE SENSORS | 121,768 | 11,650 | 133,418 |
| | | Sensors and Near-Field Communications | | [2,900] | |
| | | Net-Centric Sensor Grids | | [3,000] | |
| | | Advanced Meta Materials | | [3,750] | |
| | | Information Quality Tools for Persistent Surveillance Data Sets | | [2,000] | |
| 012 | 0602601F | SPACE TECHNOLOGY | 104,148 | 4,800 | 108,948 |
| | | Advanced Modular Avionics for ORS Use | | [4,800] | |
| 013 | 0602602F | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 58,289 | | 58,289 |
| 014 | 0602605F | DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY | 105,677 | | 105,677 |
| 015 | 0602702F | COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS | 0 | | 0 |
| 016 | 0602788F | DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS | 115,278 | 1,000 | 116,278 |
| | | Cyber Boot Camp | | [1,000] | |
| 017 | 0602890F | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH | 52,754 | 2,000 | 54,754 |
| | | Advanced Deformable Mirrors for High Energy Laser Weapons | | [2,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, AIR FORCE** | **1,094,651** | **55,450** | **1,150,101** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 018 | 0603112F | ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS | 37,901 | 14,500 | 52,401 |
| | | Metals Affordability Initiative | | [10,000] | |
| | | Rapid Automated Processing of Advances Low Observables | | [4,500] | |
| 019 | 0603199F | SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) | 2,955 | | 2,955 |
| 020 | 0603203F | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS | 51,482 | 3,000 | 54,482 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Moving Target Strike | | [3,000] | |
| 021 | 0603211F | AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO | 76,844 | 8,000 | 84,844 |
| | | Long Loiter, Load Bearing Antenna Platform for Pervasive Airborne Intelligence | | [8,000] | |
| 022 | 0603216F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY | 175,676 | 9,200 | 184,876 |
| | | 150 Shaft HP Scaleable UAV Engine | | [5,000] | |
| | | Adaptable Integrated Vapor Cycle Based Environmental Control and Power System | | [4,200] | |
| 023 | 0603231F | CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| | | JSF Tactical Air Configuration Module | | [5,000] | |
| 024 | 0603270F | ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY | 31,021 | 1,500 | 32,521 |
| | | COTS Analysis Tools for Navigational Warfare | | [1,500] | |
| 025 | 0603401F | ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY | 83,909 | 6,500 | 90,409 |
| | | Department of Defense Cubesat Bus Development | | [2,000] | |
| | | Small Responsive Spacecraft at Low-Cost (SRSL) | | [4,500] | |
| 026 | 0603444F | MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS) | 5,813 | | 5,813 |
| 027 | 0603456F | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 24,565 | | 24,565 |
| 028 | 0603601F | CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 14,356 | | 14,356 |
| 029 | 0603605F | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 30,056 | | 30,056 |
| 030 | 0603680F | MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 39,913 | 15,700 | 55,613 |
| | | Nano-Composite and Structures Manufacturing Technology Development | | [4,000] | |
| | | Repair Technology Insertion Program | | [5,200] | |
| | | Advanced Integrated Structrure for Affordable Transport Aircraft | | [3,000] | |
| | | Production of Nanocomposites for Aerospace Applications | | [3,500] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 031 | 0603788F | BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | 39,708 | 5,000 | 44,708 |
| | | Cyber Attack and Security Environment | | [5,000] | |
| 032 | 0603789F | C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| 033 | 0603924F | HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 3,831 | | 3,831 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, AIR FORCE** | **618,030** | **68,400** | **686,430** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | |
| 034 | 0603260F | INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 5,009 | | 5,009 |
| 035 | 0603287F | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 3,623 | | 3,623 |
| 036 | 0603421F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III | 0 | | 0 |
| 037 | 0603423F | GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III - OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| 038 | 0603430F | ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 464,335 | | 464,335 |
| 039 | 0603432F | POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 253,150 | | 253,150 |
| 040 | 0603438F | SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY | 97,701 | | 97,701 |
| 041 | 0603742F | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | 27,252 | | 27,252 |
| 042 | 0603790F | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 4,351 | | 4,351 |
| 043 | 0603791F | INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D | 632 | | 632 |
| 044 | 0603845F | TRANSFORMATIONAL SATCOM (TSAT) | 0 | | 0 |
| 045 | 0603850F | INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE | 20,739 | | 20,739 |
| 046 | 0603851F | INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE | 66,079 | | 66,079 |
| 047 | 0603854F | WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE) | 70,956 | | 70,956 |
| 048 | 0603859F | POLLUTION PREVENTION | 2,896 | | 2,896 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 049 | 0603860F | JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS | 23,174 | | 23,174 |
| 050 | 0604015F | NEXT GENERATION BOMBER | 0 | | 0 |
| 051 | 0604283F | BATTLE MGMT COM & CTRL SENSOR DEVELOPMENT | 22,612 | | 22,612 |
| 052 | 0604327F | HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM | 20,891 | | 20,891 |
| 053 | 0604330F | JOINT DUAL ROLE AIR DOMINANCE MISSILE | 6,882 | | 6,882 |
| 054 | 0604337F | REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION (NON-SPACE/SPACE) | 35,533 | | 35,533 |
| 055 | 0604635F | GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT | 18,778 | | 18,778 |
| 056 | 0604796F | ALTERNATIVE FUELS | 89,020 | 8,500 | 97,520 |
| | | Bio-Diesel Algae Fuel Production Program | | [3,000] | |
| | | Advanced Propulsion Non-Tactical Vehicle | | [5,500] | |
| 057 | 0604830F | AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING | 43,158 | | 43,158 |
| 058 | 0604856F | COMMON AERO VEHICLE (CAV) | 0 | | 0 |
| 059 | 0604857F | OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE | 112,861 | 23,400 | 136,261 |
| | | Program Increase | | [23,400] | |
| 060 | 0604858F | TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM | 9,611 | | 9,611 |
| 061 | 0305178F | NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM (NPOESS) | 396,641 | | 396,641 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, AIR FORCE** | **1,795,884** | **31,900** | **1,827,784** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | |
| 062 | 0603840F | GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS) | 31,124 | | 31,124 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 063 | 0604222F | NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT | 37,860 | | 37,860 |
| 064 | 0604226F | B-1B | 0 | | 0 |
| 065 | 0604233F | SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING | 6,227 | | 6,227 |
| 066 | 0604240F | B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER | 0 | 14,600 | 14,600 |
| | | Advanced Data Link | | [14,600] | |
| 067 | 0604261F | PERSONNEL RECOVERY SYSTEMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 068 | 0604270F | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 97,275 | 4,900 | 102,175 |
| | | Rapid Replacement of Mission Critical Logistics Electronics | | [4,900] | |
| 069 | 0604281F | TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE | 88,444 | | 88,444 |
| 070 | 0604287F | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 50 | | 50 |
| 071 | 0604329F | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) | 153,815 | | 153,815 |
| 072 | 0604421F | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS | 64,248 | | 64,248 |
| 073 | 0604425F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS | 308,134 | | 308,134 |
| 074 | 0604429F | AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK | 11,107 | | 11,107 |
| 075 | 0604441F | SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD | 512,642 | | 512,642 |
| 076 | 0604443F | THIRD GENERATION INFRARED SURVEILLANCE (3GIRS) | 143,169 | -20,000 | 123,169 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-20,000] | |
| 077 | 0604602F | ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 18,671 | | 18,671 |
| 078 | 0604604F | SUBMUNITIONS | 1,784 | | 1,784 |
| 079 | 0604617F | AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT | 11,261 | 2,900 | 14,161 |
| | | Backpack Medical Oxygen System | | [2,900] | |
| 080 | 0604706F | LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS | 10,711 | 7,000 | 17,711 |
| | | ACES 5 Ejection Seat | | [7,000] | |
| 081 | 0604735F | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | 29,718 | | 29,718 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 082 | 0604740F | INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A) | 10 | 7,000 | 7,010 |
| | | Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT) | | [7,000] | |
| 083 | 0604750F | INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT | 1,495 | | 1,495 |
| 084 | 0604800F | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) | 1,858,055 | 153,500 | 2,011,555 |
| | | F136 Engine Development | | [231,500] | |
| | | Program Excess | | [-78,000] | |
| 085 | 0604851F | INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE | 60,010 | | 60,010 |
| 086 | 0604853F | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE) | 26,545 | | 26,545 |
| 087 | 0605011F | RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT | 0 | | 0 |
| 088 | 0605221F | NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT | 439,615 | | 439,615 |
| 089 | 0605277F | CSAR-X RDT&E | 89,975 | -75,000 | 14,975 |
| | | Unjustified Request for HH-60M | | [-75,000] | |
| 090 | 0605278F | HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E | 20,582 | | 20,582 |
| 091 | 0605452F | JOINT SIAP EXECUTIVE PROGRAM OFFICE | 34,877 | | 34,877 |
| 092 | 0207434F | LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| 093 | 0207450F | E-10 SQUADRONS | 0 | | 0 |
| 094 | 0207451F | SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) | 13,466 | | 13,466 |
| 095 | 0207701F | FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING | 99,807 | | 99,807 |
| 096 | 0305176F | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR | 0 | | 0 |
| 097 | 0401138F | JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA) | 9,353 | | 9,353 |
| 098 | 0401318F | CV-22 | 19,640 | | 19,640 |
| 099 | 0401845F | AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S) | 20,056 | | 20,056 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, AIR FORCE** | **4,219,726** | **94,900** | **4,314,626** |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | |
| 100 | 0604256F | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 27,789 | | 27,789 |
| 101 | 0604759F | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 60,824 | 3,000 | 63,824 |
| | | Eglin AFB Range Operations Control Center | | [3,000] | |
| 102 | 0605101F | RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE | 27,501 | | 27,501 |
| 103 | 0605502F | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 104 | 0605712F | INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION | 25,833 | | 25,833 |
| 105 | 0605807F | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 736,488 | | 736,488 |
| 106 | 0605860F | ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE) | 14,637 | | 14,637 |
| 107 | 0605864F | SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP) | 47,215 | | 47,215 |
| 108 | 0605976F | FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 52,409 | | 52,409 |
| 109 | 0605978F | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 29,683 | 1,750 | 31,433 |
| | | Computer-Control Upgrade to the BAK-12 | | [1,750] | |
| 110 | 0702806F | ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 18,947 | | 18,947 |
| 111 | 0804731F | GENERAL SKILL TRAINING | 1,450 | | 1,450 |
| 112 | 0909999F | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | | 0 |
| 113 | 1001004F | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES | 3,748 | | 3,748 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, AIR FORCE** | **1,046,524** | **4,750** | **1,051,274** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 114 | 0604263F | COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM | 9,513 | | 9,513 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 115 | 0605024F | ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY | 47,276 | | 47,276 |
| 116 | 0605798F | ANALYSIS SUPPORT GROUP | 0 | | 0 |
| 117 | 0101113F | B-52 SQUADRONS | 93,930 | | 93,930 |
| 118 | 0101122F | AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | 3,652 | | 3,652 |
| 119 | 0101126F | B-1B SQUADRONS | 148,025 | | 148,025 |
| 120 | 0101127F | B-2 SQUADRONS | 415,414 | | 415,414 |
| 121 | 0101313F | STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM | 33,836 | | 33,836 |
| 122 | 0101314F | NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM | 5,328 | | 5,328 |
| 123 | 0101815F | ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | 0 | 1,250 | 1,250 |
| | | DaVinci Project | | [1,250] | |
| 124 | 0102325F | ATMOSPHERIC EARLY WARNING SYSTEM | 9,832 | | 9,832 |
| 125 | 0102326F | REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 25,734 | | 25,734 |
| 126 | 0102823F | STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES | 18 | | 18 |
| 127 | 0203761F | WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND | 11,996 | | 11,996 |
| 128 | 0205219F | MQ-9 UAV | 39,245 | | 39,245 |
| 129 | 0207040F | MULTI-PLATFORM ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT | 14,747 | | 14,747 |
| 130 | 0207131F | A-10 SQUADRONS | 9,697 | | 9,697 |
| 131 | 0207133F | F-16 SQUADRONS | 141,020 | | 141,020 |
| 132 | 0207134F | F-15E SQUADRONS | 311,167 | 2,000 | 313,167 |
| | | Corrosion Detection and Visualization Program | | [2,000] | |
| 133 | 0207136F | MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION | 10,748 | | 10,748 |
| 134 | 0207138F | F-22A SQUADRONS | 569,345 | | 569,345 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 135 | 0207161F | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES | 5,915 | | 5,915 |
| 136 | 0207163F | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) | 49,971 | | 49,971 |
| 137 | 0207170F | JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS) | 2,529 | | 2,529 |
| 138 | 0207227F | COMBAT RESCUE - PARARESCUE | 2,950 | | 2,950 |
| 139 | 0207247F | AF TENCAP | 11,643 | | 11,643 |
| 140 | 0207249F | PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT | 2,950 | | 2,950 |
| 141 | 0207253F | COMPASS CALL | 13,019 | | 13,019 |
| 142 | 0207268F | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 166,563 | | 166,563 |
| 143 | 0207277F | CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM | 4,621 | | 4,621 |
| 144 | 0207325F | JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM) | 29,494 | | 29,494 |
| 145 | 0207410F | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) | 99,405 | | 99,405 |
| 146 | 0207412F | CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC) | 52,508 | | 52,508 |
| 147 | 0207417F | AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) | 176,040 | | 176,040 |
| 148 | 0207418F | TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 149 | 0207423F | ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS/JTRS | 63,782 | | 63,782 |
| 150 | 0207424F | EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM ( C ) | 0 | | 0 |
| 151 | 0207431F | COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES | 1,475 | | 1,475 |
| 152 | 0207438F | THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I | 19,067 | | 19,067 |
| 153 | 0207445F | FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK | 72,106 | | 72,106 |
| 154 | 0207446F | BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK | 0 | | 0 |
| 155 | 0207448F | C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK | 1,667 | | 1,667 |
| 156 | 0207449F | COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION | 26,792 | | 26,792 |
| 157 | 0207581F | JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS) | 140,670 | | 140,670 |
| 158 | 0207590F | SEEK EAGLE | 22,071 | | 22,071 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 159 | 0207601F | USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION | 27,245 | | 27,245 |
| 160 | 0207605F | WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS | 7,018 | | 7,018 |
| 161 | 0207697F | DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES | 6,740 | | 6,740 |
| 162 | 0208006F | MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | 91,995 | | 91,995 |
| 163 | 0208021F | INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT | 12,271 | | 12,271 |
| 164 | 0208161F | SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM | 0 | | 0 |
| 165 | 0301310F | NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER | 0 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| | | Open Source Research Centers | | [4,000] | |
| 166 | 0301314F | COBRA BALL | 0 | | 0 |
| 167 | 0301315F | MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION | 0 | 4,800 | 4,800 |
| | | Technical Sensors Integrated Ground Station | | [4,800] | |
| 168 | 0301324F | FOREST GREEN | 0 | | 0 |
| 169 | 0301386F | GDIP COLLECTION MANAGEMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| 170 | 0302015F | E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC) | 26,107 | | 26,107 |
| 171 | 0303112F | AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM) | 0 | | 0 |
| 172 | 0303131F | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) | 72,694 | | 72,694 |
| 173 | 0303140F | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 196,621 | | 196,621 |
| 174 | 0303141F | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 3,375 | | 3,375 |
| 175 | 0303150F | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 3,149 | | 3,149 |
| 176 | 0303158F | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | 3,087 | | 3,087 |
| 177 | 0303601F | MILSATCOM TERMINALS | 257,693 | | 257,693 |
| 179 | 0304260F | AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE | 176,989 | | 176,989 |
| 180 | 0304311F | SELECTED ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 181 | 0304348F | ADVANCED GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE (AGI) | 0 | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| | | Advanced Technical Intelligence Center | | [9,000] | |
| 182 | 0305099F | GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM) | 6,028 | 3,300 | 9,328 |
| | | Carbon Nanotube Enhanced Power Sources for Space | | [3,300] | |
| 183 | 0305103F | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 2,065 | | 2,065 |
| 184 | 0305110F | SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE) | 20,991 | | 20,991 |
| 185 | 0305111F | WEATHER SERVICE | 33,531 | | 33,531 |
| 186 | 0305114F | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS) | 9,006 | | 9,006 |
| 187 | 0305116F | AERIAL TARGETS | 54,807 | | 54,807 |
| 188 | 0305124F | SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| 189 | 0305127F | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 190 | 0305128F | SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES | 742 | | 742 |
| 191 | 0305142F | APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION | 0 | | 0 |
| 192 | 0305146F | DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 39 | | 39 |
| 194 | 0305164F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE) | 137,692 | | 137,692 |
| 195 | 0305165F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS) | 52,039 | | 52,039 |
| 196 | 0305172F | COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS | 0 | | 0 |
| 197 | 0305173F | SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER | 3,599 | | 3,599 |
| 198 | 0305174F | SPACE WARFARE CENTER | 3,009 | | 3,009 |
| 199 | 0305182F | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE) | 9,957 | | 9,957 |
| 200 | 0305193F | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) | 1,240 | | 1,240 |
| 201 | 0305202F | DRAGON U-2 | 0 | | 0 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 202 | 0305205F | ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 73,736 | | 73,736 |
| 203 | 0305206F | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 143,892 | 7,500 | 151,392 |
| | | Multiple UAS Cooperative Concentrated Observation and Engagement Against a Common Ground Objective | | [7,500] | |
| 204 | 0305207F | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 12,846 | 2,500 | 15,346 |
| | | Rivet Joint Services Oriented Architecture (SOA) | | [2,500] | |
| 205 | 0305208F | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 82,765 | | 82,765 |
| 206 | 0305219F | MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV | 18,101 | | 18,101 |
| 207 | 0305220F | RQ-4 UAV | 317,316 | | 317,316 |
| 208 | 0305221F | NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING | 8,160 | | 8,160 |
| 209 | 0305265F | GPS III SPACE SEGMENT | 815,095 | | 815,095 |
| 210 | 0305614F | JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM | 131,271 | | 131,271 |
| 211 | 0305887F | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE | 5,267 | | 5,267 |
| 212 | 0305906F | NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM | 0 | | 0 |
| 213 | 0305913F | NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE) | 84,021 | | 84,021 |
| 214 | 0305924F | NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE | 10,634 | | 10,634 |
| 215 | 0305940F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS | 54,648 | | 54,648 |
| 216 | 0307141F | INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOPMENT | 30,076 | | 30,076 |
| 217 | 0308699F | SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW) | 3,082 | | 3,082 |
| 218 | 0401115F | C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON | 201,250 | | 201,250 |
| 219 | 0401119F | C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF) | 95,266 | | 95,266 |
| 220 | 0401130F | C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF) | 161,855 | | 161,855 |
| 221 | 0401132F | C-130J PROGRAM | 30,019 | | 30,019 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 222 | 0401134F | LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM) | 31,784 | | 31,784 |
| 223 | 0401218F | KC-135S | 10,297 | | 10,297 |
| 224 | 0401219F | KC-10S | 35,586 | | 35,586 |
| 225 | 0401221F | KC-135 TANKER REPLACEMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| 226 | 0401314F | OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT | 4,916 | -4,916 | 0 |
| | | Unjustified Requirement for PAR | | [-4,916] | |
| 227 | 0401839F | AIR MOBILITY TACTICAL DATA LINK | 0 | | 0 |
| 228 | 0408011F | SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL | 8,222 | 2,700 | 10,922 |
| | | Special Mission Clothing for AFSOC | | [2,700] | |
| 229 | 0702207F | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) | 1,508 | | 1,508 |
| 230 | 0702976F | FACILITIES RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION - LOGISTICS | 0 | | 0 |
| 231 | 0708011F | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 0 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| | | Wire Integrity Technology | | [2,000] | |
| 232 | 0708610F | LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT) | 246,483 | | 246,483 |
| 233 | 0708611F | SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 6,288 | 11,200 | 17,488 |
| | | Warner-Robins Air Logistics Center Streamlined Processes | | [4,200] | |
| | | Micro-Grid Energy Storage Utilizing a Deployable Zinc-Bromide Flow Battery | | [5,000] | |
| | | ALC Logistics Integration Environment | | [2,000] | |
| 234 | 0804743F | OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING | 805 | | 805 |
| 235 | 0804757F | JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER | 3,220 | | 3,220 |
| 236 | 0804772F | TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS | 1,769 | | 1,769 |
| 237 | 0808716F | OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES | 116 | | 116 |
| 238 | 0901202F | JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY | 6,376 | | 6,376 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 239 | 0901212F | SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT (NOT OTHERWISE ACCOUNTED FOR) | 0 | | 0 |
| 240 | 0901218F | CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM | 8,174 | | 8,174 |
| 241 | 0901220F | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | 10,492 | | 10,492 |
| 242 | 0901538F | FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 55,991 | | 55,991 |
| 999 | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 11,955,084 | 215,000 | 12,170,084 |
| | | Program Inrease | | [215,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, AIR FORCE** | **18,751,901** | **260,334** | **19,012,235** |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E AIR FORCE** | **27,992,827** | **515,734** | **28,508,561** |

Items of Special Interest

*Advanced Modular Avionics for Operationally Responsive Space Use*

The budget request contained $104.1 million in PE 62601F for space technology, but contained no funding for the Advanced Modular Avionics for Operationally Responsive Space Use project.

Developing modern modular avionics systems will enable a dynamic input/output capability for a variety of satellite systems, thereby bringing interoperability and interchangeability to systems on tactical satellites.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in PE 62601F for the Advanced Modular Avionics for Operationally Responsive Space Use project.

*Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center*

The budget request contained $196.5 million in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion, but contained no funding for the Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center (AVPC).

The AVPC initiative is a unique, world-class analytical environment for engineering, design, and development of current and future propulsion systems, space vehicles, missiles, and advanced weapon concepts at Edwards Air Force Base in California. The center could save the Air Force millions of dollars in future program costs through the integration of the best engineering, design, analysis, and cost tools from government, industry, and academia and by providing uniquely sophisticated system optimization and support.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62203F for the Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center.

*Air Force test and evaluation support*

The budget request contained $736.5 million in PE 65807F for Air Force test and evaluation support.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2010 request for Air Force test and evaluation is $57.9 million below the level projected in the fiscal year 2009 budget request. The committee further notes that the other six program elements that support Air Force test and evaluation were a combined $24.4 million below fiscal year 2009 budget projections. The committee is concerned that these reductions could, over time, reduce the Air Force's ability to provide adequate test and evaluation support, and that such a lack of support could negatively impact numerous critical Department of Defense programs. In addition, the committee notes that fiscal year 2010 budget request materials do not show future year's funding for this program, making it impossible for the committee to fully evaluate the Air Force's long term plans. Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Test Resource Management Center to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by February 15, 2010, laying out the potential negative impacts of projected funding levels for the Air Force test and evaluation program.

The committee recommends $736.5 million, the full amount requested, in PE 65807F for Air Force test and evaluation support.

*Battle Control Center Acquisition Strategy*

Battle Control System-Mobile (BCS–M) is the ground-based tactical command and control system for theater air defense, airspace management, aircraft identification, surveillance, and tactical data link management. BCS–M modernizes the Theater Air Control System's (TACS) aging Control and Reporting Center. The command and control operations center-piece of BCS–M is known as Battle Control Center (BCC). The original Air Force acquisition strategy for the BCC intended to capitalize on the common software architecture baseline of the BCS-Fixed North American Air Defense Command air defense system, which achieved initial operational capability on October 31, 2006.

The committee notes that the Air Force terminated the BCC portion of the BCS-Mobile in September 2008, due to budget constraints. Air Combat Command has stated its intent to conduct an analysis of alternatives to validate a revised BCC roadmap in order to include a new program in the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2010, on the Air Force's plan to leverage investments made in the BCS-Fixed air defense program into the follow-on BCC program. The report should include an analysis of the investment already made in the BCC, the costs of a new start program, and the plan to ensure software and hardware commonality between the BCS-Fixed and the follow-on BCC programs.

*Cyber Boot Camp*

The budget request contained $115.3 million in PE 62788F for the enhancement of command, control, and communications systems within the Air Force, including funds to support the Advanced Course in Engineering (ACE) Cyber Boot Camp summer program for the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC).

The committee is encouraged by efforts at the Air Force Research Laboratory Rome Research Site (AFRL/RRS) to develop educational curriculum to train the future workforce of cyber operations experts. The mission of the ACE is to develop ROTC cadets into cyber officers. ACE represents the only cyber education offered by the Department of Defense for ROTC cadets. ACE is a 10-week summer program consisting of classes, on-the-job mentoring, and officer development that targets the top students in computer-related disciplines and teaches them to become original thinkers, problem solvers, and technical leaders. The committee recognizes that this program is vital to ensuring a robust information technology workforce that is capable of handling cyber threats to our systems. The committee believes the ACE Cyber Boot Camp should be expanded beyond the Air Force to include ROTC cadets from the other military services.

The committee recommends $116.3 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 62788F for AFRL/RRS to support the expansion of the ACE Cyber Boot curriculum to other service ROTC participants, and to provide for additional 10-week courses to accommodate this expansion.

*Department of Defense Cubesat Bus Development*

The budget request contained $83.9 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but contained no funding for the Department of Defense Cubesat Bus Development project.

The Department of Defense Cubesat Bus Development project would contribute to the development of smaller and more agile national space surveillance assets that deliver space-based capabilities at substantially lower cost than current systems. The project would perform fundamental research, development, testing, and validation of domestic source, low-cost key system components comprised of flight computers, power switching hardware, and spacecraft attitude determination and control hardware.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63401F for the Department of Defense Cubesat Bus Development project.

*F–35*

The budget request contained $1.9 billion in PE 64800F, and $1.7 billion in PE 64800N, for development of the F–35, but contained no funds for development of a competitive F–35 propulsion system. The committee notes that the aggregate amount requested for F–35 development is $1.4 billion higher than projected last year, and that $476.0 million of that amount conforms to increases recommended by a recent joint estimating team, and understands this amount will be used primarily for management reserve. The budget request also contained $2.0 billion for procurement of 10 F–35As and $300.6 million for F–35 advance procurement in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, but contained no funds for either procurement of competitive F–35 propulsion systems or for advance procurement of competitive F–35 propulsion system long-lead components. Additionally, the budget request contained $4.0 billion for the procurement of 16 F–35Bs and four F–35Cs and $481.0 million for F–35 advance procurement in Aircraft Procurement, Navy, but contained funds for neither procurement of competitive propulsion systems nor advance procurement of competitive F–35 competitive F–35 propulsion systems long-lead components. The Aircraft Procurement, Navy budget request also contained $1.3 billion for spares and repair parts.

The competitive F–35 propulsion system program is developing the F136 engine, which would provide a competitive alternative to the currently-planned F135 engine. For the past three years, in the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, in the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, and in the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee recommended increases for the F–35 competitive propulsion system, and notes that in all cases, the other three congressional defense committees also recommended increases for this purpose. Despite section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which requires the Secretary of Defense to obligate and expend sufficient annual amounts for the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the F–35, the committee is disappointed that

the Department of Defense (DOD) has, for the third consecutive year, chosen not to comply with both the spirit and intent of this provision by opting not to include funds for this purpose in the budget request.

The committee notes that the F135 engine development program has experienced cost growth since the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program began in fiscal year 2002. At the beginning of EMD in fiscal year 2002, the F135 engine development program was expected to cost $4.828 billion in then-year dollars. The F–35 program manager reports that as of the end of 2008, development costs have grown to $6.7 billion in then-year dollars, an increase of $1.872 billion, or 38 percent. Additionally, the committee notes that the F–35 program manager has reported an increase of approximately 38 to 43 percent in F135 engine procurement cost estimates between December 2005 and December 2008, in the annual selected acquisition reports for the F–35C and F–35A variants. Between December 2005 and December 2008, engine procurement cost estimates for the F–35B have grown approximately 47 percent, but the F–35B engine procurement cost growth is attributable to both the F135 engine and the F–35B's lift fan. Conversely, the F136 engine program has not experienced any cost growth since its inception. The F136 pre-EMD contract, which began in 2002 and was completed in 2004, was for $411.0 million and did not experience cost growth. The F136 EMD contract was awarded in 2005, and the cost estimate, at $2.486 billion, has been stable since contract award. Given the F135 development and procurement cost increases, the committee is perplexed by the Department's decisions over the past three years to not include an F–35 competitive propulsion system program in its budget requests. Based on the F135 cost growth, F135 test failures noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, and resultant schedule delays due to F135 engine test failures, the committee remains steadfast in its belief that the non-financial factors of a two-engine competitive program such as better engine performance, improved contractor responsiveness, a more robust industrial base, increased engine reliability and improved operational readiness, strongly favor continuing the F–35 competitive propulsion system program.

The committee also notes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense's Director of Portfolio Acquisition testified before the Air and Land Forces Subcommittee on May 20, 2009, and stated that the Department planned a 75 percent higher year-over-year production rate for the F–35 program for fiscal year 2010 and that this rate, "seems to be an achievable rate." The committee further notes that the production rate for fiscal year 2009 is 17 aircraft, of which 14 are for the Department of Defense and 3 are international aircraft. A 75 percent higher production rate for fiscal year 2010 would total 30 aircraft, and the committee notes that 2 international aircraft are planned, leaving 28 DOD aircraft in fiscal year 2010 necessary to achieve the 75 percent year-over-year production rate, two less than the 30 F–35s contained in the Department of the Navy and Department of the Air Force budget requests. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of one F–35B in Aircraft Procurement, Navy and one F–35A in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, and

their associated spares, as noted in the tables elsewhere in this report.

The committee understands that $320.0 million of the $476 million recommended by the recent joint estimating team would meet requirements for sufficient management reserve, and therefore recommends an aggregate reduction of $156.0 million in PEs 64800N and 64800F as noted in the tables elsewhere in this report.

For continued development of the competitive F–35 propulsion system program, the committee recommends a total increase of $463.0 million in PEs 64800F and 64800N as noted in the tables elsewhere in this report. The committee also recommends an aggregate increase of $140.0 million as noted in the tables elsewhere in this report in Aircraft Procurement, Navy and Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for the procurement of four F136 engines, F136 spare parts, and advance procurement of F136 long-lead components to continue F136 procurement in fiscal year 2011.

*KC–X tanker replacement program*

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should implement measures to ensure competition throughout the lifecycle of the KC–X tanker replacement program to ensure that the program delivers the best capability to the warfighter and the best value to the U.S. Government. Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to utilize as many of the competitive measures specified in subsection (b) of section 202 of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) as is practicable when developing the acquisition strategy and source selection plan. The committee notes that the intent of section 202 is to require the Secretary of Defense to plan for persistent competition to control program costs and improve the reliability of the KC–X tanker acquired by the Department throughout the program's lifecycle, including development, procurement, and sustainment.

*Metals Affordability Initiative*

The budget request contained $37.9 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapon systems.

The committee supports the continued government-industry collaboration provided through the Metals Affordability Initiative. It provides significant improvements in the manufacturing of specialty metals for aerospace applications for the government and aerospace industry, and provides improved affordability of aerospace metals. Further, the committee encourages the Air Force to budget for this highly successful initiative in future years.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63112F for the Metals Affordability Initiative.

*Multi-Mode Propulsion Phase IIA: High Performance Green Propellant*

The budget request contained $196.5 million in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion, but contained no funding for the Multi-Mode Propulsion Phase IIA: High Performance Green Propellant project.

The Multi-Mode Propulsion (MMP) system is designed to be an enabler of Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) by meeting multiple program needs with the same propulsion system. However, as currently planned, MMP would not meet a key requirement for

ORS, which is the ability to launch within seven days from a stated need. The current hydrazine chemical solution being demonstrated under MMP Phase III does not allow such launch flexibility due to its toxicity and related extended launch operations loading procedures. Funding would accommodate a Phase IIA risk-reduction effort to develop an alternate chemical solution.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62203F for the Multi-Mode Propulsion Phase IIA: High Performance Green Propellant project.

*National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System*

The committee is concerned that the tri-agency National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS) program will not deliver operational weather data in a timely fashion. The committee is aware of the cost, schedule, and management issues that continue to impede progress, and is not confident that the tri-agency executive committee governing the program can remedy the chronic problems plaguing this national priority acquisition.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to evaluate options for restructuring the program, ranging from improving the current management structure to creating two separate programs based on the Defense Meteorological Satellite and the Polar Orbiting Environmental Satellite programs.

The committee further directs that, for each option, the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space assess the prospects for achieving the objectives of the May 5, 1994, Presidential Decision Directive, National Science and Technology Council (NSTC)-2 that created the NPOESS program. NSTC–2 placed emphasis on maintaining continuity and reducing the cost of the operational weather mission. The description of the options should also include cost analyses and proposed mechanisms for cost control. The committee directs the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space to submit the evaluation of options for restructuring the NPOESS program to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2009.

*Operationally Responsive Space*

The budget request contained $112.9 million in PE 64857F for Operationally Responsive Space (ORS). However, the budget request did not include sufficient funding to complete and launch ORS Satellite-1, an intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance satellite being developed to satisfy an urgent and compelling combatant commander requirement, validated by U.S. Strategic Command, to directly support U.S. Central Command's ongoing operations. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force identified this requirement in his letter of May 18, 2009, describing unfunded requirements.

The committee recommends $136.3 million, an increase of $23.4 million, in PE 64857F for Operationally Responsive Space to fund

the remainder of the development and launch costs for ORS Satellite-1.

*Protected military satellite communications*

On April 6, 2009, the Secretary of Defense announced his recommendation to the President to terminate the $26.0 billion Transformational Satellite Communications (TSAT) program, which was intended to extend high-bandwidth protected satellite communications capabilities to deployed troops and deliver more data at higher speeds for "on the move" military users.

The budget request contained no funding for the TSAT program and the Department has begun the process of closing it down.

With the cancellation of the TSAT program, the budget request for Air Force national security space programs shifted emphasis to the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) program to meet future requirements for protected communications. However, the current version of the AEHF satellite will only be capable of delivering a fraction of the protected communications bandwidth that was anticipated in the TSAT program, and currently has almost no capability for delivering data to mobile users.

In addition, the committee is aware that, as a result of the cancellation of the TSAT program, the industrial talent focused on developing systems to meet the very specific military requirement for jam-resistant communications will begin to rapidly dissipate over the next year.

In a related effort to meet growing military requirements for communications bandwidth, the budget request contained increased funding for the Wideband Global Satellite (WGS) communications program, a constellation of commercial-class satellites that will provide high bandwidth for mobile, as well as fixed users. However, the WGS system does not currently provide jam-resistant communications.

Contractors participating in both the AEHF and WGS programs have provided to the committee various recommendations for modifying each of these satellites in ways that might address bandwidth requirements for protected communications.

Section 1047 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) requires the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a joint review of the bandwidth capacity requirements of the Department of Defense and the intelligence community by October 14, 2009. In coordination with this statutory review, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a strategy for addressing the military requirements for jam-resistant, protected communications that addresses the fragility of the industrial base supporting efforts to meet these requirements, and to deliver the strategy concurrent with the submission of the statutory review.

*Rivet Joint RC–135 Services Oriented Architecture*

The budget request contained $12.8 million in PE 35207F for manned reconnaissance systems, but did not contain sufficient funding to complete implementation of the Rivet Joint RC–135 Services Oriented Architecture (SOA) program.

The RC–135 SOA project will ensure full integration of Rivet Joint into the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR)

enterprise, and will meet Department of Defense and intelligence community requirements for making ISR data and information discoverable, accessible, and to enable information sharing.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 35207F to complete implementation of the Rivet Joint RC–135 Services Oriented Architecture program, including the RC–135 Processing and Analysis Center.

*Small Responsive Spacecraft at Low-Cost*

The budget request contained $83.9 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but contained no funding for the Small Responsive Spacecraft at Low-Cost (SRSL) project.

The SRSL would build on previous accomplishments of the Space Dynamics Laboratory at Utah State University in conjunction with the Air Force Research Laboratory, to develop and demonstrate technologies for new, low-cost space systems that have military utility and address warfighter needs. The project would develop a series of quick-response, small, lower-cost reconnaissance spacecraft, modular in design, to allow configuration to meet specific military needs under Operationally Responsive Space mission requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 63401F for the Small Responsive Spacecraft at Low-Cost project.

*Third Generation Infrared Surveillance*

The budget request contained $143.2 million in PE 64443F for Third Generation Infrared Surveillance (3GIRS).

The 3GIRS program is designed to provide advanced capability to warn of ballistic missile attacks on the United States, its deployed forces, and its allies, while also supporting missile defense, battlespace awareness, and technical intelligence missions. The program, originally referred to as the Alternative Infrared Satellite System (AIRSS), was initiated in 2006, as a result of a Nunn-McCurdy review of the Space Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS)-High program to generate competition for the SBIRS geosynchronous orbit (GEO)-3 satellite and to explore alternative technologies.

With the Defense Acquisition Executive's decision to procure SBIRS GEO–3 in July 2007, and following congressional guidance, the Air Force has redirected AIRSS resources to pursue risk reduction, system definition, and ground tests to enable a Third Generation Space Based Infrared program after the SBIRS satellites are delivered.

Originally conceived as a low-technical risk system, the 3GIRS program now includes significant technology development and flight-test demonstrations. The fiscal year 2010 budget request would support continued risk reduction and maturation of full-earth, wide field-of-view (WFOV) infrared (IR) sensor technology, enabling improved detection sensitivities and faster warning times of new and emerging worldwide missile threats against the United States, its deployed forces, and its allies. Sensor test and evaluation efforts would include hosting an IR payload prototype on a commercial host, WFOV algorithm development, and planning for integration into the existing SBIRS ground architecture.

While the committee supports continued development of the innovative sensor technologies being explored by this program, it

finds the 3GIRS development program is somewhat premature given the continuing challenges involved in fielding the current generation of SBIRS satellites.

The committee recommends $123.2 million, a decrease of $20.0 million, in PE 64443F for 3GIRS.

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

### Overview

The budget request contained $20.7 billion for Defense-Wide research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $20.8 billion, a decrease of $100.0 million to the budget request.

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | |
| 001 | 0601000BR | DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE | 48,544 | 2,000 | 50,544 |
| | | Virtual Perimeter Monitoring System (VPMS) | | [2,000] | |
| 002 | 0601101E | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 226,125 | 4,200 | 230,325 |
| | | Development of Low-Cost, Stable Vaccines for Field Application | | [3,200] | |
| | | High School Science Study Group/CS Futures | | [1,000] | |
| 003 | 0601111D8Z | GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 004 | 0601114D8Z | DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 005 | 0601120D8Z | NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM | 89,980 | | 89,980 |
| 006 | 0601384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 58,974 | 5,000 | 63,974 |
| | | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | | [5,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **423,623** | **11,200** | **434,823** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | |
| 007 | 0602000D8Z | JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY | 22,669 | | 22,669 |
| 008 | 0602227D8Z | MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER | 0 | | 0 |
| 009 | 0602228D8Z | HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE | 15,164 | 5,000 | 20,164 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions Program | | [5,000] | |
| 010 | 0602234D8Z | LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM | 34,034 | | 34,034 |
| 011 | 0602303E | INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY | 282,749 | -10,000 | 272,749 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-10,000] | |
| 012 | 0602304E | COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS | 142,840 | | 142,840 |
| 013 | 0602383E | BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE | 40,587 | | 40,587 |
| 014 | 0602384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 209,072 | 2,000 | 211,072 |
| | | Chemical and Biological Resistant Clothing | | [2,000] | |
| 015 | 0602663D8Z | JOINT DATA MANAGEMENT ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 4,940 | | 4,940 |
| 016 | 0602670D8Z | HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH | 9,446 | | 9,446 |
| 017 | 0602702E | TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY | 276,075 | -10,000 | 266,075 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-10,000] | |
| 018 | 0602715E | MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY | 268,859 | -3,000 | 265,859 |
| | | Improved Performance of ODS Ferritic Steels | | [2,000] | |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-5,000] | |
| 019 | 0602716E | ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY | 223,841 | -10,000 | 213,841 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-10,000] | |
| 020 | 0602718BR | WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES | 219,130 | 3,600 | 222,730 |
| | | Eagles Eyes - Stand-off Radiation Detection | | [3,600] | |
| 021 | 1160401BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 27,384 | 4,250 | 31,634 |
| | | SOF Craft Integrated Backbone | | [2,000] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Rapid and Low Cost Development of Next Generation Patrol Ships for Special Operations | | [2,250] | |
| 022 | 1160407BB | SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **1,776,790** | **-18,150** | **1,758,640** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 023 | 0603000D8Z | JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 23,538 | | 23,538 |
| 024 | 0603121D8Z | SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 43,808 | 3,000 | 46,808 |
| | | Lasercomm Link for Explosive Ordnance Disposal Robot Operations | | [3,000] | |
| 025 | 0603122D8Z | COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 81,868 | 13,400 | 95,268 |
| | | Affordable Robust Mid-Sized UGV | | [4,000] | |
| | | Advanced Transparent LAS Glass Ceramic Armor Systems for Force Protection | | [1,250] | |
| | | Integrated Rugged Checkpoint Container | | [2,500] | |
| | | Combating Terrorism: Threat and Risk Assessment | | [2,650] | |
| | | Thresholds for Neurological Injuries from Repeated Blast Exposures | | [3,000] | |
| 026 | 0603160BR | COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES - PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT | 233,203 | | 233,203 |
| 027 | 0603175C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY | 109,760 | | 109,760 |
| 028 | 0603200D8Z | JOINT ADVANCED CONCEPTS | 7,817 | 4,000 | 11,817 |
| | | Robotic Border Area Surveillance System Program | | [4,000] | |
| 029 | 0603225D8Z | JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 23,276 | | 23,276 |
| 030 | 0603286E | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS | 338,360 | -75,000 | 263,360 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Program Reduction | | [-75,000] | |
| 031 | 0603287E | SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY | 200,612 | | 200,612 |
| 032 | 0603384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 282,235 | 2,000 | 284,235 |
| | | Total Perimeter Surveillance | | [2,000] | |
| 033 | 0603618D8Z | JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 10,838 | | 10,838 |
| 034 | 0603648D8Z | JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 198,352 | 4,300 | 202,652 |
| | | High Accuracy Network Determination System - Intelligent Optical Networks (HANDS-ION) | | [2,000] | |
| | | Distributed Network Switching and Security | | [2,300] | |
| 035 | 0603662D8Z | NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES | 28,212 | | 28,212 |
| 036 | 0603663D8Z | JOINT DATA MANAGEMENT RESEARCH | 4,935 | | 4,935 |
| 037 | 0603665D8Z | BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY | 10,993 | | 10,993 |
| 038 | 0603670D8Z | HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 11,480 | | 11,480 |
| 039 | 0603680D8Z | DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 14,638 | | 14,638 |
| 040 | 0603711D8Z | JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS | 9,110 | | 9,110 |
| 041 | 0603712S | GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 19,043 | 2,000 | 21,043 |
| | | Next Generation Manufacturing Technologies Initiative | | [2,000] | |
| 042 | 0603713S | DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY | 29,356 | | 29,356 |
| 043 | 0603716D8Z | STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM | 69,175 | | 69,175 |
| 044 | 0603720S | MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT | 26,310 | 7,500 | 33,810 |
| | | Feature Size Yield Enhancement at DMEA's Semiconductors Foundry | | [2,500] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | End to End Semi Fab Alpha Tool | | [5,000] | |
| 045 | 0603727D8Z | JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM | 11,135 | | 11,135 |
| 046 | 0603739E | ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES | 205,912 | -15,000 | 190,912 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-15,000] | |
| 047 | 0603745D8Z | SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR (SAR) COHERENT CHANGE DETECTION (CDD) | 4,864 | | 4,864 |
| 048 | 0603750D8Z | ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 0 | | 0 |
| 049 | 0603755D8Z | HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 221,286 | | 221,286 |
| 050 | 0603760E | COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 293,476 | | 293,476 |
| 051 | 0603764E | LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 0 | | 0 |
| 052 | 0603765E | CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS | 186,526 | | 186,526 |
| 053 | 0603766E | NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 135,941 | | 135,941 |
| 054 | 0603767E | SENSOR TECHNOLOGY | 243,056 | -15,000 | 228,056 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-15,000] | |
| 055 | 0603768E | GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY | 37,040 | | 37,040 |
| 056 | 0603769SE | DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 13,822 | | 13,822 |
| 057 | 0603781D8Z | SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE | 31,298 | | 31,298 |
| 058 | 0603805S | DUAL USE TECHNOLOGY | 0 | | 0 |
| 059 | 0603826D8Z | QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS | 107,984 | -10,000 | 97,984 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-10,000] | |
| 060 | 0603828D8Z | JOINT EXPERIMENTATION | 124,480 | 2,700 | 127,180 |
| | | Tidewater Full Scale Exercise | | [2,700] | |
| 061 | 0603832D8Z | DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE | 38,505 | | 38,505 |
| 062 | 0603941D8Z | TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY | 95,734 | | 95,734 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 063 | 0603942D8Z | TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER | 2,219 | 3,000 | 5,219 |
| | | National Radio Frequency RD&T Transfer Center | | [3,000] | |
| 064 | 0909999D8Z | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | | 0 |
| 065 | 1160402BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 31,675 | 3,500 | 35,175 |
| | | Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center | | [3,500] | |
| 066 | 1160422BB | AVIATION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS | 3,544 | | 3,544 |
| 067 | 1160472BB | SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 4,988 | | 4,988 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **3,570,404** | **-69,600** | **3,500,804** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | |
| 068 | 0603161D8Z | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P | 36,019 | | 36,019 |
| 069 | 0603228D8Z | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 0 | | 0 |
| 070 | 0603527D8Z | RETRACT LARCH | 21,718 | | 21,718 |
| 071 | 0603709D8Z | JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM | 11,803 | 3,850 | 15,653 |
| | | Autonomous Machine Vision for Mapping and Investigation of Remote Sites | | [2,250] | |
| | | RobonostiX Integration to Improve Readiness of Robotic Unmanned Systems | | [1,600] | |
| 072 | 0603714D8Z | ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM | 17,771 | | 17,771 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 073 | 0603851D8Z | ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM | 31,613 | | 31,613 |
| 074 | 0603881C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT | 719,465 | | 719,465 |
| 075 | 0603882C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT | 982,922 | | 982,922 |
| 076 | 0603883C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT | 186,697 | | 186,697 |
| 077 | 0603884BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 205,952 | | 205,952 |
| 078 | 0603884C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS | 636,856 | | 636,856 |
| 079 | 0603886C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR | 0 | | 0 |
| 080 | 0603888C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS | 966,752 | | 966,752 |
| 081 | 0603890C | BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS | 369,145 | -25,000 | 344,145 |
| | | Programs Reduction | | [-25,000] | |
| 082 | 0603891C | SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA | 301,566 | | 301,566 |
| 083 | 0603892C | AEGIS BMD | 1,690,758 | | 1,690,758 |
| 084 | 0603893C | SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 180,000 | | 180,000 |
| 085 | 0603894C | MULTIPLE KILL VEHICLE | 0 | | 0 |
| 086 | 0603895C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS | 12,549 | | 12,549 |
| 087 | 0603896C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI | 340,014 | | 340,014 |
| 088 | 0603897C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE HERCULES | 48,186 | | 48,186 |
| 089 | 0603898C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT | 60,921 | 500 | 61,421 |
| | | Independent Advisory Group to Review Ballistic Missile Defense Training Needs | | [500] | |
| 090 | 0603904C | MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC) | 86,949 | 5,000 | 91,949 |
| | | Joint Data Exchange Center-Missile Defense | | [5,000] | |
| 091 | 0603906C | REGARDING TRENCH | 6,164 | | 6,164 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 092 | 0603907C | SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX) | 174,576 | | 174,576 |
| 093 | 0603908C | BMD EUROPEAN INTERCEPTOR SITE | 0 | | 0 |
| 094 | 0603909C | BMD EUROPEAN MIDCOURSE RADAR | 0 | | 0 |
| 095 | 0603911C | BMD EUROPEAN CAPABILITY | 50,504 | | 50,504 |
| 096 | 0603912C | BMD EUROPEAN COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| 097 | 0603913C | ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS | 119,634 | 20,500 | 140,134 |
| | | Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense | | [20,500] | |
| 098 | 0603920D8Z | HUMANITARIAN DEMINING | 14,687 | | 14,687 |
| 099 | 0603923D8Z | COALITION WARFARE | 13,885 | | 13,885 |
| 100 | 0604016D8Z | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM | 4,887 | | 4,887 |
| 101 | 0604400D8Z | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT | 55,289 | | 55,289 |
| 102 | 0604648D8Z | JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 18,577 | 4,300 | 22,877 |
| | | Mobile Detection Assessment Response System Enhancements | | [4,300] | |
| 103 | 0604670D8Z | HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING | 7,006 | | 7,006 |
| 104 | 0604787D8Z | JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC) | 19,744 | | 19,744 |
| 105 | 0604828D8Z | JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM | 16,972 | | 16,972 |
| 106 | 0605017D8Z | REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST | 24,647 | | 24,647 |
| 107 | 0303191D8Z | JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM | 3,949 | | 3,949 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **7,438,177** | **9,150** | **7,447,327** |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | |
| 108 | 0604051D8Z | DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP) | 28,862 | | 28,862 |
| 109 | 0604161D8Z | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD | 7,628 | | 7,628 |
| 110 | 0604165D8Z | PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT | 166,913 | | 166,913 |
| 111 | 0604384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 332,895 | | 332,895 |
| 112 | 0604709D8Z | JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM | 5,127 | | 5,127 |
| 113 | 0604764K | ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO) | 39,911 | | 39,911 |
| 114 | 0604771D8Z | JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS) | 20,633 | | 20,633 |
| 115 | 0605000BR | WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES | 8,735 | | 8,735 |
| 116 | 0605013BL | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 11,705 | 124,410 | 136,115 |
| | | Transfer from Title XIV | | [124,410] | |
| 117 | 0605018BTA | DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (DIMHRS) | 70,000 | | 70,000 |
| 118 | 0605020BTA | BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES | 197,008 | | 197,008 |
| 119 | 0605021SE | HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE | 395 | | 395 |
| 120 | 0605027D8Z | OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| 121 | 0605140D8Z | TRUSTED FOUNDRY | 41,223 | | 41,223 |
| 122 | 0605648D8Z | DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM | 4,267 | | 4,267 |
| 123 | 0303141K | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 18,431 | | 18,431 |
| 124 | 0303158K | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | 49,047 | | 49,047 |
| 125 | 0807708D8Z | WOUNDED ILL AND INJURED SENIOR OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (WII-SOC) STAFF OFFICE | 1,609 | | 1,609 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **1,009,389** | **124,410** | **1,133,799** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | |
| 126 | 0603757D8Z | TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2) | 0 | | 0 |
| 127 | 0604774D8Z | DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS) | 13,121 | | 13,121 |
| 128 | 0604875D8Z | JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT | 15,247 | | 15,247 |
| 129 | 0604940D8Z | CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP) | 145,052 | 7,500 | 152,552 |
| | | Joint Gulf Range Test and Training Complex | | [3,000] | |
| | | Gulf Range Mobile Instrumentation Capability | | [3,000] | |
| | | Advanced SAM Hardware Simulator Development | | [1,500] | |
| 130 | 0604943D8Z | THERMAL VICAR | 9,045 | | 9,045 |
| 131 | 0605100D8Z | JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC) | 9,455 | | 9,455 |
| 132 | 0605104D8Z | TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS | 44,760 | 1,000 | 45,760 |
| | | Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University | | [1,000] | |
| 133 | 0605110D8Z | USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 4,914 | | 4,914 |
| 134 | 0605117D8Z | FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION | 94,921 | | 94,921 |
| 135 | 0605126J | JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO) | 96,909 | -21,000 | 75,909 |
| | | Information System Security - Program Not Justified | | [-21,000] | |
| 136 | 0605128D8Z | CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P) | 0 | | 0 |
| 137 | 0605130D8Z | FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING | 35,054 | | 35,054 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 138 | 0605161D8Z | NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY | 6,474 | | 6,474 |
| 139 | 0605170D8Z | SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION | 14,916 | | 14,916 |
| 140 | 0605200D8Z | GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) | 5,888 | | 5,888 |
| 141 | 0605384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 106,477 | | 106,477 |
| 142 | 0605502BR | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 143 | 0605502C | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA | 0 | | 0 |
| 144 | 0605502D8Z | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 145 | 0605502E | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 146 | 0605502S | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH | 0 | | 0 |
| 147 | 0605790D8Z | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE ADMINISTRATION | 2,163 | | 2,163 |
| 148 | 0605798D8Z | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS | 11,005 | | 11,005 |
| 149 | 0605798S | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS | 0 | | 0 |
| 150 | 0605799D8Z | EMERGING CAPABILITIES | 19,981 | | 19,981 |
| 151 | 0605801KA | DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC) | 54,411 | -5,000 | 49,411 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-5,000] | |
| 152 | 0605803SE | R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION | 19,554 | | 19,554 |
| 153 | 0605804D8Z | DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION | 23,512 | 3,000 | 26,512 |
| | | Renewable Energy Systems (RES) for Defense Applications | | [3,000] | |
| 154 | 0605897E | DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION | 45,000 | -10,000 | 35,000 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-10,000] | |
| 155 | 0605898E | MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D | 51,055 | | 51,055 |
| 156 | 0606100D8Z | BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS | 5,929 | | 5,929 |
| 157 | 0606301D8Z | AVIATION SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES | 8,000 | | 8,000 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 158 | 0204571J | JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT | 1,250 | | 1,250 |
| 159 | 0301555G | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 160 | 0301556G | SPECIAL PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| 161 | 0303166D8Z | SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES | 30,604 | | 30,604 |
| 162 | 0303169D8Z | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION | 4,667 | | 4,667 |
| 163 | 0305103E | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| 164 | 0305193D8Z | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) | 20,648 | | 20,648 |
| 165 | 0305193G | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) | 0 | | 0 |
| 166 | 0305400D8Z | WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT | 829 | | 829 |
| 167 | 0804767D8Z | COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2) | 34,306 | | 34,306 |
| 168 | 0901585C | PENTAGON RESERVATION | 19,709 | | 19,709 |
| 169 | 0901598C | MANAGEMENT HQ - MDA | 57,403 | | 57,403 |
| 170 | 0901598D8W | IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES | 980 | | 980 |
| 170A | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 124,705 | | 124,705 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **1,189,553** | **-24,500** | **1,165,053** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 171 | 0604130V | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS) | 1,384 | | 1,384 |
| 172 | 0605127T | REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA | 2,001 | | 2,001 |
| 173 | 0605147T | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS) | 292 | | 292 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 174 | 0607384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT) | 6,198 | | 6,198 |
| 175 | 0607828D8Z | JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY | 46,214 | | 46,214 |
| 176 | 0204571J | JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| 177 | 0208043J | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 2,179 | | 2,179 |
| 178 | 0208045K | C4I INTEROPERABILITY | 74,786 | | 74,786 |
| 180 | 0301144K | JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING | 10,767 | | 10,767 |
| 181 | 0301301L | GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM | 0 | 5,800 | 5,800 |
| | | Advanced Scientific Missile Intelligence Preparation of the Battlespace (IPB) | | [4,000] | |
| | | Portable Device for Latent Fingerprint Identification | | [1,800] | |
| 182 | 0301318BB | HUMINT (CONTROLLED) | 0 | | 0 |
| 183 | 0301371G | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - CCP | 0 | | 0 |
| 184 | 0301372L | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE - GDIP | 0 | | 0 |
| 185 | 0301555BZ | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 186 | 0301556BZ | SPECIAL PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| 187 | 0302016K | NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT | 548 | | 548 |
| 188 | 0302019K | DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION | 17,655 | | 17,655 |
| 189 | 0303126K | LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS | 9,406 | | 9,406 |
| 190 | 0303131K | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) | 9,830 | | 9,830 |
| 191 | 0303135G | PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI) | 8,116 | | 8,116 |
| 192 | 0303136G | KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI) | 41,002 | | 41,002 |
| 193 | 0303140D8Z | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 13,477 | | 13,477 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 194 | 0303140G | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 408,316 | | 408,316 |
| 195 | 0303140K | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| 196 | 0303148K | DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 1,205 | | 1,205 |
| 197 | 0303149J | C4I FOR THE WARRIOR | 4,098 | | 4,098 |
| 198 | 0303150K | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 23,761 | | 23,761 |
| 199 | 0303153K | JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER | 18,944 | | 18,944 |
| 200 | 0303170K | NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) | 1,782 | | 1,782 |
| 201 | 0303260D8Z | JOINT MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE ( C ) | 942 | | 942 |
| 202 | 0303610K | TELEPORT PROGRAM | 5,239 | | 5,239 |
| 203 | 0304210BB | SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES | 16,381 | | 16,381 |
| 204 | 0304345BQ | NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NGP) | 0 | | 0 |
| 206 | 0305103D8Z | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 993 | | 993 |
| 207 | 0305103G | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 0 | | 0 |
| 208 | 0305103K | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 10,080 | | 10,080 |
| 209 | 0305125D8Z | CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP) | 12,725 | | 12,725 |
| 210 | 0305127BZ | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 211 | 0305127L | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 212 | 0305146BZ | DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 213 | 0305146L | DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 214 | 0305183L | DEFENSE HUMAN INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 215 | 0305186D8Z | POLICY R&D PROGRAMS | 6,948 | | 6,948 |
| 216 | 0305193L | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) | 0 | | 0 |
| 217 | 0305199D8Z | NET CENTRICITY | 1,479 | | 1,479 |
| 218 | 0305202G | DRAGON U-2 | 0 | | 0 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 219 | 0305206G | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 220 | 0305207G | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 0 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| | | Personal Area Network for Land Soldiers (PANLS) | | [3,000] | |
| 221 | 0305208BB | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 1,407 | | 1,407 |
| 222 | 0305208BQ | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 223 | 0305208G | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 224 | 0305208K | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 3,158 | | 3,158 |
| 225 | 0305208L | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 226 | 0305219BB | MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV | 2,067 | | 2,067 |
| 227 | 0305229G | REAL-TIME ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT (RT10) | 0 | | 0 |
| 228 | 0305387D8Z | HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM | 2,963 | | 2,963 |
| 229 | 0305600D8Z | INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, ADVANCEMENT AND INTEGRATION | 1,389 | | 1,389 |
| 230 | 0305866L | DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 231 | 0305880L | COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS | 0 | | 0 |
| 232 | 0305883L | HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET (HDBT) INTEL SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| 233 | 0305884L | INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| 235 | 0305889G | COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| 236 | 0307141G | INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEV | 0 | | 0 |
| 237 | 0307207G | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) | 0 | | 0 |
| 238 | 0708011S | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 20,514 | 4,200 | 24,714 |
| | | Commercialization of High Rate Polymide Composites for Military & Commercial Aircraft | | [2,000] | |
| | | Optical Fiber Assembly Manufacturing | | [1,000] | |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Northwest Manufacturing Initiative | | [1,200] | |
| 239 | 0708012S | LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 2,798 | | 2,798 |
| 240 | 0902298J | MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS) | 8,303 | | 8,303 |
| 241 | 1001018D8Z | NATO AGS | 74,485 | | 74,485 |
| 242 | 1105219BB | MQ-9 UAV | 4,380 | | 4,380 |
| 243 | 1130435BB | STORM | 0 | | 0 |
| 244 | 1160279BB | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG | 0 | | 0 |
| 245 | 1160403BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 82,621 | | 82,621 |
| 246 | 1160404BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 6,182 | | 6,182 |
| 247 | 1160405BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 21,273 | 30,100 | 51,373 |
| | | Biometric Optical Surveillance System (BOSS) | | [2,000] | |
| | | Advanced, Long Endurance Unattended Ground Sensor | | [8,000] | |
| | | Counterproliferation Analysis and Planning System (CAPS) | | [20,100] | |
| 248 | 1160408BB | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 60,310 | | 60,310 |
| 249 | 1160421BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT | 12,687 | | 12,687 |
| 250 | 1160423BB | JOINT MULTI-MISSION SUBMERSIBLE | 43,412 | | 43,412 |
| 251 | 1160425BB | SPECIAL OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 252 | 1160426BB | OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) DEVELOPMENT | 1,321 | | 1,321 |
| 253 | 1160427BB | MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS) | 3,192 | | 3,192 |
| 254 | 1160428BB | UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV) | 0 | | 0 |
| 255 | 1160429BB | MC130J SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION | 5,957 | | 5,957 |

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 256 | 1160474BB | SOF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS | 733 | | 733 |
| 257 | 1160476BB | SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | 2,368 | | 2,368 |
| 258 | 1160477BB | SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 1,081 | | 1,081 |
| 259 | 1160478BB | SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS | 597 | | 597 |
| 260 | 1160479BB | SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS | 3,369 | 1,750 | 5,119 |
| | | Miniature Day Night Sight for Crew Served Weapons | | [1,750] | |
| 261 | 1160480BB | SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES | 1,973 | | 1,973 |
| 262 | 1160482BB | SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION | 18,863 | | 18,863 |
| 263 | 1160483BB | SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS | 3,452 | 4,000 | 7,452 |
| | | Transformer Technology for Combat Submersibles (TTCS) | | [4,000] | |
| 264 | 1160484BB | SOF SURFACE CRAFT | 12,250 | | 12,250 |
| 265 | 1160488BB | SOF PSYOP | 9,887 | | 9,887 |
| 266 | 1160489BB | SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES | 4,944 | | 4,944 |
| 267 | 1160490BB | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 11,547 | | 11,547 |
| 999 | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 4,148,984 | 3,000 | 4,151,984 |
| | | Final E-Curfew (FeC) Enhancements | | [3,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **5,335,215** | **51,850** | **5,387,065** |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide** | **20,741,542** | **84,360** | **20,825,902** |

Items of Special Interest

*Airborne Laser*

The budget request contained $186.7 million in PE 63883C for the Airborne Laser (ABL) program.

The committee continues to have concerns about the operational effectiveness, suitability, survivability, and affordability of the ABL program. The committee notes that the ABL program is eight years behind schedule and approximately $4.0 billion over budget. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff echoed these concerns in testimony before the committee this year and noted that ABL's operational concept was "flawed."

Given these concerns, the committee supports the decision to cancel the second ABL prototype aircraft. This action is consistent with section 235 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), which limits the availability of funds for procurement of a second or subsequent ABL aircraft until the Secretary of Defense, after receiving an assessment by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, submits a certification to the congressional defense committees that the ABL system has demonstrated a high probability of being operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable.

The committee recommends $186.7 million, the amount of the budget request, in PE 63883C for the ABL program.

*Arrow-3 upper-tier weapons system*

The committee supports efforts to develop an upper-tier follow-on to the Arrow Weapons System for the State of Israel. After a number of changes to Israel's requirements, the United States and Israel have chosen to pursue the development of the Arrow-3 interceptor as the primary approach for an upper-tier missile defense capability for Israel. However, the committee notes that this is a technically challenging undertaking that involves the development of a number of critical and complex technologies that neither Israel nor the United States have ever produced. This has led a number of senior Department of Defense officials to label Arrow-3 as a "high-risk" program. Consequently, it is uncertain as to whether Israel can succeed in developing all of the technologies associated with the Arrow-3 interceptor in time to meet its required fielding schedule.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is currently negotiating a project agreement with the Israeli Ministry of Defense for the Arrow-3 program. Given the high-risk nature of Arrow-3, the committee understands that the Arrow-3 project agreement will contain clear knowledge points (i.e., technical benchmarks) and a schedule that will govern the development of the program. Future decisions about the program should be based on the Arrow-3 system's ability to meet the agreed knowledge points and schedule. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 15, 2010, that describes the agreed knowledge points and schedule, and assesses whether the Arrow-3 program is meeting the agreed knowledge points and schedule. The committee further directs that the report include a discussion of alternative paths the Department is examining to assist Israel in developing

an upper-tier missile defense capability, such as the land-based version of the Standard Missile-3 (SM–3), should the Arrow-3 program fail to meet the agreed knowledge points and schedule.

Noting the evolving ballistic missile threat in the Middle East region, the committee believes that if the Arrow-3 program fails to meet the agreed knowledge points and schedule within a reasonable timeframe, the Department should give serious consideration to deploying a land-based version of the SM–3 missile to Israel as an alternative.

*Center for technology and national security policy at the National Defense University*

The budget request contained $44.8 million in PE 65104D8Z for technical studies, support, and analysis, but contained no funds for analyses by the Center for Technology and National Security Policy (CTNSP) at the National Defense University.

The committee recognizes that CTNSP continues to provide valuable support to the Department through the development of a wide range of studies which are designed to inform and sharpen national security decision making. The committee continues to be the beneficiary of CTNSP studies and CTNSP experts, and encourages the CTNSP to continue to explore issues of importance to the Department and the nation. The committee believes the CTNSP should explore research into several key areas, including science and technology to support irregular warfare, test and evaluation infrastructure, improving integration of social science research into defense programs, and workforce development for future cyber warriors.

The committee recommends $45.8 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 65104D8Z for the CTNSP.

*Coordination of energy storage device requirements and investments*

The committee is aware that there are currently over 500 battery related programs and thousands of devices being developed or used by the Department of Defense, defense agencies, combatant commands, and military services that rely on batteries for some or all of their functionality. These devices include night vision goggles, navigational devices, thermal weapon sights, radios, chemical-biological sensors, unmanned drones, and tactical vehicles among others. Further, the demand for portable power on the battlefield continues to grow, and power requirements for portable and mobile electronics continue to outpace the capacity of existing power sources. The committee is particularly concerned that soldiers may be required to carry 20 to 40 pounds of batteries on a typical four-day mission. Additionally, the acquisition, storage, distribution, and disposal of batteries pose a formidable logistical challenge on the battlefield. The committee is also aware that the number of batteries required for military effectiveness may be further complicated by requirements for military-unique and system-unique battery sources that can be costly to manufacture and support.

Section 218 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) required the Secretary of Defense to develop an advanced energy storage technology and manufacturing roadmap. Further, that provision required that the roadmap be developed in coordination with all elements and organizations of the Department of Defense, other ap-

propriate federal, state and local government organizations, and representatives from private industry and academia. The committee notes that that report is due October 14, 2009. The committee believes that the roadmap will provide an opportunity for enhanced coordination and communication regarding development and production of energy storage technologies such as batteries, fuel cells, and capacitors. The committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the Comptroller General to conduct an assessment of the Department of Defense coordination of energy storage device investments and requirements.

*Counterproliferation analysis and planning system*

The budget request contained $21.3 million in PE 116405BB for special operations intelligence systems development, but contained no funds for the counterproliferation analysis and planning system (CAPS).

The committee is aware that the counterproliferation analysis and planning system provides military planners and intelligence analysts with a capability to identify facilities and buildings that are critical nodes in foreign weapons of mass destruction manufacturing processes. CAPS is developed and maintained by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and managed by the U.S. Special Operations Command in coordination with the U.S. Strategic Command. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to incorporate funding for CAPS into the baseline budget in future years.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.1 million in PE 116405BB for the counterproliferation analysis and planning system.

*Defense computing challenges*

The committee notes the important role of information technology (IT), computing, and processing capabilities in providing critical defense capabilities. In the past, Department of Defense funding for IT research and development has provided a solid foundation for pervasive technologies now firmly available in both the defense and commercial sectors.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to do more to improve our ability to address future and emerging grand challenges in defense computing. For example, increased persistent surveillance leads to challenges in providing management and discovery in large complex data sets. The emergence of ultra-large-scale systems and new high-end computing capabilities will require new programming approaches to handle massive parallel processing. The committee urges the Department of Defense to increase resources devoted to research on these challenges in order to maintain its military edge into the future.

*Director, Test Resource Management Center*

Section 231 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) established the Department of Defense (DOD) Test Resource Management Center (TRMC) to provide improved management and oversight of the DOD major range and test facility base (MRTFB). Section 231, as amended in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) and the National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), established the TRMC as a DOD field activity, and tasked its director with review and oversight of DOD proposed budgets and expenditures for test and evaluation resources of the MRTFB, drafting of biennial strategic plans, review of annual military service budget requests, and administration of the central test and evaluation investment program (CTEIP). Congress established this activity and the position of the director to ensure that the military services were adequately funding their test and evaluation infrastructure to a level necessary to meet DOD test and evaluation requirements.

In the eight years since its founding, the committee believes that the TRMC has largely fulfilled its purpose. Its annual certifications and reports provide a valuable tool for Congress to ensure that the MRTFB is adequately funded to meet its mission requirements. However, the committee remains concerned that the military services have, at times, not provided the Director, TRMC with adequate notice and information concerning significant proposed changes to service elements of the MRTFB to allow the director to meet his statutory obligations. The committee also remains concerned that over time, the test and evaluation infrastructure of the Department of Defense has continued to deteriorate. Therefore, to ensure that the Director, TRMC has the information necessary to provide timely and accurate recommendations, this Act includes legislative language providing the director with the same access to information granted to the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation.

*Ground-based Midcourse Defense program*

The budget request contained $982.9 million in PE 63882C for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) program.

The committee notes its continuing concerns with the operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the GMD system. The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) continues to raise concerns about GMD testing. DOT&E's "Fiscal Year 2009 Annual Report to Congress" stated, "GMD flight testing to date will not support a high level of confidence in its limited capabilities . . . additional test data collected under realistic test conditions is necessary to validate the models and simulations and to increase the ability of those models and simulations to accurately predict system capability." Furthermore, the Government Accountability Office noted in a March 2008, report on the missile defense program for fiscal year 2008 that the deployment schedule for the GMD system has outpaced testing.

The committee understands that the Department plans to limit the deployment of operational GMD interceptors in Alaska and California to 30. The committee notes that in testimony to Congress earlier this year, the Secretary of Defense indicated that given the limited nature of the long-range missile threat from rogue states, 30 GMD interceptors should be sufficient to meet warfighter requirements in the near- to mid-term. Based on this and other information, the committee supports the decision to limit the deployment of additional GMD interceptors in Alaska and California. Furthermore, the committee remains concerned that in the rush to deploy an initial system in 2004, suitability concerns associated with the system failed to receive sufficient attention. This concern was reinforced earlier this year when the Director of the

Missile Defense Agency testified to the committee that health and status indicators had forced the agency to remove a number of GMD interceptors from their silos to perform unscheduled maintenance and missile refurbishment. The committee believes that greater attention must be focused on the reliability, maintainability, and suitability of the GMD system. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision to address this issue.

The committee recommends $982.9 million, the amount of the budget request, in PE 63882C for the GMD program.

*High Accuracy Network Determination System*

The budget request contained $198.4 million in PE 63648D8Z for Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations, but contained no funding for the High Accuracy Network Determination System-Intelligent Optical Network (HANDS–ION) program. HANDS–ION addresses critical space situational awareness needs and reduces the potential for collisions of space assets by reducing errors in the current space-object maintenance catalog, as well as supplements the catalog with system characterization information.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63648D8Z for the HANDS–ION program.

*Hybrid air vehicle technology*

The committee is aware that the Rapid Reaction Technology Office in the Department of Defense is exploring early development activities for a hybrid air vehicle (HAV). If the proposed capabilities for a rigid-hull lighter-than-air vehicle come to fruition, the Department of Defense has the potential to revolutionize the future of intra-theater airlift. The conceptual goals for the HAV would greatly increase the heavy cargo lift capability, reduce the logistics footprint in theater, and radically change the hub and spoke logistics structure that has developed since the end of World War II. HAV capability could reduce our dependence on foreign airbases and ports, as well as the effectiveness of anti-access strategies like those used to disrupt our supply routes from the Islamic Republic of Pakistan into the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. In the nearer term, HAV could serve an important role in providing persistent surveillance capabilities, through longer duration dwell times and a wider range of sensor packages, than is currently possible with existing technologies. The committee encourages the Department to continue to invest in developing and demonstrating core technologies for HAVs, and believes that such efforts should include closer coordination and cooperation with the Air Force and Transportation Command.

*Implementation of the defense agencies initiative*

The committee continues to support the implementation of an enterprise resource planning (ERP) system in order to improve the financial management of the defense agencies. The Defense Agencies Initiative (DAI), the ERP solution being implemented by the Business Transformation Agency, is a vital step to improving the accuracy, reliability, and transparency of financial transactions within the 16 defense agencies and 7 field activities of the Department of Defense.

The committee is concerned that important lessons from recent implementations of ERPs are not being followed. Early integration activities of other ERPs, like DAI and the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System, indicate the need to pre-process and cleanse the data in preparation for transition from legacy systems to the new ERP. The failure to do so has resulted in extensive program delays.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to have each of the defense agencies and field activities participating in DAI to begin the process of auditing their financial data. Each of these audits should be initiated not less than 6 months before they begin implementing DAI in order to improve the chances for a successful implementation. The Secretary should submit notifications to the congressional defense committees within 15 days of the initiation, as well as the completion, of a financial audit for each defense agency and field activity participating in DAI.

*K–12 education in computer sciences and mathematics*

The budget request contained $226.1 million in PE 61101E for basic research in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), including $2.0 million for the Computer Futures program; $96.1 million in PE 61104A for basic research in the Army, including $5.3 million for the eCybermission program; and $413.7 million in PE 61153N for basic research in the Navy, but included no funds for educational outreach programs in STEM to stimulate careers in computer science and engineering.

The committee is concerned about reports such as the National Academy of Science study "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," which indicate that the United States may not be producing sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers (S&E) to meet our future national security needs. The strength of the nation is founded on a knowledge economy, so should the nation be unable to provide for its demands in S&Es, it will have severe detrimental effects on the defense sector and the broader economic health of the nation. Facing a similar challenge 50 years ago, President Eisenhower increased investments in science and mathematics education that continue to pay dividends today.

In that same spirit, service and agency investments in K–12 educational outreach programs represent an investment in the nation's intellectual capital that the committee believes will reap significant rewards in the future. The Computer Futures program is supporting K–12 educational programs to develop and foster students of computer science and mathematics at an early age in order to create a pipeline to support the nation's future scientific and engineering needs in these areas. The eCybermission program is a nationwide, web-based science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) competition designed to stimulate interest and encourage continued education in these technical areas among middle and high school students.

The committee recommends $227.1 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 61101E for DARPA's Computer Futures program to create and validate additional curriculum covering new topics, and to expand the program into new school systems. The committee recommends $97.1 million, an increase of $1.0 million, in PE 61104A for expansion of the e-Cybermission program to create new

curricula and to expand the geographic diversity of the participating schools.

The committee also recommends $415.7 million, an increase of $2.0 million, in PE 61153N for the development of a Navy cyber educational outreach program, similar to DARPA's Computer Science Futures program, or the Army e-Cybermission. In developing this program, the committee encourages the Navy to consider innovative strategies to leverage Department of Defense and Department of Navy laboratories and advanced educational institutions to create long term partnerships. The committee also encourages the Navy to consider developing a full-spectrum program that encompasses K–12 and even undergraduate outreach, including the possible provision of scholarships for promising students.

*Kinetic Energy Interceptor and Multiple Kill Vehicle technology applications*

The committee recognizes that the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) program and the Multiple Kill Vehicle (MKV) program have completed research and development of certain technologies that could be beneficial to other defense programs. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 31, 2010, on the feasibility of completing development of certain technologies that were in the process of being developed through the KEI and MKV programs and could have additional useful defense applications.

*Missile defense and military operational requirements*

One of the key themes resident in the three missile defense programs that the Secretary of Defense has recommended for termination in the fiscal year 2010 budget request (the second Airborne Laser aircraft, the Multiple Kill Vehicle program, and the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) program) is that each program has not been linked to clear military operational requirements. The committee believes that this is a direct result of the Department's decision in 2002 to remove the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) from the normal Department of Defense requirements process, and from oversight by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. For example, the KEI program was originally presented to Congress as a sea-based, mobile missile defense interceptor. However, the current KEI interceptor is too large to fit into any existing Navy surface combatant without significant and costly modifications.

The need to effectively link missile defense programs with the Department's overall requirements process is essential if the United States is to deploy operationally effective, suitable, and survivable systems. While a number of steps to improve MDA's integration with the rest of the Department of Defense have recently occurred, such as the establishment of the Warfighter Involvement Program and the Missile Defense Executive Board, the committee believes that additional effort is required in this area. As the Department conducts the missile defense policy and strategy review required by section 234 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), the committee encourages the Department to take the necessary actions to ensure that missile defense programs are closely linked to the military operational requirements process.

*Missile defense inventory and force structure analysis*

The committee has long been concerned about how the Department of Defense has developed missile defense force structure and inventory requirements. 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 Defense to develop a process and methodology for determining overall missile defense force structure and inventory requirements. The Department recently notified the committee that it has begun an initial review of requirements and plans to address the committee's direction as part of the missile defense policy and strategy review required by section 229 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The committee supports this decision.

The committee expects that once the requirements review is complete, the Department will provide the results of the review to the committee, similar to the manner in which the Department provided the Joint Capabilities Mix II study results.

The committee believes that missile defense should be placed within a stronger defense planning framework to identify the nation's longer-term missile defense requirements to defend the United States, its deployed forces, and friends and allies against the full range of ballistic missile threats. Without such a framework, the committee is concerned that program decisions and tradeoffs may be made without a comprehensive understanding of the end-to-end requirements of the entire ballistic missile defense system. The committee believes that it is important for the Department's review to include participation of key stakeholders such as the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the relevant defense agencies. Furthermore, the committee believes that the analysis supporting the review should ensure that missile defense force structure and inventory requirements are clearly linked to threat assessments and warfighter requirements, such as operational effectiveness, suitability, maintainability, and survivability.

*Missile Defense Agency space support*

The committee recognizes that global, pervasive and persistent sensor coverage is necessary to support on-demand engagement of ballistic missiles early in flight. Space sensors provide such coverage free from geographical constraints and the need for host nation basing. The Missile Defense Agency is pursuing a space architecture which will integrate feeds from existing and programmed Overhead Persistent Infrared (OPIR) satellites with an envisioned fire control quality Precision Tracking Space Sensor (PTSS) constellation in Low Earth Orbit. Leveraging of OPIR assets will result in substantial technical simplification of the PTSS layer and significant cost savings.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the defense committees not later than March 1, 2010, providing a description of the PTSS long lead risk reduction activities to include: (1) payload design, prototyping and laboratory characterization; (2) continuing work on consolidated ground processing of overhead sensor feeds; and (3) implementation of the C2BMC interface.

*New approaches for national security information sharing*

The committee notes that since the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Homeland Security, and other members of the intelligence community have made some progress in implementing recommendations for improved interagency information sharing. The committee is concerned, however, that in pursuing information technology solutions with traditional systems providers, the Departments are neither fully coordinated nor are they leveraging the full range of innovative information technologies offered by small businesses.

The committee is aware that many such technologies offered by small businesses have already been prototyped on programs such as the Department of State's Net-Centric Diplomacy initiative and the U.S. Special Operations Command INFORM program. Therefore, in an effort to ensure information sharing solutions through leveraging breakthrough technology innovations, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to explore new, emerging commercial information technologies for interagency information sharing by:

(1) Transitioning mature innovative technology prototypes for information sharing in ways that are independent of current large systems development efforts performed through traditional lead systems integrators; and

(2) Integrating Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) proposals to support major Departmental programs for information sharing, command and control and data fusion.

*Organic social science expertise within the Department of Defense*

The committee is encouraged by the amount of effort that the Department of Defense has focused on cultivating social science expertise to support defense missions. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee noted concerns about the dearth of social science expertise within the Department. As new human, cultural, and social behavior related research and operational initiatives are started or expanded, such as the Minerva Initiative and the Human Terrain System, the lack of organic expertise is becoming more acute.

The committee supports the greater development of in-house capacity to take advantage of increasing social science methods in order to reduce dependencies on contractors or academics on the battlefield. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to utilize the full range of tools at the Department's disposal to increase that capacity, including:

(1) Encouraging the development of appropriate personnel specialties in the military departments;

(2) Encouraging advanced degrees for officers and enlisted personnel in key disciplines, such as anthropology, social psychology, sociology, and computational social sciences;

(3) Expanding faculty positions in military colleges for key disciplines, such as anthropology, social psychology, sociology, and computational social sciences, especially as they support multidisciplinary research centers in those institutions; and

(4) Developing a more robust concept for reachback that better leverages the academic community.

*Quantum computing research*

The committee is aware that quantum computing is emerging as a potentially new disruptive technology. While it has the potential to greatly enhance U.S. computing capability, it can also be used as a tool by adversaries wishing to compromise our technological capabilities. The committee encourages the Department of Defense (DOD) to continue to lead research in this area, but requires a better understanding of the state of research by the Department as well as by industry, academia, other federal and international entities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, in coordination with the scientific offices of the military departments and defense agencies, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees assessing the state of quantum computing research. The report should be submitted within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and should include the following elements:

(1) A description of quantum computing research activities within the Department of Defense, including those associated with cryptography, encryption, and stenography;

(2) An assessment of the possible impacts of quantum computing on DOD operations;

(3) An assessment of the secondary materiel impacts associated with the adoption of quantum computing techniques, such as hardware, routing or networking upgrades required to implement a quantum computing architecture;

(4) A comparative assessment of efforts within the United States and internationally in quantum computing, including civilian agency and commercial research and development; and

(5) An assessment of the sufficiency of the national workforce, including those civilian and military personnel within the Department capable of carrying out or managing these quantum computing research activities.

*Report on joint wargaming simulation management*

The committee has reviewed the Department's *Report on Department of Defense Joint Modeling and Simulation Activities,* submitted in response to section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee notes that the current value of modeling and simulation (M&S) to the Department of Defense (DOD) is clear and affirms the House of Representatives 2007 declaration (H. Res. 487) that M&S is a national critical technology. The committee further notes the utility of M&S continues to expand and that the application of this technology will become pervasive in all aspects of defense military and business operations.

As the impact of, and reliance upon, M&S increases, its trustworthiness must be assured by disciplined validation. To be affordable, duplicative efforts must be identified and rationalized. Because all possible uses of models and simulations and ways of employing them in combination cannot be anticipated, they should adhere to standards that maximize their interoperability and reuse.

To allow the Department to use M&S to collaborate with other government agencies and allied nations to plan, train, and develop new defense capabilities, those standards must be common. M&S requirements and resources must be visible across the Department to facilitate cooperative developments and reuse. Additionally, the work force must be educated to use M&S to its full potential.

Attaining these enterprise-level goals requires an effective DOD M&S management process, but it is not clear that the Department's new approach as outlined in DOD Directive 5000.59, entitled DoD Modeling and Simulation Management, rises to that level. Although the report claims that "the Department is executing enterprise management of M&S capabilities to enhance the return on M&S investment," it does not provide any specifics supporting that assertion. Additionally, the report is largely unresponsive to the requirement to describe "incentives and plans to reduce or divest duplicative or outdated capabilities." The report claims the Department's M&S steering committee management and coordination efforts are "yielding a high return on investment from the over $2.2 billion annual investment in joint M&S programs . . .," but it does not provide any metrics to validate that claim.

For these and other reasons, the committee believes a more careful consideration of DOD M&S management is appropriate. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report that explains the investments from the funding provided to its M&S management organization (PE 63832D8Z, Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office) and their impact on the rest of DOD M&S investments to achieve greater cost-effectiveness. The report should cover fiscal years 2006–2009 and should be submitted by January 31, 2010.

In light of the fact that M&S technology has transitioned beyond the technology development stage into mainstream use, the report should also consider the appropriateness of the current management of this Program Element by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

*Report on requirements for non-lethal weapons*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee noted the value of non-lethal weapons in reducing risks to the warfighter and to non-combatants in current and prospective contingency operations. The committee urged the Department to accelerate its efforts to field such systems, including active denial technologies to: ensure adequate funding for the non-lethal weapons science and technology base; and to develop policy, doctrine, and tactics for their employment. Since then, the increase in piracy on the high seas, unintended noncombatant casualties in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and the evolution of U.S. defense strategy toward a greater focus on support and stability operations, support to civil authorities, humanitarian assistance, and unconventional and irregular warfare reinforce the committee's belief that non-lethal weapons can play a valuable role in ensuring mission success. Despite this, the General Accountability Office (GAO), in an April 2009 report titled *DOD Needs to Improve Program Management, Policy, and Testing to Enhance Ability to Field Operationally Useful Non-lethal Weapons,* noted flaws in the Depart-

ment's process for procuring non-lethal weapons. The committee agrees with the GAO that the acquisition process for procuring these capabilities must be streamlined and made more efficient. The process must also support the Department's requirements for fielding such systems in a timely manner in support of mission objectives.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, by November 1, 2009, on the Department's requirements for non-lethal weapons. The report should address, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of the types of missions where non-lethal weapons would provide a useful adjunct to the use of lethal force;

(2) An explanation of how the Department intends to integrate non-lethal weapons into U.S. defense strategy, including the role envisioned for non-lethal systems in the Quadrennial Defense Review;

(3) An assessment of whether the services have adequately prioritized the development and fielding of non-lethal weapons vis-a-vis other capabilities tailored to the requirements of irregular warfare;

(4) An assessment of how the combatant commanders view the utility of non-lethal weapons for operations in their respective theaters;

(5) A description of the actions the Department has taken to address the concerns contained in the GAO report and the results of those actions; and

(6) An identification of impediments to the development and fielding of non-lethal weapons and an explanation of what actions the Department is taking to overcome those impediments.

*Short-range ballistic missile defense*

The budget request contained $119.6 million in PE 63913C for Israeli Cooperative Programs.

The short-range ballistic missile defense program is being jointly developed by the United States and the State of Israel to provide an affordable and effective defense against the threat from long-range artillery rockets and short-range ballistic missiles, and will provide direct benefits to the security of both nations.

The committee recommends $140.1 million, an increase of $20.5 million, in PE 63913C to support continued development of the short-range ballistic missile defense program.

*Solid state technology for non-lethal systems*

Current active denial non-lethal systems require large gyrotron tube-based technology that limits these systems to primarily support fixed site operations. In order to make this non-lethal technology tactically viable to mobile forces, the current tube-based technology must be replaced by smaller, lighter, lower-cost systems that allow active denial technology to be integrated with ground combat vehicles. One enabler for smaller size and cost reduction is the development of a versatile high-power solid-state array. The committee urges the Department to pursue other technologies, such as a high-power solid-state source, to accelerate the development and demonstration of a more compact Active Denial System.

*Theater missile defense*

The committee has been concerned for several years that the missile defense program has been too focused on the threat from long-range ballistic missiles at the expense of providing combatant commanders with sufficient theater missile defense capabilities. The threat from short- and medium-range ballistic missiles represents the overwhelming ballistic missile threat to U.S. interests, deployed forces, and friends and allies around the world. According to estimates from the U.S. intelligence community, the total number of ballistic missiles other than from the United States, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China is over 5,900. Of that number, short- and medium-range ballistic missiles represent 99 percent of the total inventory.

The Joint Capabilities Mix Study II, conducted by the Joint Staff in 2007 to examine theater missile defense inventory requirements, concluded that combatant commanders required nearly double the 96 Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) interceptors and the 133 Standard Missile-3 (SM–3) interceptors than originally planned to address the short- and medium-range ballistic missile threat. The committee notes its support for the Department's decision to increase funding for the THAAD and Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense programs by $900.0 million in fiscal year 2010. Under the revised program plan, the SM–3 interceptor inventory will grow from 133 to 329, and the THAAD interceptor inventory will grow from 96 to 287 over the Future Years Defense Program.

This decision represents an important milestone in providing the warfighter with the capabilities necessary to defend against the threats to U.S. interests, its deployed forces, and friends and allies around the world. The committee also supports the Department's decision to initiate the development of a land-based version of the SM–3 interceptor. Deployment of such a capability has the potential to expand missile defense coverage for U.S. deployed forces and friends and allies around the world.

## OPERATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $190.8 million for Operational research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $190.8 million, the requested amount for fiscal year 2009.

## Title II - Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE** | | | |
| 001 | 0605118OTE | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION | 58,647 | | 58,647 |
| 002 | 0605131OTE | LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION | 12,285 | | 12,285 |
| 003 | 0605814OTE | OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES | 119,838 | | 119,838 |
| | | **Total, Operational Systems Development, Defense-wide** | **190,770** | **0** | **190,770** |

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would establish the amounts authorized to be appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2010.

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

### Section 211—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Navy Next Generation Enterprise Network

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from obligating more than 50 percent of the remaining funds for the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet Continuity of Services Contract or the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN) until a detailed architectural specification for NGEN is submitted to the congressional defense committees.

### Section 212—Limitation on Expenditure of Funds for Joint Multi-Mission Submersible Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to complete an assessment of a potential cost-sharing agreement between the Department of Defense and the intelligence community for the Joint Multi-Mission Submersible (JMMS) program. This section would further prohibit the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2010 for JMMS until the congressional defense and intelligence committees receive the required assessment and a certification from the Secretary that the plan developed pursuant to the aforementioned assessment represents the most effective and affordable means for meeting the underlying requirement.

### Section 213—Separate Program Elements Required for Research and Development of Individual Body Armor and Associated Components

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that within each research, development, test and evaluation account a separate, dedicated program element is assigned to the research and development of individual body armor.

The committee understands the objective for body armor science and technology (S&T) initiatives are to advance protection levels, reduce armor weights, and develop manufacturing practices that ensure quality and affordability. Current S&T programs are pursuing two technical design paths to enhance current fielded body armor designs. The first path is pursuing the same level of protection at significantly reduced weights. The second path is exploring increased levels of protection at equal weight and/or in better flexible configurations. The committee strongly supports these S&T initiatives and believes these efforts directly focused on body armor are collaborative, coordinated, and leveraged with the work of other military services, industry, and academia.

While these S&T activities are reasonably robust, the committee notes there are currently no significant research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) accounts to transfer the S&T activities into. The committee expects the establishment of RDT&E program elements to: ensure the warfighter is equipped with the most current individual protection gear; find ways to reduce weight with current technologies via mission tailoring and low-risk reduced protection; and increase investment in promising technologies that would eventually achieve reduced weight and increased protection together, as well as maximize flexibility and modularity.

Section 214—Separate Procurement and Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Line Items and Program Elements for the F–35B and the F–35C Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft

This section would require the would require the Secretary of Defense, beginning with the fiscal year 2011 annual budget submission of the Department of Defense to the President, to provide a separate budget line item and program element within the Department of the Navy aircraft procurement and research, development, test and evaluation accounts for the F–35B and the F–35C aircraft.

Section 215—Restriction on Obligation of Funds Pending Submission of Selected Acquisition Reports

This section would fence 50 percent of research and development funding for specified Army development programs pending receipt of required Department of Defense selected acquisition reports.

Section 216—Restriction on Obligation of Funds for Future Combat Systems Program Pending Receipt of Report

This section would restrict the obligation of 75 percent of fiscal year 2010 Future Combat Systems research and development funds pending receipt of the milestone review report required by section 214(c) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Current law only restricts procurement funding.

Section 217—Limitation of the Obligation of Funds for the Net-Enabled Command and Control System

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating more than 25 percent of the funds for the Net-Enabled Command and Control (NECC) system until a plan for reorganizing and consolidating the management of the NECC and the Global Command and Control System (GCCS) family of systems is submitted to the congressional defense committees.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has been unable to develop a rational plan for modernizing joint command and control. While the program has continued to address previous concerns with technical risk, testing, and cost, it is apparent that the Department's management and governance construct for this program has delayed approval of milestone B to such a point that the program will be in breach of the Nunn-McCurdy temporal limitations. This in turn, has affected the Department's

ability to develop and field the next generation of joint command and control capabilities.

### Section 218—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for F–35 Lightning II Program

This section would limit the obligation of amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2010 for research, development, test, and evaluation for the F–35 Lightning II program to 75 percent until 15 days after the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that: all funds made available for the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the F–35 Lightning II have been obligated; the Secretary of Defense submits the report required by section 123 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417); and the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees the annual plan and certification for fiscal year 2010 required by section 231a of title 10, United States Code.

### Section 219—Programs Required to Provide the Army with Ground Combat Vehicle and Self-Propelled Artillery Capabilities

This section requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out programs to develop, test, and, when demonstrated operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and affordable, field new or upgraded Army ground combat vehicle and self-propelled artillery capabilities. The Section requires a report, by February 1, 2010, on the Secretary of Defense's plans to implement these programs. The section also restricts obligation of 50 percent of the funds for certain Army vehicle research and development programs pending receipt of the report.

## SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

### Section 221—Integrated Air and Missile Defense System Project

This section would limit the obligation of funding for the Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) System project until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that he has: executed a review of the IAMD project; determined the project is an affordable, executable project; determined that the project meets a current required capability; and, concluded that no other project could be executed, at less cost, that would be capable of fulfilling the required capability.

### Section 222—Ground-based Midcourse Defense Sustainment and Modernization Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a sustainment and modernization program to ensure the long-term reliability, availability, maintainability, and supportability of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system to protect the United States against limited ballistic missile attacks, whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense

committees outlining the Department of Defense's long-term sustainment and modernization plan for that system.

The committee notes its continuing concern about the long-term sustainment, maintainability, and modernization of the GMD system. The committee believes that the establishment of a lifecycle sustainment program, as required by this provision, would ensure the long-term reliability of the GMD system through surveillance, analysis, modeling and simulation, testing, and preserve a responsive industrial base. Furthermore, the committee believes that a modernization program would allow for the industrial base to enhance the GMD system in response to evolving threats, introduce new technology as it becomes available, and mitigate parts obsolescence.

The committee further notes that the Department plans to terminate the ground-based interceptor (GBI) production line in 2012 but intends to retain the option for future procurement of GBIs, including for flight-test assets and spares. However, several second and third tier suppliers complete GBI component deliveries in 2009 and 2010. As part of the sustainment and modernization program, the committee encourages the Department to develop a strategy for preserving the industrial base that supports the GMD system.

### Section 223—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Acquisition or Deployment of Missile Defenses in Europe

This section would prohibit the Department of Defense from acquiring (other than for initial long-lead procurement) or deploying operational missiles of a long-range missile defense system in Europe until the Secretary of Defense, after receiving the views of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, submits to the congressional defense committees a report certifying that the proposed interceptor to be deployed as part of such a missile defense system has demonstrated, through successful, operationally realistic flight testing, a high probability of working in an operationally effective manner and the ability to accomplish the mission.

### Section 224—Sense of Congress Reaffirming Continued Support for Protecting the United States Against Limited Ballistic Missile Attacks Whether Accidental, Unauthorized, or Deliberate

This section would express the sense of Congress for the continued support for protecting the United States against limited ballistic missile attacks (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate) by continuing robust research, development, test, and evaluation of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system and the Standard Missile-3 Block IIA interceptor.

### Section 225—Ascent Phase Missile Defense Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees outlining a strategy for ascent phase missile defense within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Section 226—Availability of Funds for a Missile Defense System for Europe and the United States

This section would make various findings regarding missile defense, and reserve $343.1 million from funds available for the Missile Defense Agency in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 for the purpose of developing missile defenses in Europe.

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to obligate and expend funds reserved under this section for one of two purposes. Either the Secretary may obligate and expend funds on the research, development, test, and evaluation of the proposed midcourse radar element of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system in the Czech Republic and the proposed long-range missile defense interceptor site element of such defense system in the Republic of Poland; or the Secretary may obligate and expend funds on the research, development, test, and evaluation, procurement, site activation, construction, preparation of, equipment for, or deployment of an alternative integrated missile defense system that would protect Europe and the United States from the threats posed by all types of ballistic missiles.

This section would condition obligation or expenditure of funds for the second option on a certification of the Secretary that the alternative is expected to be: consistent with the direction of the North Atlantic Council to address ballistic missile threats to Europe and the United States in a prioritized manner that includes consideration of the level of imminence of the threat and the level of acceptable risk; at least as cost-effective, technically reliable, and operationally available in protecting Europe and the United States from missile threats as first alternative; deployable in a sufficient amount of time to counter current and emerging ballistic missile threats (as determined by the intelligence community) launched from the Middle East region that could threaten Europe and the United States; and interoperable with other components of missile defense and compliments the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's missile defense strategy.

## SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

### Section 231—Comptroller General Assessment of Coordination of Energy Storage Device Requirements and Investments

This section would require the Comptroller General to conduct an assessment of Department of Defense coordination of energy storage device requirements and investments and submit the findings and recommendations of the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services no later than March 1, 2010.

### Section 232—Annual Comptroller Report on the F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Acquisition Program

This section would require the Comptroller General to conduct an annual review of the F–35 Lightning II aircraft acquisition program by March 15 of each year, from 2010 through 2015, and submit a report to the congressional defense committees which shall include: the extent to which the acquisition program is meeting development and procurement cost, schedule, and performance goals;

the progress and results of developmental and operational testing and plans for correcting deficiencies in aircraft performance, operational effectiveness, and suitability; and aircraft procurement plans, production results, and efforts to improve manufacturing efficiency and supplier performance.

Section 233—Report on Integration of Department of Defense Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Capabilities

This section would limit the obligation of the amounts made available for PE 35884L for intelligence planning, to not more than 25 percent until 30 days after the date on which the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence provides the information required in subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) of section 923(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2004 (Public Law 108–136).

Section 234—Report on Future Research and Development of Man-Portable and Vehicle-Mounted Guided Missile Systems

The section requires a report from the Secretary of the Army on the Army's future plans for upgrades to, and replacement of, selected Army missile systems. The section restricts obligation of 30 percent of Army missile research and development funding pending submission of the report.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 241—Access of the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to Department of Defense Information

This section would grant the Director, Test Resource Management Center (TRMC) the same authority to military service department information that current law provides the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation. The purpose of this new authority would be to ensure that the Director, TRMC has access to all the information he needs to carry out his duties to certify service budgets and provide recommendations to the Secretary of Defense regarding Department of Defense test and evaluation infrastructure.

Section 242—Inclusion in Annual Budget Request and Future-Years Defense Program of Sufficient Amounts for Continued Development and Procurement of Competitive Propulsion System for F–35 Lightning II

This section would amend chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section 235 that would require that the Secretary of Defense to include, in the materials submitted by the Secretary to the President, a request for such amounts as necessary for the full funding of the continued development and procurement of a competitive propulsion system for the F–35 Lightning II effective for the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2011 and each fiscal year thereafter. This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense ensure that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2010 or any year thereafter for research, development, test, and evaluation and procurement, be obligated and expended in sufficient annual amounts for the continued development and procurement of two options for the F–35 Light-

ning II propulsion system in order to ensure the development and competitive production of the F–35 Lightning II propulsion system. Additionally, this section would amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by striking section 213.

Section 243—Establishment of Program to Enhance Participation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions in Defense Research Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program that would enhance the capability of minority-serving institutions, as defined under title III and title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–329), to perform research that is vital to national defense.

The committee asserts that our nation requires and will continue to require a highly trained, technical workforce in an ever-increasing knowledge-based economy. As occupations in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) rise, a critical number of America's scientists and engineers prepare to retire over the next 10 to 15 years. The committee remains concerned that this continued imbalance will leave a tremendous gap in our nation's ability to provide qualified students to meet the rising demand for a strong scientific workforce, especially within the Department of Defense (DOD).

The DOD scientific workforce has traditionally been at the forefront of technological advances supporting defense platforms, weaponry, and command and control systems as well as the changing demands of battlefields and special operations activities. However, the committee notes that several articles over the last 5 years, including the National Academies study, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future* (July 2008), argue that the United States' pre-eminence in science and technology advances has begun to erode. Over the past 5 years, senior DOD officials have testified to the committee that the Department's science and engineering workforce has experienced an attrition of more than 13,000 personnel over the last 10 years, while the demands for that same workforce is projected to increase by more than 10 percent over the next 5 years. The committee notes that several major studies since 1999 conclude that the production of U.S. graduates in critical areas of science and engineering are not meeting national, homeland, and economic security needs. The committee understands that the federal workforce and, in particular, the national security workforce, faces direct and escalating competition from domestic and global commercial interests for top-of-their-class scientists and engineers.

The committee stresses that, to address the nation's science and engineering workforce shortfall, the United States must marshal all its human capital reserves, including minority groups who are engaged or have propensity to engage in STEM fields. The committee supports the conclusion reached in the National Science and Technology Council report, *Strong U.S. Scientific, Technical, and Engineering Workforce in the 21st Century,* that as minority groups increase within the U.S. population, increasing their participation rate in science and engineering is critical if our nation is to maintain the overall participation rate in the STEM disciplines. The Na-

tional Science Board's 2004 *Science and Engineering Indicators* emphasized that African Americans, Hispanics, and other minority groups are about a quarter of the U.S. population, but make up only 18 percent of the undergraduate population, 2.5 percent of the science and engineering majors, and 6 percent of the science and engineering workforce. Given that the overall number of U.S. students receiving bachelor degrees and the number of such students attending graduate school in most STEM fields have declined sharply by comparison to the previous decade, the committee remains committed to ensuring that the Department adequately supports the training and development of all students, including those ethnic and gender-specific groups that are the most at risk within the STEM disciplines, as well as ensure an adequate supply of scientists and engineers to meet the national security needs of our nation. Therefore, the committee believes that increasing the participation of underrepresented groups is critical to ensuring the United States can draw upon a robust workforce of scientists and engineers who can continue to produce innovative technological advances for the purposes of national and economic security.

The committee notes that minority-serving institutions defined under title III and title V of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 (Public Law 89–329) represent a significant source of minority students in the engineering, science, mathematics, technology education and research fields. According to the Institute for Higher Education Policy, approximately 2.3 million students, or about one-third of all African Americans, American Indians/Alaska Natives, and Hispanics in all higher education institutions in the United States and Puerto Rico, were enrolled at institutions funded under title III and title V of HEA. These numbers have grown rapidly in recent years. The committee notes that the National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, reports enrollment at these institutions accelerated by 66 percent from 1995 to 2003, compared to only 20 percent at all postsecondary institutions. The committee believes that by educating the nation's increasingly diverse minority populations, these institutions represent the vanguard of the country's potential and promise, which should be appropriately supported.

The government's interest in the promotion of racial diversity has been found by courts to be sufficiently compelling in the context of higher education. The committee notes that sections 1067, 1101, and 1051 of title 20, Unites States Code, emphasize that there is a particular national interest in supporting institutions that serve a high percentage of low-income students. Further, those sections, express and support the nation's interest in aiding those institutions of higher education that have historically served minority students and whose participation in the American system of higher education is in the nation's interest. Accordingly, in the spirit and intent of the above noted statutory codes, the committee reaffirms this position and further confirms that the government's compelling interest in promoting diversity in higher education is buttressed by its compelling national security interest in a cohesive military. This requires a diverse civilian and enlisted base that have been educated and trained in varied educational settings to perform research, development, testing, and evaluation within the Department.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its efforts to support programs designed to provide opportunities for minority-serving institutions to participate in defense research programs. The committee encourages the Department to continue to maximize opportunities for these institutions and recommends that the Department develop innovative ways to continue the involvement of these institutions in defense research, test and evaluation programs. This section would assist the Department with implementing outreach, technical assistance, capacity building, and mentoring programs relative to minority-serving institutions.

Section 244—Extension of Authority to Award Prizes for Advanced Technology Achievements

This section would extend the Department's ability to award cash prizes in recognition of outstanding achievements and innovative research, development, and technology development of interest to the Department from both traditional and non-traditional sources. The committee recognizes that prize authority is a useful tool in generating broad public interest and engagement in defense technology needs and provides a means for the Department to gain a significant return on investment in the areas of research, technology, and prototyping. The committee notes the Department's past use of prize authority for robotic vehicle competition and wearable power systems and encourages further use.

This section would extend the authority from September 30, 2010 to September 30, 2013.

Section 245—Executive Agent for Advanced Energetics

This section would require the establishment of an executive agent to oversee Department of Defense activities related to advanced energetics. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed concerns over the known advances in energetic materials research, development, and manufacturing technologies by foreign countries. The committee noted that such advances could pose a national security risk arising from new and unanticipated energetic materials developed by foreign governments. The committee further noted that the Department of Defense has not maintained a robust energetics program necessary to develop future innovative munitions and the next generation of energetic scientists and engineers. As a result of these concerns, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with other federal agencies, to assess the current state and future advances in energetic material research, development, and manufacturing in both foreign countries and the United States and submit its findings to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009. As of May 2009, the Department has yet to submit the report.

The committee believes the Department lacks a consistent, future capability-based strategy for energetics research, development, and manufacturing and notes that efforts to address these concerns have been underfunded and disjointed. Fragmented programs supporting energetic research and the decline of the workforce affiliated with these programs create a significant loss of capacity for

such a critically important capability. The committee believes that advanced energetic technology crosses the domain of all the military departments and requires a consolidated and focused approach to enhance the capability across the Department.

### Section 246—Study on Thorium-Liquid Fueled Reactors for Naval Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) to carry out a study on the use of thorium-liquid fueled nuclear reactors for naval power needs. The report would analyze and compare thorium liquid fueled reactors and uranium fueled reactors for safety, power requirements, and lifecycle costs. The Secretary and CJCS would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on their findings by February 1, 2011.

### Section 247—Visiting National Institutes of Health Senior Neuroscience Fellowship Program

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to establish a visiting National Institutes of Health (NIH) neuroscience fellowship within the Department of Defense. The program would include fellowships with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Defense Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury for the purposes of expanding collaboration with the NIH on neuroscience research. The period of any fellowship under this program should not last more than two years.

## TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained approximately $185.7 billion in operation and maintenance funds to ensure that the Department of Defense can train, deploy, and sustain U.S. military forces. The budget request increased the operation and maintenance account by $6.6 billion over the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, resulting in a 3.7 percent increase after accounting for inflation. The committee commends the Department for applying additional resources to the readiness accounts in fiscal year 2010, but overall readiness remains tenuous and further attention will be needed in subsequent fiscal years to return U.S. forces to full-spectrum preparedness.

By relying upon Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding to achieve air, ground, and sea training at levels required to maintain military standards, the fiscal year 2010 budget request essentially leaves training at a steady state. Vital to training for the full-spectrum mission are Combat Training Center rotations, sustained air crew training, and increased ship-deployed steaming days. The fiscal year 2010 budget request slightly increases tank training miles to 550 (from 547 funded in fiscal year 2009). Flying hours slightly increase for the Navy. The Air Force's flying-hour program has been reduced by $67.0 million, or 52,000 hours, due to the retirement of roughly 250 aircraft. Additionally, the Navy

will rely upon OCO funding to achieve 58 ship underway, or steaming, days per quarter.

The Army budget request of $83.4 billion represents an increase of $600.0 million over last year's request. This increase is achieved, in part, by the movement of a number of items between the base budget authorization and the OCO request. This flat-lining of operation and maintenance funding comes at a time when the Army's readiness to meet threats across the full spectrum of conflict remains poor. Readiness reports since 2003 have shown a continual downward trend in full-mission readiness ratings. The Army remains under significant strain to meet current requirements in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in terms of equipment and personnel.

Because of ongoing requirements in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Navy today has more officers and sailors (10,743) on the ground serving as individual augmentees than it has at sea in the Central Command area of responsibility. The Department of the Navy's budget request is $600.0 million above last year's request. With the funding requested, Navy and Marine Corps pilots both achieve their training goals, but fleet replacement squadrons are budgeted well below their monthly flying-hour goal. Navy aircraft depot maintenance is expected to cover 100 percent of the primary authorized aircraft goal for deployed squadrons' airframes and 97 percent of non-deployed squadrons' airframes, but the budget request of $5.3 billion for ship maintenance leaves $186.0 million in deferred maintenance.

Of the Marine Corps' current active end strength of 200,931, some 28,000 are on deployment or forward deployed, including 5,686 in Afghanistan and the majority (16,585) still in Iraq. Specific increases in the Marine Corps budget request were driven primarily by the movement of family support programs out of the OCO request and into the baseline. Receipt of the requested $554.0 million in OCO funding is critical to reducing risk in Marine Corps depot maintenance which funds the reset of the combat equipment supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Department of the Navy budget documents state that Marine Corps equipment is being used at seven times its peacetime rate.

Air Force readiness continues to decline due to the high operational tempo required by ongoing overseas contingency operations. Of the 27,000 airmen deployed to Central Command, 6,600 are providing support for Army and Marine Corps ground combat operations in a variety of roles, including explosive ordnance disposal, military police operations, and logistics support. Since September 11, 2001, the Air Force has flown more than 570,000 sorties, including 50,000 to directly protect the United States. The Air Force has committed more than 250 aircraft to support Central Command combat operations and has been flying more than 200 sorties per day. This high utilization of aging Air Force assets has resulted in readiness rates that are 17 percent below unit operational readiness rates prior to September 11, 2001.

After more than seven years of continuous combat operations, skills not required for the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan have atrophied and will take time to restore once the troops are allowed sufficient dwell time. Readiness will improve in the out years only with intensive management and resourcing as the services require

funding to reset equipment and retrain their forces. The committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to use every available authority to accelerate restoration of a strong readiness posture to reduce risk as soon as possible.

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 1,020,490 | | 1,020,490 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 105,178 | | 105,178 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 708,038 | | 708,038 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 718,233 | | 718,233 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,379,529 | 2,000 | 1,381,529 |
| | M-Gator | | [2,000] | |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 850,750 | 8,000 | 858,750 |
| | MI-17 Aircraft Modifications | | [8,000] | |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,088,233 | | 2,088,233 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 633,704 | 1,000 | 634,704 |
| | Operational and Technical Training Validation for Joint Maneuver Forces at Fort Bliss | | [1,000] | |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 692,601 | 5,000 | 697,601 |
| | Texas Defense Manufacturing Supply Chain Initiative | | [5,000] | |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 7,586,455 | 1,700 | 7,588,155 |
| | Fort Bliss Data Center | | [1,700] | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 2,221,446 | 244,000 | 2,465,446 |
| | Increase in Sustainment to 100% | | [244,000] | |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 333,119 | | 333,119 |
| 130 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 123,163 | | 123,163 |
| 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 0 | 237,750 | 237,750 |
| | Transfer from Title I | | [237,750] | |
| 150 | COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM | 0 | | 0 |
| 160 | RESET | 0 | | 0 |
| 170 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS | 460,159 | | 460,159 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **18,921,098** | **499,450** | **19,420,548** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 180 | STRATEGIC MOBILITY | 228,376 | | 228,376 |
| 190 | ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS | 98,129 | | 98,129 |
| 200 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 5,705 | | 5,705 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **332,210** | | **332,210** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 210 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 125,615 | | 125,615 |
| 220 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 87,488 | | 87,488 |
| 230 | ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING | 59,302 | | 59,302 |
| 240 | SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 449,397 | | 449,397 |
| | **BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING** | | | |
| 250 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 970,777 | | 970,777 |
| 260 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 843,893 | | 843,893 |
| 270 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 166,812 | | 166,812 |
| 280 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 702,031 | | 702,031 |
| | **RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING** | | | |
| 290 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 541,852 | | 541,852 |
| 300 | EXAMINING | 147,915 | | 147,915 |
| 310 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 238,353 | | 238,353 |
| 320 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 217,386 | | 217,386 |
| 330 | JUNIOR ROTC | 156,904 | 13,000 | 169,904 |
| | Junior ROTC | | [13,000] | |
| | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **4,707,725** | **13,000** | **4,720,725** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 340 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 1,017,055 | | 1,017,055 |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 350 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 540,249 | | 540,249 |
| 360 | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 614,093 | | 614,093 |
| 370 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 481,318 | 3,000 | 484,318 |
| | Operational and Tactical Logistics Asset Visibility (Fuel/Ammo) | | [3,000] | |
| 380 | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 434,661 | 1,000 | 435,661 |
| | M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade | | [1,000] | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 390 | ADMINISTRATION | 776,866 | | 776,866 |
| 400 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 1,166,491 | | 1,166,491 |
| 410 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 289,383 | | 289,383 |
| 420 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 221,779 | | 221,779 |
| 430 | OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT | 993,852 | | 993,852 |
| 440 | ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES | 215,168 | | 215,168 |
| 450 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 118,785 | | 118,785 |
| | **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | | | |
| 460 | SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS | 430,449 | 10,000 | 440,449 |
| | NATO Special Operations Coordination Center | | [10,000] | |
| 470 | MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS | 13,700 | | 13,700 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **7,313,849** | **14,000** | **7,327,849** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | **-402,900** | -402,900 |
| | Unobligated Balances Estimate | | [-340,000] | |
| | Fuel Reduction | | [-62,900] | |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army** | **31,274,882** | **123,550** | **31,398,432** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 3,814,000 | | 3,814,000 |
| 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 120,868 | | 120,868 |
| 030 | AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES | 52,259 | | 52,259 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 121,649 | | 121,649 |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 485,321 | | 485,321 |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,057,747 | 195,000 | 1,252,747 |
| | Aviation Depot Maintenance | | [195,000] | |
| 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 32,083 | | 32,083 |
| | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 080 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 3,320,222 | | 3,320,222 |
| 090 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 699,581 | | 699,581 |
| 100 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 4,296,544 | 186,000 | 4,482,544 |
| | Ship Depot Maintenance | | [186,000] | |
| 110 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,170,785 | 1,500 | 1,172,285 |
| | Ship Life Assessment Pilot Program | | [1,500] | |
| | **COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT** | | | |
| 120 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 601,595 | | 601,595 |
| 130 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 86,019 | | 86,019 |
| 140 | SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE | 167,050 | | 167,050 |
| 150 | WARFARE TACTICS | 407,674 | | 407,674 |
| 160 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 315,228 | | 315,228 |
| 170 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 758,789 | 1,000 | 759,789 |
| | Navy Tactical Development | | [1,000] | |
| 180 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 186,794 | | 186,794 |
| 190 | DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,305 | | 3,305 |
| 200 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 167,789 | | 167,789 |
| 210 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 259,188 | | 259,188 |
| | **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 220 | CRUISE MISSILE | 131,895 | | 131,895 |
| 230 | FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE | 1,145,020 | | 1,145,020 |
| 240 | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 64,731 | | 64,731 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 250 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 448,777 | | 448,777 |
| 260 | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 326,535 | | 326,535 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 270 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 1,095,587 | | 1,095,587 |
| 280 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 1,746,418 | 148,000 | 1,894,418 |
| | Increase in Sustainment to 100% | | [148,000] | |
| 290 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 4,058,046 | | 4,058,046 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **27,141,499** | **531,500** | **27,672,999** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | **READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES** | | | |
| 300 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 407,977 | | 407,977 |
| | **ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS** | | | |
| 310 | AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 7,491 | | 7,491 |
| 320 | SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 192,401 | | 192,401 |
| | **MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS** | | | |
| 330 | FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM | 24,546 | | 24,546 |
| 340 | INDUSTRIAL READINESS | 2,409 | | 2,409 |
| 350 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 25,727 | | 25,727 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **660,551** | | **660,551** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 360 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 145,027 | | 145,027 |
| 370 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 11,011 | | 11,011 |
| 380 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 127,490 | | 127,490 |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 390 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 477,383 | 1,500 | 478,883 |
| | Mobile Learning Cultural Training for Military Personnel | | [1,500] | |
| 400 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 1,268,846 | | 1,268,846 |
| 410 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 161,922 | | 161,922 |
| 420 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 158,685 | | 158,685 |
| | **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | | | |
| 430 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 276,564 | 651 | 277,215 |
| | Navy Sea Cadet Corps | | [651] | |
| 440 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 154,979 | | 154,979 |
| 450 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 101,556 | | 101,556 |
| 460 | JUNIOR ROTC | 49,161 | 4,900 | 54,061 |
| | Junior ROTC | | [4,900] | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **2,932,624** | **7,051** | **2,939,675** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 470 | ADMINISTRATION | 768,048 | | 768,048 |
| 480 | EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 6,171 | | 6,171 |
| 490 | CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 114,675 | | 114,675 |
| 500 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 182,115 | | 182,115 |
| 510 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 298,729 | | 298,729 |
| 520 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 408,744 | | 408,744 |
| 530 | MEDICAL ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT** | | | |
| 540 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 246,989 | | 246,989 |
| 550 | ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS | 0 | | 0 |
| 560 | PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN | 244,337 | 3,000 | 247,337 |
| | Mobile Condition Assessment System Pilot for Commander, Navy Region Hawaii | | [3,000] | |
| 570 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 778,501 | | 778,501 |
| 580 | HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT | 60,223 | | 60,223 |
| 590 | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 17,328 | | 17,328 |
| 600 | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS | 79,065 | | 79,065 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 610 | NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE | 515,989 | | 515,989 |
| | **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | | | |
| 670 | INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES | 5,918 | -2,500 | 3,418 |
| | International Headquarters and Agencies | | [-2,500] | |
| | **CANCELLED ACCOUNTS** | | | |
| 680 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | | 0 |
| 690 | JUDGMENT FUND | 0 | | 0 |
| | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 608,840 | | 608,840 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **4,335,672** | **500** | **4,336,172** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | -278,400 | -278,400 |
| | Unobligated Balances Estimate | | [-166,000] | |
| | Fuel Reduction | | [-112,400] | |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | **35,070,346** | **260,651** | **35,330,997** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 730,931 | 11,600 | 742,531 |
| | Cold Weather Layering System | | [2,600] | |
| | Flame Resistant Organizational Gear | | [5,000] | |
| | Ultra Lightweight Camouflage Net System | | [4,000] | |
| 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 591,020 | | 591,020 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 80,971 | | 80,971 |
| | **USMC PREPOSITIONING** | | | |
| 050 | MARITIME PREPOSITIONING | 72,182 | | 72,182 |
| 060 | NORWAY PREPOSITIONING | 5,090 | | 5,090 |
| | **COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT** | | | |
| 070 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 080 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 666,330 | | 666,330 |
| 090 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 2,250,191 | | 2,250,191 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **4,396,715** | **11,600** | **4,408,315** |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 100 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 16,129 | | 16,129 |
| 110 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 418 | | 418 |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 120 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 67,336 | | 67,336 |
| 130 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 369 | | 369 |
| 140 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 28,112 | | 28,112 |
| 150 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 330,885 | | 330,885 |
| | **RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION** | | | |
| 160 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 240,832 | | 240,832 |
| 170 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 64,254 | | 64,254 |
| 180 | JUNIOR ROTC | 19,305 | 1,000 | 20,305 |
| | Junior ROTC | | [1,000] | |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 190 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 0 | 66,000 | 66,000 |
| | Increase in Sustainment to 100% | | [66,000] | |
| 200 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **767,640** | **67,000** | **834,640** |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 210 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 299,065 | | 299,065 |
| 220 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 28,924 | | 28,924 |
| 230 | ADMINISTRATION | 43,879 | | 43,879 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 240 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION | 0 | | 0 |
| 250 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **371,868** | | **371,868** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | **-44,000** | -44,000 |
| | Unobligated Balances Estimate | | [-35,000] | |
| | Fuel Reduction | | [-9,000] | |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | **5,536,223** | **34,600** | **5,570,823** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 4,017,156 | 145,700 | 4,162,856 |
| | Advanced Autonomous Robotic Inspections for Aging Aircraft | | [2,000] | |
| | Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | | [143,700] | |
| 020 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 2,754,563 | | 2,754,563 |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 1,414,913 | 135,055 | 1,549,968 |
| | Air Education and Training Command Range Improvements | | [4,555] | |
| | Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | | [130,500] | |
| 050 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 2,389,738 | -3,600 | 2,386,138 |
| | Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | | [-3,600] | |
| 060 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,420,083 | 289,000 | 1,709,083 |
| | Increase in Sustainment to 100% | | [289,000] | |
| 070 | BASE SUPPORT | 2,859,943 | 240 | 2,860,183 |
| | Wage Modification for US Azores Portugese National Employees | | [240] | |
| | **COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 080 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 1,411,813 | | 1,411,813 |
| 090 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 880,353 | 4,000 | 884,353 |
| | Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | | [4,000] | |
| 110 | TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | 552,148 | | 552,148 |
| | **SPACE OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 120 | LAUNCH FACILITIES | 356,367 | | 356,367 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 130 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 725,646 | | 725,646 |
| | **COCOM** | | | |
| 140 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 608,796 | | 608,796 |
| 150 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 216,073 | | 216,073 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **19,607,592** | **570,395** | **20,177,987** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 160 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 2,932,080 | -8,000 | 2,924,080 |
| | Warner Robins Air Logistics Center Strategic Airlift Aircraft Availability Improvements | | [2,000] | |
| | Fee for Service Refueling | | [-10,000] | |
| 170 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 211,858 | | 211,858 |
| 180 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 332,226 | | 332,226 |
| 190 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 362,954 | | 362,954 |
| 200 | BASE SUPPORT | 657,830 | | 657,830 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **4,496,948** | **-8,000** | **4,488,948** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 210 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 120,870 | | 120,870 |
| 220 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 18,135 | | 18,135 |
| 230 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) | 88,414 | | 88,414 |
| 240 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 372,788 | | 372,788 |
| 250 | BASE SUPPORT | 685,029 | | 685,029 |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 260 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 514,048 | | 514,048 |
| 270 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 833,005 | | 833,005 |
| 280 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 215,676 | | 215,676 |
| 290 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 118,877 | | 118,877 |
| 300 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 576 | | 576 |
| | **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | | | |
| 320 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 152,983 | | 152,983 |
| 330 | EXAMINING | 5,584 | | 5,584 |
| 340 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 188,198 | | 188,198 |
| 350 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 174,151 | | 174,151 |
| 360 | JUNIOR ROTC | 67,549 | 4,500 | 72,049 |
| | Junior ROTC | | [4,500] | |
| | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **3,555,883** | **4,500** | **3,560,383** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 370 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 1,055,672 | | 1,055,672 |
| 380 | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 735,036 | -36,000 | 699,036 |
| | Service-wide Technical Support | | [-36,000] | |
| 400 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 15,411 | | 15,411 |
| 410 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 359,562 | | 359,562 |
| 420 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,410,097 | | 1,410,097 |
| | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 430 | ADMINISTRATION | 646,080 | -54,700 | 591,380 |
| | Service-wide Administration | | [-54,700] | |
| 440 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 581,951 | | 581,951 |
| 450 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 1,062,803 | -53,000 | 1,009,803 |
| | Service-wide Other Activities | | [-53,000] | |
| 460 | CIVIL AIR PATROL | 22,433 | | 22,433 |
| | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 470 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 1,148,704 | | 1,148,704 |
| | **SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS** | | | |
| 480 | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 49,987 | | 49,987 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **7,087,736** | **-143,700** | **6,944,036** |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | -719,700 | -719,700 |
| | Unobligated Balances Estimate | | [-128,000] | |
| | USAF Civilian Underexecution | | [-400,000] | |
| | Fuel Reduction | | [-191,700] | |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | **34,748,159** | **-296,505** | **34,451,654** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 457,169 | | 457,169 |
| 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 3,611,492 | 2,500 | 3,613,992 |
| | Special Operations Forces Modular Glove System | | [2,500] | |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:** | **4,068,661** | **2,500** | **4,071,161** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 030 | DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY | 115,497 | | 115,497 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION** | | | |
| 040 | NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY | 103,408 | | 103,408 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:** | **218,905** | | **218,905** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 050 | AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE | 0 | | 0 |
| 060 | CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS | 132,231 | 27,000 | 159,231 |
| | National Guard Youth Challenge Program | | [20,000] | |
| | Starbase | | [7,000] | |
| 080 | CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE | 0 | | 0 |
| 090 | DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY | 139,579 | | 139,579 |
| 100 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 458,316 | | 458,316 |
| 110 | DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE | 0 | | 0 |
| 120 | DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 665,743 | | 665,743 |
| 130 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 1,322,163 | | 1,322,163 |
| 150 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES | 42,532 | | 42,532 |
| 160 | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 405,873 | 9,000 | 414,873 |
| | Procurement and Technical Assistance Program | | [9,000] | |
| 170 | DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY | 253,667 | | 253,667 |
| 180 | DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE | 20,679 | | 20,679 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 190 | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY | 34,325 | | 34,325 |
| 200 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 385,453 | | 385,453 |
| 210 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY | 2,302,116 | 14,400 | 2,316,516 |
| | SoAR Recruiting Initiative | | [3,400] | |
| | Increase DoDEA Schools Sustainment to 100% | | [11,000] | |
| 220 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 1,058,721 | | 1,058,721 |
| 230 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 721,756 | | 721,756 |
| 240 | DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 497,857 | | 497,857 |
| | NATIONAL GUARD BORDER SECURITY | 0 | | 0 |
| 260 | OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT | 37,166 | 68,000 | 105,166 |
| | Impact Aid | | [65,000] | |
| | Redevelopment of Naval Station Ingleside | | [3,000] | |
| 270 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 1,955,985 | 671,386 | 2,627,371 |
| | Transfer from Title XIV | | 808,386 | |
| | Corrosion Prevention and Control | | [6,000] | |
| | Critical Language Training | | [2,000] | |
| | Reduction to Security and Stabilization Assistance | | [-175,000] | |
| | Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative | | [20,000] | |
| | Tools for Implementation of Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 | | [10,000] | |
| 280 | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE | 589,309 | | 589,309 |
| | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 13,046,209 | | 13,046,209 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:** | **24,069,680** | **789,786** | **24,859,466** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | -133,000 | -133,000 |
| | Unobligated Balances Estimate | | [-124,000] | |
| | Fuel Reduction | | [-9,000] | |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide** | **28,357,246** | **659,286** | **29,016,532** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 1,403 | | 1,403 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 12,707 | | 12,707 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 468,288 | | 468,288 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 152,439 | | 152,439 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 520,420 | | 520,420 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 61,063 | | 61,063 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 290,443 | | 290,443 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 106,569 | | 106,569 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 94,499 | | 94,499 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 522,310 | | 522,310 |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 234,748 | | 234,748 |
| 120 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **2,464,889** | | **2,464,889** |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 130 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 9,291 | | 9,291 |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 140 | ADMINISTRATION | 72,075 | | 72,075 |
| 150 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 3,635 | | 3,635 |
| 160 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 9,104 | | 9,104 |
| 170 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 61,202 | | 61,202 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **155,307** | | **155,307** |
| | **UNDISTRIBUTED** | **0** | -48,000 | -48,000 |
| | Unobligated Balances Estimate | | [-48,000] | |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | **2,620,196** | **-48,000** | **2,572,196** |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 570,319 | | 570,319 |
| 020 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 16,596 | | 16,596 |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 3,171 | | 3,171 |
| 040 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 125,004 | | 125,004 |
| 050 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 397 | | 397 |
| | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 060 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 55,873 | | 55,873 |
| 070 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 592 | | 592 |
| 080 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 41,899 | 14,000 | 55,899 |
| | Ship Depot Maintenance | | [14,000] | |
| | **COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 090 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 15,241 | | 15,241 |
| 100 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 142,924 | | 142,924 |
| | **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 5,494 | | 5,494 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 120 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 83,611 | | 83,611 |
| 130 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 69,853 | | 69,853 |
| 140 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 124,757 | | 124,757 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **1,255,731** | **14,000** | **1,269,731** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 150 | ADMINISTRATION | 3,323 | | 3,323 |
| 160 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 13,897 | | 13,897 |
| 170 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 1,957 | | 1,957 |
| 180 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT** | | | |
| 190 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 3,593 | | 3,593 |
| | **CANCELLED ACCOUNTS** | | | |
| 200 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | 0 | | 0 |
| 210 | JUDGMENT FUND | 0 | | 0 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 0 | | 0 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **22,770** | | **22,770** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | **1,278,501** | **14,000** | **1,292,501** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 61,117 | | 61,117 |
| 020 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 13,217 | | 13,217 |
| 030 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 29,373 | | 29,373 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 040 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 25,466 | | 25,466 |
| 050 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 73,899 | | 73,899 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **203,072** | | **203,072** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 060 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 5,639 | | 5,639 |
| 070 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 818 | | 818 |
| 080 | ADMINISTRATION | 10,642 | | 10,642 |
| 090 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 8,754 | | 8,754 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 100 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 0 | | 0 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **25,853** | | **25,853** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | **228,925** | | **228,925** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 2,049,303 | 10,800 | 2,060,103 |
| | Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | | [10,800] | |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 121,417 | -1,500 | 119,917 |
| | Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | | [-1,500] | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 441,958 | | 441,958 |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 78,763 | | 78,763 |
| 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 258,091 | | 258,091 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **2,949,532** | **9,300** | **2,958,832** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 77,476 | | 77,476 |
| 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 24,553 | | 24,553 |
| 080 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC) | 20,838 | | 20,838 |
| 090 | OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP) | 6,121 | | 6,121 |
| 100 | AUDIOVISUAL | 708 | | 708 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **129,696** | | **129,696** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | **3,079,228** | **9,300** | **3,088,528** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 876,269 | | 876,269 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 173,843 | | 173,843 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 615,160 | | 615,160 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 253,997 | | 253,997 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 34,441 | 2,200 | 36,641 |
| | Modular Shoot House | | [2,200] | |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 819,031 | 2,250 | 821,281 |
| | Joint Command Vehicle and Supporting C3 Systems | | [2,250] | |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 436,799 | | 436,799 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 99,757 | | 99,757 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 379,646 | | 379,646 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 798,343 | 5,100 | 803,443 |
| | North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | | [1,600] | |
| | Our Military Kids | | [3,500] | |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 580,171 | 300 | 580,471 |
| | Camp Ethan Allen Training Site Road Equipment | | [300] | |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 573,452 | | 573,452 |
| 130 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 0 | | 0 |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **5,640,909** | **9,850** | **5,650,759** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 140 | ADMINISTRATION | 119,186 | | 119,186 |
| 150 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 48,020 | 2,000 | 50,020 |
| | Emergency Management Staff Trainer Distributed Learning Courseware | | [2,000] | |
| 160 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 7,920 | | 7,920 |
| 170 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 440,999 | | 440,999 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **616,125** | **2,000** | **618,125** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | **6,257,034** | **11,850** | **6,268,884** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 3,347,685 | 33,700 | 3,381,385 |
| | MBU-20A/P Oxygen Mask and Mask Light | | [6,000] | |
| | Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | | [27,700] | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 779,917 | | 779,917 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 780,347 | | 780,347 |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 302,949 | | 302,949 |
| 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 606,916 | | 606,916 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **5,817,814** | **33,700** | **5,851,514** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 35,174 | | 35,174 |
| 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 32,773 | | 32,773 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **67,947** | | **67,947** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | **5,885,761** | **33,700** | **5,919,461** |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE | 13,932 | | 13,932 |
| 010 | ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| 010 | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID | 109,869 | | 109,869 |
| 010 | COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION | 404,093 | 30,000 | 434,093 |
| | Program Increase | | [30,000] | |

## Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 020 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY | 415,864 | | 415,864 |
| 030 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY | 285,869 | | 285,869 |
| 040 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE | 494,276 | | 494,276 |
| 050 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE | 11,100 | | 11,100 |
| 060 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES | 267,700 | | 267,700 |
| 070 | OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| 080 | IRAQ FREEDOM FUND | 0 | | 0 |
| | **TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS** | **2,107,703** | **30,000** | **2,137,703** |
| | **TOTAL TITLE III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** | **156,444,204** | **832,432** | **157,276,636** |

# ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2010 amended budget request:

| | |
|---|---|
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 M-Gator | +2.0 |
| BA 1 Operational & Technical Training Validation for Joint Maneuver Forces at Fort Bliss | +1.0 |
| BA 1 Texas Defense Manufacturing Supply Chain Initiative | +5.0 |
| BA 1 Fort Bliss Data Center | +1.7 |
| BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100% | +244.0 |
| BA 1 Transfer from Title I | +237.8 |
| BA 1 MI–17 Aircraft Modifications | +8.0 |
| BA 3 Junior ROTC | +13.0 |
| BA 4 Operational and Tactical Logistics Asset Visibility (Fuel/Ammo) | +3.0 |
| BA 4 M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade | +1.0 |
| BA 4 NATO Special Operations Coordination Center | +10.0 |
| Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate | (340.0) |
| Undistributed—Fuel Reduction | (62.9) |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 Aviation Depot Maintenance | +195.0 |
| BA 1 Ship Depot Maintenance | +186.0 |
| BA 1 Ship Life Assessment Pilot Program | +1.5 |
| BA 1 Navy Tactical Development | +1.0 |
| BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100% | +148.0 |
| BA 3 Mobile Learning Cultural Training for Military Personnel | +1.5 |
| BA 3 Navy Sea Cadet Corps | +0.7 |
| BA 3 Junior ROTC | +4.9 |
| BA 4 Mobile Condition Assessment System Pilot for Commander, Navy Region Hawaii | +3.0 |
| BA 4 International Headquarters and Agencies | (2.5) |
| Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate | (166.0) |
| Undistributed—Fuel Reduction | (112.4) |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 Cold Weather Layering System | +2.6 |
| BA 1 Flame Resistant Organizational Gear | +5.0 |
| BA 1 Ultra Lightweight Camouflage Net System | +4.0 |
| BA 3 Junior ROTC | +1.0 |
| BA 3 Increase in Sustainment to 100% | +66.0 |
| Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate | (35.0) |
| Undistributed—Fuel Reduction | (9.0) |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 Advanced Autonomous Robotic Inspections for Aging Aircraft | +2.0 |
| BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | +143.7 |
| BA 1 Air Education and Training Command Range Improvements | +4.6 |
| BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | +130.5 |
| BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | (3.6) |
| BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100% | +289.0 |
| BA 1 Wage Modification for US Azores Portugese National Employees | +0.2 |
| BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | +4.0 |
| BA 2 Warner Robins Air Logistics Center Strategic Airlift Aircraft Availability Improvements | +2.0 |
| BA 2 Fee for Service Refueling | (10.0) |
| BA 3 Junior ROTC | +4.5 |
| BA 4 Service-wide Technical Support | (36.0) |
| BA 4 Service-wide Administration | (54.7) |
| BA 4 Service-wide Other Activities | (53.0) |
| Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate | (128.0) |
| Undistributed—USAF Civilian Underexecution | (400.0) |
| Undistributed—Fuel Reduction | (191.7) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 Special Operations Forces Modular Glove System | +2.5 |
| BA 4 National Guard Youth Challenge Program | +20.0 |
| BA 4 Starbase | +7.0 |
| BA 4 Procurement and Technical Assistance Program | +9.0 |
| BA 4 SoAR Recruiting Initiative | +3.4 |
| BA 4 Increase DoDEA Schools Sustainment to 100% | +11.0 |
| BA 4 Impact Aid | +65.0 |
| BA 4 Redevelopment of Naval Station Ingleside | +3.0 |
| BA 4 Transfer from Title XIV | +808.4 |
| BA 4 Corrosion Prevention and Control | +6.0 |
| BA 4 Critical Language Training | +2.0 |
| BA 4 Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative | +20.0 |
| BA 4 Tools for Implementation of Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 | +10.0 |
| BA 4 Reduction to Security and Stabilization Assistance | (175.0) |
| Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate | (124.0) |
| Undistributed—Fuel Reduction | (9.0) |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve Adjustments: | |
| Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate | (48.0) |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 Ship Depot Maintenance | +14.0 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | +10.8 |
| BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | (1.5) |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 Modular Shoot House | +2.2 |
| BA 1 Joint Command Vehicle and Supporting C3 Systems | +2.3 |
| BA 1 North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | +1.6 |
| BA 1 Our Military Kids | +3.5 |
| BA 1 Camp Ethan Allen Training Site Road Equipment | +0.3 |
| BA 4 Emergency Management Staff Trainer Distributed Learning Courseware | +2.0 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard Adjustments: | |
| BA 1 MBU–20A/P Oxygen Mask and Mask Light | +6.0 |
| BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements | +27.7 |
| Miscellaneous Appropriations: | |
| Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Increase | +30.0 |

## Assessments and Analytical Tools for Implementation of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009

The budget request included no funding for assessments and analytical tools for implementation of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23). The committee recommends $10.0 million for the performance of assessments and the purchase of analytical tools by officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense who are assigned additional duties under the Act, particularly those relating to the performance of analyses of alternatives for major defense acquisition programs. The committee notes that the majority of the resources required to implement the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 will involve the hiring of additional personnel for the performance of cost estimation, systems engineering, developmental test and evaluation, and performance assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and throughout the military departments. The committee expects that funding for these purposes can, and should, come initially from the Acquisition Workforce Development Fund and eventually be included in the base budget request of the department concerned.

### Combat Air Forces Restructuring

The budget request contained $4.1 billion for Primary Combat Forces. Additionally, the budget request contained $7.1 billion for Administration and Service-wide Activities. Of that amount, $735.0 million is for Technical Support Activities, $646.0 million for Administration, and $1.1 billion for Other Activities.

The committee has identified $200.9 million in unexecutable peacetime operations due to deployments in the Air Force Operating Forces Primary Combat Forces budget activity. The committee has identified an additional $143.7 million in unjustified program growth in the Air Force operation and maintenance administrative budget activity, specifically Service-wide Technical Support, Service-wide Administration, and Service-wide Other activities. In title 10 of this Act, the committee has included a provision that requires these funds totaling $344.6 be used for the continued operation and maintenance of the 249 legacy fighter aircraft that were slated for retirement during fiscal year 2010 until such time as the Secretary of the Air Force provides the report related to the Air Force Combat Air Forces restructuring plan required elsewhere in this Act.

### Fee for Service Refueling

The budget request contained $10.0 million for a fee-for-service refueling pilot program.

The committee recommends eliminating the funds for the pilot program. A provision is included elsewhere in this title that would repeal the requirement to conduct a fee-for-service pilot program.

### Navy Depot Maintenance

The budget request contained $4.3 billion for Navy active ship depot maintenance and $41.9 million for Navy reserve ship depot maintenance. The budget request for ship maintenance would leave $200.0 in deferred maintenance in fiscal year 2010 for active and reserve ships at a time when it is questionable whether the Navy can sustain ship material readiness while serving as a key element of the nation's strategic reserve force. The budget request of $1.1 billion for Navy aircraft depot maintenance would cover 100 percent of the primary authorized aircraft goal for deployed squadrons' airframes and 97 percent of non-deployed squadrons' airframes. While the requested funding would meet the zero bare firewall goal for aircraft engines, it would fall far short of the ready-for-issue engine spares goal and represents a risk area for the Navy. Therefore, the committee authorizes $4.5 billion for active and reserve ship depot maintenance, a total increase of $200.0, and $1.3 billion for aviation depot maintenance, an increase of $195.0 million. The committee notes that these programs were identified by the Chief of Naval Operations as the sole priorities in the Navy's unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2010 that was submitted to the committee.

### Procurement Technical Assistance Program

The budget request contained $20.7 million for the Procurement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP).

The committee recognizes the importance of PTAP, a nationwide network of community-based procurement professionals that provides critical assistance to small businesses seeking to participate in Department of Defense and other federal agency procurement contracts. The program is authorized under section 2412 of title 10, United States Code. The PTAP helps generate new procurement suppliers for the Department, resulting in a stronger industrial base, greater competition, and higher-quality goods at lower cost for the taxpayer. The committee is concerned that the budget request for the PTAP has been insufficient to fund the needs of the many state and regional centers carrying out the program. The committee urges the Department to increase the PTAP annual budget request to a level sufficient to fully fund the operations of all state and regional centers.

The committee recommends $29.7 million, an increase of $9.0 million, for the Procurement Technical Assistance Program.

### Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative

The budget request contained $36.7 million for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI).

The committee expects the secretaries of the military departments to use the authority and funding available through REPI to partner with public and private entities to establish protective buffer zones around military installations that have impending encroachment pressures. The committee recognizes the benefits of REPI, including its ability to enhance military readiness, increase protection of key military spaces and natural habitats, foster public safety standards, and encourage economic growth.

The committee recommends $56.7 million, an increase of $20.0 million, for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative.

### Security and Stabilization Assistance Authority for Transfers to the U.S. Department of State

The budget request included a proposal for authority to transfer $200.0 million from the operation and maintenance account to the Department of State for security and stabilization assistance. The committee included a provision in title XXII of this Act authorizing $25.0 million for transfer to the Department of State for this purpose. The committee recommends a reduction of $175.0 million in operation and maintenance, defense-wide to reflect the reduction in this authority.

## ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

### Camp Lejeune Drinking Water

The committee is aware that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) is reconsidering portions of its 1997 public health assessment for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune. According to ATSDR, this is due, in part, to ATSDR's ongoing water modeling and exposure reconstruction study and to consideration of information about the historical presence of benzene in one drinking-water supply well in the Hadnot Point drinking water system. The committee is aware that that well was shut down sometime prior to 1985. The committee encourages the Commandant of

the Marine Corps to ensure that information about this development is provided to potentially impacted service members. The committee is pleased that the Marine Corps plans to notify more than 130,000 stakeholders about the reason for, and implications of, ATSDR's decision to revisit portions of the assessment. The committee expects that that notification, as well as information made available by the Marine Corps via the internet and other public outreach efforts, will contain specific information regarding the types of toxins being investigated.

Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations

The committee is concerned that base operations at forward-deployed locations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan are fuel-reliant, and as such, are dependent upon the delivery of fuel supplies via logistical convoys that are vulnerable to insurgent attacks. As of November 2008, according to United States Central Command, there were more than 300 forward deployed locations in Iraq and more than 100 in Afghanistan that consumed, on average, more than 68 million gallons of fuel per month. In a study titled "Defense Management: DOD Needs to Increase Attention on Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations," the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that base support activities, which do not include air and ground operations, account for more than 70 percent of the fuel consumption at 3 of 5 surveyed forward-deployed locations.

The committee is aware that Department of Defense components have some efforts under way to reduce fuel demand at forward-deployed locations. Some of these efforts include the application of foam insulation to tent structures, the development of more fuel-efficient generators and environmental control units, and research on alternative and renewable energy sources for potential use at forward-deployed locations. The committee is encouraged by these initiatives but is concerned with the GAO finding that many of these efforts are in a research and development phase, and the extent to which they will be fielded and under what time frame is uncertain. The Government Accountability Office makes six recommendations in response to its findings. The first three of the recommendations are that: the combatant commanders, in consultation with their service component commands, establish requirements for managing fuel demand at forward-deployed locations within their areas of responsibility; the military services develop guidance that implements the requirements; and, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff requires that fuel demand considerations be incorporated into the Joint Staff's initiative to develop joint standards of life support at forward-deployed locations. The final three recommendations address roles and responsibilities related to section 902 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), which establishes a position for a Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs (Director of Operational Energy) and requires designation of senior officials within each of the military services.

The committee expects that the Director of Operational Energy, once confirmed, will work with the combatant commanders and military services to provide the needed guidance to direct operational commanders and forces at forward-deployed locations to re-

duce their fuel demand in ways that enhance operational capability. The committee includes a provision within this title that would require the Director of Operational Energy, or the Secretary of Defense in the event that the Director is not yet confirmed, to provide a report on what specific actions have been taken to address the first three of the Comptroller General's recommendations. The report would be required by February 1, 2010.

### Overseas Environmental Standards for Solid Waste Disposal

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) has issued guidance establishing environmental compliance standards, criteria, and management practices for overseas installations. The most recent guidance was issued in a May 1, 2007, DOD publication 4715.05G titled "Overseas Environmental Baseline Guidance Document." The committee is aware that this guidance prohibits use of open burn pits for solid waste disposal at certain installations. The committee is aware that open burn pits are currently being used at certain United States military installations in the Republic of Iraq. The committee assesses that either the Department of Defense is using open burn pits for solid waste disposal in violation of the guidance document, or installations in the Republic of Iraq are exempted from the requirements of this guidance document, pursuant to the exemption clauses it contains.

The committee is concerned that, according to a Department of the Air Force fact sheet, use of open burn pits "can be harmful to human health and environment and should only be used until more suitable disposal capabilities are established." The committee believes that the duration of operations in the Republic of Iraq has provided ample time for the Department of Defense to establish "more suitable disposal capabilities." The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the health and environmental compliance standards the Department of Defense has established for military and contractor operations in the Republic of Iraq with regard to solid waste disposal, including an assessment of whether those standards are being met. The report should also contain the health and environmental compliance standards applicable to military and contractor operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan with regard to solid waste disposal, including an assessment as to whether those standards are being met. The report should describe the ability of existing medical surveillance programs to identify and track exposures to toxic substances as a result of open burn pits, as well as make recommendations on what changes may need to be made to those programs to properly identify and track toxic exposures. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2010.

## Workplace and Depot Issues

### Air Force Civil Engineer Supply Functions

The committee understands that the Air Force is reviewing options for providing civil engineer supply functions at local installations. The committee believes this review should be comprehensive

in nature and include all methods (government, contractor, and third-party contracts) for providing civil engineer supply functions. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to add to his review the following items and to provide a copy of the completed review to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of the date of completion:

(1) An assessment of the type of contract (i.e., requirement versus indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity, commodity versus service, and statement of work versus performance work statement) that should be employed to provide civil engineer supply functions to achieve best value at the lowest cost to the government;

(2) An assessment of what is appropriate for inclusion in a civil engineer supply commodity contract versus a service contract;

(3) An assessment of the Air Force's intent to convert government-operated civil engineer supply operations to contractor operations; and

(4) A cost-benefit review of using strategic sourcing for high-volume commodity items and a plan to ensure small businesses have the opportunity to participate in strategic sourcing.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force not to take any action to implement the findings of this review until 180 days after the date of the receipt of the review by the congressional defense committees.

Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities

The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense has not included funding for the Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA) program in its budget request. The CTMA program is a unique partnership that addresses the technology needs of the Department's maintenance facilities by developing maintenance and repair solutions faster and at less cost and less risk. By the Department's own metric, the program historically realized $70.0 million in annual cost savings with estimates that savings would grow to $1.2 billion by 2020. With the leverage provided by industry through this program at a two-for-one level, a small investment by the Department would result in substantial cost savings, reductions in repair times, and improved weapon system availability.

Initially funded by the Department, the CTMA program has not been included in the Department's budget despite strong support for the program by Congress and the depot-level activities of the Department, as well as confirmation by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics that the program is providing the outcomes envisioned by the CTMA partnership. The committee continues to believe that the CTMA program is of great value as a technology resource for the maintenance community and will help improve readiness levels of our armed forces.

The committee strongly urges the Department to develop a long-term funding plan for the CMTA program.

## Corrosion Control and Prevention

The committee applauds the military departments for establishing corrosion control and prevention executives to serve as the departments' senior officials for coordinating department-level corrosion control and prevention program activities, as required by section 903 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) and as consistently recommended by the Government Accountability Office. The committee commends the Department of the Army for programming into its fiscal year 2010 budget submission $4.4 million in funding for the Army's corrosion prevention and control (CPC) office for "the implementation and management of an effective corrosion prevention and control program for all Army equipment, systems, and components."

Accordingly, the committee directs the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (as designated by section 2228 of title 10, United States Code) to submit a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the actual benefits achieved and benefits expected to be achieved from implementing the efforts funded through the $4.4 million requested for the Army CPC office, including the return on investment from specific corrosion projects managed by the Army CPC office in fiscal year 2010. The committee directs this report to be submitted by March 1, 2011.

The committee encourages the Navy and Air Force to follow the Army's example and sufficiently resource CPC implementation and management offices at the departmental level and to invest their department's corrosion control and prevention executive with the authority appropriate to carry out the mandates of section 903 of Public Law 110–417.

However, the committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense (DOD), for the second consecutive year, failed to submit with its fiscal year 2010 budget materials, the report on the corrosion control and prevention strategy and funding requirements as required by section 371 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee is also disappointed that, in the face of demonstrated successes by the DOD Office of Corrosion Control and Prevention Policy, the Department cut the Office's funding in the fiscal year 2010 budget request by $642,000. The committee notes that the Department of Defense, through its cost-of-corrosion studies, estimates that the annual cost of corrosion to the Department is approximately $22.5 billion. According to the Government Accountability Office, the Department's budget documents show a fiscal year 2010 unfunded CPC project requirement of $14.6 million. Based on a 42–1 return on investment for CPC projects, the potential cost avoidance for these requirements would be $506.0 million.

The budget request contained $8.2 million for the corrosion prevention program. In light of the potential cost avoidance cited above, the committee recommends $14.2 million, an increase of $6.0 million, for the corrosion prevention program.

## Corrosion Evaluation of F–35 Joint Strike Fighter

The committee is concerned that the lessons learned regarding the prevention and management of corrosion in the F–22 Raptor

aircraft have not been fully applied to development and acquisition of the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft. The committee's desire to have corrosion prevention and management addressed early in weapons system development and acquisition prompted inclusion of a provision in the Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) requiring the development of systems engineering master plans for major defense acquisition programs that include considerations of lifecycle management and sustainability.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (as designated by section 2228 of title 10, United States Code) to evaluate the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter program. The evaluation should include, but not be limited to, information obtained from floor inspections and examination of program documentation and should involve any and all manufacturing and engineering processes. The Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight is directed to consult with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to determine the appropriate level of access necessary to conduct an effective and comprehensive evaluation of the F–35. The committee directs that the findings of the evaluation be reported to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The evaluation report should also include implications for existing and future weapons systems based on the findings of the F–35 evaluation. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees of the completeness of the evaluation within 60 days of the evaluation's delivery to the congressional defense committees.

Impact of Contractor Support on Operational Readiness

The committee is concerned that, to date, the Department of Defense (DOD) has neither undertaken formal planning to determine the level of contractor support necessary to sustain overseas contingency operations, nor included contractor employees in any readiness assessment. This hinders awareness of the true readiness of all forces available. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense recently created a task force known as the DOD Dependence on Contractor Support in Contingency Operations Task Force, which is assessing the Department's dependence on contractor support across a range of capability areas. The committee recognizes that the efforts of the task force should assist Congress and the Department in determining the effects contractors have on overall unit and force readiness. In addition, such efforts should allow the Department to track the services being provided by contractors and associated contractor employees to joint capabilities areas, and assess whether the mix of contractors is appropriate for current operations and those anticipated in the next 10 to 15 years. These efforts should also build on information in the service contract inventories required by section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The committee notes that in the summer of 2008, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff initiated a study that focused on the Department's use of contractors in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and its dependence on contractor-provided combat and security training. This subsequently led to the

creation of the Dependence on Contractor Support in Contingency Operations Task Force, described above. Results of this study should facilitate congressional oversight of the appropriate use and role of contractors in providing support in areas that are critical to mission accomplishment, not only in contingency operations, but across all key operations.

In the section of this report relating to title VIII in the item of special interest entitled "Contingency Contracting Planning, Oversight, and Visibility", the committee requires the Secretary of Defense to address these issues in a report to the congressional defense committees.

Insourcing New and Contracted-out Functions

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense on his decision to scale back significantly the role of contractors in support services and bring appropriate contracted out functions back in-house. The committee notes that section 324 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to develop and implement guidance to provide managers within the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services with the flexibility to consider using federal civilian employees for work that is new or currently being performed by contractors in certain circumstances. Guidance for implementing section 324 was issued on April 4, 2008. The committee expects this policy to be helpful to the Department as it reshapes the DOD workforce to ensure it has the proper skill sets and capabilities in that workforce, and undertakes plans to reduce the number of service support contractors and replace them with full-time DOD employees. The committee expects this policy to assist the Department in fulfilling the intent of the President's March 4, 2009 government contracting memo to ensure that "inherently governmental" functions and those closely associated with inherently governmental functions, as well as certain personal services contracts, are performed by government personnel and not by contractor personnel.

The committee stresses, however, that this insourcing initiative should not be driven by random goals or arbitrary budget reductions which may prove to be counterproductive. The use of a contractor inventory review and planning process as prescribed by section 807 of Public Law 110–181 establishes a rational basis for goals and reductions. Furthermore, the committee notes that insourcing should not be considered only in the context of contracting, but should be considered as part of an overall strategic plan that looks at the total workforce requirements (military, civilian employee, and contract) required to accomplish the Department's mission. The committee notes that insourcing initiatives should give appropriate consideration to impacts on contractor employees. The committee notes that a proper balance should be struck between encouraging all qualified candidates to apply for a newly created federal employee position and the appearance of undue pressure on contractor employees to convert to government employees. While the committee commends the Department on its ambitious insourcing initiative, the committee is concerned that neither the Department nor the military services have developed a comprehensive plan to implement the initiative. Therefore, the

committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees an outline of its insourcing plan, including how it intends to address the impacts of insourcing on contractor employees and to comply with sections 324 and 807 of Public Law 110–181 in meeting its insourcing objectives, by October 1, 2009.

### Lifecycle Operations, Maintenance, and Supply Mission Simulation

The committee is concerned about spare parts inventory and supply management by the services. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has recommended in reports 09–199 and 09–103 that spare parts inventory and supply management should be strengthened, in part, by improving demand forecasting procedures and monitoring effectiveness of providing operational information to item managers. The committee is encouraged by the Army's efforts regarding the UH–60, OH–58, and T–700 engine programs, and the Marine Corps' efforts regarding the light armored vehicle, mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle, MV–22, and H–53 programs to adopt improved spares demand forecasting and lifecycle cost analysis methodologies.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to adopt advanced predictive modeling and simulation methodology that incorporates asset demand-influencing factors to include time, usage, aging of parts, origin of critical parts, maintenance, and logistics support for all aviation and ground equipment programs. To address recommendations made in GAO Report 09–41, the committee further encourages the Department to extend advanced predictive modeling and simulation throughout the weapons system lifecycle, especially with regard to performance-based logistics support arrangements. The committee also encourages the Department to establish, through the military departments, pilot programs for appropriate aircraft and ground systems to demonstrate the benefits of demand forecasting models which include cost savings and avoidance, reduction in unscheduled maintenance, and increased efficiency in supply chain management and budget projections.

### Repair Capability for Low-Observable Technology

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the capability, including facilities, personnel, and equipment, to carry out state-of-the-art maintenance, repair, and overhaul support to military weapons systems that employ low-observable technology, as required in section 2464 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretary is further directed to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010, on the results of the assessment, including the efforts being made, in the context of section 2464, to provide organic workload for the maintenance, repair, and overhaul of systems that employ low-observable technology. In reviewing this important capability area, the committee recognizes the high quality of work and capabilities taking place in the public and private sectors. The committee directs the Secretary to give consideration to establishment of a Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence at Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, for the maintenance, repair, and overhaul of systems that employ low-observable technology.

## Other Matters

### Accessibility of Military Historical Information

The committee recognizes that military historians and public affairs officers are presently collecting a variety of data on unit history, membership, training, deployments, social activities, and awards. These records are already being collected for historical preservation purposes under long-standing Department of Defense directives and policies, predominantly in digital formats. Unfortunately, most of that data is presently inaccessible to service members and their families.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the military departments to utilize cost-effective commercial-off-the-shelf technologies to organize this data and make it available to service members, customized at the unit level as a permanent commemoration of their time in service. The committee believes that this historical information could serve as a powerful tool for recruitment and retention, as well as a good public relations communications opportunity. The committee anticipates that such products could be offered through the use of existing funds otherwise used by military units for commemorative awards.

### Air Force Combat Support Forces

The committee recognizes that, as a result of the high pace of ongoing contingency operations, much attention has been focused on the current stress on U.S. military forces. While most of this attention has been focused on ground forces, all the military services have been affected by the high tempo of operations since September 11, 2001. During this period of increased operational tempo, the Air Force has experienced increased stress on certain career fields and challenges in maintaining the availability of certain units and personnel for future deployments in support of ongoing operations and other commitments. In view of the Government Accountability Office's prior work on readiness issues, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by June 1, 2010, that evaluates the Air Force's ability to provide combat and expeditionary combat support forces. This review should identify: the extent and type of demand for Air Force combat and expeditionary combat support capabilities; factors affecting the Air Force's ability to meet demands for ongoing operations, as well as to maintain sufficient forces and capabilities to meet other global commitments; and any potential gaps in meeting demands and Air Force plans to address such gaps, including adjustments to force structure and manning authorizations.

### Combat Skills Training for Support Units

Operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan have demonstrated that combat service and combat service support units are often exposed to hostile fire. These units are required to respond to enemy attacks on a regular basis under dynamic situations and, in some cases, without support from friendly combat arms units. The committee understands that support units receive a different level of combat training and that this

may impede their ability to operate in asymmetric combat environments. To better understand the situation, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the adequacy of combat skills training provided for non-combat arms units operating in the Central Command area of responsibility. The committee directs that the Comptroller General provide a report on this review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010. This review and report should include:

(1) An evaluation of the adequacy of existing combat skills training for support units performing missions in an asymmetric combat environment;

(2) An assessment of the system the services are using to determine the appropriate level of combat training for non-combat arms military occupational specialties and to adjust that training to support the realities of current combat operations; and

(3) Recommendations on potential improvements that could be made to increase the effectiveness of support units operating in current and future combat environments.

### Critical Infrastructure Interdependencies Vulnerability Assessments

The committee is concerned that cybersecurity vulnerabilities in many sectors of critical infrastructure pose a significant risk to the Department's ability to assure its own mission capabilities. The Comprehensive National Cybersecurity Initiative articulated the need to extend the government's protective envelope to the critical infrastructure sector, but failed to provide any concrete recommendations. The current Administration's new Cyberspace Policy Review also points to the need to develop a process between government and the private sector to assist in preventing, detecting, and responding to cyber incidents.

The committee is aware that there are efforts underway for the Department of Defense to actively assess vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure providers on which the Department is dependent to support critical warfighting missions. The Air Force's 262 Network Warfare Squadron (NWS) has been active in developing and executing the Critical Infrastructure Independencies Vulnerability Assessment (CIIVA) program. The CIIVA program supports a full-spectrum analysis of critical infrastructures, such as power, water, communications, and transportation, which are critical to the functioning of a military installation.

The committee supports the activities of the 262 NWS and recommends that the Department of Defense fund the 262 NWS to conduct additional critical infrastructure independencies vulnerability assessments and migrate their methodologies to other units within the Department of Defense.

### Defense Travel System

The committee remains concerned that the web-based Defense Travel System (DTS) is not user-friendly and does not serve as the Department of Defense's single online travel system as required by the Department's March 2008 directive. Travelers continue to experience difficulties using the system and consequently revert back to

inefficient legacy systems that cost significantly more to maintain per trip than DTS. The Department is still unable to identify the number of legacy systems in existence, or identify funding for these systems so that redundancy among systems can be minimized.

The committee recognizes the recent actions the Department has taken to improve DTS by including more types of travel, and by making progress with system testing to measure the proper functioning of DTS requirements. The committee acknowledges that DTS, despite its problems, has the potential to be a viable and cost-effective travel system for the Department.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to: enforce the March 2008 directive that DTS serve as the Department's only on-line travel system; speed efforts to make DTS more user-friendly; incorporate more travel types; and develop consistent measures for system testing. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Department's progress in meeting these directives by December 31, 2009.

The committee directs the Secretary to include in this report the number, functionality, cost, and funding sources of current operating legacy systems.

The committee further directs the Secretary to accelerate the schedule for shutting down redundant portions of legacy systems and provide this schedule to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2009.

### Evaluation of Readiness of U.S. Forces

As the Department of Defense draws down forces in the Republic of Iraq and increases force levels in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, it will likely face challenges in providing trained and ready forces to meet the needs of warfighting commanders and in managing and synchronizing these deployments and redeployments. For example, due to operational demands over the past several years, the entire U.S. force, particularly ground forces, is stressed and facing readiness challenges. These challenges include maintaining the availability of units and personnel for future deployments to ongoing operations and meeting other national security commitments.

Current training capacity has been primarily focused on operations in Iraq, thereby requiring adjustments in training regimens to shift the focus to preparing larger numbers of ground forces to deploy to Afghanistan. Similarly, requirements to provide units or personnel to fill specialized requirements, such as transition teams to train Iraq and Afghanistan security forces, are projected to continue. Other needs could also arise as the drawdown in Iraq and deployments to Afghanistan progress.

The committee is aware of the Government Accountability Office's prior evaluations of the readiness of U.S. forces and directs the Comptroller General to review the Department of Defense's approach to managing the deployment of forces to meet operational needs in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as the implications of these commitments for overall force readiness. This review should evaluate: the Department's efforts to establish processes and responsibilities for analyzing and responding to requests for force capabilities from operational commanders; the Department's ability to provide ground forces, combat support, and other specialized capabilities,

such as transition teams to train Iraq and Afghanistan security forces; factors affecting the Department's ability to meet demands for, and maintain sufficient forces and capabilities to meet, other global commitments; and any challenges the Department faces in adjusting training capacity and scope to support larger deployments to Afghanistan while still preparing forces for deployments to Iraq.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit this review by June 1, 2010, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

### Facilitation of Strategic Deployment

The committee recognizes that strategic embarkation ports are critical to efficient and effective deployment and redeployment of forces to support combatant commander requirements. The committee is concerned that less than one-quarter of current first-call contingency sealift is positioned at layberths that support expeditious embarkation. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Transportation Command to develop criteria for the selection of strategic embarkation ports and ship layberth locations that place primary importance on facilitation of strategic deployment and reduction of combatant commander force closure timelines. In developing such criteria, consideration should be given to such factors as time required to crew, activate, and sail the sealift vessel to the embarkation port; distance and travel times for the forces from the assigned installation(s) to the embarkation port; availability of adequate infrastructure to transport forces from the assigned installation(s) to the embarkation port; and time required to move forces from the embarkation port to likely areas of force employment around the world. Furthermore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Transportation Command to provide to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act a listing of the established criteria and a description of the manner in which the criteria will be used to inform selection of strategic embarkation ports and to inform the procurement of ship layberthing services.

### Medical Care Provided by the Military for Contractors in Combat Zones

The committee is aware that many contractors whose personnel receive care in U.S. military medical facilities in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan are not reimbursing the U.S. Government for that care. At the same time, the committee does not believe that it is appropriate to hold field medical units responsible for medical billing, as they are neither designed nor resourced to perform that function. As a result, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense build a contractual reimbursement mechanism by requiring a medical treatment clause in all current and future contracts for services provided in Iraq, Afghanistan, or other combat zones that does not require billing activities by military medical personnel.

Remediation of Cybersecurity System Vulnerabilities

The committee is concerned that systemic issues within the Department of Defense create disincentives for conducting information assurance vulnerability assessments, thus masking the need for proactively identifying and remediating hardware and software vulnerabilities. The committee believes that sustained senior leadership, coupled with a standardized process across the military departments and defense agencies, is necessary for the Department of Defense to overcome this challenge.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the heads of the military departments and defense agencies, to establish a process for addressing hardware or software vulnerabilities to defense information technology systems identified during an information assurance vulnerability assessment. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act detailing how this process should work, and an estimate of the resources needed to ensure hardware and software vulnerabilities identified through the assessments are remediated.

Report on Navy Training

As a result of the high pace of ongoing operations, much attention has been focused on the current stress on our military forces. While most of this attention has been focused on the Army and Marine Corps, all the services have been affected by the increased tempo of operations since September 11, 2001. During this period of increased operations, the Navy has undertaken a number of initiatives designed to improve fleet readiness while achieving cost savings. Because the cost of a ship's crew is the single largest cost incurred over the ship's lifecycle, many of these initiatives have led to changes in the ways the Navy trains its surface personnel and crews its ships.

In view of these changes, which can affect the Navy's personnel and the readiness of its ships, on March 16, 2009, the committee requested the Government Accountability Office (GAO) review the training, size, composition, and capabilities of the Navy's ship crews. Specifically, the committee requested that GAO:

(1) Evaluate current requirement, authorization, and on-hand personnel levels for selected ship types compared to historical data for the same or similar ship types, including underlying reasons for any differences;

(2) Compare shipboard rank/rate distributions over time and analyze underlying reasons for any changes, and their impact on ship capabilities;

(3) Evaluate qualification training for personnel in selected shipboard designators/ratings to determine any changes to formal off-ship training programs, including whether such changes have affected personnel availability and the amounts and types of on-the-job training that is required for personnel to achieve required qualifications; and

(4) Evaluate to what extent, if any, requirements to provide personnel for individual augmentee positions and transition

and training teams in support of ongoing operations are impacting the levels or composition of shipboard manning.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit this report to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2010.

Secure Telework Center Pilot Project

Teleworking provides benefits for continuity of operations during emergencies by providing alternate locations for workers to operate when their primary workplace is not available. The committee is concerned that there are limited facilities for teleworking in a secure environment for federal workers whose primary duties require access to highly classified processing systems.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management and the General Services Administration, to assess sites within the Washington Metropolitan Area in order to identify at least two sites for a possible pilot program to provide secure teleworking for federal employees. Possible sites must meet the security requirements necessary to process classified information at the Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information level. Ideal sites would be designated, or have a portion of the facility designated, as a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility and would be built to or meet the standards established by the Director of Central Intelligence Directive 6/9. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on this assessment within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Security Clearance Reform

The committee is aware of the continuing challenges inherent in reforming the security clearance process, with primary emphasis on the impacts to the Department of Defense mission. The committee notes that unauthorized release of classified and sensitive information impacts readiness and poses a severe security risk, especially in the current global terrorism environment. In addition, delays in clearance processing increase risks to national security and increase the cost of classified work for the government. Furthermore, the committee recognizes that, while the Government Accountability Office has placed the Department's security program on its annual high risk list, many of the security clearance process problems are not limited to the Department but are government-wide in nature. Among other calls for reform, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Department and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to implement a demonstration project on new and innovative approaches to improve the process.

In December 2008, the Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team, which also included the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Personnel Management, released its plan for substantially modernizing and automating the security clearance process across the federal government by the end of 2010. The committee endorses this transformation plan which outlines policies, standards and electronic tools, including modifications to existing forms, to make the system more efficient and effective. The committee is concerned, however, that the reform initiative may be en-

countering bureaucratic resistance and that the status of key initiatives is unclear. Given the extensive work already done by the Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team, the committee expects the Department and its agency partners to move forward expeditiously in implementing the reforms to the security clearance process. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the status of implementing all elements of the reform plan, rationale for any delays, and any obstacles that have been encountered. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2009.

Ship Material Readiness

The committee is concerned that, at a time when the Navy intends to extend the operational life of its surface ships five years or more beyond their designed lifespan, systemic problems with the Navy's manning, training, and maintenance call into question the Navy's ability to achieve even the expected service life of the fleet and sustain fleet readiness, let alone extend the service life of entire ship classes in support of force-level objectives.

The committee commends the Navy for establishing a pilot program of technical inspections to assess the surface force ships' true lifespans through assessments of their material readiness. The pilot program is designed to provide an objective assessment to the fleet regarding the capability of its ships to meet their expected service life, predict where serious or limiting material conditions may develop, establish a process for structured assessment of the degree to which current fleet ships vary from established technical criteria, and provide the analytical basis for required maintenance investment to achieve expected service life.

However, the committee is concerned that assessing only one ship each from the amphibious, destroyer, cruise, and frigate classes will not provide sufficient data to achieve the pilot program's desired outcomes. The committee has added $1.5 million in funding in the ship depot operations support account to extend the technical inspections pilot program through fiscal year 2010. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to assess multiple ships in each class.

Additionally, the committee supports the partnership between Naval Sea Systems Command and the Navy Surface Warfare Enterprise to address acknowledged deficiencies in class planning and technical support created by the shift from an engineered operating cycle for maintenance planning to a progressive maintenance strategy. The Surface Ship Life Cycle Management Activity should instill rigor into the Integrated Class Maintenance Plan, both in work package development and in availability execution, and restore emphasis to deep, long-term maintenance tasks that have recently been subject to deferral or cancellation.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit with the fiscal year 2011 budget documents a report on the findings of the technical inspections pilot program and actions planned as a result of the assessment findings to achieve and extend ships' expected service life. The report also should include a description of the steps taken to mitigate material readiness deficiencies through

actions initiated by the Surface Ship Life Cycle Management Activity.

### Strategic Port Optimization

In December 2008, the military's Surface Deployment and Distribution Command, a component of the United States Transportation Command, submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a plan on optimizing the use of strategic ports. The plan is based on a report, Port Outlook 2008, required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). Strategic seaports are designated as those the Department of Defense intends to utilize for the rapid movement of personnel and equipment overseas in a time of crisis. The report noted that the currently designated commercial strategic and military seaports (which are located on the East, West, Gulf, and Alaskan Coasts) do not provide an optimum number of ports to meet the future needs of the Department. The committee supports the recommendation that alternative seaports should be assessed for suitability as strategic seaports in addition to those currently designated in order to increase capacity.

In selecting additional strategic seaports, the committee encourages the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to consider the Port of Guam. The increasing military presence on Guam, and its strategic location in the Asia-Pacific region, would facilitate movement of military cargo in the event of a national emergency or major mobilization. The committee recognizes that the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command has outlined an implementation plan based on the recommendations of the Port Outlook 2008 report, including establishing a selection team to enhance existing strategic seaports and identify additional ones to provide future capacity to the Department. The committee supports this effort and directs the Commander of the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a progress report on its implementation of the Port Outlook 2008 recommendations by January 15, 2010.

### Tire Privatization

As part of the Tire Commodity Management Privatization initiative, undertaken in compliance with the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–510) as amended, the Department of Defense shifted responsibility for tire supply, storage, and distribution from the Defense Logistics Agency to a contractor who would be in charge of procuring and distributing all ground and air military tires worldwide for the Department and the military services. The committee recognizes that the intent of this initiative was to lower costs as well as streamline and improve the process of getting tires to the warfighter. However, the committee has longstanding concerns that the original acquisition strategy did not provide all qualified tire manufacturers with an equal opportunity to compete in the defense market.

The committee recognizes that the Defense Logistics Agency has recently taken steps to start developing an acquisition strategy for its follow-on contracts to maximize competition and ensure that all

qualified tire manufacturers have a fair opportunity to compete, and that technical performance, reliability, service, and price are all fully considered. The committee notes that the Defense Logistics Agency has reported that tires for both the aviation and ground vehicle contracts are being delivered within the allowable logistics response time and with high on-time delivery rates. The committee, therefore, urges the Defense Logistics Agency ensure that there are no contract delays in providing ground vehicle or aviation tires to the warfighter. The committee directs the Director, Defense Logistics Agency, to provide the congressional defense committees a description of the selected acquisition strategy 30 days prior to release of any request for proposal for procurement and distribution of ground and air military tires.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $157.3 billion in operation and maintenance funding for the military departments and defense-wide activities.

### SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

#### Section 311—Clarification of Requirement for Use of Available Funds for Department of Defense Participation in Conservation Banking Programs

This section would clarify authority for the Department of Defense to participate in conservation banking and in-lieu fee programs provided by section 311 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

#### Section 312—Reauthorization of Title I of Sikes Act

This section would amend section 670f of title 16, United States Code, to reauthorize title I of the Sikes Act.

#### Section 313—Authority of Secretary of a Military Department to Enter into Interagency Agreements for Land Management on Department of Defense Installations

This section would amend section 670c–1 of title 16, United States Code, to authorize the Department of Defense to enter into interagency agreements with other Federal agencies regarding the maintenance and improvement of natural resources.

#### Section 314—Reauthorization of Pilot Program for Invasive Species Management for Military Installations in Guam

This section would amend subsection (g) of section 670a of title 16, United States Code, to reauthorize a pilot program for invasive species management for military installations in Guam from 2010 through 2015.

Section 315—Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than $68,623 to the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site Special Account, within the Hazardous Substance Superfund. This transfer is final payment to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for all costs incurred in overseeing a time critical removal action under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for ordnance and explosive safety hazards at the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia.

SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

Section 321—Public-Private Competition Required Before Conversion of Any Department of Defense Function Performed by Civilian Employees to Contractor Performance

This section would require a public-private competition whenever the Department of Defense (DOD) intends to convert to contractor performance functions performed by DOD civilian personnel.

Section 322—Time Limitation on Duration of Public-Private Competitions

This section would restrict to 540 days the time from the beginning of preliminary planning to when a final performance decision is made for any public-private competitions conducted pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76. The time period would take into account any delays resulting from a protest before the Government Accountability Office or the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. The committee does not intend this statute to be used by the Department of Defense to stop an A–76 competition that has overrun the 540 days to then restart at a later date. The committee notes that public-private competitions that last a lengthy amount of time create an unfair strain on the federal employees whose jobs are being competed, as well as on the contractors who have submitted bids for the work. In addition, estimated savings will less likely be achieved the longer a competition takes to reach a final performance decision.

Section 323—Inclusion of Installation of Major Modifications in Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair

This section would amend section 2460 of title 10, United States Code, to include the installation of major weapons system modifications in the definition of depot-level maintenance and repair. The amendment would clarify the original intent of section 2460, namely to allow for the installation of major modifications to be performed by private- or public-sector depot-level activities. The committee is aware of recent Department of Defense documents that state the "50/50 rule" promulgated in section 2466, title 10, United States Code, in conjunction with section 2460, does not apply to procurement-funded projects, particularly the installation of major modifications. The committee disagrees with this interpretation of the statutes. Section 2466 simply limits the amount of contracted

depot maintenance to not more than 50 percent of the funds made available in a fiscal year to a military department or agency for depot-level maintenance and repair, regardless of type of funds (i.e., procurement, research and development, or operation and maintenance).

Section 324—Modification of Authority for Army Industrial Facilities to Engage in Cooperative Activities with Non-Army Entities

This section would amend section 4544(a) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the eight contracts or cooperative agreements referred to in section 328(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) are in addition to the contracts or agreements in effect as the date of enactment of Public Law 110–181.

Section 325—Cost-Benefit Analysis of Alternatives for Performance of Planned Maintenance Interval Events and Concurrent Modifications Performed on the AV–8B Harrier Weapons System

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Commandant of the Marine Corps, to perform a thorough economic analysis of the costs and benefits associated with each alternative under consideration for AV–8B Harrier aircraft periodic maintenance inspections. The economic analysis would include an estimate of the impact of the loss of workload on organic depot labor rates, and the impact this could have on the depot maintenance costs of other weapon systems for each alternative under consideration. In addition, this section would prohibit the Secretary from entering into any contract for AV–8B Harrier periodic maintenance inspections or associated maintenance activities until 45 days after the Secretary delivers a report to the congressional defense committees that includes: the results of the cost-benefit analysis; the criteria and rationale used to classify work as organization-level or depot-level maintenance; an explanation of the core logistics capabilities and associated workload for the AV–8B; and an assessment of the effects of proposed workload transfers on the Department of the Navy's division of depot maintenance funding between the public and private sectors.

Section 326—Termination of Certain Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Performance by a Contractor

This section would halt any public-private competition conducted pursuant to section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, or Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 that had not resulted in award to a contractor as of March 26, 2009, until the Secretary of Defense has an opportunity to review whether such studies should be continued, and provides a report to Congress. In addition, all studies that have extended beyond 18 months would be terminated unless the Secretary provides a justification to Congress for the continuation of such studies.

In light of concerns raised by the military services, on March 25, 2009, the committee wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates urging an immediate halt to any pending A–76 studies as well as the initiation or announcement of any A–76 study, and to rescind

the 2008 competitive sourcing policy memo. The committee's letter noted that this suspension would allow the Administration and Congress time to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's A–76 program and to determine the best course for moving forward with a sound competitive sourcing policy.

Section 327—Temporary Suspension of Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Performance by a Contractor

This section would suspend until Fiscal Year 2012 any Department of Defense public-private competitions conducted pursuant to section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, or Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76.

Section 328—Requirement for Debriefings Related to Conversion of Functions from Performance by Federal Employees to Performance by Contractor

This section would require the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy to revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation to allow for pre-award and post-award debriefings of federal employee representatives in the case of a public-private competition for conversion of any function performed by a federal employee to performance by a contractor.

Section 329—Amendments to Bid Protest Procedures by Federal Employees and Agency Officials in Conversion of Functions from Performance by Federal Employees to Performance by a Contractor

This section would make technical and clarifying amendments to sections 3551 and 3557 of title 31 of United States Code related to the filing of bid protests by federal employee representatives to appeal the outcome of a public-private competition that resulted in award to performance by a contractor.

SUBTITLE D—ENERGY SECURITY

Section 331—Authorization of Appropriations for Director of Operational Energy

This section would authorize $5.0 million for the Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs established by section 902 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), to be made available upon the confirmation of an individual to serve as the Director.

Section 332—Report on Implementation of Comptroller General Recommendations on Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations

This section would require the Director of Operational Energy, or the Secretary of Defense in the event that the Director is not yet confirmed, to provide a report on what specific actions have been taken to address three of the recommendations in a report by the Comptroller General dated February 20, 2009, titled "Defense Management: DOD Needs to Increase Attention on Fuel Demand Man-

agement at Forward-Deployed Locations." The report would be required to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2010.

### Section 333—Consideration of Renewable Fuels

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider renewable fuels for testing, certification, and use in aviation, maritime, and ground transportation fleets. This section also would require a report on the use of renewable fuels to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2010.

### Section 334—Department of Defense Goal Regarding Procurement of Renewable Aviation Fuels

This section would establish a goal for the Department of Defense to procure 25 percent of the total quantity of aviation fuel consumed by the Department in the contiguous United States from renewable aviation fuel sources in fiscal year 2025 and each subsequent fiscal year.

## SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

### Section 341—Annual Report on Procurement of Military Working Dogs

This section would amend section 358 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to Congress on the procurement of military working dogs for the previous fiscal year. The report would include the following: the number of military working dogs procured from domestic breeders categorized by service or defense agency; the number of military working dogs procured from non-domestic breeders broken down by service or defense agency; and the total cost to procure military working dogs broken down by source (domestic or non-domestic) and service or defense agency.

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 351—Authority for Airlift Transportation at Department of Defense Rates for Non-Department of Defense Federal Cargoes

This section would grant authority to the Secretary of Defense, for a five-year period, to charge the same rates for airlift services to all federal customers supporting national security objectives in order to maximize loads into areas where the Department of Defense might otherwise fly missions with partial aircraft loads. This section would also require the Secretary to submit an annual report by March 1 of each year to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the use of this authority.

### Section 352—Requirements for Standard Ground Combat Uniform

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Defense Logistics Agency, to require that future

ground combat uniforms be standardized in order to ensure increased interoperability of ground combat forces and reduce tactical risks encountered when military personnel wear a different uniform from their counterparts in the other military services in a combat area. The committee notes that, previously all the military services used the same desert camouflage uniform or the standard battle dress uniform, both in the temperate and enhanced weather versions. However, the Defense Supply Center Philadelphia of the Defense Logistics Agency, which is responsible for the manufacture of all U.S. military uniforms, now procures unique camouflage utility uniforms for each of the military services: the Army combat uniform, the Airman battle uniform, the Navy working uniform, and the Marine Corps combat utility uniform.

The committee is concerned that the recent move toward unique service camouflage uniforms has resulted in increased costs and production inefficiencies. For example, problems with consistency in fabric shading have required remanufacture of some uniforms. In addition, the costs for the unique uniforms are substantially more than for the standard battle dress uniform because of the differences in design, camouflage pattern, and type of fabric. Most importantly, the committee is concerned that this uniqueness poses a tactical risk in theater, especially for those assigned to combatant commands or as individual augmentees who may be wearing a different uniform from those they are serving with in combat. The committee also notes that service-specific battle dress uniforms magnify the challenges and costs associated with procuring personal protective gear and body armor that conform to the design and coloration of the basic uniform.

### Section 353—Restriction on Use of Funds for Counterthreat Finance Efforts

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to limit Department of Defense (DOD) financial support of counterthreat finance (CTF) efforts to only those activities carried out by DOD personnel and supporting DOD contract personnel until a report is provided to the congressional defense committees describing the nature, extent, and expected future cost requirements associated with the mission.

The committee is uncertain about the extent and scope of current and future CTF activities and is concerned about the generation and imposition of non-DOD cost requirements competing with Department of Defense priorities. The committee believes greater fidelity on CTF requirement and projected activities would allow for better Department of Defense budget planning and congressional oversight.

### Section 354—Limitation on Obligation of Funds Pending Submission of Classified Justification Material

This section would limit the obligation of operation and maintenance funds for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, in budget activity 4, to not more than 90 percent until 15 days after the information cited in the classified annex accompanying this Act relating to the provision of classified justification material to Congress, is provided to the congressional defense committees.

### Section 355—Condition-Based Maintenance Demonstration Programs

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to conduct 12-month condition-based maintenance demonstration programs on, respectively, tactical wheeled vehicles and four systems or components of the guided missile destroyer class of surface combatant ships. This section would specify the issues to be addressed in the demonstration programs and would require that the demonstration programs be conducted with an open architecture approach. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2010, that assesses whether the respective military departments could reduce maintenance costs and improve operational readiness by implementing condition-based maintenance for the current and future tactical wheeled vehicle fleets and Navy surface combatants.

# TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

## OVERVIEW

The committee is pleased that the fiscal year 2010 budget request includes a permanent increase in the authorized end strength for the active Army of 547,400 and 202,100 for the active Marine Corps. It also commends the Secretary of Defense for his commitment to include the increase in active duty end strength in the base budget. However, while the increases in end strength for the Army and Marine Corps will help to reduce the pressure on the current forces, the committee is concerned that these increases may not be sufficient to meet both the increased operational tempo and the increasing support requirements that are being generated by a nation that has been at war for over seven years.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, and the service chiefs, to review both the new operational and support requirements that are developing, and determine whether a change to their force structure will allow them to meet these increasing demands, or whether additional permanent end strength is needed to support these new and emerging requirements. Under current law, the services have the ability to increase the active duty end strength up to three percent above the authorized levels, and the committee notes that the services have availed themselves of this authority. However, the committee is concerned that the steady increase in operational demand and the increasing numbers of non-deployable personnel in the Army will require a hard look at whether an increase in permanent end strength is needed for the foreseeable future. As such, the committee provided authority for the Army to increase its end strength in fiscal years 2011 and 2012, and would require the additional funding to be included in the baseline budget.

The committee is pleased that the Department of Defense has restored the military-to-civilian positions within the military medical community in the fiscal year 2010 budget request, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Pub-

lic Law 110–181). The committee urges the services to assess where these additional positions can best be used to improve the efficiency and access to care for service members and their families. Given the increased demand for mental health services, the committee urges the services to consider utilizing a portion of these restored positions to recruit and retain mental health providers.

## 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, 2010:

| Service | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Authorized | Request | Committee Recommendation | FY 2010 Request | FY 2009 Authorized |
| Army | 532,400 | 547,400 | 547,400 | 0 | 15,000 |
| Navy | 326,323 | 328,800 | 328,800 | 0 | 2,477 |
| USMC | 194,000 | 202,100 | 202,100 | 0 | 8,100 |
| Air Force | 317,050 | 331,700 | 331,700 | 0 | 14,650 |
| DOD | 1,369,773 | 1,410,000 | 1,410,000 | 0 | 40,227 |

#### 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, 2010. The committee recommends 547,400 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Army, 328,800 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Navy, 202,100 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 331,700 as the minimum active duty end strength for the Air Force.

#### Section 403—Additional Authority for Increases of Army Active Duty End Strengths for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012

This section would authorize additional increases of active duty end strength for the Army in fiscal years 2011 and 2012 above the strengths authorized in fiscal year 2010. Over the two-year period, the Army would be authorized to increase active duty end strength by 30,000 for a total of up to 577,400.

### 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, 2010:

| Service | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Authorized | Request | Committee Recommendation | FY 2010 Request | FY 2009 Authorized |
| Army National Guard | 352,600 | 358,200 | 358,200 | 0 | 5,600 |
| Army Reserve | 205,000 | 205,000 | 205,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Navy Reserve | 66,700 | 65,500 | 65,500 | 0 | −1,200 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 39,600 | 39,600 | 39,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 106,756 | 106,700 | 106,700 | 0 | −56 |
| Air Force Reserve | 67,400 | 69,500 | 69,500 | 0 | 2,100 |
| DOD Total | 838,056 | 844,500 | 844,500 | 0 | 6,444 |
| Coast Guard Reserve | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |

## Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the Reserves as of September 30, 2010:

| Service | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Authorized | Request | Committee Recommendation | FY 2010 Request | FY 2009 Authorized |
| Army National Guard | 32,060 | 32,060 | 32,060 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 16,170 | 16,261 | 16,261 | 0 | 91 |
| Naval Reserve | 11,099 | 10,818 | 10,818 | 0 | −281 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 2,261 | 2,261 | 2,261 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 14,360 | 14,555 | 14,555 | 0 | 195 |
| Air Force Reserve | 2,733 | 2,896 | 2,896 | 0 | 163 |
| DOD Total | 78,683 | 78,851 | 78,851 | 0 | 168 |

## 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, 2010:

| Service | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Authorized | Request | Committee Recommendation | FY 2010 Request | FY 2009 Authorized |
| Army National Guard | 27,210 | 26,901 | 27,210 | 309 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 8,395 | 8,154 | 8,395 | 241 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 22,452 | 22,313 | 22,313 | 0 | −139 |
| Air Force Reserve | 10,003 | 10,417 | 10,417 | 0 | 414 |
| DOD Total | 68,060 | 67,785 | 68,335 | 550 | 275 |

Section 10216 of title 10, United States Code, establishes the authorization for dual status military technicians. This section of law also requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a justification to the congressional defense committees, if the budget submitted for any fiscal year reduces the number of dual status military technicians established in law. The justification should include the basis for the reduction, as well as clearly delineate the specific force structure reductions that form the basis for the reduction in dual status technicians. The committee is concerned that the Department has failed to comply with this requirement.

Upon further investigation, the committee understands that the proposed reductions, particularly for the Army Reserve, may have resulted in erroneous information that was provided during the development of the budget. The committee, therefore, maintains the current authorized end strength level for dual status technicians for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve.

The committee did receive additional information that justified the reduction of 139 for the Air National Guard. However, the committee urges the Air National Guard to meet requirements and officially submit its budget justification for the reduction to the congressional defense committees as required by law.

The committee is open to continue this dialogue with the Department as this Act continues through the legislative process.

## Section 414—Fiscal Year 2010 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, 2010:

| Service | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Authorized | Request | Committee Recommendation | FY 2010 Request | FY 2009 Authorized |
| Army National Guard | 1,600 | 2,500 | 2,191 | −309 | 591 |
| Army Reserve | 595 | 836 | 595 | −241 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 350 | 350 | 350 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force Reserve | 90 | 90 | 90 | 0 | 0 |
| DOD Total | 2,635 | 3,776 | 3,226 | −550 | 591 |

Given the modification of dual status military technicians in the previous section, the committee recommends a corresponding reduction in the proposed increases for non-dual status technicians for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve.

## 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 2010 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by sections 401 or 412.

| Service | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Authorized | Request | Committee Recommendation | FY 2010 Request | FY 2009 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 |

### Section 416—Submission of Options for Creation of Trainees, Transients, Holdees, and Students Account for Army National Guard

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to report to the congressional defense committees on options for the creation of a Trainee, Transient, Holdees, and Students (TTHS) Account within the Army National Guard. This section would express the sense of Congress that an increase in Army National Guard end strength should be considered in the deliberations of the Quadrennial Defense Review.

## SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $135,723,781,000 to be appropriated for military personnel. This authorization of appropriations reflects both reductions and increases to the budget request for military personnel that are itemized below:

## Title IV - Military Personnel

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL** | **136,016,281** | **-292,500** | **135,723,781** |
| Unobligated balances | | [-799,000] | |
| Military Pay Raise Increase (sec. 601) | | [348,000] | |
| Pilot Program to develop Critical and Strategic Languages (535) | | [5,000] | |
| Stabilization of pay and allowances enlisted to officers (603) | | [1,000] | |
| Transportation of 2nd privately owned vehicles from non-foreign (631) | | [22,000] | |
| Limitations on collections (661) | | [15,000] | |
| Army authority to provide additional recruitment incentives (662) | | [5,000] | |
| Guarantee benefits for our troops (663) | | [57,000] | |
| JROTC funding to meet 2020 goal, Army | | [1,000] | |
| JROTC funding to meet 2020 goal, Navy | | [500] | |
| JROTC funding to meet 2020 goal, Marine Corps | | [500] | |
| JROTC funding to meet 2020 goal, Air Force | | [500] | |
| Mental health HPSP scholarships | | [20,000] | |
| Increase in weight allowance for NCOs | | [31,000] | |

### Section 422—Repeal of Delayed One-Time Shift of Military Retirement Payments

This section would repeal section 1002 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), which required a one-time delay in military retirement payments from September 1, 2013, to October 1, 2013.

## TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

### OVERVIEW

On March 11, 2009, the U.S. House of Representatives passed House Concurrent Resolution 64, which urged the President to declare 2009 as the "Year of the Military Family." This declaration builds upon the committee's active interest in expanding and enhancing programs and policies that support our military families. As our nation continues in its eighth year of military conflict, it is service members and their families who are shouldering the burdens of these multiple and lengthy deployments. Their quality of life is not only important to their physical and mental well-being, it is vital to our national security. Without the outstanding men and women in uniform and their families, the freedoms that all Americans enjoy would be in jeopardy.

The committee recognizes the selfless sacrifices that both our military men and women and their families are making on behalf of this country. To ensure that we continue to support military families, the committee included a provision that would establish a pilot program for military spouses to secure internships with other federal agencies and departments that will lead to employment portability and advancement. The committee also included a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to review the housing standards used to calculate the monthly rate for basic allowance for housing to determine if the housing standards are meeting the needs of today's military families. In addition, the committee also supports the transportation of an additional motor vehicle for members on permanent change of station to or from a nonforeign area outside the United States. In today's world, more than one vehicle is needed to support a family, and having another vehicle will allow spouses to seek employment outside of a base, or transport children to and from schools, after-school activities, and other daily activities. The committee also recognizes the importance of leave to families and recommends a section that would extend the period during which service members may accumulate 75, in lieu of 60, days of leave at the end of a fiscal year from December 31, 2010, to December 31, 2012. The committee also recommends additional funding to help local educational agencies that are providing support to military children by including $50.0 million for local educational agencies that are heavily impacted by the attendance of military dependents, and an additional $15.0 million for local educational agencies that experience significant increases or decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to military force structure changes. There are additional provisions throughout other sections of the bill that continue the committee's effort to support military families.

The committee heard from various organizations of the need to improve and enhance the capabilities and resources of the Department of Defense in its efforts to account for missing persons from all conflicts in a timely manner. The committee believes that the Department should provide a comprehensive, coordinated, and fully resourced program that provides for the timely recovery and identification of remains from all conflicts beginning with World War II. As a nation, we make a commitment to our service members that they will not be forgotten or left behind, we must do all we can to honor that commitment.

The committee recognizes the Army in moving forward to improve the career development for Public Affairs Officers (PAO). This new career path will create a new standardized and continuous training program that will allow the professional development of strategic communications officers in the Army. In today's vast communications environment, the Army requires well-rounded leaders who can build upon their operational experience, and develop communication skills, as well as regional and cultural understanding, to develop effective communication strategies for the Army. The committee is pleased that the Army is taking this initiative.

## Items of Special Interest

### Addressing the Shortage of Company Grade Officers Within the Army National Guard and Army Reserve

The committee understands that the Army National Guard and Army Reserve have historically been challenged with company grade officer shortages, primarily at the captain (0–3) rank. The reasons for these shortages stem from a number of issues, including the difficulty officers have in meeting the requirement for a bachelor's degree as a condition for promotion to captain.

The committee is concerned that this shortage of company grade officers needs to be addressed if the Army National Guard and Army Reserve are to be an effective part of the operational reserve force. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Chief of the Army Reserve, to conduct a comprehensive study of this issue and to make recommendations on how to address these officer shortages. The study should include:

(1) A review of the concept of a National Guard military academy, similar to the service academies including the following: whether such a National Guard academy is a feasible partial solution to the officer shortages and, if feasible, the roles and responsibilities for operating a military academy; the estimated costs for the establishment of an academy; the annual operating costs, to include staffing requirements and academic faculty requirements to meet accreditation requirements of a four-year institution of higher learning; and the ability to incorporate junior military colleges into the program. It should also address: issues of compulsory service obligations; the challenges involved with granting commissions to cadets from different states; how funding for students and resources for the academy might be provided; what academic programs the academy might offer; the admissions process; the train-

ing requirements for cadets/student; and the number of cadets/students that would have to be authorized each school year.

(2) A consideration of the feasibility of requiring state Officer Candidate School programs to require candidates to hold a four-year degree in order to participate in the program, and the necessary programmatic changes that may be required to support such a requirement.

The committee directs the Secretary to report his findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Joint Duty Assignment Credit for Military JPME Faculty Members

The committee is encouraged to find that many military officers serving on the faculties of joint professional military education (JPME) phase II institutions are being appropriately recognized for their joint experience on the joint duty assignment list (JDAL). However, the committee finds that some of these officers, who should have this assignment designation, still do not. The committee encourages these institutions to be proactive in ensuring that military faculty at the senior level institutions receive the appropriate joint credit, and that those positions are included on the JDAL through the validation process. As part of its comprehensive review of professional military education, the committee is reviewing the faculty positions at JPME I level institutions. The Department of Defense should also review the faculty positions at the JPME I level institutions for JDAL suitability and provide the committee the results of its review.

Recognizing Service Women Who Have Participated as "Lionesses" During Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan

The committee is aware that there are members of the armed forces deployed in support of contingency operations who, as a result of operational requirements on the battlefield, volunteer to provide mission support outside of the requirements of their military occupation. These individuals are often temporarily removed from their regular assignment to serve in these capacities before returning to their regular duties during their deployment.

One such group of volunteers are women who are serving at the point of the spear and are referred to as "Lionesses." They participate in offensive operations by providing culturally-sensitive search and engagement activities for certain combat units deployed in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The committee is aware that service women, particularly those who volunteered during the early stages of the Lioness program, have encountered difficulties in gaining proper recognition for their service, both within the services and when they leave active duty and seek assistance from the Department of Veterans Affairs. For example, service women who volunteered to accompany units during the Battle of Fallujah in 2004 have had to rely on the support of an outside organization in order to provide the witnesses and documentation needed to seek recognition of their actions under fire and to establish their combat experience while deployed, in

order to receive health care and disability benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The committee is concerned that there is no mechanism in place within the services to properly document service member participation in operational missions outside of the requirements of their military occupation.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the services, to review the way the services manages and documents the additional services some service members perform. The review should also consider a way to properly document participation in such actions, particularly since they are being pulled from their regular units for these missions. The review should consider whether a service or skill identifier to identify these individuals, who have previously served and may be called upon again to serve in future deployments, is appropriate. The review should also consider whether the current chain of command construct allows these individuals sufficient oversight to be able to seek proper recognition for their service. The review should also take into consideration the differences that may need to be addressed between those within the active component and those within the Reserve Component who are activated and subsequently demobilized.

In addition, the committee believes that there should be a systematic training program for these individuals prior to their deployment that takes into account the unique mission for which they have volunteered. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the results of the review, and any recommendations, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2010.

### Report on Medal of Honor Award Process

The committee is concerned with the minimal amount of Medal of Honors awarded for acts of gallantry during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, especially the lack of living recipients. The committee believes it is important to have living Medal of Honor recipients from current conflicts to inspire our nation, while honoring those men and women who have dedicated themselves to the defense of our country. The committee recognizes that the military services are manned with an all-volunteer professional force that is more skilled, and that members of the armed forces are executing heroic acts on a daily basis in combat. The committee is concerned that since heroic acts are occurring on a routine basis, commanders may have unintentionally raised the subjective criteria for recommending the Medal of Honor, and the Department of Defense is incorporating informal standards with unnecessary action and requirements when considering the recommendations for the Medal of Honor. The committee recognizes that the criteria in statute has not changed and therefore directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the secretaries of the military services, to review the current trends in awarding the Medal of Honor to identify whether there is an inadvertent subjective bias amongst commanders that has contributed to the low numbers of awards of the Medal of Honor. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to survey military leaders, both officers and non-commissioned officers, to the lowest level of

command to determine if there is a trend of downgrading awards taking place for medals related to acts of valor and gallantry. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2010.

Restricted Reporting Requirements for Sexual Assault Victims

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense currently affords a victim of sexual assault the option of confidential reporting of the assault to specified individuals and provides the victim access to medical care, counseling and victim advocacy, without initiating an investigation. The committee is concerned that information about a sexual assault that is disclosed to a commander or law enforcement from a source other than the victim or individuals covered under confidential reporting may result in an investigation, regardless of the victim's desire for confidentiality. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a procedure to provide a victim of sexual assault the option for confidential reporting if the information about a sexual assault is disclosed to a commander or law enforcement from a source other than the victim or individual covered under confidential reporting.

Social Networking in Recruiting

The committee notes that the armed services have been slow to embrace the use of social networking and job search internet sites to support recruiting operations. America's youth are using social networking systems though the internet at ever increasing rates and many Americans are now receiving most of their information from internet sources. The armed services must not ignore the potential that resides in these systems and fall behind private sector competitors. The committee believes that such sites and other support services available on the internet are powerful tools to increase awareness of military career opportunities among America's youth. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to explore the opportunities to use these sites to support recruiting and to empower the recruiter workforce to use social networking and other internet capabilities to enhance their recruiting efforts.

Stars and Stripes Newspaper

The committee values the contributions that *Stars and Stripes* newspapers make to the morale and welfare of service members and their families serving in overseas duty locations. The *Stars and Stripes* newspaper is an important ingredient in all overseas military communities that people rely on and trust as an independent source of news. The *Stars and Stripes* mission is particularly important as a source of news for deployed service members serving in combat zones. The committee recognizes that the *Stars and Stripes* organization must embrace change to accommodate the new ways to deliver information that technology will create, but the committee believes that the *Stars and Stripes* mission will remain as valid in the future as it is today. The committee urges the

Secretary of Defense to fully fund the *Stars and Stripes* organization to allow it to continue its community and battlefield role and to keep pace with technological advances and to preserve and protect its status as an independent news organization representing the best traditions of American free press.

The Awarding of the Purple Heart for Traumatic Brain Injuries

The committee understands there are provisions in law and policy to award the Purple Heart to members of the armed forces who sustain a traumatic brain injury as a result of enemy action. Although the services have awarded the Purple Heart for these injuries, the committee is concerned there are inconsistencies in the procedures for the determination of the award in the theater of operations. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the policies and procedures for determining eligibility and awarding of the Purple Heart to service members who sustain traumatic brain injury due to enemy action. The committee directs the Secretary to report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2010.

Virtual Army Experience

The committee commends the Army for investing in new technological approaches to increase awareness and knowledge of the military among recruitment-age youth. The Army Experience Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and its transportable counterpart, the Virtual Army Experience, are examples of technological projects that hold great potential to reshape recruiting techniques and conduct recruiting operations on a more cost effective basis. The committee believes this type of investment is essential if the Army intends to keep pace with societal changes regarding the subjects that capture the attention of young people and methods young people use to gather information and socially interact. In the case of the Army Experience Center and the Virtual Army Experience, the Army should be commended for using game technology and other high-tech systems to reach out to and communicate with America's youth. The committee understands that during periods when recruiting is relatively easy, investment in experimental programs draws increased scrutiny. The committee urges the Army to continue to use these tools and to invest in other related projects to maximize their immediate value, and learn more about how the Army may further adapt technology to harness the power of the information age to support the recruiting mission.

Wounded Warriors and Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

The committee is aware that the services are actively seeking retired wounded warriors, who express an interest and are qualified to become instructors at Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) units. The Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the services, to establish at least 3,700 JROTC units by September 30, 2020. Given the expansion, the committee urges the services to continue to expand their efforts to recruit retired wounded warriors to serve in these

units. These individuals have proven themselves in service to our nation, and would be exemplary examples of selfless service and mentors to the thousands of young high school students who participate in JROTC, their classmates, teachers, administrators and other community influencers.

The committee understands that challenges may exist given the unique circumstances of retired wounded warriors seeking such positions. These medically retired wounded warriors may be at a disadvantage in competing for these positions, especially as the current economic downturn has had an adverse impact on local school budgets across the country. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the service secretaries, to review the current utilization of retired wounded warriors as JROTC instructors to determine if there are barriers unique to their service that need to be addressed, whether through change in policy or legislation. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees the results of the review, including recommendations for legislative change, by April 1, 2010.

### Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program Improvements

The committee recognizes the challenges for Reserve Component members of an operational reserve fully engaged in a prolonged conflict. To assist the Department of Defense with some of these challenges, section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Secretary of Defense to establish the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program to provide National Guard and Reserve members and their families with sufficient information, services, resources and outreach throughout the deployment cycle. The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Department and the progress the program has made to date including resourcing the program as part of the base budget beginning in fiscal year 2010. As the Department continues to improve the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense ensure the reintegration program office captures best practices from the Department of Defense Mental Health Task Force and the Traumatic Brain Injury Initiative and incorporates them into the 30–60–90 day events of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program. The committee also recommends that the Secretary explore the feasibility of incorporating the best practices as determined by various states' pilot programs into the Yellow Ribbon program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include a description of additions or changes to the program as a portion of the annual reporting requirement in section 582 of Public Law 110–181.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

#### Section 501—Extension of Temporary Increase in Maximum Number of Days' Leave Members May Accumulate and Carryover

This section would extend the period during which service members may accumulate 75, in lieu of 60, days of leave at the end of a fiscal year from December 31, 2010, to December 31, 2012.

Section 502—Rank Requirement for Officer Serving as Chief of the Navy Dental Corps to Correspond to Army and Air Force Requirements

This section would require an increase in the rank of the Chief of the Navy Dental Corps, from the rank of O–7, rear admiral (lower half) to the rank of O–8, rear admiral (upper half), similar to the corresponding rank of the Navy chiefs in the Unites States Army and the United States Air Force.

Section 503—Computation of Retirement Eligibility for Enlisted Members of the Navy Who Complete the Seaman to Admiral (STA–21) Officer Candidate Program

This section would exclude the active duty service after January 1, 2011, for service members pursuing a baccalaureate-level degree under the Seaman to Admiral program of the Navy from computed as years of officer service required to qualify for retirement. This section would authorize the service in the Seaman to Admiral program to be counted for computing active duty service for all other purposes.

SUBTITLE B—JOINT QUALIFIED OFFICERS AND REQUIREMENTS

Section 511—Revisions to Annual Reporting Requirement on Joint Officer Management

This section would amend section 667 of title 10, United States Code, to align reporting requirements with the new joint programs and policies developed and implemented by the Department of Defense that were authorized by section 516 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The new policy establishes the minimum requirements for all Joint Qualified Officers to include education and tour lengths. Additionally, Joint Qualified Officers filling level 3 (critical positions on the joint duty assignment list), would require a waiver if not filled by Joint Qualified Officer. Joint Professional Military Education reporting requirements would be amended to align with expanded Joint Professional Military Education Level II opportunities and Joint Professional Military Education Level II credit would no longer be authorized until completion of Joint Professional Military Credit Level I.

SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Section 521—Medical Examination Required before Separation of Members Diagnosed with or Asserting Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Traumatic Brain Injury

This section would bar the secretary concerned from authorizing the involuntary separation or an other than honorable separation of a service member who has been deployed overseas in support of a contingency operation and is diagnosed as experiencing post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury, or is asserting the influence of such a condition, until after the service member is provided a medical exam conducted by an appropriate medical practitioner. The secretary would review the medical exam to determine if the behavior of the member upon which the involuntary or other

than honorable separation was based was influenced by a post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury condition and would determine the appropriate separation course of action. This section would require the discharge review boards operated by the secretaries of the military departments to include a member who is a physician, clinical psychologist, or psychiatrist and, when authorized by the former service member, to provide a Member of Congress with information on decisions and supporting rationale when considering cases involving deployment related post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury. This section would also require discharge review boards to render a final decision within six months of receipt when considering cases involving deployment related post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury or other personal health care issues offered as supporting rationale or as justification for priority consideration.

Section 522—Evaluation of Test of Utility of Test Preparation Guides and Education Programs in Improving Qualifications of Recruits for the Armed Forces

This section would clarify that evaluation of job performance required to complete the test of the utility of using test preparation guides to improve the qualification test scores of new recruits authorized in section 546 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) may be accomplished by using data derived from existing sources.

Section 523—Inclusion of Email Address on Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214)

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to modify the DD Form 214, Certificate or Release or Discharge from Active Duty, to permit a service member to include an email address on the form.

SUBTITLE D—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Section 531—Appointment of Persons Enrolled in Advanced Course of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Military Junior Colleges as Cadets in Army Reserve or Army National Guard of the United States

This section would increase, from 17 to 22, the number of cadets at each of the Military Colleges who may receive financial assistance under the early commissioning program.

Section 532—Increase in Number of Private Sector Civilians Authorized for Admission to the National Defense University

This section would authorize the change in the number of private sector civilians authorized admission to the professional military education program at the National Defense University from 10 to 20.

Section 533—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by Delegate from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

This section would increase, from one to two, the number of appointments to each of the military service academies that can be made as a result of nominations made by the Delegate to Congress from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Section 534—Pilot Program to Establish and Evaluate Language Training Centers for Members of the Armed Forces and Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense

This section would establish a pilot program to create foundational critical and strategic language and regional area expertise for members of the armed forces, including Reserve Component members, Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates, and civilian employees of the Department of Defense. The pilot program would begin on October 1, 2010, and terminate on September 30, 2015. The pilot should seek to expand access to critical and strategic languages to as many military personnel as possible. The Secretary of Defense would also be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with an assessment of the effectiveness of the programs to create critical and strategic language and regional area expertise in support of the Defense Language Transformation Roadmap.

Section 535—Use of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program to Increase Number of Health Professionals with Skills to Assist in Providing Mental Health Care

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments to include, within the health professions scholarship and financial assistance program, a portion of the total number of scholarships for the purpose of assisting students to pursue a degree at the masters and doctoral level in social work, clinical psychology, psychiatry, or other disciplines that contribute to the mental health care programs within the military departments. This section would also increase the total number of scholarships under the health professions scholarship and financial assistance program by 300 to accommodate such students.

Section 536—Establishment of Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps Units for Students in Grades above Sixth Grade

This section would amend section 2031 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the establishment of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) units at public and private secondary educational institutions that permit enrollment of students in the Corps who are in a grade above the sixth grade. Any unit established under this section would meet similar requirements of the JROTC program. The service secretary would also establish a program under this authority to conduct a review of the program, and report the impacts, if any, the program may have on the operations of JROTC in secondary educational institutions.

## SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION

### Section 551—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $50.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that have military dependent students comprising at least 20 percent of the students in average daily attendance during a year. This section would also provide $15.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that experience significant increases and decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to the military force structure changes, the relocation of military forces from one base to another, and from Base Closures and Realignments. The committee recommendation continues its effort to ensure that local school districts with significant concentration of military students continue to receive the support necessary to provide for military families and their dependents.

### Section 552—Determination of Number of Weighted Student Units for Local Educational Agencies for Receipt of Basic Support Payments under Impact Aid

This section would change the number of weighted student units, from 6,500 to 5,000, when determining basic support payments under Impact Aid.

### Section 553—Permanent Authority for Enrollment in Defense Dependents' Education System of Dependents of Foreign Military Members Assigned to Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe

This section would amend the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 923a) to provide permanent authority for the Secretary of Defense to enroll on a space-required, tuition-free basis, a limited number of dependents of foreign military members assigned to the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe (SHAPE), to the Department of Defense dependents' education system in Mons, Belgium. This section would also require the Secretary to make this determination with the advice and assistance of the European Combatant Commander.

## SUBTITLE F—MISSING OR DECEASED PERSONS

### Section 561—Additional Requirements for Accounting for Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees Listed as Missing in Conflicts Occurring before Enactment of New System for Accounting for Missing Persons

This section would amend section 1509 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of Defense to implement a comprehensive, coordinated, integrated, and fully resourced program to account for missing persons from all conflicts beginning with World War II. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to take appropriate measures with respect to resources to increase the annual number for which missing persons are accounted to 200 by fiscal year 2015, and to 350 by fiscal year 2020. This section would

require the Secretary of Defense to establish a personnel file for each unaccounted person.

Section 562—Clarification of Guidelines Regarding Return of Remains and Media Access at Ceremonies for the Dignified Transfer of Remains at Dover Air Force Base

This section would codify the Department of Defense policy on media access at ceremonies for the dignified transfer of remains from a theater of combat operations to Dover Air Force Base, in Dover, Delaware. This section would take effect one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE G—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Section 571—Award of Vietnam Service Medal to Veterans Who Participated in Mayaguez Rescue Operation

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to award the Vietnam Service Medal to veterans as a substitute for the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal that had been awarded for participation in the operation to rescue the SS Mayaguez during the period May 12 through May 15, 1975.

Section 572—Authorization and Request for Award of Medal of Honor to Anthony T. Koho'ohanohano for Acts of Valor during the Korean War

This section would authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Anthony T. Koho'ohanohano, who served in the United States Army during the Korean War. This section would also waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 573—Authorization and Request for Award of Distinguished-Service Cross to Jack T. Stewart for Acts of Valor during the Vietnam War

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Distinguished-Service Cross to Jack T. Stewart, who served in the United States Army during the Vietnam War. This section would also waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 574—Authorization and Request for Award of Distinguished-Service Cross to William T. Miles, Jr., for Acts of Valor during the Korean War

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Distinguished-Service Cross to William T. Miles, Jr., who served in the United States Army during the Korean War. This section would also waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code.

## SUBTITLE H—MILITARY FAMILIES

### Section 581—Pilot Program to Secure Internships for Military Spouses with Federal Agencies

This section would establish an internship pilot program for certain military spouses to obtain employment with other federal agencies or departments that would lead to career portability and advancement. It would also require a report on the effectiveness of the program following the completion of the pilot program, and a recommendation from the Secretary of Defense on the need to extend, modify, or terminate the program.

### Section 582—Report on Progress Made in Implementing Recommendations to Reduce Domestic Violence in Military Families

This section would require the Comptroller General to review and assess the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the recommendations contained in the report entitled, "Military Personnel: Progress Made in Implementing Recommendations to Reduce Domestic Violence, but Further Management Action Needed" (GAO–06–540), and to submit a report containing the results of the review and assessment to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Section 583—Modification of Servicemembers Civil Relief Act Regarding Termination or Suspension of Service Contracts and Effect of Violation of Interest Rate Limitation

This section would amend section 305a of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 535a) to increase the types of services a service member being deployed for more than 90 days can terminate upon receiving orders without paying termination and other fees. In addition to cellular telephone service, the amendment includes telephone exchange service, multichannel video programming service, internet access services, water, electricity, oil, gas, or other utilities.

### Section 584—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces Deployed in Support of a Contingency Operation

This section would amend title 2 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 535a) by preventing a court from permanently altering a custody order while a service member is deployed, unless evidence shows a temporary order is in the best interest of the child. It also requires the pre-deployment order to be reinstated when a service member returns from deployment, unless evidence shows reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child, and prohibits courts from using deployment or the possibility of deployment against a service member when determining the best interest of a child.

### Section 585—Definitions in Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 Related to Active Duty Servicemembers, and Related Matters

This section would amend sections 2611 and 2612 of title 29, United States Code, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, to

expand coverage of the exigency leave to members of the active duty. The section would modify the definition of a covered active duty service member, and expand coverage of such members to include a veteran who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation and therapy for a serious injury or illness at any time during a period of five years preceding the date upon which the veteran receives treatment. This section would take effect on the date of enactment, and would direct the Secretary of Labor to issue final conforming regulations to implement the section, not later than 120 days.

## SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 591—Navy Grants to Naval Sea Cadet Corps

This section would allow the Secretary of the Navy to make grants, subject to the availability of funds, to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps, a federally chartered corporation under chapter 1541 of title 36, United States Code.

### Section 592—Improved Response and Investigation of Allegations of Sexual Assault Involving Members of the Armed Forces

The committee is concerned with the incidence of sexual assault in the military, and wants to ensure that the Department of Defense is taking all possible actions to prevent sexual assault from occurring, as well as fully investigating and prosecuting all sexual assaults.

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide to the congressional defense committees, a report on the capacity of each military services' infrastructure for the investigation and adjudication of allegations of sexual assault, to determine if there are any barriers which negatively affect the ability of the services to facilitate the investigation and adjudication of these cases to the full extent of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to develop and submit to the congressional defense committees, a sexual assault prevention program. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, a report describing sexual assault forensic examinations in combat zones, to include the following: the current availability of sexual assault forensic examinations in combat zones; the existence of any barriers to providing sexual assault forensic examinations at all echelons of care in combat zones; and the need for any legislative actions required to improve the availability of sexual assault forensic examinations in combat zones.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, a report describing the implementation of section 701 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–324), which authorized coverage of sexual assault forensic examinations under the TRICARE program. This section would also require that sexual assault statistics collected by the Department of Defense, that are a part of the annual report to Congress, include whether a military protective order was issued that involved either

the victim or perpetrator of cases of sexual assault, that was reported as an unrestricted report. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that when a military protective order is issued, the service member protected by that order is informed that he or she has a right to request a base transfer from the command.

### Section 593—Modification of Matching Fund Requirements under National Guard Youth Challenge Program

This section would reduce the matching fund requirement for states participating in the National Guard Youth Challenge Program from 75 percent of the costs, to 60 percent of the costs of the program beginning October 1, 2009.

## TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

### OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that successful recruiting and retention in a wartime environment directly depends on the close oversight of compensation and benefit programs to ensure that they remain robust, flexible, and effective. Accordingly, the committee recommends an across-the-board pay raise of 3.4 percent, one-half of one percent above pay raise levels in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index (ECI). This would be the 11th consecutive year that the pay raise would exceed the ECI level and would result in an average cumulative pay increase of 57 percent over the last 11 years.

The committee recognizes that some previously adopted compensation policies, bonuses, and special pays require modification to ensure they remain current and effective. The committee recommends a number of such adjustments, including a number of refinements to the initiative to reform special and incentive pays adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The committee believes that more needs to be done to benefit military families. For example, the committee includes provisions that would authorize a study of housing standards to ensure that service members and their families receive an appropriate level of housing allowance, an additional privately owned vehicle to be shipped to non-foreign overseas locations to assist families with transportation needs, and new limits to protect the welfare of families when required to repay compensation overpayments incurred through administrative error.

The committee notes that the benefits provided to wounded warriors and their loved ones needs to be updated. The committee recommends two provisions to improve travel and transportation benefits for family members, other persons designated by the service member, and non-medical attendants. The committee also recommends a provision to pay an allowance to service members with a catastrophic combat-related injury or illness in order to assist the member in acquiring aid and attendance services.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Exchange Dividend Payments to the Puerto Rico National Guard

The committee is aware that the Army morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) central fund is holding over $50.0 million in Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) dividend payments that are the property of the Puerto Rico National Guard (PRNG). The committee believes that the funds should be transferred to the control of the PRNG to be used to provide for the welfare of PRNG service members and their families. Accordingly, the committee urges the adjutant general of the PRNG and MWR managers within the Army and the Office of Secretary of Defense to resolve any uncertainty about the process for distributing the funds, and to transfer the full amount to the control of the PRNG.

### Review of Policy and Cost Considerations by Which National Guard Military Technicians are Treated for Overtime Work

The committee is aware of the challenges with section 709(h) of title 32, United States Code, which prohibits Army and Air Force National Guard military technicians from receiving overtime pay but grants compensatory time off for overtime work performed. The committee recognized that the law concerning National Guard military technician overtime has remained essentially unchanged since the enactment of the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968 (Public Law 90–486), and required a review of this policy as part of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398). In response, the Department stated its position that the overtime ban for National Guard technicians should remain unchanged. The committee notes, however, that much has changed since 2001, with many National Guard technicians facing increased workloads due to increased operational support demands, while also being deployed themselves in support of ongoing military operations abroad.

In order to fully evaluate the extent to which National Guard military technicians are compensated for their overtime hours, the committee believes that a more comprehensive review of this policy is needed. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a new review of the policy and cost considerations by which National Guard military technicians are treated for overtime work The review shall also contain the following: (1) data on the overtime work performed by National Guard military technicians during fiscal years 2002 through 2009, for which technicians are ineligible for overtime compensation in accordance with section 709(h) of title 32, United States Code; (2) indicate the average and annual amount of compensatory time off earned by National Guard military technicians and the average amount of that compensatory time actually used by the technicians; and (3) indicate the number of overtime hours performed by National Guard military technicians and the estimated cost of providing overtime pay in lieu of compensatory time for the performance of overtime work. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by May 1, 2010.

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

### Section 601—Fiscal Year 2010 Increase in Military Basic Pay

This section would increase basic pay for members of the uniform services by 3.4 percent effective January 1, 2010. This raise would continue to fulfill Congress's commitment to keep pay raises for the uniformed services ahead of private sector pay raises. Accordingly, the gap between pay increases for the uniformed services and private sector employees during fiscal year 2010 would be reduced from approximately 2.9 percent to 2.4 percent.

### Section 602—Special Monthly Compensation Allowance for Members with Combat-Related Catastrophic Injuries or Illnesses Pending Their Retirement or Separation for Physical Disability

This section would authorize the secretaries concerned to pay a special monthly compensation to a service member with a combat-related catastrophic injury or illness. The service member would be entitled to the compensation after being certified by a physician that the service member requires aid and attendance services to perform personal functions required in everyday living. The secretary concerned may pay the service member an amount that may not exceed the aid and attendance allowance authorized by section 1114(r) of title 38, United States Code, and in determining the amount shall consider aid and attendance service being provided by the government. The compensation would terminate the first month following a 90 day period beginning on the date of separation or retirement of the member, the first month beginning after the death of the member, or the first month beginning after the date on which the member is determined to be no longer afflicted by a catastrophic injury or illness, whichever is earlier.

### Section 603—Stabilization of Pay and Allowances for Senior Enlisted Members and Warrant Officers Appointed as Officers and Officers Reappointed in a Lower Grade

This section would authorize a member of the armed forces who accepts an appointment or reappointment as an officer without a break in service to retain the pay and allowances to which the member was entitled in the previous grade if it is more than the pay and allowances to which the member is entitled in the grade to which he is appointed or reappointed.

### Section 604—Report on Housing Standards Used to Determine Basic Allowance for Housing

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the housing standards that are used to calculate the monthly rates of basic allowance for housing and to report his findings and recommendations with associated cost estimates by July 1, 2010. The review would determine if the housing standards meet societal needs and expectations of American families, provide for an appropriate quality of life for military families, and recognize the prestige associated with promotion to higher military grades.

## 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 bonus for persons with prior service, and income replacement payments until December 31, 2010.

### 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, 2010.

### 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, 2010.

### Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the authority for the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health professions incentive pay and bonus authorities, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high priority units until December 31, 2010.

### Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pay

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 per-

sonnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between armed forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates until December 31, 2010.

Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses

This section would extend the authority for the health professions referral bonus and the Army referral bonus until December 31, 2010.

Section 617—Technical Corrections and Conforming Amendments to Reconcile Conflicting Amendments Regarding Continued Payment of Bonuses and Similar Benefits for Certain Members

This section would make technical and conforming amendments in regard to provisions concerning the payment of bonuses that were included in the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) and the Hubbard Act (Public Law 110–317).

Section 618—Proration of Certain Special and Incentive Pays to Reflect Time During Which a Member Satisfies Eligibility Requirements for the Special or Incentive Pay

This section would clarify that the monthly payment of hostile fire pay, imminent danger pay, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay, and special duty pay may be prorated to reflect the actual time the service members performed qualifying service during the month. This section would also clarify that reserve members may be paid a skill incentive bonus in the same manner as such a bonus is paid to active duty members and that the monthly payment of the bonus may be prorated to reflect the actual time served in a critical skill.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 631—Transportation of Additional Motor Vehicle of Members on Change of Permanent Station to or from Nonforeign Areas Outside the Continental United States

This section would authorize members with at least one family member eligible to drive to ship two privately owned vehicles during permanent change of station moves to nonforeign duty locations located outside the continental United States. Nonforeign duty locations outside the continental United States include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and other territories and possessions.

Section 632—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Designated Individuals of Wounded, Ill, or Injured Members for Duration of Inpatient Treatment

This section would authorize the secretaries concerned to allow service members to designate three persons, to include persons that are not family members, that may be authorized travel and transportation benefits to visit a wounded, injured, and ill service member while hospitalized. This section would also clarify that a service member's designated individuals may only be granted 3 rounds

trips from their homes to the hospital during any 60 day period and that other service members who are properly designated may be granted the same travel and transportation benefits.

Section 633—Authorized Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Very Seriously and Seriously Wounded, Ill, or Injured Members

This section would authorize the secretaries concerned to provide travel and transportation benefits to non-medical attendants serving very seriously or seriously wounded, ill, or injured service members when such persons are designated as non-medical attendants by the service members and medical authorities agree that the designee is qualified and would contribute to the health and welfare of the service member. This section would also authorize travel and transportation benefits from the homes of the designated non-medical attendants to the location at which the service members are receiving treatment and to any other location to which such service members are subsequently transferred or are required to temporarily visit to receive further treatment.

Section 634—Increased Weight Allowance for Transportation of Baggage and Household Effects for Certain Enlisted Members

This section would authorize noncommissioned officers in the grades of E–5 through E–9 with an increased weight allowance for shipping household goods during permanent changes in station.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Section 641—Recomputation of Retired Pay and Adjustment of Retired Grade of Reserve Retirees to Reflect Service after Retirement

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to recompute the retired pay and adjust the retired grade of non-regular retirees who have been recalled to an active status in the Selected Reserve for not less than two years. This section would authorize the secretary concerned to reduce the two-year service requirement for a member recalled to serve in the position of adjutant general or assistant adjutant general within the National Guard when the member serves at least six months but fails to complete the two years of service due to the requirements of the law of the state, commonwealth, or territory in which the member is serving.

Section 642—Election to Receive Retired Pay for Non-Regular Service Upon Retirement for Service in an Active Reserve Status Performed After Attaining Eligibility for Regular Retirement

This section would authorize members of Reserve Components who served in an active reserve status in the Selected Reserve for not less than two years after becoming eligible for an active duty retirement to elect a non-regular retirement for which they are qualified. This section would authorize the secretary concerned to reduce the two-year service requirement for a member recalled to serve in the position of adjutant general or assistant adjutant general within the National Guard when the member serves at least six months but fails to complete the two years of service due to the

requirements of the law of the state, commonwealth, or territory in which the member is serving. This section would further specify that a member has attained retirement eligibility after meeting all qualifying criteria without regard to whether the person actually retired or received retired or retainer pay.

## SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

### Section 651—Additional Exception to Limitation on Use of Appropriated Funds for Department of Defense Golf Courses

This section would authorize the use of appropriated funds to purchase and maintain equipment intended to ensure military golf courses are in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101).

### Section 652—Limitation on Department of Defense Entities Offering Personal Information Services to Members and Their Dependents

This section would bar the Secretary of Defense from authorizing a Department of Defense (DOD) entity to provide personal information services using DOD resources, personnel or equipment, or compete for contracts to provide such services when the intent is to charge users to recover cost or to earn profits. This section would authorize the Secretary to elect to provide personal information services when users will not be charged, when a private sector vendor is not available to provide the services at specific locations, or when the Secretary of Defense determines that the interests of the user population would be best served by allowing the government to provide such services.

### Section 653—Report on Impact of Purchasing From Local Distributors All Alcoholic Beverages for Resale on Military Installations on Guam

This section would require the Comptroller General to evaluate the implications for nonappropriated fund activities and alcohol beverage pricing of reimposing the requirement that all alcoholic beverages intended for resale on military installations on Guam be purchased from local sources as provided in section 8073 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–116).

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 661—Limitations on Collection of Overpayments of Pay and Allowances Erroneously Paid to Members

This section would require the secretary concerned to reduce the maximum percentage of monthly compensation that may be involuntarily collected to repay overpayments erroneously paid to the member from 20 percent to 10 percent. This section would also require the secretaries concerned to consult with service members about establishing a repayment plan, delay collection from wounded warriors for 180 days, and consider forgiving the debt when the service member relies on social security benefits or repayment

would impose a financial hardship. This section would also establish a five-year deadline on collection actions.

### Section 662—Army Authority to Provide Additional Recruitment Incentives

This section would extend from December 31, 2009, to December 31, 2012, the authority for the Secretary of the Army to develop and implement recruiting incentive programs that are unique to the Army. This section would also allow the Secretary to replace incentive programs within the maximum of four authorized under the law.

### Section 663—Benefits Under Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence Program for Certain Periods Before Implementation of Program

This section would authorize the secretaries concerned, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, to provide service members a benefit under the Post-Deployment/Mobilization Respite Absence (PDMRA) program when the service member qualified for such a benefit during the period after the PDMRA program was announced on January 19, 2007, but before the appropriate secretary concerned implemented the program. This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay former service members up to $200 for each day of administrative absence for which the former service members are qualified. This section would authorize the secretary concerned to elect to provide service members the appropriate number of days of administrative absence for which the service members are qualified or to pay the service members up to $200 for each day of administrative absence for which the service members are qualified. This section would exclude former service members from eligibility if the former members were discharged or released from the armed forces under other than honorable conditions and would limit the number of days for which a benefit may be provided to 40 days. This section would also require the secretaries concerned to conclude awarding benefits under the authority of the section at the end of a one-year period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

### Section 664—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Compensation, Retirement, and Other Military Personnel Programs

This section would express the sense of Congress that service members and their families and military retirees deserve ongoing recognition and support for their service. The section would also confirm that Congress will be vigilant in identifying appropriate direct spending offsets that can be used to address shortcomings within military personnel programs that incur mandatory spending obligations.

## TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

### OVERVIEW

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Defense Health Program to support operational requirements, accessi-

bility, and quality of health care provided to service members, retirees, and family members. After over seven years of conflict, the military health system appears to be unable to keep up with its current demands, as evidenced by a continuing shift, from the direct care system, to the purchased care system. The committee is aware of extended closures or suspensions of clinical departments and graduate medical education programs at military treatment facilities due to deploying staff. The committee is concerned with the Department's ability to retain exceptional military health care providers in the face of the strains placed upon the system. The committee commends the Department of Defense for fully funding the Defense Health Program to help meet the demands placed on the military health system.

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense did not again propose their Sustain the Benefit plan, which would have achieved most of their cost savings by raising TRICARE fees and cost shares by such a great amount, that a significant number of current beneficiaries would choose to leave the military health system. The committee is also encouraged that the Secretary of Defense has indicated a willingness to engage in a dialogue with Congress to develop a thoughtful and comprehensive strategy to control the growing cost of health care.

The committee is encouraged that the Department budgeted for the restoration of military medical positions previously converted to civilian positions, but never filled. However, the committee remains concerned that the Department will resume conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions once the statutory prohibition expires in 2012, despite indications that such conversions have had an adverse effect on the military health system.

The committee remains vigilant in its oversight of the care, rehabilitation, and support provided to our wounded warriors, and is especially concerned with access to mental health services. The committee is also concerned with the health of military family members, to include mental health, and will likewise provide vigilant oversight to ensure they receive the health services they need.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Active Duty Dental Care

The committee continues to be concerned about the ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide timely access to quality dental care. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense employs several methods to provide dental care to active duty service members, including non-DOD dental providers. The committee is further concerned that active duty service members receive consistent dental benefits regardless of the type of dental provider utilized to provide quality care under DOD dental programs. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of and prepare a report on the time it takes active duty service members to access dental care, and whether or not it is qualitatively different from care provided prior to October 1, 2008.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of and prepare a report on non-DOD provider partici-

pation in any dental support contract entered into by the Department of Defense since October 1, 2008, to include provider participation rates.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the reports required above to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2009.

### Arthritis

The committee is aware that 46 million Americans have arthritis. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recently reported that nearly one in five American adults have disabilities, and that arthritis remained the most common cause of disability.

The committee is concerned by growing evidence that arthritis, especially osteoarthritis, is an increasing problem for military personnel. Recent studies indicate that U.S. veterans are more likely to report physician-diagnosed arthritis than the general population, and that arthritis represents a significant health problem among veterans. Studies also show that the stress placed on joints during military training and military combat operations, account for an increased prevalence of arthritis in service members and veterans. The committee is particularly concerned with evidence that some injuries may be responsible for the early onset of arthritis, by as much as 10 years.

The committee believes that a proactive approach is necessary to mitigate the negative impact of arthritis on military readiness and the quality of life for service members and their families. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a comprehensive policy for the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of arthritis, and to submit a report on this program to the congressional defense committees within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Availability of Proper and Comprehensive Medical Care for Victims of Sexual Assault

The committee notes the importance of the availability of proper and comprehensive medical care for victims of sexual assault. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the availability and adequacy of proper medical care, including mental health care, for victims of sexual assault in combat zones. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the availability and adequacy of post-mobilization medical and mental health care for victims of sexual assault in the Reserve Components. The Secretary of Defense shall submit the report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

### Human Systems Integration

The committee notes the research on injury prevention being conducted at Naval Special Warfare Group Two. This research has two goals: to understand the mechanics and mechanisms of common non-hostile fire injuries; and to develop physical training regimens that reduce the likelihood of service members incurring these injuries. The committee notes how quickly this program has been embraced by special operators who have incorporated it into their reg-

ular training. The committee also notes that the potential reduction of injuries through physical training tailored to the tactical tasks required of service members in combat is not limited to special operations forces. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive study to determine what aspects of this research are ready for inclusion in conventional combat training and what additional research is needed to tailor the physical training of service members to the tactical tasks they are required to perform while deployed. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report on the results of the study to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Internet-Based Interactive Mental Health Technology

The committee commends the Department of Defense for investigating new technological advancements that can provide armed forces personnel and their families with interactive self-help for their behavioral health needs in a manner which reduces stigma and increases confidentiality. The committee understands that the Department, in its effort to find the most efficient and timely means of disseminating health-related information, is investigating interactive tools, such as virtual agents, that provide intelligent self-service by engaging the individual online, discovering their intent, and delivering the most appropriate and consistent response using voice, text, and page navigation. The committee encourages the Department to employ these human emulation technologies, to expand available mental health services for military personnel and their families.

Long-Term Tracking for Blast Exposures

The committee is aware that the Army National Guard has a process for tracking long-term blast exposures among its troops. This initiative records the exposure to blasts in service member's personnel records in order to document the incident in the event of problems associated with traumatic brain injury or exposure to contaminants. The committee understands that the database aids in the determination of eligibility for appropriate treatment, care, and disability entitlements. Further, the committee believes that the utilization of a long-term blast exposure tool has the potential to improve long-term medical treatment for all service members and facilitate research into traumatic brain injury and other blast-related health issues. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to work with secretaries of the military services to establish a database to track long-term blast exposures.

Mental Health and Traumatic Brain Injury

The committee is aware of the challenges the Department of Defense continues to face in providing mental health care to service members and their families, as well as diagnosing and treating traumatic brain injury. The committee notes the myriad recommendations provided by the Department of Defense Task Force on Mental Health, required by section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). Further, the committee understands that the Department has not yet

fully implemented the comprehensive mental health requirements contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The committee notes the diverse range of evolving concepts and technologies from the nation's academic, scientific, and public health base that directly relate to mental health and traumatic brain injury. The committee therefore recommends that the Department consider funding multiple projects, to include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) A demonstration project conducted at two military installations, one active and one Reserve Component demobilization station, to assess the feasibility and efficacy of providing a face-to-face post-deployment mental health and traumatic brain injury screening between a service member and a mental health provider.

(2) A program to address the needs of service members and their families, to include members of the Reserve Components, that reside in rural areas, to ensure that the full spectrum of mental health services is available.

(3) A program to recruit and train veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom as crisis hotline staff for Department of Defense supported crisis hotlines.

(4) A project that partners with a school of nursing to use the Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction model used to treat cancer survivors, to help service members cope with stress and emotional difficulties associated with disabilities incurred while deployed.

(5) A program conducted by a health and hazards research center of a major university to reduce vicarious trauma among military behavioral health providers.

(6) A program to develop battlefield-related injury translational research and strategies, to document effective treatments to improve the long-term disability and predictive models to identify individuals at increased risk for long-term disability from traumatic brain injury and polytrauma, including physical and emotional trauma.

(7) A program conducted by a rehabilitation institute of a major university to advance treatment strategies to address traumatic injuries to military personnel that result in the loss of, or impact to limbs, cognition, vision, hearing, and/or motor function.

### Military Mental Health Providers

The committee is concerned about the shortage of military mental health providers. The committee is also aware that the nation, as a whole, suffers from a serious shortage of mental health providers. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military services to develop programs to identify and train current service members to become licensed mental health providers.

The committee commends the Army for creating its own masters of social work program, which selects commissioned officers for a graduate level course of study at the Army Medical Department Center & School at Fort Sam Houston, Texas. This program, when followed by a preceptor phase at an Army military treatment facility, allows commissioned officers who have received a master of so-

cial work, to become licensed social workers. The committee also commends the psychiatric nurse practitioner program at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland, which awards a doctor of nursing practice degree in psychiatric health to military nurses.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to identify any legal authorities required to develop additional Department of Defense training programs that lead to licensure as a mental health provider, and submit a report listing any required legal authorities to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Pulse!!

The "Pulse!!" platform immerses medical personnel in a high-fidelity, three-dimensional virtual space that replicates the actual world in sight and sound by employing cutting-edge computer game based technologies to present clinical cases in real time. The learning platform provides an array of interactive tools to guide learning, as well as technical capabilities for integrating new advances in technology, medicine, and education. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to ensure seamless transition of "Pulse!!" and integration of capabilities into the medical learning environment. The committee directs the Secretary to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report detailing: planned funding of "Pulse!!" for fiscal years 2010 and 2011; any plans for transitioning "Pulse!!" to the Naval Medical Support Command; and any plans for integrating capabilities into current and future training requirements.

### Reserve Dental Readiness

The committee is aware that the military departments continue to be challenged in bringing Reserve Component service members up to the appropriate level of dental readiness prior to mobilization. The committee recognizes the need for dental readiness activities to be conducted at the home station, in order to maximize collective training at mobilization stations and reduce the delays in deployment. The committee encourages the military departments to seek innovative approaches to ensuring dental readiness for Reserve Component members, including the development of cooperative agreements with college and university dental programs to provide preventive care and treatment close to the home station. The committee also encourages the military departments to examine the successful model used at Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado, to provide dental support to the Reserve Components. Further, the committee is aware of an innovative Army effort to systematically address this challenge through the Army Selected Reserve Dental Readiness System. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report, to the congressional defense committees, on the status of the Army Selected Reserve Dental Readiness System within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Trauma Training Technology

The committee notes that there is a 94 percent survival rate for combat wounded service members who reach an Echelon III medical facility. The committee understands that two of the main contributing factors to the remarkable survival rate are advancements in medical technology used in the field, such as improved tourniquets, and a larger percentage of medics and corpsman who have received advanced trauma training before deployment. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense uses all currently available methods to conduct trauma training, to include simulators, live tissue models, and training rotations in civilian trauma centers. The committee notes that the Department of Defense is working with private industry to develop more advanced and realistic training simulators for trauma training. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to further improve medical training by leveraging the Department of Defense's science & technology and research & development organizations, as well as private industry, to develop additional advanced training simulators and training aids, to include animal-alternative training, to offer the most realistic, practical, transferable, and cost-effective training to all medical personnel.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—IMPROVEMENTS TO HEALTH BENEFITS

#### Section 701—Prohibition on Conversion of Military Medical and Dental Positions to Civilian Medical and Dental Positions

This section would indefinitely extend the prohibition on conversions of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions by a secretary of a military department by removing the end date of section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

#### Section 702—Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide chiropractic services and benefits as a permanent part of the Defense Health Program, including the TRICARE program, for all active duty service members.

#### Section 703—Expansion of Survivor Eligibility under TRICARE Dental Program

This section would expand survivor eligibility under the TRICARE dental program so that it matches survivor eligibility under other TRICARE programs.

#### Section 704—TRICARE Standard Coverage for Certain Members of the Retired Reserve Who Are Qualified for a Non-Regular Retirement But Are Not Yet Age 60

This section would extend TRICARE standard coverage for certain members of the Retired Reserve who are qualified for a non-regular retirement but are not yet age 60. Members of the Retired Reserve eligible under this section would be required to pay 100

percent of the cost of the monthly premium for TRICARE Standard as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

### Section 705—Cooperative Health Care Agreements between Military Installations and Non-Military Health Care Systems

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense to establish cooperative health care arrangements and agreements between military installations and local and regional non-military health care systems.

### Section 706—Health Care for Members of the Reserve Components

This section would extend the eligibility of members of the Reserve Components who are issued or covered by a delayed-effective-date active-duty order in support of a contingency operation for TRICARE coverage under section 1074 of title 10, United States Code, from 90 days before the date on which the period of active duty is to commence, to 180 days before that date.

### Section 707—National Casualty Care Research Center

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a National Casualty Care Research Center at the Army Medical Research and Material Command. The purpose of the center would be to establish additional linkages between military and civilian casualty research. The center would be required to provide public-private partnership for funding studies on combat injury, integrate military and civilian research to improve care, and ensure that data from both the Joint Theater Trauma Registry and the National Trauma Bank are used to establish research priorities.

## SUBTITLE B—REPORTS

### Section 711—Report on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Efforts

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate itemizing the current treatments of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), ongoing research, and areas for future exploration by December 31, 2010.

The committee is concerned that research and treatment efforts are disjointed and may be duplicative. The committee encourages the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense, and their respective agents, to collaborate in the area of PTSD prevention and treatment research in order to focus and improve preventative efforts and the efficacy of treatment.

### Section 712—Report on the Feasibility of TRICARE Prime in Certain Commonwealths and Territories of the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study examining the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of offering TRICARE Prime in Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Section 713—Report on the Health Care Needs of Military Family Members

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report on the health care needs of military family members, and to submit a report containing the results to the congressional defense committees within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. This section would also require the Secretary of the Army to establish as a pilot program, a center focused on the needs of military children and adolescents.

### Section 714—Report on Stipends for Members of Reserve Components for Health Care for Certain Dependents

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the extent to which the Secretary has exercised the authority provided in section 704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

### Section 715—Report on the Required Number of Military Mental Health Providers

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the appropriate number of military mental health providers required to meet the mental health care needs of members of the armed forces, retired members, and dependents. This section would also require the Secretary to provide a plan on how the Department of Defense will achieve the appropriate number of military mental health providers.

## TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

### OVERVIEW

Acquisition reform has been a major area of focus for the committee this year. On March 18, 2009, the committee organized a Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform to examine the operation of the defense acquisition system. The Panel will serve for a period of six months, with the potential to be extended for up to an additional six months. In addition to the oversight that the Panel's activities provide, the committee expects that the Panel will provide recommendations to the full committee for further reform of the defense acquisition system for consideration next year. In addition, on May 12, the committee reported out H.R. 2101, a bill to promote reform and independence in the oversight of weapons system acqui-

sition by the Department of Defense. This legislation was enacted into law as S. 454, the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) on May 22, 2009.

The committee's recommendations in this title reflect the fact that significant reform of the acquisition of major weapon systems has already been enacted this year. However, the committee notes that major weapon systems acquisition constitutes only about 20 percent of the annual acquisitions of the Department of Defense. The committee is continuing its work on other major areas of acquisition, especially contingency contracting and service contracting. Recognizing the critical importance of the acquisition workforce to success in all areas of acquisition, the committee incorporates in this title improvements that were requested by the Department of Defense in the operation of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund and in the implementation of expedited hiring authority for acquisition positions. These authorities will assist the Department in achieving the goals of its hiring initiative for the acquisition workforce which is discussed in greater detail in an item of special interest in this section of the report.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### CONTINGENCY CONTRACTING

#### Contingency Contracting Planning, Oversight, and Visibility

The committee continues to be concerned about the level of planning and oversight for contractor support, particularly in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and believes that continued progress in this area will require ongoing commitment from the leadership of the Department of Defense (DOD), including the military services. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has taken several positive steps to address issues of contingency contracting, including signing a Memorandum of Understanding for matters relating to contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan with the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development as mandated in section 861 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), identifying the Synchronized Predeployment and Operational Tracker database to track contractors, deploying Joint Asset Management and Movement System scanners, establishing the Joint Contracting Acquisition Support Office and Joint Operational Contract Support Planners, and establishing the DOD Dependence on Contractor Support in Contingency Operations Task Force. However, the committee remains concerned that the military services have not fully developed and formalized doctrine for deployed forces to ensure that: the role for contractor support is appropriately defined; such forces and their commanders are trained on the integration of contractor support into combat and contingency operations; and adequate systems exist to oversee contractors supporting deployed forces. Further, the Department of Defense has not yet assigned oversight responsibilities nor developed all of the departmental directives and policies necessary to an enduring contingency contracting policy within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the combatant commands, the defense agencies, and the military departments.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010 that addresses the development of relevant doctrine and training; the status, plans, and resources for existing programs to support contingency contracting and improve visibility into contractors in theater; and plans for establishing enduring oversight responsibilities and policies. The report should also address the results of the study of the DOD Dependence on Contractor Support in Contingency Operations Task Force including: information on the rationale for the study and what was hoped to be achieved; a description of joint capability areas and uniform joint task lists that are particularly reliant on contractors, and other shortfalls that the study identified; an assessment of the broader implications of the study results for the Department's ability to provide those capabilities in the decades ahead; and a description of how the study's recommendations will be implemented.

### Serious Corrective Action Measures in Department of Defense Contracts

The committee is aware that in rare cases, contractor quality controls on Department of Defense contracts could deteriorate so badly that serious corrective action measures would be required. In these cases, the Department normally issues a Level III Corrective Action Request (CAR). The committee is concerned that the severity of cases involving Level III CARs could challenge existing measures for corrective action in the event the Department of Defense is entirely dependent on a single contractor due to the existence of: a sole source contracting strategy that cannot be quickly adjusted; an urgent and unavoidable requirement; or a challenging environment for contract performance. In such cases, the Department may be unable, in a timely fashion, to fully exercise its right to sanction the contractor, which could allow potentially life-threatening issues of deficient contractor performance to continue for a significant period of time. Accordingly, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to carry out an assessment of the sufficiency of mechanisms currently in place to respond to contractor deficiencies that result in Level III or higher CARs on the kinds of contracts identified above, including possible enhancements to such mechanisms, and directs the Under Secretary to provide a report on the findings of the assessment to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2009.

### Third-Party Certification of Private Security Contractors

The committee recognizes that third-party certification is common in government procurements. For example, third-party generated standards have been adopted as a requirement in many contracts, such as the International Organization for Standardization certification, American Bureau of Shipbuilding certification, or radio frequency standards established by the Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers. Similar requirements have also been targeted to individuals or key employees of a potential contractor, such as license requirements for engineers, training standards for

canine handlers, or unexploded ordnance technicians. The committee notes that such standards have yielded benefits for both the Department of Defense and industry, in terms of consistency, clarity in requirements, and affordability.

The committee believes that a third-party or industry generated set of standards for private security contractors may create similar results for the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the feasibility of requiring that an independent, third-party certification body certify a private security contractor has met appropriate operational and business practice standards, consistent with applicable defense regulations and legal precedent. Such a certification could attest that a contractor possesses and utilizes approved hiring, screening, training, and reporting practices, in addition to compliance with tax law, ethics, and auditing programs. As part of the Secretary's assessment, the committee encourages the Secretary to consider the extent to which independent, third-party certification of private contractors would increase or decrease the end cost to the taxpayer for such contracts. The Secretary of Defense is further directed to submit a report containing the findings of the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services of the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2010.

War Zone Contractor Communications Safety

The Department of Defense (DOD) increasingly must work with multi-national partners and interact with local populations in a variety of regions. While the Department traditionally relied on its language professionals to ensure that it had the regional proficiencies it needed, it has recognized that deployed combat forces also must have the ability to understand and communicate with native populations, local officials, and coalition partners. The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, the military services, and combatant commands are responsible for the development, training, and use of foreign language capabilities among civilian and military personnel. The committee notes that similar attention should be paid to contractors supporting the military forces. Currently, in the Central Command area of responsibility, there is almost a one-to-one ratio between military personnel and contractor personnel, many of whom are third-country or host-country nationals working as private security guards. The ability to communicate with military forces with whom they are stationed or with the local community is an essential security protection measure.

The committee is aware that contracts awarded for security guards in the region require contractor personnel to have an ability to speak English at a level sufficient to give and receive situational reports. However, recent contract audits have questioned the language proficiency of many of the third-country nationals. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on contractor language proficiency requirements for those working as private security contractors to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The report should include: a description of the policy requirements, including contract clauses, for contractor language proficiency; the type of language

training provided to contractor personnel, including ongoing refresher courses; and the mechanisms used by DOD contract oversight personnel to assess whether the contractors have complied with the proficiency requirements for their employees.

## OTHER MATTERS

### Acquisition Workforce

The acquisition workforce is at the heart of the Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition system. Ensuring that the acquisition workforce is adequately staffed, skilled, and trained and improving the workforce's quality and performance are as important as improvements to acquisition processes and structures. Congress formally established the acquisition workforce as a profession, and set education, training, and experience standards in the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act, which was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510). The committee has been concerned, however, that since then, the Department's civilian acquisition workforce may have been downsized too much, particularly since many recent acquisition problems have been attributed to inadequate oversight, poor decision making, and faulty implementation of acquisition laws and regulations.

Congress has enacted several initiatives as part of the annual national defense authorization acts aimed at addressing those concerns and giving the Department the necessary tools to hire, retain, and train acquisition professionals, including the creation of an acquisition workforce development fund, authorization of direct hire authority for acquisition positions, and establishment of exceptions to Department personnel caps to ensure performance of certain functions by government employees, both civilian and military. In addition, the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) requires the Department to establish policies for career paths for military personnel in the acquisition field. Opportunities to advance to general and flag officer positions have been limited in the past, discouraging talented active duty personnel from seeking a career in the acquisition field. The committee notes that the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary Operations, in its 2007 report, found that the contracting failures in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan could be attributed in part to the lack of general officers with contracting experience in the Army. The committee expects that a commitment to properly developing members of the armed forces in the acquisition field should help attract the highest quality candidates for these positions.

The committee commends the Department's initiative to increase the size of the in-house acquisition workforce, proposing to hire 9,000 new government personnel and convert 11,000 contractor positions to DOD civilian personnel positions. The committee encourages the Department to consider whether additional civilian personnel or training programs may be needed based on the completion of its own competency modeling effort, as well as the results of its insourcing analysis. The committee also recommends that the Department look not only at the existing gaps in its workforce, but

take a pro-active approach in determining what capabilities may need to be developed to ensure that the Department has a high-performing acquisition workforce that is ready to meet the demands of today's complex national security environment and that is adaptable enough to respond to future needs.

In addition to, and, as important as, the Department's initiative to increase the overall size of the government acquisition workforce, the committee urges the Department to undertake a focused campaign deliberately designed to instill an enterprise-wide mindset that properly recognizes the critical mission the acquisition workforce performs.

### Industrial Security

The committee notes that section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) codified the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense to protect classified information disclosed to contractors of the Department of Defense. Section 845 also required the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009, on measures to improve industrial security. The committee notes that the Secretary submitted the required report on time, and that the report provided a concise and well thought-out presentation of measures being taken, and potential measures to be taken, to improve industrial security. The report revealed that the Department is currently updating its industrial security policy as it pertains to foreign ownership, control or influence. The committee looks forward to issuance of the new policy. The committee urges the Secretary to aggressively pursue additional measures to improve industrial security as described in the section of the report relating to the Secretary's recommendations. Additionally, the committee looks forward to receiving the Secretary's first biennial report on the Department's industrial security expenditures and activities by September 1, 2009. The committee endorses the Secretary's decision to increase staffing in the Defense Security Service (DSS) and to increase DSS's capability in the area of industrial security, particularly in analyzing the impact of new financial arrangements on the Department's ability to establish the existence of foreign ownership, control, or influence (FOCI) on defense contractors. The committee expects that the Secretary will place a high priority on addressing weaknesses in cyber security and on improvements in the detection of FOCI in discussions of revisions to interagency guidance on industrial security.

### Report on Small Business Concerns with Defense Policy Review Initiative Acquisition Strategy

The committee is aware of the complexities of the acquisition strategy associated with the realignment of military forces on Guam and concerns raised about the Naval Facilities Engineering Command use of Multiple Award Construction Contracts (MACCs) as the primary vehicle for design and construction of facilities on Guam. The committee notes that requests for proposals for performance under the MACCs will require prospective contractors to meet certain bonding, workforce healthcare, workforce housing, and material management requirements. Although the committee ac-

knowledges the importance of these requirements, the committee is concerned that this contracting mechanism may make it difficult for small business concerns, particularly local small businesses, to submit responsive proposals.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by February 1, 2010, on the small business goals associated with the realignment of military forces on Guam and how such goals will be attained. Additionally, the report shall address the extent to which the Navy considered small businesses' abilities to meet the bonding requirements of task orders associated with MACCs on Guam and the ability of program management support contractors to bid on such task orders.

Service Contracting

The Department of Defense (DOD) now spends more of its budget on the procurement of services than products. Within the United States and at U.S. military installations overseas, contractors provide basic base support operations (such as food and housing), logistical support, equipment maintenance, medical care, and administrative support as well as the development and support of complex information technology systems. The committee notes that the wide variety of types of services provided, along with the range of different contracting vehicles for the procurement of services, leads to challenges in describing standard requirements, establishing measurable and performance-based outcomes, and overseeing contractor performance. Congress has enacted several initiatives as part of the annual national defense authorization acts aimed at providing improved management and oversight of the acquisition of services by the Department and the military services.

The committee remains concerned, however, that the Department has not adequately focused on how it contracts for services. As the Government Accountability Office has stated in numerous reports, the Department lacks a strategic approach to managing services and needs to develop methods to assess risk when acquiring services. Without such an approach, the Department is at risk of being unable to identify and correct poor contractor performance in a timely manner and is at risk of paying contractors more than the value of the services they performed.

The committee's Panel on Defense Acquisition Reform is examining the problem of ensuring the Department improves its procurement processes for services overall, including performance assessments, evaluation of risks, management structure for award and oversight, and use of appropriate contracts. In addition, the committee recommends legislation, elsewhere in this title, that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to provide for an independent assessment of improvements necessary for the procurement and oversight of services. The committee also expects that the inventory of service contracts required by section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) will provide the Department with a valuable tool for identifying its existing service contracts, considering which functions should be brought back in house for performance by DOD civilian personnel, and de-

termining the appropriate total workforce mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel.

Service Contractor Inventory

Section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires an annual inventory of the Department of Defense's contracts for services. The committee understands that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics has been tasked with the responsibility for developing this service contracting inventory. The committee notes, however, that the inventory mandated by section 807 is intended to be of a much broader scope than simply capturing data from the Federal Procurement Data System. The committee encourages the Under Secretary to also consider the data requirements needed by the personnel, manpower, cost assessment and program evaluation, and comptroller communities in order to ensure that the inventory may be used to facilitate the military services' ability to conduct total workforce planning that is fully integrated into the programming and budget processes, and to fulfill the Secretary of Defense's plans to reduce the number of service support contractors and replace them with full-time government employees.

While the committee recognizes that development of a comprehensive inventory takes time, the committee is concerned because almost two years after enactment of section 807, no information has been provided and no methodology has been developed to conduct the inventory, except by the Department of the Army which began its effort as early as 2002. The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy and Department of the Air Force intend to provide a prototype inventory by the third quarter of the current fiscal year. From initial reports of what these inventories will cover, the committee is concerned that the prototypes will provide only sampling projections and not the robust and qualitative information required by section 807. The committee notes that the Department of the Army inventory captures data not only on contracting organizations, but the components administering the contract as well as the funding source for the contract and the number of full time contractor equivalent employees. The committee recommends that the Army methodology be used by the other military departments. Alternatively, should the military departments develop their own methodology, they should provide the same level of detail and completeness as that provided by the Army in order to ensure accurate comparisons of the inventories.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report describing the methodology and data sources selected by the military departments to gather and analyze the information to complete the required annual inventory, an explanation, if the Army methodology is not used, of the rationale for developing a different method, and a timeframe for submission of a complete inventory by each of the military departments. Such report shall be provided to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2009. In addition, the Secretary is directed to submit a copy of the report on the data collection methodology to the Comptroller General concurrent with submission to the defense committees. The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide an assess-

ment of the methodology to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after receiving the Secretary's report. Since this report is intended to assist the review of the inventories, the committee stresses that it should not delay the scheduled provision of the initial inventories by the military departments.

Strategic Materials

Section 843 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) established the Strategic Materials Protection Board within the Department of Defense to: 1) determine the need to provide a long-term domestic supply of materials designated as critical to national security; 2) analyze the risk associated with each material designated as critical to national security and the effect on national defense that the non-availability of such material from a domestic source would have; and 3) recommend a strategy to the President to ensure the domestic availability of materials designated as critical to national security.

The committee is concerned that the December 2008 report of the Department of Defense's Strategic Materials Protection Board falls short of these objectives, particularly by revising the definition of the term "strategic material critical to national security" in a way which undermines the Board's purpose. Under the revised definition, a material would be deemed critical to national security only if: the Department dominates the market for the material; the Department actively shapes the strategic direction of the market; and there is a significant and unacceptable risk of supply disruption. This definition limits the purview of the Board to only those materials for which the determinations the Board is tasked to make are presupposed in the definition of the materials themselves. Furthermore, such a definition fails to include a range of materials that Congress has designated as critical to national security and, as such, has provided significant protection or domestic preference in DOD policy and in statute. For example, Congress has determined that reliance on foreign sources of supply for materials such as titanium, specialty steel, and high performance magnets, poses a heightened risk. The Board's narrowing of the definition of materials critical to national security renders the Board unable to provide perspective on the adequacy, suitability, or effectiveness of those policies. Moreover, it limits the ability of the Board to consider any course of action, however minor, in relation to a material until the point at which potential damage to national security is imminent and severe. It also creates the perverse situation that a material could be critical to every element of the industrial base upon which the Department depends, but not considered critical to the Department itself if the material is also used significantly in commercial items. As an indication of the inadequacy of this definition for the Board's functioning, the Board currently identifies only one material as meeting the definition for consideration as a strategic material critical to national security. The committee does not find this conclusion to be plausible and expects that the Board will swiftly revisit this definition to ensure that it is able to identify gaps in our domestic defense supply chain and provide the President, the Secretary of Defense, and Congress with information,

analysis, and advice on strategic materials which are critical to the operations of the Department of Defense.

The committee also notes that the Department has yet to finalize its proposed rule implementing recent legislative changes relating to the procurement of specialty metals. In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying H.R. 5658 the committee expressed concern about several issues in the proposed rule including the determination of when an item is a commercial off the shelf (COTS) item, and the definition of the term "produced." These concerns remain valid for the pending proposed rule. In particular, the proposed rule provides that an item should be considered to be COTS if accepted in an unmodified form at the next higher contracting tier. The committee notes that it is reasonable for the contracting tier purchasing the item to make the determination at the time of such purchase that it is COTS, but also notes that a COTS item which is subsequently modified at a higher tier may, depending on the nature of the modification, no longer qualify as a COTS item. In fact, the statutory definition of COTS in section 431(c) of title 41, United States Code, is restricted to items offered to the government without modification. The committee also notes that two illustrative examples given in the proposed rule relating to modification of COTS items appear to deal with fasteners, which are exempted from the COTS exception in many circumstances. The committee is concerned that a recent General Services Administration rule reiterates this flawed definition of a COTS item from the proposed rule.

The committee is also concerned that the proposed rule provides an unprecedented definition of the term "produced," which would treat imported metals that are subjected to late-stage processing operations, such as heat treatment, as specialty metals produced in the United States. The committee notes that in most cases, the metal being treated through these processes would qualify as a specialty metal pursuant to title 10, United States Code, prior to receiving the treatment. Thus, the committee believes this definition is inconsistent with the law. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to review the changes suggested in the proposed rule to ensure that they are compliant with both the law and with congressional intent, and submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2009, explaining how the committee's concerns were addressed.

### Use of Non-Traditional Defense Contractors for Information Technology Programs

The committee notes that the top six contractors of the Department of Defense, in terms of revenue, continue to be the primary recipients of contracts for the integration of information technology systems and major automated information systems. While these contractors may provide best value to the warfighter in many instances, the committee also recognizes that much of the innovation in information technology is led by non-traditional defense contractors. Therefore, as the Secretary of Defense implements the requirements of section 202 of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act (Public Law 111–23) with regard to ensuring competition throughout the lifecycle of a defense acquisition program, the com-

mittee directs the Secretary to consider mechanisms to offer greater opportunities for non-traditional defense contractors on large information technology efforts or major automated information systems. The Secretary is further directed to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by October 1, 2009, regarding the feasibility of setting an aggressive goal for the award of contracts to such businesses for information technology efforts during fiscal year 2010, such as the award of 75 percent of the total value of such contracts to non-traditional systems integrators. This report should also detail any significant barriers impeding the ability of non-traditional defense contractors from competing on major information technology programs.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

#### Section 801—Enhanced Authority to Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan.

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to limit competition or provide a preference to sources in one or more countries along a major supply route to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The authority would be available upon a determination by the Secretary that the product or service being acquired was being used only by personnel that ship goods, or provide support for shipping goods, for use in operations in Afghanistan; that the Secretary determined that use of the authority would either: reduce overall U.S. transportation costs and risks in shipping goods to Afghanistan; encourage countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan to expand that supply route; or help develop more robust and enduring routes of supply to Afghanistan; and that the use of the authority would not adversely affect operations in Afghanistan or the United States industrial base. This section would define a country along a major route of supply to Afghanistan as including Georgia, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, the Republic of Armenia, the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Republic of Tajikistan, the Republic of Uzbekistan, or Turkmenistan. This section would terminate the authority 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by April 1, 2010, on the use of this authority, including: (1) the number of determinations made by the Secretary of Defense; (2) a description of the products and services acquired under this authority; (3) the extent to which the use of the authority conforms to the objectives of this section; (4) the list of countries providing products or services; and (5) any recommended modifications to the authority.

#### Section 802—Assessment of Improvements in Service Contracting

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to commission a study by a federally funded research and development center on the Department of Defense's oversight of service contracting. Matters to be covered in the study include: the quality of guidance relating to

service contracting; best practices in the process of setting requirements and developing statements of work; the development of effective performance metrics; an assessment of the management structure for service contracting; the effectiveness of peer reviews; the quality and sufficiency of the acquisition workforce for service contracting; and such other matters as the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics deems appropriate for inclusion in the study. This section would require the Under Secretary to submit a report containing the findings and recommendations of the study, along with the Under Secretary's comments, to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010.

Section 803—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Procurement of Contract Services and Related Clarifying Technical Amendments

This section would codify section 806 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by adding a new section at the end of chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code. This section would also add a requirement to include contractor employee data based on the service contract inventory required by section 807 of Public Law 110–181 in the annual budget justification documents. Furthermore, this section would amend the review and planning requirements process in section 807 of Public Law 110–181 to require an approval process related to conversion of functions based on the inventory. The committee notes that the amendments made by this section should assist the Department of Defense in its planning, programming, and budgeting for service contracts.

Section 804—Demonstration Authority for Alternative Acquisition Process for Defense Information Technology Programs

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to designate up to 10 information technology (IT) programs annually to be included in a pilot demonstration of an alternative acquisition process for rapidly acquiring information technology capabilities. The programs selected for this demonstration would include a mix that represents a cross section of functional domains. No more than two of these 10 designated programs would be major automated information systems.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Defense Science Board (DSB) to carry out a review of Department of Defense (DOD) policies and procedures for the acquisition of information technology for the Secretary of Defense. *The DSB Task Force on Department of Defense Policies and Procedures for the Acquisition of Information Technology,* released March 2009, found the current process for acquisition of IT ineffective, stating: "The conventional DOD acquisition process is too long and too cumbersome for the needs of the many systems that require continuous changes and upgrades." The DSB called for a unique acquisition process for IT, and went so far as to offer a preliminary draft for such a process. The committee perceives that while this is a unique parallel process, it appears to be developed in such a way as to be interoperable with the existing

conventional process, allowing programs to pass back and forth seamlessly.

The committee is encouraged by these findings, and believes the Secretary of Defense should use the *DSB Task Force on Department of Defense Policies and Procedures for the Acquisition of Information Technology* as the basis for the procedures required to be developed by this provision.

### Section 805—Limitation on Performance of Product Support Integrator Functions

This section would amend chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section that would require that when the Department of Defense (DOD) enters into contractor sustainment arrangements for the purchase of logistics support for a major system, the product support integration function would be performed by a member of the armed forces or an employee of the Department of Defense, beginning after September 30, 2010. This section would not require a member of the armed forces or an employee of the Department of Defense to perform the product support integrator function on subsystems or components of a major system.

The committee understands that the product support integrator function is an entity performing as a formally bound agent charged with integrating all sources of support, public and private, defined within the scope of the sustainment agreements, to achieve the documented performance metrics and outcomes or sustainment and logistics requirements. The committee expects this section would allow the Department of Defense to:

(1) Improve competition for subsystems and components;

(2) Manage support contracts through competitive procedures;

(3) Avoid administrative costs charged by a product support integrator; and

(4) Leverage both industry and DOD Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence to achieve competition, performance, and cost savings.

## SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 811—Revision of Defense Supplement Relating to Payment of Costs Prior to Definitization

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to revise the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to ensure that, when a clause relating to the payment of costs prior to definitization is included in a contract of the Department of Defense, such clause should apply to such contract regardless of the contract type and should also apply to all contract actions pursuant to such contract regardless of the type of the contract action.

### Section 812—Revisions to Definitions Relating to Contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan

This section would amend section 864 and section 1248 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public

Law 110–181) to clarify and streamline reporting of information relating to contracts in the Government of the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The revisions would: clarify that reporting requirements relating to contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan also apply to grants and cooperative agreements; increase the threshold for the duration of a contract above which reporting is required from 14 days to 30 days; and align the threshold for requiring contractors to report their employment of Iraqi nationals with the simplified acquisition threshold. These changes would improve the availability and quality of information provided to Congress under both sections.

Section 813—Amendment to Notification Requirements for Awards of Single Source Task or Delivery Orders

This provision would amend the notification requirements for awards of any single source task or delivery orders exceeding $100.0 million to ensure proper notification to the congressional defense committees, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the case of intelligence programs, of intent to proceed with such a transaction under the exceptions outlined in section 843 of the conference report (H. Rept. 110–477) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

Section 814—Clarification of Uniform Suspension and Debarment Requirement

This section would amend section 2455 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) to clarify that regulations regarding suspension and debarment procedures required by section 2455 should apply to subcontracts at any tier.

Section 815—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 (Public Law 104–106) to extend the authority to use simplified acquisition procedures for commercial items that are less than $5.5 million in value for two additional years, until January 1, 2012.

Section 816—Revision to Definitions of Major Defense Acquisition Program and Major Automated Information System

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to designate a program that qualifies as both a major defense acquisition program and a major automated information system as one or the other. This change will focus legislative requirements on appropriate acquisition programs: chapter 144 of title 10 on major defense acquisition programs that develop custom weapons systems hardware, and chapter 144A of title 10 on major automated information systems that develop major software-intensive systems using commercial hardware. This authority will also simplify oversight and streamline associated reporting requirements.

### Section 817—Small Arms Production Industrial Base

This section would amend section 2473 of title 10, United States Code, which provides the definition of the small arms production industrial base. This section would expand and broaden the definition of the small arms production industrial base to include all domestically-based United States small arms manufacturers and to also include pistols.

### Section 818—Publication of Justification for Bundling of Contracts of the Department of Defense

This section would require that contracting officers of the Department of Defense make public the justification currently required in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, 30 days before issuing a solicitation which would result in bundling contracts of the Department, with certain limited exceptions.

### Section 819—Contract Authority for Advanced Component Development or Prototype Units

This section would provide temporary authority to award a contract option for a "bridge" between the end of the science and technology portion of a contract awarded under a Federal Acquisition Regulation Broad Agency Announcement and the competitive award of a contract under a new acquisition for advanced component development or prototyping. The authority would be limited, in the case of a contract option awarded for prototyping, to the minimum number of prototype items necessary to allow for the timely competitive solicitation and award of a follow-on development or production contract for such items. In the case of a contract option awarded for advanced component development, the authority would be limited to a term of not more than 12 months. Each military department would be authorized to exercise such a contract option not more than four times per year. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to approve up to four total additional options a year for projects supported by defense agencies. The authority would expire on September 30, 2014. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the use of such authority by March 1, 2014, describing the use of the authority to date, the extent to which the authority has increased competition and improved technology transition, and any recommendations the Secretary may have about the modification or extension of such authority.

## SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 821—Enhanced Expedited Hiring Authority for Defense Acquisition Workforce Positions

This section would amend section 1705(h) of title 10, United States Code, to add the term "critical need" as a basis for using the expedited hiring authority allowed under section 1705, and deletes the word "highly" to ensure full application of the expedited hiring authority from entry through expert levels. This section would improve the ability of the Secretary of Defense to increase the size of the Department of Defense acquisition workforce. The committee

notes that the Department, in its fiscal year 2010 budget request, has indicated that it will increase the size of the defense acquisition workforce by converting 11,000 contractors and hiring an additional 9,000 government acquisition professionals through 2015, beginning with 4,080 in 2010. The committee believes that the focus on the acquisition workforce is particularly critical, since the acquisition workforce is at the heart of the Department's acquisition system.

### Section 822—Acquisition Workforce Development Fund Amendments

This section would modify section 852 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to clarify the availability of funds from the defense acquisition workforce development fund. This section would allow payments to members of the armed forces or to civilian personnel who were not members of the acquisition workforce as of the date of enactment of section 852 of Public Law 110–181 for the purpose of hiring such persons into the acquisition workforce. This section would further modify section 852 of Public Law 110–181 to provide that the Secretary of Defense may suspend or reduce the requirement to collect funds from the military departments and defense agencies whenever funds are actually requested, authorized, and appropriated for the defense acquisition development fund that would exceed the minimum deposit that would otherwise have been collected and deposited to the fund. The President's budget request for fiscal year 2010 includes $100.0 million for this fund. The committee notes, however, that this is less than what is estimated to be credited to the fund. The Department of Defense intends to credit $700.0 million in fiscal year 2009 to the fund, with $230.0 million allocated for fiscal year 2009 efforts and $470.0 million for continuing hiring, training, and retention efforts in fiscal year 2010.

The committee notes that over the period from fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2009, total funding for the defense acquisition development workforce fund, at a minimum, will equal $1.8 billion based on set percentages of the amount of funds the military departments and defense agencies spend on certain service contracts. This funding mechanism has had the effect of forcing immediate funding for recruitment, retention, education, and training initiatives that the Department had not otherwise programmed. The committee recognizes that the fund represents a "jump start" to the acquisition workforce hiring and training initiative recently announced by the Secretary of Defense.

### Section 823—Reports to Congress on Full Deployment Decisions for Major Automated Information System Programs

This section would amend the reporting requirement in section 2445 of title 10, United States Code, by replacing references to "initial operational capability" and "full operational capability" with the term "full deployment decision" in order to bring terminology more in line with updated acquisition regulations. For major automated information systems, the final acquisition decision is referred to as the full deployment decision (FDD). FDD is a more meaningful metric for software intensive programs than initial

operational capability (IOC) and full operational capability (FOC) because the user community vice the acquisition community defines and controls IOC and FOC.

Section 824—Requirement for Secretary of Defense to Deny Award and Incentive Fees to Companies Found to Jeopardize Health or Safety of Government Personnel

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prohibit the payment of award and incentive fees to defense contractors who are determined through a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding, to be responsible for causing the death or serious bodily injury of any civilian or military personnel of the government through gross negligence or reckless disregard for safety. This section would apply to both prime contractors and subcontractors. The prohibition would apply to contractors after a criminal conviction, a civil proceeding, or an administrative proceeding resulting in a finding of fault and payment of a fine, a penalty, reimbursement, restitution, or damages. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to waive the prohibition on the basis of national security and would be required to notify the congressional defense committees of the waiver. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to issue implementing regulations within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and the prohibition would apply to contracts awarded 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to determine whether the defense contractor should be barred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

Section 825—Authorization for Actions to Correct the Industrial Resource Shortfall for High-Purity Beryllium Metal in Amounts Not in Excess of $85,000,000

This section would increase the threshold for the Department of Defense program undertaken pursuant to section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–774) to address the industrial resources shortfall for high-purity beryllium metal from $50.0 million to $85.0 million.

Section 826—Review of Post-Employment Restrictions Applicable to the Department of Defense

This section would require the Panel on Contracting Integrity to review policies relating to post-employment restrictions on former Department of Defense (DOD) personnel to determine whether such policies adequately protect the public interest without unreasonably limiting future employment options for these personnel. The review would consider the extent to which post-employment restrictions: (1) protect the public interest by preventing personal conflicts of interest and preventing former Department of Defense officials from exercising undue or inappropriate influence; (2) require disclosure of personnel accepting employment with defense contractors; (3) use appropriate thresholds; (4) are clear and have been explained to DOD personnel; (5) appropriately address personnel performing duties in acquisition-related activities that are not covered by current procurement integrity restrictions; (6) ensure that the Department has access to world-class talent; and (7)

ensure that service in the Department remains an attractive career option. This section would require that the review be completed in one year and submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 30 days of completion. This section would also require the National Academy of Public Administration to assess the review and provide its analysis to the Secretary of Defense and to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 210 days of receiving the review from the Secretary of Defense.

Section 827—Requirement to Buy Military Decorations, Ribbons, Badges, Medals, Insignia, and Other Uniform Accouterments Produced in the United States

This section would require military exchanges and other non-appropriated fund activities to purchase decorations, ribbons, badges, medals, insignia, and other uniform accouterments that are manufactured in the United States using competitive procedures. This section would bar the agencies within the services that certify quality and specifications of products from issuing certificates of authority for the manufacture and sale for any such uniform item unless the items are from domestic material manufactured in the United States. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the requirements of the provision when a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of an item produced in the United States cannot be procured at reasonable cost. This section would also amend the Berry Amendment, section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, to add military decorations, ribbons, badges, medals, insignia, and other uniform accouterments to the list of items that may only be procured with appropriated funds when the items are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States.

Section 828—Findings and Report on the Usage of Rare Earth Materials in the Defense Supply Chain

This section would make findings regarding the availability of rare earth materials, the importance of an uninterrupted supply of strategic materials critical to national security, the criticality of rare earth materials and thorium to numerous defense technologies, and the need to identify the strategic value placed on such materials by foreign nations. This section would require a report by the Comptroller General, to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than April 1, 2010, on the usage or rare earth materials in the supply chain of the Department of Defense. The Comptroller General shall consider strategic acquisitions of rare earth mines and mineral rights by foreign governments; the worldwide availability of rare earth materials and projected availability of these materials for the export market, including the current and potential domestic sources; and a determination regarding defense systems that are dependent on rare earth materials supplied by foreign sources.

### Section 829—Furniture Standards

This section would require that all Department of Defense (DOD) purchases of furniture, made with DOD funds, including design-build contracts, comply with quality standards established in the General Services Administration program and by the Department of Defense.

## TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Biometrics-Enabled Intelligence Analysis

The committee applauds the Department of Defense (DOD) for its utilization of tactical biometrics collection leading to numerous arrests and detentions during Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee is concerned, however, that poor coordination and inconsistent funding contribute to a significant shortfall of operational and strategic analysis, potentially opening an intelligence gap. The committee notes threats to U.S. national security, particularly violent extremist organizations, originate from all corners of the globe. Operational and strategic analysis serves to connect the dots across the geographic commands.

The committee notes DOD Directive 8521.01E, dated February 21, 2008 entitled "Department of Defense Biometrics" requires the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) to develop implementing instructions to direct the applications of intelligence processing and analysis of all-source biometrics-enabled intelligence (BEI) products for tactical, operational, and strategic customers. Furthermore, the committee understands that the Defense Intelligence Agency is responsible for ensuring the appropriate DOD intelligence components develop collection and analysis capabilities that incorporate BEI contextual information. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to utilize these directives and ensure the Defense Intelligence Agency develop an operational and strategic analysis framework for BEI. The framework should include a BEI training curriculum and a concept of operations for BEI being incorporated into the geographic combatant commands, the Special Operations Command, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Defense to submit a report on DIA's progress in executing its directives and implementing a training curriculum for operational and strategic analysis across the geographic commands to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, House Committee on Armed Services, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The committee is aware that a large portion of funds requested for BEI related efforts reside in funding for Overseas Contingency Operations. The committee notes that the use of BEI will increasingly play a vital role in supporting global pursuit operations. The

committee urges the Department to include long-term funding for BEI in the base budget.

### Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, or High-Yield Explosive Consequence Management Forces

The committee notes that Congress, the Commission on the National Guard and the Reserves, the Government Accountability Office, and others have previously expressed concern about the capacity of the Department of Defense to respond to domestic chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive (CBRNE) incidents. The committee also notes that, in response to these concerns, the Department increased its priority for establishing dedicated CBRNE Consequence Management Response Forces (CCMRF), planned the phased activation of three CCMRF between calendar years 2008 and 2010, and assigned the first of those forces to U.S. Northern Command as of October 1, 2008.

The committee is aware that in or around April 2009, the Secretary of Defense decided that the CCMRF forces will no longer be assigned to U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) effective October 1, 2009, but instead will only be allocated to NORTHCOM. The committee is concerned that the recent change in assignment of CCMRF could weaken the Department's future preparedness to respond to domestic CBRNE incidents. The committee understands that in organizing the second and third CBRNE forces, the Department is relying heavily on National Guard and Reserve units and will need to consider the appropriate command relationships with respect to U.S. Northern Command.

The committee notes that section 944 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) required the Secretary of Defense to submit to congressional defense committees a report that describes the progress made by the Department of Defense in addressing concerns related to U.S. Northern Command identified in Comptroller General reports GAO–08–251 and GAO–08–252 and provides a detailed description of the plans and progress made to establish forces assigned to the domestic CBRNE consequence management mission. This report was due in April 2009; the committee notes that it has not received the required report and encourages the Secretary to submit it expeditiously.

### Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs

Section 902 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) established within the Office of the Secretary of Defense the Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs (Director of Operational Energy). This position was established, in part, due to concern with the operational risks associated with delivering supplies to the battlefield and awareness of operational benefits that could be realized by reducing logistics demands. The committee is aware that fuel is a significant fraction of the supplies needed for battle. In 2001, the Defense Science Board issued a finding that fuel logistics represent 70 percent of the tonnage that the Army ships into battle. In 2008, the Defense Science Board and Government Accountability Office found that the Department still lacked the oversight structure,

strategies, policies, and metrics necessary to manage its energy risks properly. Meanwhile, the energy demand for operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan grew from 9 to 16 gallons per soldier per day from 2005 to 2007, a further illustration of the need to manage operational fuel consumption.

The committee believes that the Director will serve as an important advocate for process improvements (such as implementation of the fully burdened cost of fuel and energy efficiency key performance parameter as required by section 332 of Public Law 110–417) and technological advances (such as innovative renewable and alternative energy technologies) that will enhance military capability and reduce logistics and support requirements for military operations.

The committee is pleased that the Secretary of Defense expressed support for filling the Director of Operational Energy position in testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on January 27, 2009. The committee believes that because of the shifting military posture in United States Central Command area of responsibility, this is a critical time to have the leadership in place in the Department to address operational energy. The committee encourages the Secretary to communicate to the President the need to expeditiously nominate a Director of Operational Energy. The committee looks forward to working with the Director in the future.

### Financial Crisis

The committee is concerned about the likely national security consequences of the global financial crisis, that it exacerbates an already growing set of political and economic uncertainties and aggravates negative tendencies ever present in global politics. In the 2009 Annual Threat Assessment, the intelligence community makes the global financial crisis its top priority and believes it is the "lens or prism" through which all security challenges must be viewed. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to take the national security implications of the global financial crisis into account in all types of processes including: combatant commanders' engagements with partner nations; war game scenarios; and coordination with service schools to integrate a focus on economic crises on national security.

The committee remains concerned about the stability of the world financial system, including the potential for recurrence of financial crises, and encourages the Department to convene with members of academia and industry to examine how systemic problems and vulnerabilities in the global economy affect national security.

### Implementation of Strategy for Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction: Counterproliferation

The committee has closely reviewed the 2002 *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* and the 2006 *National Military Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* as they apply to counterproliferation from both strategic and programmatic perspectives. The committee found that although the 2002 and 2006 strategies outline a sophisticated construct including three "pillars" (counterproliferation, nonproliferation, and consequence

management), four cross-cutting enabling functions, six guiding principles, a strategic framework of three elements, four military strategic objectives, three strategic enablers, and eight military missions, agencies have not leveraged this strategic construct. For example, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency has organized its programs into six "campaigns" that differ from any of the aforementioned strategic elements. Additionally, the committee observed that those organizations with "counterproliferation" in their titles, such as the National Counterproliferation Center and the Counterproliferation Program Review Committee, do not adhere to a single definition of "counterproliferation" and often consider some or all aspects of nonproliferation and consequence management to be within their purview.

The committee believes the efforts, initiatives, and interagency coordination for programs associated with counterproliferation have been improving over the past several years. However, given the lack of definitional clarity regarding counterproliferation and the seemingly divergent interpretations, the committee directs the Comptroller General to assess interagency counterproliferation efforts in general and Department of Defense counterproliferation activities in particular, including an assessment of the working definitions of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and counterproliferation. The study should include:

(1) An assessment of the efficacy of the existing strategies applicable to the combating WMD mission as applied to counterproliferation;

(2) An assessment of the extent to which the Department has developed comprehensive plans to conduct counterproliferation activities, including at the unified combatant command and military service levels, and to what extent these plans are integrated across mission areas;

(3) A review of programs and funding for counterproliferation programs and the extent to which such programs support Department plans and strategies;

(4) Any observations or recommendations regarding whether clarification is needed in the strategic framework for combating weapons of mass destruction to enhance the ability of various agencies to utilize a common lexicon; and

(5) Suggestions for reconciliation or clarification of the strategic lexicon, if a need for such is perceived.

The Comptroller General should submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2010.

## Interagency Coordination

The National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 80–253) created the National Security Council system to better integrate the government's diverse departmental expertise and capabilities. The committee believes that the national security system has not structurally kept pace with the rapidly changing global security environment, and that the existing structure needs to be strengthened. Toward that end, section 1049 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required a study of the national security interagency system by an independent, nonprofit, non-partisan organization which became known as the

Project on National Security Reform (PNSR). The committee received the PNSR report on November 26, 2008, and held a hearing on March 12, 2009, to discuss the report's recommendations.

The committee believes many of the PNSR's recommendations have merit and wishes to call the Administration's particular attention to those recommendations that suggest ways in which to:

(1) Provide an overarching interagency concept of operations; and

(2) Create a cadre of civilians that are truly "national security" professionals.

Along those lines, the committee is encouraged by evidence of a National Security Professional Development (NSPD) program and the existence of an NSPD Integration Office, but believes the program needs more visibility and support. The committee believes NSPD should be a priority for all agencies engaged in national security matters.

### Organizing for Cyber Operations

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense continues to assess the utility of a sub-unified Cyber Command under United States Strategic Command. The committee believes that there are still a number of issues that must be resolved before such an organization can be created. For example, a thorough cost-benefit analysis comparing the proposed reorganization to the current joint functional component command has not been fully developed. The committee encourages the Department to conduct a rigorous business-case analysis of all alternatives before selecting a final option.

The committee is encouraged by service efforts to increase the stature and efficiency of their cyber operations organizations. The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in particular have created mature organizations for conducting the full range of cyber operations. The committee believes the establishment of the 24th Air Force is an important step in bringing the Air Force into better alignment with the other services, and creating a true cadre of cyber warriors.

### Special Operations Command Strategic Communications

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee expresses concerns about the inability of the Department of Defense and its partners to effectively counter the propaganda of violent extremist groups abroad. The committee believes that to prevail in an information-centric fight, the Department of Defense and its partners must develop and employ innovative strategies that dominate the information spectrum both in terms of the network and the message. Therefore, the committee urges the Commander, Special Operations Command, to develop and demonstrate innovative strategic services in support of both national and theater-level special operations forces. The committee urges the Commander to utilize to the fullest extent the unique interagency authorities available to the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) and incorporate guidance and direction from the Director, Center for Special Operations (CSO), in relation to interagency matters and concerns. The committee encourages the Commander to develop and demonstrate innovative techniques and capabilities, with respect to relevant linguistic and cul-

tural expertise, and increase both guidance and response linkages between strategic communications and operations. The committee further encourages the Commander to utilize personnel who possess requisite expertise and generational perspective.

### Special Operations Forces Overhead Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Support

The committee recognizes the ongoing efforts of the Task Force on intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) conducted under the auspices and direction of the Secretary of Defense, yet remains concerned about the inadequate level of (ISR) resources provided in support of theater special operations forces (SOF) relative to that provided in support of national SOF. As a result, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a plan to address this ISR imbalance and to give particular attention to the geographical areas identified in the classified annex accompanying this report. The committee directs the Secretary to provide the plan with the submission of the fiscal year 2011 budget request.

### Temporary Reconfiguration of USAFCENT/9th Air Force Headquarters

The committee understands that to satisfy certain exigent demands in U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility, the Air Force intends to temporarily reconfigure the command structure of Headquarters U.S. Air Forces Central (USAFCENT)/9th Air Force. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force has testified that operational control of USAFCENT elements will be provisionally decoupled from the control of support functions provided by 9th Air Force. USAFCENT will be commanded by an Air Force lieutenant general to be forward deployed with a staff of fewer than 50 personnel to Al Udeid Air Base, Qatar. The 9th Air Force will be commanded by an Air Force major general stationed at Shaw Air Force Base.

The committee expects that the Air Force will maintain a permanent rear headquarters capacity for the USAFCENT commander and USAFCENT staff at Shaw Air Force Base, and the Air Force will return to a command structure that consolidates the duties and responsibilities of the USAFCENT commander with those of the commander of the 9th Air Force as expeditiously as conditions in Southwest Asia will permit. The committee also expects that the Air Force will act in close coordination with the Army, and that each service will act in full compliance with the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of 2005, while the temporary command reconfiguration plan is implemented. Finally, the committee directs the Chief of Staff of the Air Force apprise the committee of the Air Force's near and long-term command restructuring plans with respect to USAFCENT/9th Air Force in greater detail within 180 days.

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

### Section 901—Role of Commander of Special Operations Command Regarding Personnel Management Policy and Plans Affecting Special Operations Forces

This section would modify section 167 of title 10, United States Code, to require the secretaries of the military services to coordinate certain personnel management policy and plans affecting special operations personnel with the commander of Special Operations Command. The intent of the legislation is to establish a means by which the service secretaries and the commander, Special Operations Command, can consult with each other to manage and mitigate concerns across the entire special operations community. This section does not convey to the commander, Special Operations Command, authority to veto or stop decisions by the service secretaries in carrying out their personnel management responsibilities under title 10, United States Code.

### Section 902—Special Operations Activities

This section would revise the statute governing special operations activities to accurately reflect current mission requirements of Special Operations Command.

### Section 903—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

### Section 904—Authority to Allow Private Sector Civilians to Receive Instruction at Defense Cyber Investigations Training Academy of the Defense Cyber Crime Center

This section would permit up to 200 eligible private sector employees per year to receive instruction at the Defense Cyber Investigations Training Academy operating under the direction of the Defense Cyber Crime Center. This section would also allow the Defense Cyber Crime Center to charge private sector employees enrolled under this section tuition at a rate that is at least equal to the rate charged for employees of the United States.

The committee is increasingly concerned by the extent of cyber attacks against and data exfiltration from Department of Defense civilian contractors. The committee feels the Department should be more actively involved in supporting the protection and defense of these contractor networks. To the extent possible, the Department should leverage acquisition and contracting regulations to promote positive behavior from the contractor community. The Department should also leverage its extensive training infrastructure to promote good practices, exchange information and standardize proc-

esses across the Department, including networks within the defense industrial contractor base that provide vital support to departmental missions.

Section 905—Organizational Structure of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and the TRICARE Management Activity

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the organizational structure of Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs/TRICARE Management Activity. The committee is aware that the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense has a unique organizational structure within the Department of Defense, with the only complete and total integration of the staff of an assistant secretary (Health Affairs) and a field operating activity (TRICARE Management Activity). The committee must understand if the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and the TRICARE Management Activity, as currently organized, are able to appropriately perform the discrete functions of policy formulation, policy and program execution, and program oversight.

Section 906—Requirement for Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs to Report Directly to Secretary of Defense

This section would amend section 139b of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs should report directly to the Secretary of Defense.

Section 907—Increased Flexibility for Combatant Commander Initiative Fund

This section would amend section 166a(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the authority to purchase items from $10.0 million to $20.0 million. It would also increase the unit cost threshold of those items. It would also require coordination with the Secretary of State when the fund is used for humanitarian or civic assistance purposes.

Section 908—Repeal of Requirement for a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, by repealing section 134b, relating to the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Technology Security Policy within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. This section would also require notification to Congress 30 days prior to a significant change in the reporting structure for the Defense Technology Security Administration (DTSA). The committee understands that the Under Secretary for Policy is committed to retaining DTSA within the Office of the Under Secretary and expects that the authority provided in this section would allow the Under Secretary to adopt an organizational structure that provides appropriate levels of management attention to issues of technology security policy.

### Section 909—Recommendations to Congress by Members of Joint Chiefs of Staff

This section would require members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide advice to Congress upon request.

## SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

### Section 911—Submission and Review of Space Science and Technology Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to annually submit a space science and technology strategy on the date that the President submits the budget to Congress. It would also require the strategy to address the process for transitioning space science and technology programs to new or existing space acquisition programs. Finally, it would require the Comptroller General to review and assess the first version of the strategy submitted pursuant to this section.

Section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) required the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a space science and technology strategy, and to review and, as appropriate, revise the strategy annually. The provision was designed to increase coordination among space science and technology activities of the Department. It also required a one-time review of the strategy by the General Accounting Office (GAO).

The GAO review, submitted on January 28, 2005, found that while the strategy provided a foundation for enhancing coordination among space science and technology efforts, it "lacks details in key areas needed to achieve its goals." Unfortunately, the Department has not updated this strategy on an annual basis in response to the stated concerns.

### Section 912—Converting the Space Surveillance Network Pilot Program to a Permanent Program

This section would convert the space surveillance network pilot program to a permanent program. This section would make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Defense, originally authorized in section 821 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), to share space surveillance data with state governments, governments of political subdivisions of states, United States commercial entities, governments of foreign countries, and foreign commercial entities.

## SUBTITLE C—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED MATTERS

### Section 921—Plan to Address Foreign Ballistic Missile Intelligence Analysis

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to conduct an assessment of foreign ballistic missile intelligence analysis gaps and shortfalls, and prepare a plan to ensure that the appropriate intelligence centers have sufficient analytical capabilities to address such gaps and shortfalls. The committee is aware of certain intelligence gaps and shortfalls in foreign ballistic missile activities, in

particular emerging longer-range ballistic missile activities, as noted by the Missile Defense Agency.

This section would also require a report by February 28, 2010, on the results of the assessment, the plan to ensure sufficient analytical capabilities, and a description of the resources required to implement such plan.

## SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 931—Joint Program Office for Cyber Operations Capabilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a Joint Program Office for Cyber Operations Capabilities to assist the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics in improving the development of specific leap-ahead capabilities, including manpower development, tactics, and technologies, for the services, defense agencies, and combatant commands.

### Section 932—Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System Transition Council

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) Transition Council to provide advice to the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries on implementing the DIMHRS core configuration and potentially service-funded extension capabilities.

DIMHRS, as an information technology system for enterprise human resource management, recently incurred a Nunn-McCurdy breach requiring a major restructuring of the system. The critical program change certification identified the need for a program governance structure to ensure proper management oversight. The establishment of the DIMHRS Transition Council would increase oversight to ensure that the investments made to date would successfully transition to the services, and ensure that future capabilities developed around the DIMHRS core configuration are interoperable and meet the needs of the services.

### Section 933—Department of Defense School of Nursing Revisions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a Department of Defense School of Nursing. The committee is aware of the growing shortage of military medical personnel and believes that Department of Defense schools that produce military health professionals, such as the recently established Army school of social work, will have a significant positive impact on the shortage.

The committee also encourages the Secretary to find ways to incentivize non-Nurse Corps personnel, such as medics and corpsmen, to obtain a Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing, perhaps following the model of the Department of Defense's Physician Assistant program. The committee further recommends that the Secretary examine the feasibility and desirability of entering into long-term contractual relationships with civilian schools of nursing to provide a minimum number of training slots for military nursing students.

Section 934—Report on Special Operations Command Organization, Manning, and Management

This section would require the Commander, Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to submit a report, by March 15, 2010, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the Commander's efforts to provide increased special operations capability through organization, manning, and management of special operations forces (SOF).

The committee supports SOCOM's recent efforts in this area to include: the establishment of the interagency task force at the Center for Special Operations; the establishment of the Cultural Engagement Group (CEG) at Special Operations Command, U.S. Central Command (SOCCENT); the incorporation of supplemental funding into the current and future baseline budget requests as a means of better managing requirements, programmatic stability, and multiple-year sustainment; the appointment of a SOCOM science and technology (S&T) advisor to promote low-cost innovative solutions, streamlined acquisition processes, and improved interface with the Department's larger S&T enterprise; and the application of full range of authorities inherent to the SOCOM acquisition executive, authorities clarified in section 810 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The committee urges the Commander to continue these initiatives and pursue further efforts with the dual objective of achieving efficiencies at SOCOM headquarters and providing the highest level of special operations capability to the geographical combatant commanders and national command authority. To better understand the extent to which SOCOM is already interacting with interagency partners, the Commander of SOCOM should include in this reporting requirement a review of formal exchange programs, liaison, and other interagency assignments of SOF personnel, especially as those exchange activities support counterterrorism and counterinsurgency matters.

The committee is encouraged with the establishment and success of the CEG at SOCCENT and believes it might serve as a model for improving unconventional warfare support at each of the geographical commands. The committee is aware that SOF forward deployed in the SOCCENT area of operations have benefited greatly from CEG support. The committee also notes the Office of the Secretary of Defense made reference to this approach in its report entitled, "Full Spectrum Analysis of Irregular Warfare," provided in response to the committee report (H. Rept. 110–146) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008. The analysis notes the potential benefits of, and recommends further examination for, empowering theater special operations commands (TSOC), such as SOCCENT, as a means for sustaining command and control of, and support to, deployed SOF.

This section would require the Commander to submit the report, in a classified supplemental report, if necessary, by March 15, 2010.

Section 935—Study on the Recruitment, Retention and Career Progression of Uniformed and Civilian Military Cyber Operations Personnel

This section would require the Department of Defense to produce a study on the recruitment, retention, and career progression of uniformed and civilian military cyber operations personnel.

# TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

#### Overview

The budget request contained $1.06 billion for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $135.8 million, for operational tempo, which is contained within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2010 to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2) domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2010 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

| | |
|---|---|
| FY10 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request | $1,059.0 |
| International Support | $537.5 |
| Domestic Support | $212.5 |
| Intelligence Technology and Other Demand Reduction | $169.8 |
| Demand Reduction | $139.2 |
| Recommended Decrease: | |
| International Support—USEUCOM | −$5.6 |
| International Support | −$32.0 |
| Recommended Increase: | |
| International Support—USNORTHCOM/USSOUTHCOM | $5.6 |
| International Support—USCENTCOM CN TRAINING | $24.0 |
| FY10 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Recommendation | $1,051.0 |

#### Items of Special Interest

*Budget requests*

The budget request contained nearly $1.1 billion for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, including all counter-narcotics resources in the Department of Defense with the exception of those resources in the operating budget for the military services and those resources which are appropriated or requested in emergency budgets. The committee notes that, in the fiscal year 2010 budget request, the Administration proposed to fund the counter-narcotics activities to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the rest of Central Asia through the regular budget request process, instead of using separate Overseas Contingency Operations budget requests, as had become the pattern in previous years. The committee welcomes this development and notes that the fiscal year 2010 Overseas Contingency Operations request for $324.6 million, which was submitted as part of the regular budget process, is fully funded in title XV of this Act.

*Department of Defense efforts to combat drug-related cartel activity along the United States border with Mexico*

The committee notes that over the past year, narcotics-related activity has increased in the northern United Mexican States to the point that in April 2008, the Mexican government deployed three Army brigades to the city of Juarez to quell cartel crime and violence. The committee is aware that, concurrently, many U.S. border-states have realized an increase in narcotics-related violence, and states across the country have felt the impact of increasingly powerful narco-trafficking cartels. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing on the efforts of the Department of Defense (DOD) to combat cartel activity to the House Committee on Armed Services by August 1, 2009. The briefing may be classified and should include a review of DOD coordination with other U.S. agencies and with the Mexican government.

*International support*

The budget request contained $537.5 million for international support. The committee understands the importance of international support and notes that this request for international support will result in increased operational support for all four military services. This support includes: detection and monitoring platforms and assets; command and control support; and the training, equipment, and supplies intended for other nations that are key to the U.S. national drug strategy and defense security cooperation goals.

The committee recommends fully funding the proposed international support with a number of changes. The Administration proposes increasing the counter-narcotics operational support of the U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) by more than 134 percent in fiscal year 2010 from fiscal year 2009 enacted levels. Although USEUCOM provided invaluable counter-narcotics support to the U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) while the latter was being established, USEUCOM no longer has responsibility over that geographic area. Further, the Administration's cursory explanation for more than doubling this account year-on-year is insufficient. As a result, given the counter-narcotics needs elsewhere in the world, the committee recommends decreasing the budget for USEUCOM counter-narcotics operational support from $9.95 million to $4.35 million, which still represents a two percent increase from last year. The committee is prepared to entertain a reprogramming request from the Department of Defense should USEUCOM present a detailed justification for additional resources.

As part of a comprehensive effort of the United States to assist the United Mexican States, the committee intends to address the influx of illicit narcotics into the United States from Mexico which entered the latter country from its southern border with the Republic of Guatemala and Belize. The committee recommends increasing the accounts for U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) and U.S. Southern Command (USSOUTHCOM) by $5.6 million to improve the coordination of counter-narcotic efforts between Mexico, Guatemala, and Belize along their shared borders.

The Department of Defense estimates that approximately 80 percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States enters Mexico

through its southern border. Guatemala and Belize have become major transshipment hubs of cocaine, with the majority of illicit drugs originating in South America. The Department of Defense estimates that nearly 90 percent of cocaine entering Guatemala is subsequently shipped into Mexico, most of this amount arriving by overland transport. The Department of Defense finds that the profits from the sale of this cocaine perpetuate the drug-related violence in Mexico and the United States.

To address the influx of illicit narcotics into Mexico through its southern border by facilitating the coordination and interdiction efforts in the tri-border area, the committee increases the counter-drug accounts for USNORTHCOM and USSOUTHCOM by $5.6 million. Specifically, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, working through the commanders of USNORTHCOM and USSOUTHCOM, to assist Mexico and its two southern Central American neighbors by: strengthening their respective governmental presence in remote areas; improving full spectrum domain awareness and reaction capability; and encouraging nations to cooperate and respond in a regional nature. Specifically, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense: upgrade fixed Belizean border checkpoints west of San Ignacio and at Corozal; upgrade fixed sites in Guatemala along the Guatemalan/Mexican border; train Belizean security forces in the best practices of border security, night interdiction operations, and jungle and riverine operations; and properly equip the Belizean security forces for these missions.

The second major change within international support, which the committee recommends, regards the transfer of Mi-17s to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Although the committee supports the President's commitment to assist the government of Pakistan in its fight against insurgents and terrorists, including through the use by the armed forces of Pakistan of existing U.S. stocks of Mi-17s, the committee is concerned that the transfer of such equipment to Pakistan may substantially decrease the training capabilities of the Department of Defense to combat the narcotics trade in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. As a result, the committee expects the Secretary of Defense to procure, at a cost of $16.0 million, two factory-rebuilt Mi-17 helicopters and upgrade their cockpits to make them night-vision capable as well as compatible for operations involving the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization serving in Afghanistan. The committee recommends decreasing international support by $16 million to account for this purchase.

The committee recommends an additional $16.0 million is recommended to be allocated from international support in the following manner: (1) $8.0 million to remain within international support for the purchase of one factory-rebuilt Mi-17 helicopter with upgraded cockpit; and (2) $8.0 million from international support to be transferred to Operation and Maintenance, Army, for the purchase of one factory-rebuilt Mi-17 helicopter with upgraded cockpit. Both of these helicopters are meant to fulfill the requirement that was created by the transfer of two Mi-17 helicopters from Ft. Bliss, Texas, where they were part of a training program for counter-drug activities by Afghan security forces.

*Obligating 1033/1004 CN funds for Baluchistan, Pakistan*

The committee notes with concern that, according to the Department of State and as determined by the President, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is a major transit country for illicit opiates and other narcotics that are trafficked from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to markets around the globe. According to Pakistan's Anti-Narcotics Force, over one-third of illicit opiates that are exported from Afghanistan pass through Pakistan. A significant percentage of these narcotics transit through the porous borders of Baluchistan, Pakistan, and exit either through the Islamic Republic of Iran or Pakistan's Makran Coast to regional and international markets. Further, the Department of States' 2009 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report notes that most Afghan drug trafficking organizations concentrate their operational cells in remote areas of Baluchistan.

The committee further notes that increased military operations in southern Afghanistan should also result in greater emphasis on narcotics trafficking along the Baluchistan border given the narcotics-insurgency nexus.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not adequately planned for or allocated its counter-narcotics resources appropriately to address this trafficking threat and build the capacity of the government of Pakistan to interdict the movement of narcotics through Baluchistan's border area with Afghanistan. The committee notes that the Department's counter-narcotics funding is primarily expended on efforts in the Makran Coast and toward the Security Development Plan. This includes counter-narcotics funding used to train and equip the Frontier Corps in the Northwest Frontier Province for counter-terrorism/counter-insurgency missions. Accordingly, the committee welcomes the Department's recently expressed intention to increase its available counter-narcotics resources to address the trafficking threat in Baluchistan.

The committee remains generally supportive of the Department of Defense's counter-narcotics efforts in U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility. In the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), the committee required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on a comprehensive counter-narcotics strategy for South and Central Asia. The committee looks forward to reviewing the report upon submission in June 2009. As such, the committee encourages the Department to keep the committee informed of its counter-narcotics efforts in Baluchistan.

## OTHER ACTIVITIES

### Analysis of the Strategic Communications Workforce

The committee encourages the development of strategic communications capability within the Department of Defense as a soft-power complement to traditional hard-power tools. The committee has explored policy, management, and organizational impediments to wider adoption of strategic communications capability, but is becoming increasingly concerned that human capital planning in this area is insufficient compared to the needs. The committee notes that the Department has a large and diverse pool of people with

talents, experience, and skills that can contribute to strategic communications from which to draw. The committee is concerned that, since the disestablishment of the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Support to Public Diplomacy, the Department lacks an effective management structure for providing the necessary leadership to guide the growth of needed capabilities in this area.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the assessment of the Department's strategic communications workforce to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The report should include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of the critical skills and core competencies needed for strategic communications;

(2) A comparison of the skills and competencies identified in (1) to the actual civilian and military workforce within the Department;

(3) Identification of critical gaps that are filled by contractors;

(4) An assessment of the adequacy of top-level guidance related both to the policy, organization, and management of strategic communications and recruiting for strategic communications disciplines;

(5) An assessment of the existing management structure for providing policy, guidance and leadership for human capital planning and workforce development in this area; and

(6) An assessment of the adequacy of interagency mechanisms for recruiting and detailing personnel.

### Assessment of Defense Information Technology Systems for Financial Management

The committee is concerned about the continued lack of progress in implementing sound information technology (IT) systems for financial management. After nearly 15 years, Department of Defense (DOD) systems for financial and contract management and business system modernization remain on the Government Accountability Office's high-risk list. As long as the Department lacks an effective financial management system, the level of transparency required to receive a clean audit opinion will remain non-existent. By increasing financial transparency and moving towards a clean audit opinion, the Department will free additional resources that might be invested into other priorities.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to have an outside company or other entity conduct an independent analysis of DOD financial IT systems and submit the findings to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This assessment should determine if there are overlaps in capabilities currently in development, and how well these programs are able to adhere to cost and schedule. This assessment should include service programs, as well as any programs being developed by the defense agencies.

## Government Accountability Office Review of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Capabilities

The committee notes that ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and Islamic Republic of Afghanistan have produced an increasing demand from operational commanders for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities. In response, the Department of Defense has rapidly increased procurement of ISR collection assets, including a wide variety of unmanned and manned aerial systems. The committee has expressed its concern over the proliferation of ISR programs in the Department, without an apparent force-sizing construct or ability to measure the value each ISR component system provides to the ISR collection objective. Further, the committee is concerned as to whether the Department is maximizing the use of the information and data collected throughout the entire intelligence cycle, including data processing, exploitation, and dissemination (PED) activities, in order to fully meet the tactical and theater intelligence needs of operational military forces. If there is imbalance between ISR collection and PED activities, there is a potential problem of operational forces continuing to request more collection platforms because of a failure of the operational forces to receive the necessary feedback from ISR collection efforts. In November 2007, the committee requested that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) conduct a review of the ability of the Department to properly process, exploit, and disseminate the information it receives from ISR systems. To fully carry out this request, GAO must understand the roles and capabilities of all of the elements of the intelligence community within the Department to process, exploit, and disseminate ISR data and information in support of the needs of warfighters. It has, however, come to the committee's attention that the National Security Agency has not been responsive in providing GAO access to the information and personnel required to conduct this work. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to immediately provide GAO with access to the information and personnel it requires to effectively perform its responsibilities on behalf of Congress. In addition, the committee requests that GAO provide it with an update within 30 days regarding the status of this matter, so that the committee can consider whether additional actions may be required.

## Information Programs

The committee is concerned with the clarity and agility of existing policies through which the Department of Defense and its partners execute internet-based strategic communications. The committee believes that online strategic communications are essential tools for the Department to effectively counter the propaganda of violent extremist groups abroad. Many of these groups operate exclusively in this arena and execute online media operations that greatly outnumber, outpace, and outperform United States government initiatives. In many cases, our inability to develop and execute such operations in near real-time ultimately cedes the initiative to our adversaries. Such a phenomenon not only renders subsequent factual messages useless, it endangers our troops abroad by mischaracterizing the positive impact and stability they have cultivated with regional inhabitants.

The committee perceives an overly cautious approach in the Department of Defense and its partners' military messaging operations partially as a result of misinterpretation of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 80–402). The committee's understanding is that Public Law 80–402 was created to apply exclusively to the Department of State. The committee's concern is that over the past sixty years, applicability of this law has affected the development of Department of Defense policy. The committee is aware of legal interpretations from the Department of Defense that reflect this commonly accepted view.

The committee does not believe that Public Law 80–402 should constrain the Department of Defense and its partners' strategic communication and messaging efforts abroad and encourages the Department to conduct a legal review of the applicability of Public Law 80–402 and its intersection with Department of Defense policy guiding online media operations. The committee believes this effort is essential in clarifying any confusion or misinterpretation that may inhibit more aggressive strategic communications against our adversaries abroad, and ensure all elements of national power are utilized in executing this essential mission.

### Institute for Analysis

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense and the Open Source Center established the Institute for Analysis (IfA) in 2004. The purpose of the IfA is to conduct analysis and training programs that use industry best practices, open source assets, and cost-effective techniques to produce innovative methodologies and intelligence gains that can be applied to a range of national security challenges. The methodologies being developed by IfA have been valuable in improving capabilities supporting media analysis to counter violent extremist messages, as well as understanding the psychology and group formation of hacker communities. The committee believes that the efforts of the IfA are a valuable contribution to the development of innovative new tradecraft for assessing and understanding emerging irregular threats. The committee encourages the Department to expand the IfA to provide support to a wider range of consumers within the Department, the intelligence community, and the broader community of interagency partners.

### Interagency Responsibility for Detection, Monitoring and Information Sharing in the Maritime Domain

The committee is increasingly concerned with the complicated lines of coordination between interagency organizations in order to persistently detect, monitor and cue responses to deal with irregular threats from the maritime domain including piracy, proliferation, illicit trafficking, and terrorism. The committee notes the success of the Joint Interagency Task Forces (JIATFs) in developing an effective organization for the execution of interagency counterdrug operations. The committee notes that the scope of irregular threats to the United States in the maritime domain has increased since the creation of the JIATFs. The committee is concerned that current interagency mechanisms may not be effectively

leveraging the JIATF model to ensure that detection, monitoring, early warning, and cuing for the full range of threats in the maritime domain does not lead to exploited jurisdictional seams, redundancy and inefficiency in acquisition and mission, and lack of information-sharing. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretary of the Navy and other interagency partners, submit a report to the congressional defense committees on interagency responsibilities for maritime threat detection, monitoring and information-sharing within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

### Joint Cargo Aircraft Force Structure Requirements and Basing Plan

The committee is aware that the 2009 Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review (QRMR), dated January 2009, determined that "service responsibilities for intra-theater airlift operations are appropriately aligned, and the option that provided the most value to the joint force was to assign the C–27J to both the Air Force and Army." The committee is also aware of the analysis and multitude of studies completed to develop the requirements for the program. These studies supported the minimum requirement of 78 aircraft and were developed through the Joint Capabilities Integration Development System, validated through the Joint Requirements Oversight Council and supported by the Defense Acquisition Board. The committee notes that the March 2009 report of Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA) on alternatives for the proper size and mix of fixed-wing intra-theater airlift assets identifies an airlift mix including 91 C–27Js as particularly cost-effective for the sustained, numerous, geographically separated, non-major combat operations anticipated by the Department of Defense's (DOD's) planning scenarios, including those in the on-going Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee is not aware of any studies or analysis that would support a lower C–27J procurement objective. However, on May 7, 2009, the Department of Defense announced that the Army and Air Force have agreed to assign the C–27J airlift mission solely to the Department of the Air Force with an initial procurement objective of 38 aircraft but final C–27J force structure yet to be determined.

The committee is concerned the Department of Defense has not adequately explained the rationale, nor fully examined the operational impacts, of transferring and consolidating the direct support airlift mission with the Department of the Air Force. The committee recalls the unfortunate history of a similar transfer of the C–7 Caribou's direct support mission from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Air Force during the Vietnam War and notes that this transfer resulted in reduced support for Department of the Army personnel causing critical missions to remain unfulfilled and endangering lives of troops conducting combat operations. The committee expects that the Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force leadership will execute a detailed agreement concerning the Department of the Army's direct support requirements to be met by the Department of the Air Force, including agreed-upon metrics to determine whether these requirements are being achieved.

Furthermore, the committee: believes that the composition of Air Force aviation force structure should include an appropriate number and mix of Air National Guard flying missions; notes that the Air Force has announced that six states including Maryland, Ohio, Connecticut, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Michigan would be assigned C–27J aircraft; and encourages the Air Force to consider those six states in its assignment of C–27J flying missions. The committee also notes that the Department of the Army had previously announced that it would assign C–27Js to the following locations: Quonset Point, Rhode Island; Standiford Field, Kentucky; Robins Air Force Base, Georgia; Cecil Field, Florida; Austin-Bergstrom International Airport, Texas; Will Rogers Army National Guard Base, Oklahoma; Springfield Airport, Missouri; Grissom Army Reserve Base, Indiana; March Air Reserve Base, California; Portland Army National Guard Base, Oregon; Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington; and four aircraft to be shared between Bryant Army Air Field, Alaska, and Guam. The committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to consider these locations in its assignment of C–27J flying missions.

The committee believes that National Guard missions for all locations planned for assignment of C–27Js should be preserved with either the assignment of a C–27J or a new mission identified by either the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force. The committee also believes in making every effort to retain the expertise and experience that had been developed in the Army, that the services should consider the transition of these individuals. The committee urges the Department of the Army and Air Force to develop a plan of action that will allow Army air crew personnel to either transfer to the Air National Guard to support the C–27Js, or develop a joint staffing model that will allow these individuals to maintain their status in the Army National Guard, and be able to participate in support of this new Air Force mission.

The committee further notes that airlift is a core Department of the Air Force mission, and that the Air Force Materiel Command, including its depots and personnel, currently manage and execute acquisition, sustainment, maintenance and modernization programs for the C–5, C–17 and C–130 aircraft. The committee believes that the Department of the Air Force should fulfill a similar role for the C–27J, and expects that as additional C–27Js are acquired, the Department of the Air Force will seek to acquire technical data rights and an agreed plan for the Air Force to efficiently manage and provide lifecycle, cost effective maintenance, modernization and sustainment for the C–27J in its core depot capability.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2010, that identifies the new force structure requirements and basing plan for the C–27J. The report should also identify future missions and a way forward that will allow for the retention of these highly skilled personnel for any base previously announced to be assigned the C–27J mission, if it is determined that the C–27J will not be assigned as previously announced.

## Military Aircraft Industrial Base

The committee remains concerned about the adequacy of the United States military aircraft industrial base, particularly for fixed-wing aircraft in both unclassified and classified programs of the Department of Defense (DOD), given the trend toward consolidation and the continued challenges faced by established prime contractors and suppliers to remain competitive, innovative and be cost-efficient.

Furthermore, the committee reiterates the sense of Congress expressed in section 8162 of the Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–117), that the United States must ensure, among other things, that more than one aircraft company can design, engineer, produce and support military aircraft in the future. Section 8162 also required a study of the military aircraft industrial base, which was completed by a federally funded research and development center, on behalf of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in 2003. This report concluded that there might not be sufficient military aircraft design and development work to sustain an engineering and technical workforce to support future system concepts. The report also suggested that starting or stopping a single program might have major effects on industry.

In addition, the concerns of the committee were underscored by the Annual Industrial Capabilities Report to Congress, submitted by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Industrial Policy (DUSD(IP)) in March, 2009. The report of the DUSD(IP) stated that "The reduction in RDT&E [Research, Development, Test & Evaluation] funding does not bode well for companies without long term production programs." The report identified certain contractors' business segments, at both the prime and lower-tier level, that were in danger of closing or being subject to further consolidation, and stated that "These suppliers will be forced to either exit the business or find new non-DOD programs for their products."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to commission a study and report by a federally funded research and development center to update the analysis conducted during the 2003 study, particularly in light of DOD programmatic decisions made in the last seven years and the recent DUSD(IP) assessment. The study and report should also include a classified annex that provides an assessment of the military aircraft industrial base capacity and capability to remain competitive and sufficiently staffed to support DOD classified activities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the report to the congressional defense committees within six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

## Report of the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review

The committee anticipates the delivery of the report of the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) in early 2010 as required by section 118 of title 10, United States Code. The committee notes that while that section contains specific requirements for the conduct of the QDR, the QDR itself is largely an internal process for the Department of Defense under the direction of the Secretary of

Defense. Congress, however, is the primary consumer of the output of that process, the report of the QDR, which is why the reporting requirements are described in such detail in law. The committee considers that report to be an important input to the development of defense policy positions as Congress makes budget related decisions, evaluates legislative proposals from the Department of Defense, and generally fulfills its oversight role consistent with the requirements of the U.S. Constitution.

The committee has been disappointed with the last several QDR reports and notes that modification made to the reporting requirement by section 1031 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) reflects some of those concerns. Additionally, the committee highlights the further modification to the reporting requirement made by section 951 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) regarding the effects of climate change.

The committee understands that the QDR process is robust and far-reaching, and the Department of Defense uses it for additional purposes besides producing the required report. The committee encourages those activities. Nevertheless, the committee believes that the reporting requirements in the statute are clear and straightforward and urges the Department of Defense to organize the report of the 2009 QDR to mirror those requirements as closely as possible. When certain elements are not present or not easily discernable in the report, there is a risk that the process through which Congress determines national security priorities will be suboptimized. To the extent that the Secretary of Defense may wish to communicate additional findings and policy positions beyond what is required in the report, the committee urges the Secretary to do so in such a way that it does not detract from the report's required focus. Some of that additional material may best be suited for the report of the Quadrennial Roles and Missions review, as required by section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which the committee regards as a subordinate document to the report of the QDR, or as a separate stand alone document published separately.

### Report on Military Public Diplomacy Activities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense carries out a number of engagement activities with foreign partners that might be construed as military public diplomacy. While the Department of State is responsible for public diplomacy for the United States, many of the activities the Department of Defense uses to promote better understanding and build capacity with foreign partners have a similar effect. For example, the Department of Defense helped to fund the Iraqi Virtual Science Library, which provides free, full-text access to thousands of scientific journals from major publishers as well as a large collection of online educational materials. There are also a number of activities to promote exchanges between scientific institutions as well as military personnel exchanges with professional military educational establishments. These activities represent an analogy to the kinds of Fulbright scholarships, American Corners, and book translation programs offered by the Department of State's public diplomacy program. Other activities, such as the deployment of hospital ships, or the

use of military medical personnel to carry out medical, dental, and veterinary operations, have no analogue elsewhere within the government.

However, it is not clear to the committee that there is a good accounting for all of these activities within the Department of Defense. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the disestablishment of the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Support to Public Diplomacy has left the Department of Defense without the necessary management structure to coordinate and guide effectively the myriad activities that comprise military public diplomacy. In order to craft an effective engagement strategy, the Department of Defense should understand all of the instruments at its disposal. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the planning for, and execution of, military public diplomacy to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The report should include the following:

(1) A taxonomy for understanding the scope of military public diplomacy activities;

(2) A description of all of the activities in the Department of Defense, services and defense agencies that might fall within the scope of military public diplomacy;

(3) Metrics for measuring the effectiveness or return on investment of these activities;

(4) A description of the current management structures for coordinating and overseeing military public diplomacy activities, including any changes needed to increase that structures effectiveness;

(5) An analysis of how these activities are coordinated with regional theater security cooperation plans; and

(6) An assessment of the feasibility or efficacy of establishing an exchange program between the Departments of State and Defense for informational and public diplomacy programs.

Study of the Effective Use of Aerial Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Systems in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan

For the past several years, the committee has actively urged and supported the Department's efforts to field additional aerial intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) systems to the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. These assets have proven to be invaluable in supporting a number of missions for contingency operations. The committee is encouraged by the Secretary of Defense's recent establishment of a task force to quickly field much needed aerial and other ISR systems in both theaters.

The Secretary has often referred to the Army's Task Force (TF) Observe, Detect, Identify, Neutralize (ODIN) as a model for successful implementation of a dedicated ISR system to achieve a specific purpose. The committee understands that providing an entire system of ISR assets, such as TF ODIN to ground force commanders for their tasking control, and for a specified amount of time, can be an effective use of these systems. The committee is also aware that it is necessary to share limited strategic ISR assets such as limited Predator unmanned aerial vehicles, across the the-

ater of operations. In the near-term, it is likely that the number of fielded ISR systems will be insufficient to meet all the commanders' requirements in theater. The committee believes that understanding the relative effectiveness and trade-offs of massing a system of several ISR platforms, and providing this system or even a single platform, to local commanders versus spreading centrally controlled platforms across the theater of operations, is critical for making the best use of limited assets.

The committee therefore directs the Director of the Operations Directorate of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a study of the effectiveness of aerial ISR systems in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, with particular emphasis on the allocation and tasking of these systems, and the relative benefits and trade-offs of providing control of a dedicated system or platform to ground force commanders versus centrally controlling individual assets across the theater of operations. The Director should also consider how factors such as base locations for aerial ISR platforms, the unique attributes of manned and unmanned aerial systems, real-time information and data sharing, and the assignment of dedicated reaction teams contribute to overall effectiveness. The study should address all ground force commanders' needs for aerial ISR, including but not limited to: operational support; force protection over-watch; counter-insurgency missions; high-value individual targeting; and counter-improvised explosive device missions. The study should also consider lessons learned from the extensive use of aerial ISR systems in the Republic of Iraq and how these lessons may be applied to more effectively use ISR systems in Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. In addition to an assessment of the current use of aerial ISR systems, the Director should make recommendations on how to more effectively use the systems to achieve the combatant commanders' goals. The committee directs the Director to report the findings of this study to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

### Undersea and Off-Shore Critical Infrastructure

The committee has become increasingly concerned about the security and resiliency of undersea and off-shore critical infrastructure assets, such as undersea telecommunication cables. Events in recent years indicate the vulnerability of many of these systems to natural and man-made mishaps. However, it is unclear to the committee whom would be responsible for protecting these assets, or for providing for their resilience in the face of deliberate attacks, environmental disruption, or other failures. The committee believes that the Department of Defense must work closely with the Department of Homeland Security, other civilian agencies, and private sector infrastructure providers to ensure that appropriate protection and response plans, policies, and strategies are in place, but the committee remains uncertain as to the extent of the current coordination and interaction between those varied organizations. Accordingly, the committee requests that the Department, in consultation with interagency and private sector interests, brief the committee on its efforts to protect these infrastructure assets within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

# 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 2010 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount transferred under this authority to $5.0 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

This section would introduce a new exemption to the general transfer authority. Any funds required to be transferred from Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide in support of the Defense Health Program Information Technology system as described in section 1403 of this report, would not be subject to the $5.0 billion limitation. The committee would provide relief to the Department to facilitate the realignment of funds in support of a higher level of leadership oversight.

### Section 1002—Incorporation of Funding Decisions into Law

This section would authorize, by law, amounts specified in the committee report wherever a funding table lists a dollar amount for a project, program, or activity to be carried out to the same extent as if included in the text of the Act, subject to the availability of the appropriation.

## SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG AND COUNTER-TERRORISM ACTIVITIES

### Section 1011—One-year Extension of Department of Defense Counter-drug Authorities and Requirements

This section would extend, by one 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 1021 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

This section would also extend, by one year, the unified counter-drug and counter-terrorism 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 1023 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

This section would further extend, by one year, the support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments under section 1033(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1024(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

### Section 1012—Joint Task Forces Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-Terrorism Activities

This section would extend, by one year, the support by joint task forces under section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 1022 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The current authority provides that a joint task force of the Department of Defense, which is providing support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities, may also provide, subject to all applicable laws and regulations, these law enforcement agencies with support for their counter-terrorism activities.

### Section 1013—Border Coordination Centers in Afghanistan and Pakistan

This section would prohibit the use of drug interdiction and counter-drug funds of the Department of Defense for the construction, expansion, repair, or operation and maintenance of any existing or proposed border coordination center. This section would not limit the availability of other authorities or sources of funding for these costs.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to construct or have under construction a border coordination center in Regional Command-South in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan or in Baluchistan, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, before beginning construction on a third border coordination center in Regional Command-East. This section does not restrict the funding for the construction of a border coordination center in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas or the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan until a border coordination center is constructed or is under construction in Regional Command-South or in Baluchistan.

This section would provide a definition for border coordination centers, such that the definition would include border coordination centers like the ones in Khyber and Lwara, Afghanistan.

After extensive committee investigation, including two delegations to visit the border coordination center at the Torkham Gate in the Khyber Pass, the committee found that the intended primary purpose of the border coordination centers, as had been repeatedly articulated by officials of the previous administration, did not correlate with the center's current mission. Instead of coordinating counter-narcotics activities of the governments of the Afghanistan and Pakistan with those of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the International Security Assistance Force, the border coordination center was, in the main, a venue to begin easing historical tensions between the security forces of these Islamic republics. Although facilitating better communication between these governments has merit, the source of the funding stream did not match this purpose. This section intends to correct this misalignment while continuing to support the ultimate objectives, intended and real, of the border coordination centers.

### Section 1014—Comptroller General Report on Effectiveness of Accountability Measures for Assistance from Counter-Narcotics Central Transfer Account

This section would require the Comptroller General to present a report to the appropriate defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, which would: describe the performance evaluation system of the Department of Defense for measuring the effectiveness of the Department of Defense's counter-drug activities; assess the ability of this system to measure such activities effectively; and recommend improvements to such a system.

## SUBTITLE C—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 1021—Operational Procedures for Experimental Military Prototypes

This section would direct the senior military officer of each military service, in consultation with the senior acquisition executive of each military department, to develop and prescribe guidance for the conduct of test and evaluation efforts of experimental military prototypes. This guidance would allow for the testing of equipment or systems that have been modified from their original condition for the purpose of developing new technology or improving system capability. A report detailing the development of the required guidance would be submitted by the Secretary of each military department within 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act.

Additionally, this section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to Piasecki Aircraft Corporation of Essington, Pennsylvania, all rights, title, and interest to Navy aircraft N40VT (Bureau Number 163283). The conveyance would be directed to be at no cost to the government, and liability to the United States for operations of the aircraft would cease upon conveyance. Additionally, this section would provide that the United States have rights to the vectored thrust ducted propeller technology under development with the aircraft. This section would provide that, should the United States desire to acquire the technology under development, the acquisition costs would be reduced by the amount of value of aircraft N40VT on the date of transfer.

### Section 1022—Temporary Reduction in Minimum Number of Operational Aircraft Carriers

This section would, notwithstanding the requirement contained in section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code, allow for only 10 aircraft carriers in the combat forces of the Navy during the period between the deactivation of the USS Enterprise (CVN 65) in fiscal year 2013 and the commissioning of USS Ford (CVN 79) in fiscal year 2015. Additionally, this section would require in fiscal year 2012, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the commanders of the combatant commands, to conduct an analysis of risk associated with the temporary reduction in aircraft carrier force levels. The report of the analysis would be forwarded by the Secretary of Defense to Congress with the budget request for fiscal year 2013.

Section 1023—Limitation on 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 transferring or releasing Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States until 120 days after the date that the President submits to the congressional defense committees a plan that: identifies the risk that these detainees may pose to the national security of the United States; proposes risk mitigation measures; proposes what the final disposition of these detainees should be; and summarizes the results of the required consultations with the chief executives of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

Section 1024—Charter for the National Reconnaissance Office

This section would require the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense to jointly submit a revised charter for the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) to the congressional intelligence committees and congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

This section would require that the revised charter must include the organizational and governance structure of the NRO; the provision of NRO participation in the development and generation of requirements and acquisition; the scope of the capabilities of the NRO; and the roles and responsibilities of the NRO and the relationship of the NRO to other organizations.

SUBTITLE D—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1031—Report of Statutory Compliance of the Report on the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would require that within 90 days after the Secretary of Defense releases the report of the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), the Comptroller General would be required to issue a report on the degree to which the report of the QDR complies with the requirement in 10 USC 118(d), as amended.

If the Comptroller General determines that the report of the QDR has deviated significantly from the statutory requirement, the Secretary of Defense would be required to issue a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services addressing those areas within 30 days after the Government Accountability Office releases its report.

Section 1032—Report on the Force Structure Findings of the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report concurrently with the report on the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) containing the analyses used to determine and support the findings on force structure in the QDR.

The committee expects that the analyses submitted will include details on all elements of the force structure discussed in the QDR report, and particularly the following:

(1) A description of the factors that informed decisions regarding the fighter force structure for the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, including: the assumed threat capabilities to include fighter force capabilities as well as air defense capabilities; the modeling simulations and analysis used to determine fighter force structure for the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps; the extent to which unmanned aerial vehicle inventories compensate for manned fighter aircraft inventory; and the quantifiable operational risks associated with the planned fighter fleets, based on requirements of combatant commanders, and measures planned to address those risks;

(2) A description of the factors that informed decisions regarding strategic and tactical airlift force structure, including: the modeling, simulations, and analyses used to determine the number and type of airlift aircraft necessary to meet the national defense strategy; the number and type of airlift aircraft necessary to meet the national defense strategy; the changes made, and supporting rationale for the changes made, to the airlift force structure from that proposed in Mobility Capabilities Study 2005 (MCS–05), including numbers of airlift aircraft necessary to meet additional demands for increased Army and Marine Corps personnel, airlift necessary to transport the Army's future combat systems, and the use of airlift aircraft in intra-theater airlift missions; the force sizing constructs used, including peak demand as measured in millions of ton-miles per day and force structure necessary to meet peak demand including the number of C–17s, C–5s, C–130s, C–27s, and civil reserve air fleet; and the operational risks associated with the planned strategic and tactical airlift aircraft fleet, based on requirements of combatant commanders, and measures planned to address those risks;

(3) A description of the factors that informed decisions regarding aerial refueling aircraft force structure, including: the modeling, simulations, and analyses used to determine the number and type of aerial refueling aircraft necessary to meet the national defense strategy; the force sizing constructs used including peak demand; the number and type of aerial refueling aircraft necessary to meet the national security objective; the changes made, and supporting rationale for the changes made, to the aerial refueling aircraft force structure from that proposed in MCS–05; and the operational risks associated with the planned aerial refueling aircraft fleet, based on requirements of combatant commanders, and measures planned to address those risks;

(4) A description of the factors that informed decisions regarding bomber force structure, including: the modeling, simulations, and analyses used to determine the number and type of bomber aircraft necessary to meet the national defense strategy; the force sizing constructs used including peak demand; the number and type of bomber aircraft necessary to meet the national defense strategy; and the operational risks associated with the planned bomber aircraft fleet, based on requirements of combatant commanders, and measures planned to address those risks; and

(5) A description of the factors that informed decisions regarding the Navy battle force, including: assumptions regarding threat capabilities; the modeling, simulation, and analysis used to determine the number and type of battle force vessels necessary to meet the national defense strategy; the force sizing construct including contingency operations; the analysis used to determine the deployed operations required for the battle force fleet during peacetime; the limitations on meeting combatant commander priorities with the proposed battle force structure, including an analysis of risk of not meeting all priority requirements; and the deployed operations envisioned for the battle force fleet and the geographic areas left uncovered by continuous deployed operations of battle force vessels.

Section 1033—Sense of Congress and Amendment Relating to the Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Quadrennial Defense Review should not be budget constrained and also stipulates that the existence of an ongoing Quadrennial Defense Review does not exempt the President or Department of Defense from submitting the budget materials as required by law.

Section 1034—Strategic Review of Basing Plans for United States European Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, concurrently, with the report on the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) required by section 118 of title 10, United States Code, that would describe the plan for basing forces in Europe. The report would be required to be submitted to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense notify Congress at least 30 days prior to permanently relocating a unit stationed outside the United States.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense will complete a Global Force Posture review that will contribute to the QDR report. The committee recommends that the elements required in the report under this section should be given primary consideration as the Department completes its Global Force Posture review. The committee believes that decisions on global force presence, particularly in Europe, should not be determined by fiscal considerations alone.

Section 1035—National Defense Panel

This section would create a 12 member bipartisan, independent panel to review the National Defense Strategy, the National Military Strategy, the Secretary of Defense's Terms of Reference, and any other materials providing the basis for, or substantial inputs to, the work of the Department of Defense on the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), and conduct an assessment of the assumptions, strategy, findings, costs, and risks of the report of the 2009 QDR. It would further require the panel to provide its recommendations and findings to Congress and the Secretary of De-

fense in at least two interim reports and in a final report due by February 15, 2011.

### Section 1036—Report Required on Notification of Detainees of Rights of Miranda v. Arizona

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report that would describe numerous possible impacts of the reading of rights under Miranda v. Arizona (384 U.S. 436 (1966)) on the operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan of U.S. Forces Afghanistan.

### Section 1037—Annual Report on the Electronic Warfare Strategy of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Joint Staff and military departments, to provide the congressional defense committees an annual report on the Department's electronic warfare strategy and associated acquisition programs and projects.

### Section 1038—Studies to Analyze Alternative Models for Acquisition and Funding of Technologies Supporting Network-centric Operations

This section would require concurrent studies by an independent federally funded research and development center and the Joint Staff to analyze alternative models and recommend changes to the present Service-based approach for acquisition and funding of interconnected systems for network-centric operations.

## SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 1041—Prohibition Relating to Propaganda

This section would amend chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of funds made available to the Department of Defense for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not otherwise specifically authorized by law. The committee intends for the definition of the term "publicity or propaganda" to include materials such as editorials or other articles prepared by an agency or its contractors at the behest of the agency and circulated as the ostensible position of parties outside the agency.

### Section 1042—Extension of Certain Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism

This section would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with armed forces through FY 2010.

The authority to offer and make rewards by acting through government personnel of allied forces is currently in use in Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The Commander, United States Central Command, is supportive and expects to expand this method of of-

fering and making rewards. The authority was not implemented until fiscal year 2009 and requires more time to mature and develop based on adjusted national and theater strategies.

This section would provide authority only; there is no associated funding or appropriation line. The Department of Defense would be requested to confirm that the implementation procedures established by the previous Deputy Secretary of Defense on August 19, 2008, are still valid.

### Section 1043—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

### Section 1044—Repeal of Pilot Program on Commercial Fee-for-Service Air Refueling Support for the Air Force

This section would repeal section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which directed the Department of the Air Force to undertake a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of utilizing commercial fee-for-service air refueling aircraft for Air Force operations. The committee is aware that the Air Force has conducted initial analysis to develop the program structure for the pilot program, based on two diverse options, and has received feedback from potential providers in the aviation industry. However, based on its review of data gathered to date, the committee is concerned that the pilot program will be a costly alternative with little operational benefit and is not in the best interest of the Air Force.

### Section 1045—Extension of Sunset for Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States

This section would amend section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended, to extend the date by which activities of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States must cease. This section would further require the commission to submit a follow-on report to complement the final report submitted on May 6, 2009.

The Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, established by section 1062 of Public Law 110–181, delivered to the President and Congress an interim report on December 1, 2008, and a final report on May 6, 2009. With the exception of a single issue in the final report, both reports reflected the consensus of the 12 commissioners. The ability of the commission to speak with one voice enables it to fulfill its role in fostering and framing a national-level discussion of strategic national security issues.

A follow-on report by the commission will be a valuable contribution to policymakers, especially in light of the critical military issues that will be addressed by the Nuclear Posture Review and the Quadrennial Defense Review. The committee values the work of the commission, and will work with the President to address the findings and recommendations of the commission.

Section 1046—Authorization of Appropriations for Payments to Portuguese Nationals Employed by the Department of Defense

This section would authorize payments for salary increases based on wage survey data for fiscal years 2006 and 2007. Such Portuguese nationals employed by the Department of Defense for payments may be paid only if: (1) the wage survey methodology described in the United States–Portugal Agreement on Cooperation and Defense, signed at Lisbon on June 1, 1995, is eliminated; and (2) these agreements and any implementing regulations are revised to provide that all obligations of the United States regarding annual pay increases are subject to U.S. appropriation law governing the funding available for such pay increases.

Section 1047—Combat Air Forces Restructuring

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from retiring additional legacy fighter aircraft, announced in the Combat Air Forces restructuring plan on May 18, 2009, until the Secretary submits a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This section would require the report to include: a detailed plan describing how the Secretary will fill the force structure and capability gaps resulting from the retirement actions; a description of the follow-on missions for each affected base, along with an explanation of the criteria used for selecting the affected bases and the particular fighters chosen for retirement; the plan of action for reassignment of the individual Air Force active, Reserve, and National Guard personnel affected by the potential aircraft retirements; and an estimation of the cost avoidance and how the funds would be invested during the Future Years Defense Program should the restructuring plan move forward. With the exception of the 5 fighters originally slated for retirement, this section would prohibit additional legacy fighters from being retired until 90 days after the Secretary submits his report. In addition, no Air Force personnel affected by the restructuring plan would be reassigned until the report is submitted.

The committee is concerned about Air Force plans to accelerate the retirement of 249 legacy fighter aircraft in fiscal year 2010, in addition to the five fighter aircraft previously scheduled for retirement. The additional aircraft scheduled for retirement are 112 F–15s, 134 F–15s and 3 A–10s. The committee notes that such actions could lead to serious gaps in force structure and capability since these actions are being taken while replacement aircraft are still being tested and are not yet available for fielding. Additionally, the committee is concerned that the Air Force has not identified, for all of the affected bases, the follow-on missions that will serve to fill force structure and capability gaps.

The committee has identified $143.7 million in unjustified program growth in the Air Force operation and maintenance administrative budget, specifically service-wide technical support, service-wide administration, and service-wide other activities. Additionally, the committee has identified $200.9 million in unexecutable peacetime operations due to deployments in the Air Force operating forces, air operations budget activity. The committee recommends that these funds totaling $344.6 be used for the continued operation and maintenance of the 249 legacy fighters that were slated

for retirement during fiscal year 2010 until such time as the reporting requirement above is met. In addition, the committee recommends that $10.5 million of funds for aircraft procurement be available for obligations for modifications necessary to sustain the 249 fighter aircraft.

Section 1048—Sense of Congress Honoring the Honorable Ellen O. Tauscher

This section would enumerate the accomplishments and honor the leadership of Representative Ellen O. Tauscher during her career on the House Committee on Armed Services and in the House of Representatives, and would express the sincere and humble gratitude of Congress and the nation.

Section 1049—Sense of Congress Concerning the Disposition of Submarine NR–1

This section would express the sense of Congress that the submarine NR–1 was a unique and significant part of the history of the submarine force and that as much of the vessel as practicable should be preserved for historical and educational purposes.

The section would also express that the Secretary of the Navy should make available for transfer to the Submarine Museum in Groton, Connecticut unique on-board components and clearly recognizable and distinctive portions of the ship's hull.

Section 1050—Compliance with Requirement for Plan on the Disposition of Detainees at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would require the President to comply with section 1023 of this Act, Limitation on Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Section 1051—Sense of Congress Regarding Carrier Air Wing Force Structure

This section would make certain findings regarding the Department of the Navy strike fighter force structure and express the sense of Congress that in addition to the requirement in section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code, for the United States naval combat forces to include not less than 11 operational aircraft carriers, such forces should also include not less than 10 carrier air wings, that are comprised of not less than 44 strike fighter aircraft. This section would express the further sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Navy should take all appropriate actions necessary to make resources available in order to meet this objective.

Section 1052—Sense of Congress on Department of Defense Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness; Plan

This section would make several findings regarding the seriousness of the inability of the Department of Defense to achieve a clean audit opinion on its financial statements. This section would also express the sense of Congress that it is no longer excusable to allow poor business systems, a deficiency of resource allocation, or a lack of commitment from the Department's senior leadership, to

foster waste or non-accountability for financial management. This section would express further the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, through the Chief Management Officer, should make compliance with financial management and audit readiness standards a top priority. Finally, this section would require the Secretary, in the next update of the biennial Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan, to outline a plan to achieve a full, unqualified audit of the Department by September 30, 2013, four years in advance of the Department's current plan. The Secretary would also be required to identify a mechanism to conduct and publish audits of the military intelligence programs and agencies, in a classified manner.

### Section 1053—Justice for Victims of Torture and Terrorism

This section makes numerous findings related to American victims of torture and kidnapping by the former regime in the Islamic Republic of Iraq and states that it is a sense of Congress that the claims of these individuals should be resolved.

### Section 1054—Repeal of Certain Laws Pertaining to the Joint Committee for the Review of Counterproliferation Programs of the United States

This section would repeal section 1605 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), section 1503 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) and subsequent amendments to these sections, thereby canceling the Counterproliferation Program Review Committee (CPRC) and associated reporting requirements. The Department of Defense asserts that the CPRC report is resource intensive and "has been overtaken by events." In particular, a new office, the Office of the United States Coordinator for Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, is being established pursuant to the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53) within the National Security Council. The committee believes that this new office will effectively assume, among other responsibilities, the coordinating function previously assigned to the CPRC.

# TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Civilian Expeditionary Workforce

The committee acknowledges the recently signed Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 1404.10 entitled "DOD Civilian Expeditionary Workforce" and notes that the Civilian Expeditionary Workforce should not duplicate efforts within civilian agencies and urges the Department of Defense to remain committed to collaborating with the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development in stabilization and reconstruction operations.

National Security Personnel System

The National Security Personnel System (NSPS), included in title XI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), established a new Department of Defense (DOD) personnel management system. The intent of NSPS is to provide the Secretary of Defense with flexibility for hiring, firing, and promoting DOD employees. Under NSPS, employee pay is tied to mission accomplishment and performance, and employees are assigned to broad pay bands based on job functions. Responding to concerns over negative employee perceptions, and employee apprehension over the fairness of the performance ratings, and potential adverse impact on diversity, Congress enacted several changes to NSPS in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). The modifications included exempting wage grade employees from the system and restoring collective bargaining and merit systems protections.

Despite the modifications, concerns remain regarding the system and its overall impact on DOD employees. The committee is encouraged that the President has directed the Department to undertake a comprehensive review of NSPS, and recently established an independent task force to provide an assessment and recommendations of the Department's personnel management system. This review is consistent with the committee's request that the Department suspend conversion of current DOD employees to NSPS, until the Administration and Congress can properly address the future of the system. The committee is concerned, however, that the Department is continuing to bring new employees into NSPS, and is reclassifying Wage Grade and General Schedule (GS) positions as NSPS.

While the committee expects a thorough review of the DOD personnel management system to be conducted, there are specific areas that the committee would recommend for consideration, such as the suitability of having DOD civilian employees covered by separate personnel systems: NSPS, GS, and Wage Grade. The review should also address potential initiatives to reform and improve federal hiring practices, which was one of the principal rationales for enactment of NSPS. Furthermore, the review should also examine the pay and performance management flexibilities within the existing GS system, especially the flexibilities and incentives provided by the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act (Public Law 101–509), the adequacy of training for managers within the GS system, and the potential development of career paths for DOD employees.

Furthermore, the committee notes that a review of the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) should be undertaken before that system moves forward. The committee has expressed its objection to the continued implementation of this unique intelligence personnel management system, which essentially establishes another defense personnel system. As with NSPS, the committee stresses that implementation of DCIPS should be suspended as well.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1101—Authority to Employ Individuals Completing the National Security Education Program

This section would amend section 1902 of title 50, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense and other agencies and organizations with national security responsibilities the authority to appoint those individuals who have successfully completed the requirements of the National Security Education Program (NSEP) to a position in the excepted service. There is no current direct-hire authority with which to appoint these graduates into excepted service positions within the Department of Defense or other agencies with national security positions. This presents a difficulty because these graduates are required by the NSEP to enter into a service agreement before receipt of a scholarship, fellowship or grant.

### Section 1102—Authority for Employment by Department of Defense of Individuals Who Have Successfully Completed the Requirements of the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) Defense Scholarship Program

This section would amend subsection 2192a(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize direct-hire authority of graduates of the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) Defense Scholarship Program. The SMART program provides the Department of Defense with a pool of highly qualified, highly educated individuals that are capable of filling mission-critical and hard-to-fill scientific and technical positions. However, the current hiring authority set forth in subsection 2192a(d) is not adequate because it does not allow the Secretary of Defense to directly appoint individuals who have successfully completed the requirements of the SMART program to the excepted service. Graduates currently must competitively apply for vacant positions within the Department. This presents a difficulty because these individuals are required by the SMART program to sign a service agreement that obligates them to employment within the Department for a specified period of time.

### Section 1103—Authority for the Employment of Individuals Who Have Successfully Completed the Department of Defense Information Assurance Scholarship Program

This section would amend subsection (b) of section 2200a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize direct hire authority of graduates of the Information Assurance Scholarship (IAS) program. The IAS program provides the Department of Defense with a pool of individuals who possess key information assurance and cyber security information technology skills. However, the current statute does not allow the Secretary of Defense to directly appoint individuals who have successfully completed the IAS program to the excepted service. Graduates currently must competitively apply for vacant positions within the Department. This presents a difficulty because these individuals are required by the program to sign a service agreement that obligates their employment within the Department for a specified period of time.

Section 1104—Additional Personnel Authorities for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction

This section would amend section 1229(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 101–181) to provide additional personnel authorities to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) similar to those provided to the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. The legislation would expedite the standard hiring process for civilian personnel positions by permitting the SIGAR to use the same employment authorities currently granted to heads of other temporary organizations. Employees hired under this new authority could serve until the termination of the SIGAR office.

Section 1105—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 one 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 civilian employee who performs certain work in an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of the 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 1106—Extension of Certain Benefits to Federal Civilian Employees on Official Duty in Pakistan

This section would extend to Department of Defense (DOD) civilians working in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan the same benefits that are currently provided to civilians deployed in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would ensure parity for DOD civilians who could be assigned to perform stability, security, transition and reconstruction type duties in Pakistan.

Section 1107—Authority to Expand Scope of Provisions Relating to Unreduced Compensation for Certain Reemployed Annuitants

This section would direct the President to develop regulations relating to the reemployment of annuitants. Such regulations should consider existing provisions such as subsection 1106(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which allows former federal employees seeking reemployment with the Department of Defense to retain their annuities. These individuals have tremendous practical and operational experience, and their reemployment will help the Department sustain a high-quality workforce. As a result of its extensive oversight work on improving the quality of instruction provided at professional military education institutions and the Naval Criminal Investigative Service Training Academy, the committee finds that this authority may be particularly useful in the hiring of civilian professors under the authorities granted by section 1595 of title 10,

United States Code, as well as former federal law enforcement officers at the Naval Criminal Investigative Service Training Academy.

### Section 1108—Requirement for Department of Defense Strategic Workforce Plans

This section would codify the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual plan to shape and improve the civilian workforce of the Department of Defense. This section also would consolidate three separate requirements for elements of the plan into a new statutory requirement at a new section 115b of title 10, United States Code. The committee recognizes that, to meaningfully implement this section, requirements determination, planning, programming, and budgeting must be an integral part of the development of the plan. Therefore, this section would place overall responsibility for developing and implementing the strategic workforce plan with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.

The committee notes that the plan should support, and be integrated with, the Department's efforts to achieve the appropriate balance in its total workforce, recognizing the distinct value of each component of the plan (military, civilian employee and contractor). For example: the military provides an expeditionary capability with specialized training in combat, combat support, and combat service support capabilities; civilian employees provide needed oversight and direction, continuity of operations, and specialized enduring skills that do not require expeditionary, combat, or combat-related competencies; and contractors provide specialized skills and surge capabilities that do not require the command and control or transparency to the public required by military and civilian employees. Improved requirements determination and planning will facilitate determining who is most appropriate to perform that requirement.

Finally, the committee encourages the Department to consult with federal employee union representatives when developing any aspect of this workforce plan that would alter the conditions of employment of any federal employee. The committee notes that requests for management flexibilities should be driven by real requirements, not to simply maximize managerial discretion.

### Section 1109—Adjustments to Limitations on Personnel and Requirement for Annual Manpower Reporting

This section would amend section 1111 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to eliminate any personnel limitations on: Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition personnel hired pursuant to section 1705 of title 10, United States Code; DOD personnel hired pursuant to a shortage category designation by the Secretary of Defense or the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; or DOD personnel hired to fill workforce gaps as identified by the Secretary of Defense in his annual strategic workforce plan submitted to Congress. This section would also eliminate such personnel limitations to accommodate increases in workload to perform work that is either inherently governmental, or must be performed by DOD

civilian employees or members of the armed forces because of the critical nature of the work or the necessity to maintain sufficient organic expertise and technical capability.

This section also would consolidate and modify the reports required under section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and section 1111 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The consolidated report would be included within the annual defense manpower report required under section 115a of title 10, United States Code. This section would clarify that the consolidated report should provide programmed workforce data for military and civilian personnel appropriate to the overall DOD budget material. The report should include data, on the replacement of contractor personnel performing inherently governmental or exempt functions with military or DOD civilian personnel, and a plan for continued review of such contractor personnel for possible conversion to military or civilian performance in accordance with section 2463 of title 10, United States Code.

### Section 1110—Modification to the Department of Defense Laboratory Personnel Authority

This section would extend the authorities of section 342(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) to establish a demonstration personnel management system at additional defense laboratories, and designate these laboratories as science and technology reinvention laboratories. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to convert the employees at the listed laboratories into a personnel demonstration program consistent with section 342(b) of Public Law 103–337. The committee does not intend for such conversion to adversely affect any employee with respect to pay or any other term or condition of employment, and shall be consistent with any collective bargaining agreements. Furthermore, this section would extend the exclusion from conversion to the National Security Personnel System of the personnel demonstration laboratories listed in section 9902(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, until October 1, 2014.

### Section 1111—Pilot Program for the Temporary Exchange of Information Technology Personnel

This section would provide the authority for the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with private sector organizations to arrange for the temporary assignment of Department of Defense (DOD) information technology (IT) professionals to the private sector, or for private sector IT professionals to be assigned to DOD organizations. This authority is limited to 10 individuals at any given time, and would not allow for any further exchanges after September 30, 2013. This section would supersede the authority provided by section 1109 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

In a report to Congress titled, *Benefits of Assigning Information Technology Private Sector Employees to the Department of Defense*, dated June 2008, the Department of Defense found that "this type of public/private sector dialogue and the sharing of best practices has great potential in enhancing Defense transformation." The De-

partment also found that such exchanges play an important role in reducing "skill gaps in mission critical occupations" by accelerated learning of industry best practices through direct interactions.

The committee also recognizes that the Department has produced a credible governance structure and underlying directives to ensure that there are no potential conflicts of interest with the private sector employees eligible for exchange in DOD organizations.

### Section 1112—Provisions Relating to the National Security Personnel System

This section would freeze implementation of the National Security Personnel System (NSPS), by prohibiting the transition or hiring of any new employees into the system, as of the date of the mark up of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to transition employees back to the civilian compensation system in effect as of September 30, 2007, within one year of enactment. If the Secretary of Defense determines that NSPS should not be terminated with respect to covered employees, he is required to submit to the President and Congress, within six months of enactment, a written report with the Secretary's views and his reasons for his determination. The section would also amend section 9902 of title 5, United States Codes, to restore to 100 percent, the payment of the annual nation-wide adjustment to employees who are rated above unacceptable.

### Section 1113—Provisions Relating to the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System

This section would freeze implementation of the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS), by prohibiting the transition or hiring of any new employees into the system, as of the date of the mark up of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to transition employees back to the civilian compensation system in effect as of September 30, 2007, within one year of enactment. The section to require return to the previous compensation system does not apply to members of the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service, or an individual in an Intelligence Senior level position under section 1607 of title 10, chapter 83. If the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Director of Office of Personnel Management, determines that the DCIPS pay system should not be terminated with respect to covered employees, he is required to submit to the President and Congress within six months of enactment a written report with the Secretary's views and his reasons for that determination.

### Section 1114—Sense of Congress on Pay Parity for Federal Employees Service at Joint Base McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst

This section would express the sense of Congress that the pay schedules and rates for employees serving at the Joint Base McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst should be the same, and that the Office of Personnel Management should develop regulations ensuring pay parity among civilian employees employed by different military services at joint bases.

# TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

## OVERVIEW

The committee continues its focus on operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, while also responding to current events and emerging needs in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. These efforts are addressed to a great extent in this title. The committee has continued to act to ensure that the Department of Defense has the authority it needs to prosecute the nation's wars, while simultaneously making sure that those war efforts are subjected to thorough oversight. In this title the committee also continues to address the need to build partner capacity.

The committee has long sought to bring a greater focus to the war in Afghanistan and therefore has welcomed the current Administration's renewed effort in that theater. The Administration has announced a new strategy in Afghanistan, and the committee has attempted to bring the necessary oversight to this vital theater, requiring the Administration to conduct regular assessments of the effort in that war and to develop ways of measuring success. Relatively recent efforts in Afghanistan have also garnered the committee's attention, for example the decision to set up the Afghan Public Protection Program, and the committee has acted to better understand this effort and how it will fit in the overall war plan. In a variety of ways, the committee has made clear its belief that: the war in Afghanistan should be fully resourced; that the Afghan National Security Forces should be substantially increased in size and improved in quality; and U.S. efforts should be better coordinated both within the military, and between the Department of Defense and civilian agencies.

United States efforts in Iraq have begun to shift from a focus on active combat to a greater focus on training and equipping the Iraqi Security Forces while beginning the drawdown and redeployment out of Iraq consistent with the policy of the current Administration and the agreement negotiated by the previous Administration with the Republic of Iraq. The committee has correspondingly shifted its oversight efforts to include a greater focus on that redeployment. At the same time, the committee has authorized a continuation of tools, like the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), that remain required. The committee has also acted to ensure that the Department of Defense has a well-developed plan for the disposition of U.S. military equipment that is currently in Iraq.

Finally, the committee has brought an increased level of attention to Pakistan. In the past, Pakistan has largely been seen in the context of the war in Afghanistan. While the committee has continued to view the two countries as almost inextricably linked, the committee has also focused on Pakistan as a matter of great importance in its own right, and not merely a subordinate element of the war in Afghanistan. Similarly, the committee has required the Administration to regularly assess efforts and success in Pakistan. The committee has authorized new tools for the Department of Defense, like the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund, and continued to

work to improve older tools, such as Coalition Support Funds, that have been a major element in the effort to eliminate al Qa'ida and the Taliban in Pakistan.

Our nation has been at war in Iraq and Afghanistan for over seven years. The actions taken by the committee in this title will allow for the better prosecution and improved oversight of those wars, while also assisting Pakistan and working towards the elimination of al Qa'ida and the Taliban.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Building Partnership Capacity

The committee notes that the Administration submitted several legislative proposals designed to create additional authorities to build the capacity of foreign military general purpose forces and special operations forces specifically for deployment to ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee considers these proposals to be excellent examples of a cooperative interagency effort, and commends the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State for their leadership in these matters. However, while the committee strongly approves of the purpose for which these proposals were drafted, the committee believes existing security cooperation authorities are sufficient to meet this requirement. In particular, the committee notes that section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to build the capacity of foreign military forces "to participate in or support military and stability operations in which the United States Armed Forces are a participant" and would consider proposals to use that existing authority for the purposes for which these other legislative provisions were drafted.

### Donated Helicopters for the Afghan National Army

The committee notes that helicopters are essential to building the operational airlift capacity for the Afghan Air Corps and improving the operational effectiveness of the Afghan National Army. The committee welcomes the Department of Defense's decision to purchase 12 Mi-17 aircraft in fiscal year 2010. In addition to those helicopters purchased by the United States, the committee welcomes our allies' commitment to donate helicopters to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan as part of their contributions to train and equip the Afghan National Army. However, the committee notes that, should additional helicopters be donated in the future, such helicopters may require upgrades to comply with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) compatible configuration airframe overhauls to meet airworthiness standards for United States military personnel who provide training and assist once in operations with the Afghan National Army. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue to work with our allies to ensure that donated helicopters are upgraded as necessary to meet the relevant standards.

## Employment for Resettled Iraqis

In section 1235 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), Congress gave the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State the authority to jointly establish and operate a temporary program to offer employment as translators, interpreters, or cultural awareness instructors to citizens of the Republic of Iraq who received a special immigrant visa issued pursuant to section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The committee notes that no such temporary program has yet been established.

The committee believes that the Iraqi recipients of the special immigrant visas possess skills, particularly fluency in Arabic and knowledge of the people and culture of Iraq, which could be useful while the United States is involved in Iraq. Further, the committee notes that many of the recipients of the special immigrant visas worked on behalf of the mission of the coalition forces for years and often at great risk to themselves or their families, and that many Iraqi citizens who worked for or with coalition forces have been threatened or killed in Iraq.

The committee therefore urges the Secretary of Defense to work with the Secretary of State to start the temporary program established in section 1235 of Public Law 110–417 as quickly as possible.

## Increased Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

The committee supports efforts of the Department of Defense to combat terrorism and remains supportive of the authority provided by section 1208(c) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as amended, and commonly referenced as the "1208 Program."

The committee is encouraged with the progress, including reporting protocols, established in pursuit of this authority and urges the Secretary of Defense to maintain the current level of openness, transparency, and consultation on all related activities. Despite experiencing a period of poor execution during fiscal years 2005 and 2006, the managers of the 1208 Program have since experienced numerous examples of success and the committee notes with appreciation the greater detail included in the annual submission of activities. The committee further applauds the constant consultation provided by Special Operations Command (SOCOM) with respect to these activities, and support for congressional delegations traveling to investigate the execution of these initiatives in the field.

The committee is aware that the SOCOM Commander seeks additional program flexibility and stability with respect to the 1208 authority and remains supportive. The committee notes that the 1208 Program is an authorization to utilize funds available, as opposed to a separate appropriation, and believes that such a distinction offers an additional amount of oversight review and discipline. Prior to recommending a specific operation under 1208, the SOCOM Commander must prioritize between operations and maintenance requirements at SOCOM and those that might be best executed by, with, and through foreign irregular forces, groups, or in-

dividuals. The committee believes such a process of prioritization is beneficial.

The committee, however, remains concerned about the 1208 Program in at least two specific respects. First, the committee remains concerned about any attempts to expand 1208 initiatives into a "train and equip" program managed out of SOCOM. The committee fundamentally believes that major train and equip efforts are best maintained elsewhere in the Department of Defense and only after close collaboration between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State.

The committee is also concerned about the past and potential use of private contractors to execute the 1208 program. As a result, the committee directs the Secretary to submit a report summarizing both U.S. and foreign contractor support on these activities and an explanation of the circumstances of each to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2009. The summation should include an explanation about the amount and type of contract award, the name of the award recipient, and details about the nature of both the solicitation and selection process. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary to modify subsequent annual 1208 summations to include information on all future contractor involvement by operation and as appropriate. The committee also directs the Secretary to include information on the intent to use contractor support when notifying the congressional defense committees of an approval of a new operation.

Finally, to provide maximum management flexibility of the 1208 Program, the committee recommends an increase in the annual authorization from $35.0 million to $50.0 million. The committee believes that the additional authority would relieve the threat of funding constraints during planning discussions about potential 1208 operations.

### Increasing the Size of the Afghan National Security Forces and Accelerating the Growth of These Forces

On March 27, 2009, the President announced that he was sending 4,000 additional U.S. forces to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to train and equip Afghan security forces. The President also stated that the emphasis of the U.S. mission in that country was shifting to training and increasing the size of the Afghan security forces so that those forces can eventually take the lead in securing Afghanistan and allow U.S. troops to be redeployed. The President further endorsed the decision to accelerate the growth of the Afghan National Army (ANA) and Afghan National Police (ANP) to 134,000 and 82,000 respectively by 2011. Finally, the President noted that further increases might be necessary, and the target for the ANP was in fact recently increased by almost 5,000 personnel.

The committee supports efforts to accelerate the growth of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) to achieve these targets as well as the ongoing effort to provide for the reform of the ANP. These efforts are vitally important to the ability to ultimately provide for the internal and external security of Afghanistan and should be viewed as an element of a population-based counterinsurgency strategy. However, the committee is concerned that the current target level of about 221,000 security forces is not only inad-

equate to take over the current fight and provide population security from the Taliban, al Qa'ida, other extremist groups, insurgents, warlords, narcotics traffickers, and other anti-government elements, it is likely to be insufficient for the external defense of Afghanistan and to provide basic law enforcement functions internally. U.S. Government officials, ministers of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and outside experts have all proposed different estimates of the levels of security forces necessary to secure Afghanistan in the future. The only element in common to all these estimated is that the proposed levels are substantially higher than current targets—ranging from around 400,000 for both the ANA and ANP to over 350,000 for just the ANA. The committee does not intend to offer its own judgment of what level of ANSF will ultimately be required, but the committee is certain that the current targets are not enough to allow the Afghans to fully take the lead in the ongoing conflict and to allow for the responsible redeployment of U.S. troops out of Afghanistan.

While the committee approves of efforts to increase the rate of growth of the ANSF, it is concerned that there are significant challenges in accelerating the growth of Afghan security forces. The committee notes that the President has called for an increase in the rate of training to allow the ANA to grow by about 50,000 and the ANP to grow by about 10,000 over two years. While the situations in the Republic of Iraq and Afghanistan are not directly comparable, the committee notes that between the beginning of 2006 and the end of 2008, Multi National Security and Transition Command—Iraq trained about 140,000 Iraqi Ministry of the Interior police personnel and about 150,000 personnel in forces of the Iraqi Ministry of Defense.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to undertake a serious and urgent review to determine what sustainable levels of ANSF are required for the future to provide security in Afghanistan and to allow the redeployment of U.S. troops. As part of this review, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consider what steps can be taken to accelerate training of ANSF personnel to allow the Afghan National Army and Afghan National Police to achieve the size and quality necessary to provide security in Afghanistan and allow for the responsible redeployment of U.S. forces.

### The North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Coordination Center

The committee supports the Department of Defense's initiative to create and strengthen a common special operations structure within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The committee notes that the NATO Special Operations Coordination Center (NSCC), created at NATO's summit in Riga, Latvia, in 2006, has now achieved full operational capability and has shown considerable promise since its inception, supporting the first-ever International Security Assistance Force–Special Operations Forces (ISAF–SOF) command in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. As a result, the committee urges the Department of Defense, working with the Department of State, to take further steps to institutionalize the NSCC within NATO.

Accordingly, and with recognition of the primary role played by the Department of Defense in launching and supporting the Center, the committee recommends $30.0 million, an increase of $10.0 million for the operation of the NSCC. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends $20.0 million for military construction associated with the Center. The committee encourages increased efforts to: improve coordination and cooperation between special operations forces of partner NATO nations and aspirant nations of NATO; facilitate joint operations by the special operations forces of partner NATO nations and aspirant nations of NATO; support special operations forces peculiar capabilities; promote special operations forces intelligence and informational requirements within NATO; and promote interoperability through the development of common equipment standards, tactics, techniques and procedures, and through the execution of a multinational education and training program. The committee also urges the Commander, Special Operations Command, to pursue SOF-peculiar funding support to the NSCC and to NATO special operations more broadly.

The committee believes that U.S. national security interests are well served when allied NATO and partner nations develop highly trained special operations forces and maintain interoperable capabilities with those exhibited by United States SOF personnel. The committee notes that military construction is needed to support the NSCC and, elsewhere in this report, recommends funds to support this requirement.

The committee is concerned that the future success of the NSCC is endangered by the lack of a clear organizational proponent within the Department of Defense. Accordingly, elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to certify that executive agent responsibility has been assigned and to detail the Department's efforts to foster special operations capabilities within NATO.

### Piracy Off the Somali Coast and Within Somalia

During the early months of the 111th Congress, the committee held several briefings and hearings on piracy off the coast of Somalia. This increasingly complex and dangerous challenge, organized from within Somalia and conducted primarily within its territorial waters, has become much more sophisticated over the last year, as have the organizations behind these actions. The committee is concerned about reports of funding of pirate attacks from outside groups and individuals. The committee is also concerned about possible links or future links to other criminal, extremist, or terrorist groups that are already known to be operating in the same areas of Somalia. While the efforts of the United States Navy and its international partners have succeeded in thwarting a number of attacks, there does not appear to be a strategy for dealing with the organizations ashore in Somalia. The committee is concerned that as long as the individuals responsible for organizing the attacks retain their safe havens, the problem will grow into an even greater national security risk for the United States and its allies. Historically, the only successful way to eliminate pirate attacks has been to eliminate their access to safe havens ashore.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by October 1, 2009, to the Senate Committee on

Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the Department of Defense's role in the short- and long-term strategies for combating piracy off the coast of Somalia as well as the strategy for dealing with the parent organization ashore in Somalia. At a minimum, the report should include the following:

(1) An assessment of the effectiveness of United States military assets currently deployed to the region under command of Joint Combined Task Force One Five One and future plans for such deployments.

(2) The efforts of the Department of Defense to deal with the command structure responsible for organizing the attacks.

(3) A discussion of any links between Somali piracy and any other criminal, extremist, or terrorist organizations.

(4) The extent to which the Department of Defense is addressing foreign funding for acts of piracy from groups or individuals outside of Somalia.

Planning for Logistical Challenges in Iraq and Afghanistan

The committee is concerned that as the Department of Defense begins to drawdown forces in the Republic of Iraq and increase force levels in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, it will face an array of challenges. For example, the Department's ability to move equipment and materiel from Iraq may be constrained, impacting its ability to quickly deploy these resources in Afghanistan or elsewhere. U.S. forces are also significantly stressed from ongoing operations, thereby affecting the availability of trained and ready personnel to deploy to Afghanistan. Availability of equipment also may be limited as much has been deployed to Iraq and many prepositioned assets have been withdrawn to support ongoing operations. Further, the ability to transport personnel and equipment into Afghanistan will likely be constrained due to the limited infrastructure and topography of Afghanistan. Additionally, efforts in both countries will require significant combat support capabilities, which are already significantly stressed because of operational demands over the past several years. The Department will also need to assess its requirements for specialized capabilities, such as intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, to support increased force levels in Afghanistan, given its current allocation of such assets to support ongoing operations in Iraq. Finally, the extent to which contractors will be used and available to support deployed U.S. forces in both countries must be considered as well as how oversight of these contractors will be ensured.

Given all of these factors, it is critical that the Department develop sound plans with realistic assumptions, carefully assess risks and develop alternative mitigation strategies, and implement clear leadership accountability to guide both its planning and execution. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report on its plans for executing the drawdown in Iraq and buildup in Afghanistan to the congressional defense committees within 180 days. Such a report should identify organizational responsibilities at the national level for developing the overall plan and synchronizing the efforts, including planned movements of forces and

equipment with timelines, and provide information on the analysis performed to reach these decisions. In particular, the committee is interested in understanding: the underlying assumptions used to formulate the plans; the nature of any risk assessments and mitigation strategies; the level of combat support capabilities required, including required contractor support, and how the Department plans to provide this capability; and any analysis performed to assess the feasibility of the current timelines for drawdown and build-up given competing demands on the availability of personnel, equipment, and specialized capabilities.

### Report on Department of Defense Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund

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 April 10, 2010, on efforts of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2010 to enhance the counterinsurgency capabilities of Pakistan's security forces. The report should include the following:

(1) A description of the mechanisms within the Department of Defense to receive funds that are transferred from the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCCF) of the Department of State to the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) of the Department of Defense and to manage the execution of such funds, including the following:

a. The office accountable for the acceptance of transferred funds.

b. The office responsible for the transfer of funds to the United States Central Command.

c. The office responsible for oversight and the execution of transferred funds.

(2) A description of the spending plan of United States Central Command for the PCF, as submitted in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2010.

(3) A description of any adjustments made to the spending plan described in paragraph (2), including an identification of any departments, agencies, or other organizations responsible for making such adjustments.

(4) A description of any requirements or conditions placed on PCF funds prior to the transfer of such funds to the Office of Defense Representative for Pakistan (ODRP), including an identification of any departments, agencies, or other organizations responsible for setting such requirements or conditions.

(5) A description of any delays in transfers of PCF funds to the ODRP.

(6) A description of any goals, objectives, or emerging requirements that the ODRP was not able to meet as a result of any delays in transfers of PCF funds to the ODRP.

(7) Any other relevant information regarding the execution of PCF funds.

### Security Cooperation and Security Assistance

The committee notes that over the last several years, the Department of Defense has developed a number of security cooperation

programs to increase the capability of the military forces of certain partner nations, broadly referred to as Building Partnership Capacity (BPC). The committee commends the Department for proactively adapting to a rapidly evolving operating environment but notes that Congress continues to consider the future, permanent form these BPC authorities will take.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report not later than April 1, 2010, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the timeliness, effectiveness, and interagency coordination of Department of Defense BPC programs relative to the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) security assistance programs that conduct similar activities. At a minimum, the report should include an assessment of:

(1) Where, if anywhere, BPC programs and BPC-like security assistance programs in the Department of State and USAID do not meet requirements identified by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State.

(2) The long-term plans for these programs, to include resourcing and legal authorities that may be required.

(3) The requirements of other executive branch stakeholders in the program, beyond the department or agency administrating a particular program, including, but not be limited to relevant ambassadors, USAID missions, combatant commands, and Department of State regional bureaus.

Security Concerns Involving North Korea

The committee is seriously concerned by the nuclear test of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) on May 25, 2009, as well as North Korea's launch of a long-range Taepodong–2 missile on April 5, 2009, and other recent missile launch activities. North Korea's nuclear and missile activities constitute a threat to international peace and security and are in blatant defiance of the United Nations (U.N.) Security Council.

The committee supports recent U.N. Security Council actions, which condemn North Korea's reckless and threatening provocations and confirm that they violate international law; and urges appropriate action by the U.N. to generate tough consequences for North Korea. The committee also supports actions by the Administration that urge North Korea to verifiably abandon its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, and refrain from further provocations in this regard. This includes efforts to work with U.S. allies and partners in the Six-Party Talks and other members of the U.N. Security Council to achieve the verifiable elimination of the North Korea's nuclear weapons program and the reduction of tensions on the Korean peninsula.

The committee is carefully monitoring the security situation on the Korean peninsula and in the region and encourages the Department of Defense and the interagency to keep the committee fully informed of any significant developments.

## Security Developments in Pakistan and Implications for Afghanistan

The committee is seriously concerned about instability in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, which has steeply increased since mid-2007, and the implications for U.S. national security and security in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the region. The committee notes that it has held hearings and briefings throughout the last year on a range of security issues involving Pakistan, including:

(1) The security situation in Pakistan's border areas, and any implications for Afghanistan;

(2) Internal instability in Pakistan, including increasing militant attacks in the country's settled areas;

(3) The security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons, including the command and control structure;

(4) Counterterrorism operations by Pakistan's military;

(5) Pakistan-India tensions following the November 2008 terrorist bombings in Mumbai, India;

(6) U.S. strategy and policy involving Pakistan, including measures of progress toward achieving goals and objectives;

(7) U.S. military and other security-related assistance for Pakistan, and possible limits, conditions, and performance requirements relating to such assistance;

(8) Department of Defense (DOD) Coalition Support Fund reimbursements to Pakistan and possible alternatives that could achieve the same goals and objectives;

(9) Information regarding possible U.S. military involvement in Pakistan; and

(10) The U.S. Security Development Plan for Pakistan, including efforts to: train and equip the Pakistani Frontier Corp; increase the counterinsurgency capabilities of the Pakistan military; and establish Border Coordination Centers.

The committee welcomes the Administration's efforts to prioritize issues involving Pakistan, and its commitment to strengthening the U.S.-Pakistan partnership. The committee believes the Administration's new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, its appointment of a U.S. Special Representative for the two countries, and its regional approach to issues involving Pakistan are positive developments. The committee also appreciates the Administration's efforts to improve the effectiveness of U.S. funding and other assistance for Pakistan, including efforts to achieve the appropriate balance between military and non-military assistance.

However, the committee emphasizes that implementation of the Afghanistan-Pakistan strategy, measures of effectiveness, and accountability are also critical, as well as close cooperation with Pakistan in these areas. The committee also notes that the Administration continues to request significant funding from Congress and the American people for efforts in Pakistan. The committee has been conducting vigorous oversight of such DOD funding, and will continue to do so to ensure that funding achieves its intended goals and objectives and is not without limits.

The committee appreciates the information that has been provided by the Department of Defense and the interagency on Pakistan. The committee encourages the Department and the inter-

agency to remain actively engaged on security matters involving Pakistan and to keep the committee fully informed of any significant developments.

### Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction and Women

Section 103(a)(7) of the Afghan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7513(a)(7)) states that the objectives of U.S. assistance in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan should be aimed toward advancing political and human rights, health care, education, training, security, and shelter for women and girls. However, it has come to the committee's attention that the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) and the Inspector General for the Department of Defense (DOD IG) have not conducted their auditing missions with a focus on social, economic, and political empowerment of women in Afghanistan.

The committee notes that the protection of the rights of women and girls in Afghanistan and their full and equal participation in Afghan civil society is essential to the development of a stable and democratic Afghanistan. To achieve these goals, the United States Government must continue to commit resources to advance the rights of women throughout Afghanistan. However, without adequate metrics, it will remain difficult for Congress to assess the effectiveness of U.S. assistance in support of girls and women in Afghanistan. Therefore, the committee recommends that SIGAR and DOD IG modify their auditing and assessment protocols to include the impact that U.S. development assistance has on the lives of girls and women as part of their reporting requirements to Congress.

### Train and Equip Authorities

The committee has closely watched the application and evolution of the "train and equip" authority also known as "1206" since its inception through section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). In general, and with some notable exceptions, the committee regards the historical execution of this authority favorably and concludes that it is an important aspect of a combatant commander's theater engagement strategy. The committee recognizes that it has become an important tool for building partner capacity and security cooperation.

In the past, the committee has regarded this and related authorities as part of the foreign assistance family of authorities that has traditionally resided within the Department of State's purview. However, as the committee has observed the execution and growth of this program over time, the committee has come to see a distinction between traditional foreign assistance-related authorities designed to assist a foreign country to meet what it perceives as its own national security requirements within the context of a larger United States foreign policy framework, and this new type of authority, which generally represents the Secretary of Defense's assessment of a combatant commander's need to build certain capacities in partner nations to satisfy specific theater security requirements.

This fundamental distinction of purpose between requirements generated on behalf of the foreign nation (consistent with U.S. policy), and requirements generated through a Department of Defense-led assessment of the United States' national security needs is significant. It is critical to the understanding of the future of these authorities. The committee believes it is appropriate for the Secretary of Defense to have a major role in the latter case. In the past, the committee has supported the notion that these "train and equip" authorities might better reside within the Department of State's suite of foreign assistance tools. This may still prove to be the optimal case in the future. Nevertheless, the committee supports the idea of retaining the "dual key" approach that requires Secretary of State concurrence, but emphasizes that, whatever the final, permanent form these authorities take, the Secretary of Defense must play a primary role in generating requirements.

Additionally, the committee is concerned that the Department of State still lacks the capacity to execute these authorities. The Department of State has not yet reformed the management of its foreign assistance programs in a manner that would give the committee confidence that the Department of State is ready to assume responsibility for Department of Defense security cooperation programs. The committee looks forward to continuing interaction with the Department of Defense and the Department of State to design the enduring form these authorities will take when this temporary authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 2011.

The committee notes that, so far, the bulk of the application of this authority has been for the counterterrorism purpose. That, coupled with the planned reorganization within the Office of the Secretary of Defense to house the office which oversees this authority under the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict & Interdependent Capabilities, threatens to create an enduring perception that this is primarily intended to be counterterrorism authority. "1206" authority was meant for a fairly broad purpose, both to train and equip partner countries to conduct counterterrorism operations and also to participate in military or stability operations in conjunction with United States forces. The committee cautions against the sub-optimization of the authority and therefore would like to make clear that, as an example, it would entertain proposals to use this authority to train and equip partner nations and allies with a demonstrated need for assistance for participation in third theatres, including ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

## U.S.-China Maritime Issues

The committee welcomes recent positive exchanges between the navies of the U.S. and the People's Republic of China. Such exchanges are particularly important given the harassment of an unarmed U.S. ship, the U.S.N.S. Impeccable, by Chinese ships in international waters on March 8, 2009. This incident violated China's requirement under international law to operate with due regard for the rights and safety of other lawful users of the sea.

The committee urges more U.S.-China engagement and cooperation on maritime issues of mutual concern. The committee also supports the Administration's call for Chinese ships to act responsibly and refrain from provocative activities that could lead to mis-

calculation or a collision at sea, endangering vessels and the lives of U.S. and Chinese mariners.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

#### Section 1201—Modification and Extension of Authority for Security and Stabilization Assistance

This section would extend the authority for general security and stabilization assistance provided in section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1207(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) through September 30, 2010, but would reduce the authorized amount to $25.0 million. This section would not extend the specific authority for assistance to the Republic of Georgia.

As stated in the conference report (H. Rept. 109–360) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the committee does not believe it is appropriate to provide long-term funding from the Department of Defense to the Department of State so that the Department of State can fulfill its statutory requirements. While the projects undertaken with funds provided by this authority are worthy, the committee is concerned that insufficient progress has been made in building the capacity within the Department of State to assume the statutory and fiscal responsibility necessary to fulfill its statutory requirements. Moreover, the committee believes that Department of Defense operation and maintenance funds should be used for core missions of the Department of Defense including security cooperation. The committee stresses that it has always been the intent of Congress for this to be a temporary authority and urges the Administration to develop capacity within the Department of State so that this transfer authority is no longer required.

#### Section 1202—Increase of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

This provision would increase the amount of funds available to the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals supporting or facilitating military operations by U.S. special operations forces to combat terrorism. This provision would increase the amount that may be expended from available funds during any fiscal year from $35.0 million to $50.0 million.

#### Section 1203—Modification of Report on Foreign-Assistance Related Programs Carried Out by the Department of Defense

This section would make permanent the reporting requirement in section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requiring a report on certain assistance provided to foreign nations. It would also add the humanitarian and civil assistance provided through the Combatant Commander's Initiative Fund as an additional reporting requirement.

### Section 1204—Report on Authorities to Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces and Related Matters

This section would require a report from the President by March 1, 2010, on the relationship between security cooperation authorities the Department of Defense uses to build the capacity of foreign military forces and the security assistance authorities the Department of State and other agencies use to train and equip foreign military forces. The report required by this section would also include information regarding: the strengths and weaknesses of current laws governing and relating to the provision of this type of assistance; recommended changes, if any, to those laws; any organizational and procedural changes that should be made in the Department of Defense and the Department of State to improve their ability to conduct such programs; and the resources and funding mechanisms required to assure adequate funding for such programs.

## SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND PAKISTAN

### Section 1211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Certain Purposes Relating to Iraq

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized by this Act to establish permanent U.S. military installations or bases in the Republic of Iraq or to exercise U.S. control of the oil resources of Iraq.

### Section 1212—Reauthorization of Commanders' Emergency Response Program

This section would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 106–163), as amended most recently by section 1214 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to modify the authorized level of funding for the activities on the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP). This section would authorize $1.3 billion for activities in fiscal year 2010.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has been unable to provide adequate justification to date for the budget requests for the Commanders Emergency Response Program. It was for this reason that the committee, as part of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, directed the Secretary of Defense to submit a report detailing how the Department of Defense formulated the CERP requests. Unfortunately, that report did not adequately address the committee's concerns, and the Department of Defense to date continues to be unable to satisfactorily justify the request for fiscal year 2010. The Department has been unable to explain how changes in basing and operating patterns in the Republic of Iraq, low spending rates for fiscal year 2009 in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, differences in operating environments in areas of Afghanistan, and an overall reduction in the force levels from the high points in the past are taken into account in developing the CERP budget request. In addition, the committee has been informed by the Department that

the funding for CERP in Afghanistan will be increased significantly over the past two years, but the Department has been unable to provide information about increased personnel to the contracting and contract administration functions. The committee is concerned that without these additional personnel in Afghanistan, the Department will be unable to successfully manage and oversee CERP to ensure that authorized and appropriated funding is used effectively.

Finally, the committee notes that the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, and the Army Audit Agency are currently conducting or are planning to conduct major reviews of controls and accountability of funds in the Commanders' Emergency Response Program and to determine if procedures and guidance are sufficient to appropriately implement the program. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will act to implement any recommendations that may result from these reviews and will keep the committee informed of his actions.

### Section 1213—Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical and military support provided by that nation to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom (Coalition Support Fund reimbursements). The total amount of reimbursements made under this authority during fiscal year 2010 could not exceed $1.6 billion. The Secretary would be required to notify the congressional defense committees and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs not less than 15 days before making any reimbursement under this section, and submit detailed notifications for reimbursements for the Islamic Republic of Pakistan through fiscal year 2011. The Secretary would also be required to submit quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on any reimbursements made under this section.

### Section 1214—Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund

As addressed in title XV of this Act, the Department of Defense requested $700.0 million for fiscal year 2010 for a new Pakistan Counter-insurgency Capabilities Fund (PCCF). The committee has not provided the Department of Defense with funding for the PCCF because of the understanding between the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and the respective authorizing and appropriating congressional committees that for fiscal year 2010, the PCCF is to be funded from amounts authorized and appropriated to the 150 (International Affairs) Account, and that such amounts may be transferred to the 050 (National Defense) Account.

However, this section would establish a Department of Defense "Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund" (PCF), which would consist of: (1) amounts appropriated to the PCF for fiscal year 2009; and (2) amounts transferred to the PCF by the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense. Amounts in the PCF would be available to the Secretary of Defense to improve the coun-

terinsurgency capabilities of the security forces of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan (including Pakistan's military, Frontier Corps, and other security forces), and to provide limited humanitarian assistance to the people of Pakistan as part of civil-military training exercises for Pakistani security forces receiving assistance under the PCF. Except as provided in section 1215 (regarding the program to provide for the registration and end-use monitoring of defense articles and defense services transferred to Afghanistan and Pakistan) of this Act, amounts in the PCF would be authorized notwithstanding any other provision of law.

The Secretary of Defense would also be able to transfer amounts within the PCF to any Department of Defense account, or with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and the head of the relevant department or agency, to any non-intelligence related federal account. The amounts transferred would be for the purposes of this section, and subject to account conditions and limitations. If any transferred amounts are not necessary, such amounts could be transferred back to the PCF and would be subject to the originally applicable conditions and limitations.

Amounts could not be obligated or transferred from the PCF until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense notifies the congressional defense committees, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in writing of the details of the proposed obligation or transfer.

The committee has not provided the Department of Defense with the authority it requested to provide assistance to irregular security forces operating within Pakistan since the committee does not currently have enough information regarding the Department's intended use of such authority.

The committee emphasizes the critical importance of security and stability in Pakistan to U.S. national security and regional security, and the importance of assisting Pakistan to achieve necessary goals of objectives in this area. By authorizing the PCF, this section provides the Commander of the United States Central Command (CENTCOM) with a useful tool to train and equip Pakistan's security forces. The committee intends to closely monitor the management of PCF funds and the transfer of such funds from the Department of State to the Department of Defense, and urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the CENTCOM Commander receives the funding and resources needed to execute the train and equip program effectively. The committee also urges the Department of State, over the next year, to develop the capacity to manage this important program.

Section 1215—Program to Provide for the Registration and End-Use Monitoring of Defense Articles and Defense Services Transferred to Afghanistan and Pakistan

This section would establish an export and transfer policy for the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan that would require that the President implement a registration and monitoring system for all defense articles provided to the Government of Afghanistan or the Government of Pakistan or other individuals or groups in Afghanistan or in Pakistan.

This section would require the President to certify that a system for registration and monitoring is in place before defense articles

are provided to the Government of Afghanistan or the Government of Pakistan or any other group, organization, or individual in Afghanistan or in Pakistan. The committee expects that the end-use monitoring program would be at least equivalent in scope to existing U.S. end-use monitoring programs. This section would also provide an exemption for an item from registration and monitoring procedures if the President submits a notification to congressional defense committees. This section would require the President to conduct periodic reviews of the registration and monitoring system and report findings to the congressional defense committees. This section would take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This section would provide the President with the authority to delay the effective date of this section up to 90 days following a formal notification to the congressional defense committees.

Section 1216—Report on Campaign Plans for Iraq and Afghanistan

This section would require that the Comptroller General submit, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, separate assessments of the campaign plans for the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would additionally require updates to these assessments if the existing campaign plans are significantly altered. This section would provide an exception to the requirement for an assessment if the Comptroller General stated in writing that a previously issued report would substantially fulfill the requirement for an initial assessment.

Section 1217—Required Assessments of United States Efforts in Afghanistan

This section would require that the President, 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter, conduct an assessment of progress in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would require that the President assess progress in at least four areas including: assisting the Afghan people to build a legitimate and functional government; helping the government and people of Afghanistan to spread the rule of law and reduce corruption; assisting the government and people of Afghanistan to reduce the ability of anti-government elements to operate, establish safe havens, and carry out attacks in and from Afghanistan; and assisting the people and government of Afghanistan to improve the legal economy of that country. This section would require that the President develop goals and timelines to achieve those goals for each of the listed areas and any others he deemed necessary. This section would further require that the President develop metrics and measures of effectiveness to allow for the thorough and accurate assessment of these areas. Finally, this section would require that the President report to Congress on this assessment and how it was conducted.

Section 1218—Report on Responsible Redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a quarterly report, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, or December 31, 2009, whichever is later, to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, on the responsible redeployment of U.S. forces out of the Republic of Iraq. This section would require that the Secretary of Defense report on: the number of United States military personnel in Iraq for each month of the reporting period; the number of facilities in Iraq occupied by 100 or more U.S. military personnel; an estimate of the amount of equipment and other material that has been removed from Iraq in the reporting period; an assessment of detainee operations and releases; and information about how the Commander, Multi-National Force-Iraq and the Secretary of Defense assess risk associated with the drawdown and make recommendations about maintaining or changing the pace of the redeployment out of Iraq.

Section 1219—Report on Afghan Public Protection Program

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense submit a report on the Afghan Public Protection Program to the congressional defense committees 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The report would include an assessment of the program in the initial pilot districts of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and an assessment of the future of the program including how decisions about the program would be made.

Section 1220—Updates of Report on Command and Control Structure for Military Forces Operating in Afghanistan

This section would clarify that any updates of the report on command and control arrangements in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan as required by section 1216 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) can be included as an element of the reports on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan as required by section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

The committee notes that: a new commander for U.S. forces in the Afghanistan has been nominated; the decision has been made to add an additional three-star general officer to the U.S. headquarters in Afghanistan; and the President has decided to deploy 21,000 U.S. troops to southern Afghanistan, 17,000 of whom will fall under the International Assistance Security Force. These changes could help create an improved system of command and control in Afghanistan or could further complicate an already-complex chain of command structure. The committee expects that the Department of Defense will continue its efforts to clarify command and control relationships in Afghanistan and to report to Congress on these efforts as required in section 1216 of Public Law 110–417.

Section 1221—Report on Payments Made by United States Armed Forces to Residents of Afghanistan as Compensation for Losses Caused by United States Military Operations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a semi-annual report, beginning not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to the congressional defense committees on payments made to noncombatant residents of the Islamic

Republic of Afghanistan for losses caused by United States military operations. The initial report would include payments made over the previous five year period while updates to the report would include information on payments made since the issuance of the previous report. The reporting requirement would terminate on September 30, 2012.

Section 1222—Assessment and Report on United States-Pakistan Military Relations and Cooperation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to conduct an assessment of possible alternatives to Department of Defense reimbursements to Pakistan for logistical, military, or other support provided by Pakistan to, or in connection with, U.S. military operations (Coalition Support Fund reimbursements), which could encourage the Pakistani military to undertake counterterrorism and counterinsurgency operations and achieve the goals and objectives for long-term U.S.-Pakistan military relations and cooperation. The assessment should include alternatives that are not reimbursements. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report on the assessment.

Section 1223—Required Assessments of Progress toward Security and Stability in Pakistan

This section would require the President, 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter, to conduct an assessment of progress toward long-term security and stability in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This section would specifically require the President to assess the effectiveness of efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al Qa'ida, its affiliated networks, and other violent extremist forces in Pakistan; eliminate the safe havens for such forces; and prevent the return of such forces to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan or Pakistan. It would also require the President to assess the effectiveness of U.S. security assistance to Pakistan to achieve this strategic goal. The areas assessed should include: (1) progress toward Pakistan no longer being a safe haven for terrorist or insurgent networks, including improvements in the capacity of Pakistani military forces to conduct effective counterterrorism and counterinsurgency operations; (2) progress toward increasingly effective civilian governance throughout Pakistan; and (3) progress toward creating conditions for long-term economic and social growth and stability in Pakistan.

For any area assessed, this section would require the President, in consultation with the Government of Pakistan and the governments of other countries the President determines to be necessary, to establish goals and objectives and timelines for meeting such goals and objectives. This section would further require the President to develop metrics that allow for the accurate and thorough assessment of these areas. This section would also require the

President to report to Congress on the assessment and how it was conducted.

Section 1224—Repeal of GAO War-Related Reporting Requirement

This section would eliminate the requirement that the Government Accountability Office submit quarterly reports to Congress on the costs of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom as required under section 1221(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163).

Section 1225—Plan to Govern the Disposition of Specified Defense Items in Iraq

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a plan to govern the disposition of major end items and tactical equipment in the Republic of Iraq. The plan would include: the identification of an individual, position, or office that would be responsible for making recommendations about the disposition of covered equipment; a mechanism for conducting a thorough inventory of covered equipment, including any that might be operated by contractors; a mechanism for soliciting input regarding competing requirements for covered equipment; a mechanism for identification of, and disposition of, covered equipment that is not economically viable to move out of Iraq or needed for other requirements; and a mechanism for ensuring that the views of other agencies of the Federal government are taken into account. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees at the time of the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2011 outlining the plan required by this section. This section would require that the Comptroller General of the United States review the plan required by this section and make recommendations. Finally, this section would clarify that this section would not grant any additional authority to transfer equipment to Iraq or any other entity outside the Department of Defense.

The redeployment of U.S. forces and their associated equipment from the Republic of Iraq by December 31, 2011, will be a monumental undertaking. The committee understands that there are more than 31 million items, 100,000 vehicles, 120,000 containers, and tens of thousands of tons of ammunition in Iraq that must be moved or otherwise disposed. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense does not currently have an approved plan or mechanism for evaluating competing priorities when making decisions about the disposition of equipment, and that this shortfall could result in a less-than-optimal disposition of large amounts of equipment. The committee expects that the Department of Defense will continue to keep the committee informed during the development of the plan required by this section.

Section 1226—Civilian Ministry of Defense Advisor Program

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide civilian advisors to the Republic of Iraq and Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to provide institutional, ministerial-level advice and training to senior civilian and military officials of those countries. This section would require

that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State jointly formulate any program to provide advice and training. This section would limit the amount of advice and training to $13.1 million in any fiscal year. Finally, the authority provided by this section would terminate on September 30, 2010.

The committee is concerned that the present effort to provide mentors and advisors is not well coordinated, particularly the effort to provide those mentors and advisors to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee expects that the authority and requirements in this section would lead to a substantial improvement in coordination in this effort between the Department of Defense and the Department of State. The committee expects that the process of selecting appropriate personnel from the Department of Defense and placing them in appropriate positions in the ministries in Iraq and Afghanistan would be coordinated with and transparent to the Secretary of State. The committee further expects the Secretary of Defense to keep the committee informed about the effort to provide mentors and advisors in Afghanistan.

Finally, the committee notes that the authority provided in this section would only be for one year, as was requested by the Administration. The committee is concerned that the Ministries of Defense in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan may require assistance for several years and that a one-year authority will be insufficient to address this need. The committee therefore expects the Secretary of Defense to examine carefully the need for a fully-resourced, multi-year authority and to report back to the committee.

Section 1227—Report on the Status of Interagency Coordination in the Afghanistan and Operation Enduring Freedom Theater of Operations

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State submit to the appropriate congressional committees, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, a report on the status of interagency cooperation in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and Operation Enduring Freedom theater of operations. This section would require that the report include information regarding the staffing structure of Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan, including the role of non-Armed Forces personnel; the use of members of the Armed Forces for reconstruction activities outside the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense; coordination between United States-led and NATO ISAF-led reconstruction programs; and unfilled staffing and resource requirements for reconstruction.

Section 1228—Sense of Congress Supporting United States Policy for Afghanistan

This section expresses the sense of Congress that the United States has a vital national security interest in ensuring that the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan does not once again become a haven for terrorists; that the President's announced strategy requires an integrated civil-military counterinsurgency strategy and a sustained commitment of military resources to operations in Afghanistan; that the President should provide the necessary military

forces to conduct combat operations in Afghanistan; and that Congress should provide commanders in Afghanistan with the funding and resources needed to succeed.

Section 1229—Analysis of Required Force Levels and Types of Forces Needed to Secure Southern and Eastern Regions of Afghanistan

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, at the request of the Commander of United States Forces for Afghanistan (USFOR–A), to enter into a contract with a Federally Funded Research Development Center to provide analysis and support to the commander to assist with analyzing the required force levels and types of forces needed to secure the southern and eastern regions of Afghanistan. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use up to $3,000,000 from the amounts appropriated for Defense-wide operation and maintenance accounts to accomplish this purpose.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1231—NATO Special Operations Coordination Center

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to allocate up to $30.0 million to improve the capacity and capabilities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Coordination Center. Accordingly, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to allocate such funds to:

(1) Improve coordination and cooperation among the special operations forces of NATO nations;

(2) Facilitate joint operations by the special operations forces of NATO nations;

(3) Support special operations-peculiar command, control, and communications capabilities;

(4) Promote special operations forces' intelligence and informational requirements within the NATO structure; and

(5) Promote interoperability through the development of common equipment standards, tactics, techniques, and procedures, and through the execution of a multinational education and training program.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to certify 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 that the Department of Defense (DOD) has assigned executive agent responsibility for the NATO Special Operations Coordination Center to an appropriate DOD organization.

Section 1232—Annual Report on Military Power of the Islamic Republic of Iran

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report by March 1 of each year to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the current and future military strategy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This section would require that the report

contain: information related to Iran's strategy; an assessment of Iran's conventional capabilities; an assessment of Iran's unconventional capabilities, including special operations forces and terrorist proxies; and an assessment of Iranian capabilities related to nuclear capabilities and missile forces.

### Section 1233—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) by changing the title of the report to "Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China," and by making certain clarifying and technical changes.

This section would also expand the scope of the report. It would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and Secretary of Energy, to provide analyses and forecasts of developments regarding U.S. engagement and cooperation with the People's Republic of China on security matters, such engagement and cooperation through military-to-military contacts, and the U.S. strategy for such engagement and cooperation in the future. Specifically, the committee requests the Secretary to provide information regarding U.S.-China engagement and cooperation in the areas of: counter-terrorism; counter-piracy; maritime safety; strategic capabilities, including space, nuclear and cyber warfare capabilities; nuclear policy and strategy; nonproliferation, including export controls, border security, and illicit arms transfers and interdictions; energy and environmental security; peacekeeping; humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, including in the area of military medicine; crisis management, including use of the "defense hotline"; regional security issues, including in the Taiwan Strait and South and East China Seas and on the Korean peninsula; and regional security organizations and other mechanisms.

In addition, this section would incorporate the reporting requirement under section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) on U.S.-China military-to-military contacts into the reporting requirement under section 1202 of that Act. It would also include a new requirement for a comprehensive and coordinated strategy for U.S.-China military-to-military contacts.

This section would further require the Secretary of Defense to provide additional information regarding military and security developments involving China that the Secretary considers relevant to U.S. national security.

### Section 1234—Report on Impacts of Drawdown Authorities on the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report at the time of the President's budget submission to the congressional defense committees and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the impact of drawdown authorities on the Department of Defense. This section would require that the report address several potential impacts on the Department of Defense, including cost to replace equipment or other items; potential impacts on readiness; and im-

pacts on the ability of the United States armed forces to meet the requirements of ongoing contingency operations, the impact on the level of risk on the ability of the armed forces to execute the missions called for in the National Military Strategy, the impact on the ability of the armed forces to reset; the impacts on training, and the ability of the reserve forces to respond to domestic emergencies.

### Section 1235—Risk Assessment of United States Space Export Control Policy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to carry out an assessment of the national security risks of removing satellites and related components from the United States Munitions List (USML).

The assessment required by this section must include a review of the space and space-related technologies currently on the USML; an assessment of the national security risks of removing certain space and space-related technologies from the list; and an examination of the degree to which other nations' export control policies control or limit the export of space and space-related technologies for national security reasons. The assessment must also include: recommendations for the space and space-related technologies that should remain on, or may be candidates for removal from, the USML; the safeguards and verifications necessary to prevent the proliferation and diversion of such space and space-related technologies, confirm appropriate end use and end users, and minimize the risk that such space and space-related technologies could be used in foreign missile, space, or other applications that may pose a threat to the security of the United States; and improvements to the space export control policy and processes of the United States that do not adversely affect national security.

This section also requires the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to submit a report to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the assessment required within 180 days after enactment of this Act.

### Section 1236—Patriot Air and Missile Defense Battery in Poland

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to seek to deploy a United States Army Patriot air and missile defense battery and the personnel required to operate and maintain such battery to the Republic of Poland by 2012, consistent with United States national security interests and the Declaration on Strategic Cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland (signed in Warsaw, Poland, on August 20, 2008), and subject to the availability of appropriations.

### Section 1237—Report on Potential Foreign Military Sales of the F–22A Fighter Aircraft to Japan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs within 30 days after the

date of the enactment of this Act on the potential for foreign military sales of the F–22A fighter aircraft to the Government of Japan.

### Section 1238—Expansion of United States-Russian Federation Joint Center to Include Exchange of Data on Missile Defense

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Government of the Russian Federation, to expand the United States-Russian Federation joint center for the exchange of data from early warning systems for launches of ballistic missiles, as established pursuant to section 1231 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), to include the exchange of data on missile defense-related activities.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on plans for expansion of the joint data exchange center to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

This section would also make $5.0 million available from the fiscal year 2010 authorization for PE 64869A within research, development, test, and evaluation for the Army to carry out this section.

## TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

### OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $404.1 million for fiscal year 2010, representing a decrease of $30.0 million from the amount authorized in fiscal year 2009, excluding any supplemental funds. The request contained the following decreases: $13.6 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in the Russian Federation; $1.0 million for chemical weapons destruction; $9.0 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia; $32.3 million for biological threat reduction in states of the former Soviet Union (FSU); $3.0 million for defense and military contacts; and $10.0 million for new CTR initiatives. The request also contained the following increases: $0.4 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine; $5.6 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia; $31.6 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention in the FSU; and $1.3 million for other assessments and administrative costs.

The committee fully supports the goals of the CTR Program and continues to believe that the Program is critical to U.S. national security and must be a top priority. In recent years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have limited the progress of the CTR Program. The committee has also noted that despite the significant achievements of the CTR Program over the last 10 years, much remains to be done, and has emphasized the need for a strong national commitment to reinvigorate the CTR Program.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) addressed these concerns by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the FSU; 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; requiring a report by the Secretary of Defense regarding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project at Shchuch'ye, Russia; and including other provisions to ensure that wherever possible, the CTR Program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise. In addition, the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), passed in the 110th Congress by both the House and Senate as H.R. 1 and commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," included a number of provisions and authorized funding to accelerate, strengthen, and expand the CTR Program.

However, the committee believes there are additional opportunities for the CTR Program to address the wide variety of global threats arising from the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise. The committee welcomes the President's commitment to reinvigorate the CTR Program and ensure that it is a top priority going forward. This Act provides the President with additional funding and new tools to further the President's goals and objectives for the CTR Program, including: the authority to accept international contributions for CTR activities; a limited exemption from CTR funding limitations for urgent CTR activities; and a report by the National Academy of Sciences on metrics to measure the impact and effectiveness of CTR activities.

The committee authorizes $434.1 million, an increase of $30.0 million from the budget request, which includes an increase of $29.0 million for new CTR initiatives.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Biological Threat Reduction

The committee continues to recognize the importance of biological threat reduction activities to U.S. national security interests and believes the United States should be actively engaged in this area. However, the committee also believes that the Biological Threat Reduction Program (BTRP) under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program should be guided by a comprehensive long-term interagency strategy for biological threat reduction and requires: robust interagency engagement and coordination; rigorous Department management and oversight; coordination and integration with other Department programs and activities; and concrete metrics for measuring progress.

The committee welcomes the Department's current efforts to restructure and strengthen BTRP activities, including in the area of interagency engagement and coordination to ensure that the Department of Defense is the appropriate agency to undertake such activities. The committee encourages the Department to keep the

committee fully informed of developments with respect to this effort. The committee also encourages the Department to maintain a strong focus within the CTR Program on other threat reduction challenges, including preventing the proliferation of chemical and nuclear weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

### Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Contracting Procedures and Agreements

The committee welcomes current efforts of the Department of Defense to review the contracting procedures and umbrella agreements used by the Department's Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program, and to assess possible alternatives, in order to ensure that all CTR activities are being undertaken in the most effective manner possible and consistent with the urgency and necessity of such activities.

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 December 31, 2010, on the results of the review, including any related actions that the Secretary plans to take.

### New Initiatives for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

The committee welcomes the recent report of the National Academy of Sciences, pursuant to section 1306 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), regarding options for strengthening and expanding the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program. The report includes many findings and recommendations on possible ways to make the CTR Program more flexible, responsive, and effective in addressing threats arising from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons, and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to seriously assess the report's findings and recommendations, and to continue taking actions to strengthen and expand the CTR Program. The committee notes that it has authorized additional funding for new CTR initiatives in this Act, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). Such funding is consistent with the President's commitment to reinvigorate the CTR Program and ensure that it is a top priority going forward. The committee encourages the Department to actively consult with the committee regarding possible new CTR initiatives, and to keep the committee fully informed of significant developments in this area.

### Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Project

The committee welcomes recent progress by the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program toward completion of the chemical weapons destruction project in the Russian Federation at Shchuch'ye. This has been a flagship project for the CTR Program, and in past years the committee has conducted vigorous oversight of the project. The committee encourages the De-

partment to make efforts to ensure completion and sustainability of the project and to keep the committee fully informed of developments in this regard.

## 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 1301 of this Act and specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for three 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 $434.1 million that the committee would authorize for the CTR Program. The allocation under this section reflects a $30.0 million increase from the budget request of $404.1 million for fiscal year 2010 as follows: $29.0 million for new CTR initiatives; and $1.0 million for chemical weapons destruction. This section would also require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2010 funds for purposes other than those specifically authorized. In addition, this section would provide limited authority to obligate amounts for a program element under the CTR Program in excess of the amount specifically authorized for that purpose.

### Section 1303—Utilization of Contributions to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

This section would establish the authority of the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to enter into agreements with any person, including a foreign government or entity, which the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate, to accept funds to assist with the activities of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. Contributed funds would be maintained in a separate account in the Treasury and would be returned to the donor if not used in five years. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a quarterly report to the congressional defense committees on the receipt and use of funds, and to include in the first such report, an implementation plan for the authority provided under this section. The authority provided in this section to accept contributions would expire on December 31, 2012, and the authority to retain and use contributions would expire on December 31, 2015. This provision would not preclude the transfer of funds pursuant to the Economy Act (P.L. 97–258 and P.L. 98–216) from the Department of Defense to other U.S. agencies.

### Section 1304—National Academy of Sciences Study of Metrics for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) under which the NAS would carry out a study to identify metrics to measure the impact and effectiveness of activities under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to address threats arising from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report to Congress by December 31, 2010, on the NAS study, including the Secretary's assessment of the NAS report and any actions the Secretary plans to take to implement its recommendations.

### Section 1305—Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Authority for Urgent Threat Reduction Activities

This section would enable the Secretary of Defense to expend up to 10 percent of Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program funds in any fiscal year, notwithstanding certain provisions of law, for CTR activities to address urgent threats arising from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons, and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

Prior to expending funds under the authority provided in this section, the Secretary would be required to make a written determination, in consultation with the Secretary of State, that Department of Defense CTR Program funds are needed for urgent Program activities and that certain provisions of law would unnecessarily impede the Secretary's ability to carry out such activities. The Secretary would also be required to submit a 15-day advance notice to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that includes: the Secretary's written determination; an identification of the provisions of law addressed in the determination; a description of the CTR activities to be undertaken pursuant to the determination; and the expected time frame for, and cost of, such activities.

### Section 1306—Cooperative Threat Reduction Defense and Military Contacts Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Defense and Military Contacts Program under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program is: strategically used to advance the mission of the CTR Program; focused and expanded to support specific relationship-building opportunities, which could lead to CTR Program development in new geographic areas and achieve other CTR Program benefits; directly administered as part of the CTR Program; and includes, within an overall strategic framework, cooperation and coordination with the unified combatant commands that operate in areas in which CTR activities are carried out, and with related diplomatic efforts.

# TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Defense Working Capital Fund Cash Balance

The committee is concerned that the setting of prices and rates for Defense Working Capital Fund activities is being driven by an arbitrary, outdated goal of maintaining 7 to 10 days of cash to sustain business operations. The committee is concerned that this metric was developed during peacetime and cannot account for changes related to overseas contingency operations supported by supplemental appropriations or fluctuations in commodity markets that are outside of the Department of Defense's control.

As an example, the committee notes that in recent fiscal years, the Defense Working Capital Fund has changed the standard fuel price multiple times during the year of execution. Additionally, as part of the budget request for fiscal year 2010, the Army proposes levying cash surcharges against its industrial operations customers during the fiscal year to recover potential cash shortfalls at the same time the Army is lowering its direct labor hours rate to return positive accumulated operating results to its customers. These changes directly impact the readiness of the services, as organizations engaged in daily combat operations or combat support cannot adequately gauge their costs during the year of execution.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that examines a range of alternative cash balance parameters by which the revolving funds could be managed to sustain a single rate or price to the customer throughout the fiscal year. These parameters should not necessarily be the same across all working capital funds, as the nature of the activity should be a significant factor in determining the appropriate cash balance levels.

## SUBTITLE A— MILITARY PROGRAMS

### Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $1.5 billion for Working Capital Funds.

### Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize $1.7 billion for the National Defense Sealift Fund.

### Section 1403—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize $26.9 billion in fiscal year 2010 funds for the Defense Health Program (DHP) and other programs.

The committee notes the difficulties that the Department of Defense continues to experience with its health information management (IM)/information technology (IT) systems. The committee is concerned that none of the solutions proposed by the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs/TRICARE Management Activity over the past two years have found their way into

the President's budget request. Consequently, the committee believes that a higher level of leadership oversight is required to ensure that existing problems with the Department's health information management/information technology programs are addressed and to ensure better coordination among other Department information technology efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends the following transfers of funds from the Defense Health Program to the Office of the Secretary of Defense:

(1) $808.4 million ($692.1 million from Tri-Service IM/IT and $116.2 million from DHP IM/IT Support Program) from Defense Health Program Operations and Maintenance to Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) $144.6 million from Defense Health Program Procurement to Procurement Line 47 (Major Equipment, Office of the Secretary of Defense).

(3) $124.4 million from PE 65013 Information Technology Development to PE 65170D8Z, Support to Networks and Information Integration, RDT&E, Defense-wide.

The committee intends for these funds to be used only for their original budgeted purpose of providing health information management/information technology.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan for the projected expenditure of these funds to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Further, the committee directs the Secretary to provide prior notification of any transfer of the funds listed above to the congressional defense committees not less than 10 days before those funds are transferred to another account.

### Section 1404—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize $1.6 billion for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

### Section 1405—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize $1.1 billion for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities.

### Section 1406—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize $279.2 million for the Department of Defense Inspector General. This would represent an increase of $6.8 million for operation and maintenance. This increase would support activities such as increased audit, inspection policy oversight, and investigative efforts.

## SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

### Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $41.2 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2010. This

section would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

### Section 1412—Extension of Previously Authorized Disposal of Cobalt from National Defense Stockpile

This section would amend section 114(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to extend the authority for cobalt sales through fiscal year 2011.

### Section 1413—Report on Implementation of Reconfiguration of the National Defense Stockpile

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on any actions the Secretary plans to take in response to the recommendations in the April 2009 report entitled "Reconfiguration of the National Defense Stockpile Report to Congress." This section also would require congressional notification 45 days prior to the Secretary taking any action regarding implementation of the report's recommendations.

The committee agrees with the conclusion contained in the report by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics that "ensuring the current and future availability of strategic and critical materials requires a more integrated and responsive approach on the national level." However, the committee desires to explore other options that were not included in the Under Secretary's recommendations. The committee will work collaboratively with the Department of Defense to identify the steps that should be taken to address the strategic materials issues that the Department and nation face in the emerging security environment.

## SUBTITLE C—ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

### Section 1421—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $134.0 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2010.

## Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | | | |
| | **DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS** | | | |
| | DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS | 141,388 | | 141,388 |
| | DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY | 1,313,616 | | 1,313,616 |
| | **Total, Defense Working Capital Funds** | **1,455,004** | | **1,455,004** |
| | **NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND** | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC SHIP ACQUISITION** | | | |
| 0120 | T-AKE | 940,115 | | 940,115 |
| 0401 | MLP | 120,047 | 60,000 | 180,047 |
| | Program Increase | | [60,000] | |
| 5000 | OUTFITTING AND POST DELIVERY | 29,740 | | 29,740 |
| | **DOD MOBILIZATION ASSETS** | | | |
| 0200 | NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT VESSEL | 1,438 | | 1,438 |
| 0210 | FAST SEALIFT SHIP MAINTENANCE | | | |
| 0220 | LMSR MAINTENANCE | 96,363 | | 96,363 |
| 0230 | DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS | 64,167 | | 64,167 |
| 0250 | T-AH MAINTENANCE | 37,627 | | 37,627 |
| | **STRATEGIC SEALIFT SUPPORT** | | | |
| 0300 | STRATEGIC SEALIFT SUPPORT | 4,794 | | 4,794 |
| | **SEALIFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 0900 | RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 72,983 | | 72,983 |

## Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **READY RESERVE FORCE** | | | |
| 0500 | READY RESERVE FORCE | 275,484 | | 275,484 |
| | **Total, National Defense Sealift Fund** | **1,642,758** | **60,000** | **1,702,758** |
| | **DEFENSE COALITION SUPPORT FUND** | | | |
| | DEFENSE COALITION SUPPORT FUND | 22,000 | -22,000 | 0 |
| | **Total, Revolving and Management Funds** | **3,119,762** | **38,000** | **3,157,762** |
| | **MILITARY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| | **DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | | | |
| | DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM O&M | 26,967,919 | -675,456 | 26,292,463 |
| | Transfer to Title III | | [-808,386] | |
| | Pre-mobliization health care coverage for Reservists and their families | | [92,000] | |
| | Establish the Military School of Nursing | | [10,000] | |
| | Madigan Medical Center Trauma Assistance Program | | [2,500] | |
| | Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization | | [430] | |
| | Extend Dental Coverage to Dependent Survivors | | [2,000] | |
| | National Casualty Care Research Center | | [1,000] | |
| | Chiropractice Health Care Expansion | | [5,000] | |
| | TRICARE Coverage for Gray-Area Retirees | | [10,000] | |
| | Center of Care for Military Family Members | | [10,000] | |

## Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM R&D | 613,102 | -119,910 | 493,192 |
| | Combined Injury Consortium | | [1,500] | |
| | Transfer to Title III | | [-124,410] | |
| | USUHS Immersive, Wide Area Virtual Environment | | [3,000] | |
| | DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM PROCUREMENT | 322,142 | -144,610 | 177,532 |
| | Transfer to Title I | | [-144,610] | |
| | **Total Defense Health Program** | **27,903,163** | **-939,976** | **26,963,187** |
| | **CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION** | | | |
| | CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M | 1,146,802 | | 1,146,802 |
| | CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E | 401,269 | | 401,269 |
| | CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC | 12,689 | | 12,689 |
| | **Total Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction** | **1,560,760** | | **1,560,760** |
| | **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE | 1,058,984 | -8,000 | 1,050,984 |
| | International Support | | [-32,000] | |
| | International Support - USEUCOM | | [-5,600] | |
| | International Support - USNORTHCOM/USSOUTHCOM | | [5,600] | |
| | International Support - US CENTCOM CN Training | | [24,000] | |
| | **Total Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities** | **1,058,984** | **-8,000** | **1,050,984** |
| | **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | | | |

## Title XIV - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | 271,444 | 6,780 | 278,224 |
| | Inspector General Growth Plan | | [6,780] | |
| | PROCUREMENT | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| | **Total Office of the Inspection General** | **272,444** | **6,780** | **279,224** |
| | **Total, Military Programs** | **30,795,351** | **-941,196** | **29,854,155** |
| | **Civil Programs (non-defense)** | | | |
| | Armed Forces Retirement Home (non-add) | [134,000] | | [134,000] |
| | **TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | **33,915,113** | **-903,196** | **33,011,917** |

# 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 greatly appreciates that the Department's Overseas Contingency Operations request for fiscal year 2010 complied with these requirements, and commends the Department on its action.

The committee recommends authorization of $130.0 billion in funds to be appropriated available upon enactment of this Act to support overseas contingency operations principally associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

## SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The following table summarizes authorizations included in the bill for Overseas Contingency Operations.

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **FIXED WING** | | | | | | |
| 003 | MQ-1 UAV | 12 | 250,000 | 12 | 237,989 | 24 | 487,989 |
| | Transfer from Title I | | | [12] | [237,989] | | |
| 004 | RQ-11 (RAVEN) | 86 | 44,640 | | | 86 | 44,640 |
| 004A | C-12A | 6 | 45,000 | | | 6 | 45,000 |
| | **ROTARY WING** | | | | | | |
| 011 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | 4 | 74,340 | | | 4 | 74,340 |
| 013 | CH-47 HELICOPTER | 4 | 141,200 | | | 4 | 141,200 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 016 | MQ-1 PAYLOAD - UAS | 0 | 0 | | 87,424 | 0 | 87,424 |
| | Transfer from Title I | | | | [87,424] | | |
| 017 | MQ-1 WEAPONIZATION - UAS | 0 | 0 | | 14,832 | 0 | 14,832 |
| | Transfer from Title I | | | | [14,832] | | |
| 018 | GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP) | 0 | 50,210 | | | 0 | 50,210 |
| 019 | MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) | 0 | 54,000 | | | 0 | 54,000 |
| 020 | AH-64 MODS | 4 | 315,300 | | | 4 | 315,300 |
| 026 | UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS | 0 | 2,500 | | | 0 | 2,500 |
| 027 | KIOWA WARRIOR | 6 | 94,335 | | | 6 | 94,335 |
| 030 | RQ-7 UAV MODS | 0 | 326,400 | | | 0 | 326,400 |
| 030A | C-12A | 0 | 60,000 | | | 0 | 60,000 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 031 | SPARE PARTS (AIR) | 0 | 18,200 | | | 0 | 18,200 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| | **GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS** | | | | | | |
| 033 | ASE INFRARED CM | 0 | 111,600 | | | 0 | 111,600 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 035 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | 0 | 23,704 | | | 0 | 23,704 |
| 036 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | 0 | 24,800 | | | 0 | 24,800 |
| | **TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **122** | **1,636,229** | **12** | **340,245** | **134** | **1,976,474** |
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | |
| 005 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | 2,133 | 219,700 | | | 2,133 | 219,700 |
| | **ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | |
| 006 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | 864 | 140,979 | | | 864 | 140,979 |
| 007 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | 1,294 | 59,200 | | | 1,294 | 59,200 |
| 008 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 678 | 60,600 | | | 678 | 60,600 |
| | **MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 014 | MLRS MODS | 0 | 18,772 | | | 0 | 18,772 |
| 015 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 32,319 | | | 0 | 32,319 |
| | **TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **4,969** | **531,570** | **0** | **0** | **4,969** | **531,570** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS & TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| | **MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 009 | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) | 0 | 36,000 | | | 0 | 36,000 |
| 010 | BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) | 0 | 243,600 | | | 0 | 243,600 |
| 011 | HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD) | 0 | 37,620 | | | 0 | 37,620 |
| 012 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES) | 0 | 0 | | 115,000 | 0 | 115,000 |
| | M88A2 Program Increase | | | | [115,000] | | |
| | **WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 027 | XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) | 3,643 | 13,900 | | | 3,643 | 13,900 |
| 031 | COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO | 1,000 | 235,000 | | | 1,000 | 235,000 |
| 033 | HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T) | 36 | 107,996 | | | 36 | 107,996 |
| | **MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH** | | | | | | |
| 036 | M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS | 0 | 27,600 | | | 0 | 27,600 |
| 037 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS | 0 | 20,900 | | | 0 | 20,900 |
| 038 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS | 0 | 4,800 | | | 0 | 4,800 |
| 040 | M119 MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 21,250 | | | 0 | 21,250 |
| 041A | M14 7.62 RIFLE MODS | 0 | 5,800 | | | 0 | 5,800 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| 043 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | 0 | 5,000 | | | 0 | 5,000 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF WTCV, ARMY** | **4,679** | **759,466** | **0** | **115,000** | **4,679** | **874,466** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL/MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 001 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 22,000 | | | 0 | 22,000 |
| 002 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 8,300 | | | 0 | 8,300 |
| 003 | CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES | 0 | 500 | | | 0 | 500 |
| 004 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | 0 | 26,500 | | | 0 | 26,500 |
| 006 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 530 | | | 0 | 530 |
| | **MORTAR AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 008 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | 0 | 20,000 | | | 0 | 20,000 |
| | **ARTILLERY AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 014 | CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES | 0 | 9,200 | | | 0 | 9,200 |
| 016 | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982 | 0 | 52,200 | | | 0 | 52,200 |
| 017 | MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T | 0 | 10,000 | | | 0 | 10,000 |
| | **ARTILLERY FUZES** | | | | | | |
| 018 | ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 7,800 | | | 0 | 7,800 |
| | **MINES** | | | | | | |
| 019 | MINES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 5,000 | | | 0 | 5,000 |
| 020 | MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES | 0 | 7,000 | | | 0 | 7,000 |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | |
| 024 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | 0 | 169,505 | | | 0 | 169,505 |
| | **OTHER AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 027 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 100 | | | 0 | 100 |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS** | | | | | | |
| 030 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | 0 | 32,000 | | | 0 | 32,000 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | **0** | **370,635** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **370,635** |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 001 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | 185 | 1,948 | | | 185 | 1,948 |
| 002 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED: | 670 | 40,403 | | | 670 | 40,403 |
| 003 | SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS | 44 | 8,651 | | | 44 | 8,651 |
| 004 | HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) | 8,444 | 1,251,038 | | | 8,444 | 1,251,038 |
| 005 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | 1,643 | 461,657 | | -200,000 | 1,643 | 261,657 |
| | Production and Delivery Delays | | | | [-200,000] | | |
| 007 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | 0 | 623,230 | | | 0 | 623,230 |
| 009 | ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) | 0 | 13,206 | | | 0 | 13,206 |
| 012 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916 | 259 | 62,654 | | | 259 | 62,654 |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **COMM-JOINT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 023 | WIN-T - GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK | 0 | 13,500 | | | 0 | 13,500 |
| | **COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 028 | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) | 0 | 53,486 | | 5,000 | 0 | 58,486 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Defense Advanced GPS Receiver (DAGR) | | | | [5,000] | | |
| 029 | SMART-T (SPACE) | 0 | 26,000 | | | 0 | 26,000 |
| 032 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) | 0 | 23,900 | | | 0 | 23,900 |
| | **COMM - COMBAT SUPPORT COMM** | | | | | | |
| 032A | MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER | 0 | 6,070 | | | 0 | 6,070 |
| | **COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 034 | ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO) | 0 | 239 | | | 0 | 239 |
| 037 | SINCGARS FAMILY | 0 | 128,180 | | -128,180 | 0 | 0 |
| | SINCGARS Family | | | | [-128,180] | | |
| 038 | AMC CRITICAL ITEMS - OPA2 | 0 | 100,000 | | | 0 | 100,000 |
| 046 | RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY | 0 | 11,286 | | | 0 | 11,286 |
| 047 | MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4) | 0 | 18 | | | 0 | 18 |
| | **INFORMATION SECURITY** | | | | | | |
| 050 | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP | 0 | 32,095 | | | 0 | 32,095 |
| | **COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 055 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS | 0 | 330,342 | | | 0 | 330,342 |
| 057 | INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM( | 0 | 227,733 | | | 0 | 227,733 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)** | | | | | | |
| 062 | JTT/CIBS-M (MIP) | 0 | 1,660 | | | 0 | 1,660 |
| 066 | DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP) | 0 | 265 | | | 0 | 265 |
| 069 | DCGS-A (MIP) | 0 | 167,100 | | | 0 | 167,100 |
| 073 | CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) (MIP | 0 | 34,208 | | | 0 | 34,208 |
| 075 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP) | 0 | 5,064 | | | 0 | 5,064 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)** | | | | | | |
| 076 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR | 0 | 58,590 | | | 0 | 58,590 |
| 077 | WARLOCK | 0 | 164,435 | | | 0 | 164,435 |
| 078 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | 0 | 126,030 | | | 0 | 126,030 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)** | | | | | | |
| 082 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | 0 | 93,183 | | | 0 | 93,183 |
| 084 | NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT | 0 | 25,000 | | | 0 | 25,000 |
| 085 | SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF | 0 | 15,000 | | | 0 | 15,000 |
| 087 | COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM) | 0 | 150,400 | | | 0 | 150,400 |
| 091 | ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE | 0 | 1,900 | | | 0 | 1,900 |
| 094 | FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2) | 0 | 242,999 | | 179,000 | 0 | 421,999 |
| | FBCB2 Program Increase | | | | [179,000] | | |
| 095 | JOINT BATTLE COMMAND - PLATFORM (JBC-P) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 096 | LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD | 0 | 97,020 | | | 0 | 97,020 |
| 097 | COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32 | 0 | 3,780 | | | 0 | 3,780 |
| 099 | COUNTERFIRE RADARS | 0 | 26,000 | | | 0 | 26,000 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS** | | | | | | |
| 103 | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY | 0 | 14,840 | | | 0 | 14,840 |
| 104 | BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC | 0 | 16 | | | 0 | 16 |
| 107 | KNIGHT FAMILY | 0 | 178,500 | | | 0 | 178,500 |
| 113 | NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE | 0 | 58,900 | | | 0 | 58,900 |
| 114 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | 0 | 5,000 | | | 0 | 5,000 |
| 115 | SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE) | 0 | 1,440 | | | 0 | 1,440 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 760 | | | 0 | 760 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 129 | PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS / BAIS | 0 | 44,460 | | | 0 | 44,460 |
| 130 | CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION | 0 | 38,811 | | | 0 | 38,811 |
| | **BRIDGING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 133 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | 0 | 13,525 | | | 0 | 13,525 |
| | **ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 136 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) | 0 | 10,800 | | | 0 | 10,800 |
| | **COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 140 | LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES | 0 | 21,561 | | | 0 | 21,561 |
| 142 | LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME) | 0 | 1,955 | | | 0 | 1,955 |
| 146 | FORCE PROVIDER | 0 | 245,382 | | -60,000 | 0 | 185,382 |
| | Funding in Excess of Requirement | | | | [-60,000] | | |
| 147 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 4,011 | | | 0 | 4,011 |
| 150 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT) | 0 | 4,987 | | | 0 | 4,987 |
| | **PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 152 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER | 0 | 58,554 | | | 0 | 58,554 |
| | **WATER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 153 | WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS | 0 | 3,017 | | | 0 | 3,017 |
| | **MEDICAL EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 154 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | 0 | 11,386 | | | 0 | 11,386 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 155 | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS | 0 | 12,365 | | | 0 | 12,365 |
| 156 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ) | 0 | 546 | | | 0 | 546 |
| | **CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 162 | LOADERS | 0 | 1,100 | | | 0 | 1,100 |
| 163 | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR | 0 | 290 | | | 0 | 290 |
| 166 | PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING | 0 | 2,500 | | | 0 | 2,500 |
| 167 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS | 0 | 16,500 | | | 0 | 16,500 |
| 169 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | 0 | 360 | | | 0 | 360 |
| | **RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 172 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | 0 | 3,550 | | | 0 | 3,550 |
| | **GENERATORS** | | | | | | |
| 173 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | 0 | 62,210 | | | 0 | 62,210 |
| | **MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 174 | ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH) | 0 | 54,360 | | | 0 | 54,360 |
| 175 | ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM | 0 | 49,319 | | | 0 | 49,319 |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 176 | COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT | 0 | 60,200 | | | 0 | 60,200 |
| 177 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | 0 | 28,200 | | | 0 | 28,200 |
| | **TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)** | | | | | | |
| 182 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | 0 | 1,524 | | | 0 | 1,524 |
| 183 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) | 0 | 3,817 | | | 0 | 3,817 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 184 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 27,000 | | | 0 | 27,000 |
| 187 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) | 0 | 555,950 | | | 0 | 555,950 |
| | **TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | **11,245** | **6,225,966** | **0** | **-204,180** | **11,245** | **6,021,786** |
| | **JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND** | | | | | | |
| | **NETWORK ATTACK** | | | | | | |
| 001 | ATTACK THE NETWORK | 0 | 812,000 | | -100,000 | 0 | 712,000 |
| | Transfer to RDDW-24 | | | | [-100,000] | | |
| | **JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT** | | | | | | |
| 002 | DEFEAT THE DEVICE | 0 | 536,000 | | | 0 | 536,000 |
| | **FORCE TRAINING** | | | | | | |
| 003 | TRAIN THE FORCE | 0 | 187,000 | | | 0 | 187,000 |
| | **STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE** | | | | | | |
| 004 | OPERATIONS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **TOTAL - JOINT IED DEFEAT FUND** | **0** | **1,535,000** | **0** | **-100,000** | **0** | **1,435,000** |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 010 | UH-1Y/AH-1Z | 2 | 55,006 | | | 2 | 55,006 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 028 | EA-6 SERIES | 0 | 45,000 | | | 0 | 45,000 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 029 | AV-8 SERIES | 0 | 28,296 | | | 0 | 28,296 |
| 030 | F-18 SERIES | 0 | 96,000 | | | 0 | 96,000 |
| 031 | H-46 SERIES | 0 | 17,485 | | | 0 | 17,485 |
| 033 | H-53 SERIES | 0 | 164,730 | | | 0 | 164,730 |
| 034 | SH-60 SERIES | 0 | 11,192 | | | 0 | 11,192 |
| 035 | H-1 SERIES | 0 | 11,217 | | | 0 | 11,217 |
| 037 | P-3 SERIES | 0 | 74,900 | | | 0 | 74,900 |
| 039 | E-2 SERIES | 0 | 17,200 | | | 0 | 17,200 |
| 041 | C-2A | 0 | 14,100 | | | 0 | 14,100 |
| 042 | C-130 SERIES | 0 | 52,324 | | | 0 | 52,324 |
| 049 | POWER PLANT CHANGES | 0 | 4,456 | | | 0 | 4,456 |
| 052 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | 0 | 263,382 | | | 0 | 263,382 |
| 054 | COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM | 0 | 5,500 | | | 0 | 5,500 |
| 056 | V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | 0 | 53,500 | | | 0 | 53,500 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 057 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS/CLASSIFIED | 0 | 2,265 | | | 0 | 2,265 |
| | **TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **2** | **916,553** | **0** | **0** | **2** | **916,553** |
| | **WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| 010 | HELLFIRE | 782 | 73,700 | | | 782 | 73,700 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL - WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **782** | **73,700** | **0** | **0** | **782** | **73,700** |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS** | | | | | | |
| | **PROC AMMO, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **NAVY AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 001 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | 0 | 40,500 | | | 0 | 40,500 |
| 003 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 42,510 | | | 0 | 42,510 |
| 004 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | 0 | 109,200 | | | 0 | 109,200 |
| 007 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | 0 | 5,501 | | | 0 | 5,501 |
| 009 | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | 0 | 352 | | | 0 | 352 |
| 011 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | 0 | 2,835 | | | 0 | 2,835 |
| 012 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | 0 | 14,229 | | | 0 | 14,229 |
| 013 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | 0 | 1,442 | | | 0 | 1,442 |
| | **PROC AMMO, MC** | | | | | | |
| | **MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION** | | | | | | |
| 015 | SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION | 0 | 16,930 | | | 0 | 16,930 |
| 016 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 5,881 | | | 0 | 5,881 |
| 017 | 40 MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 104,824 | | | 0 | 104,824 |
| 018 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 43,623 | | | 0 | 43,623 |
| 019 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 103,647 | | | 0 | 103,647 |
| 020 | 120MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 62,265 | | | 0 | 62,265 |
| 021 | CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES | 0 | 563 | | | 0 | 563 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 022 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | 0 | 6,074 | | | 0 | 6,074 |
| 023 | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 8,117 | | | 0 | 8,117 |
| 024 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | 0 | 81,975 | | | 0 | 81,975 |
| 026 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 0 | 9,241 | | | 0 | 9,241 |
| 027 | FUZE, ALL TYPES | 0 | 51,071 | | | 0 | 51,071 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE** | **0** | **710,780** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **710,780** |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | |
| | **SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 018 | UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS | 0 | 12,040 | | | 0 | 12,040 |
| | **SMALL BOATS** | | | | | | |
| 025 | STANDARD BOATS | 0 | 13,000 | | | 0 | 13,000 |
| | **AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 056 | MATCALS | 0 | 400 | | | 0 | 400 |
| | **SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| 076 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | 0 | 1,500 | | | 0 | 1,500 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 092 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | 0 | 37,345 | | | 0 | 37,345 |
| 097 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT | 0 | 17,883 | | | 0 | 17,883 |
| | **OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 115 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | 0 | 43,650 | | | 0 | 43,650 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 120 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 0 | 25 | | | 0 | 25 |
| 121 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | 0 | 93 | | | 0 | 93 |
| 122 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | 0 | 11,167 | | | 0 | 11,167 |
| 124 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 0 | 54,008 | | | 0 | 54,008 |
| 127 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION | 0 | 10,842 | | | 0 | 10,842 |
| 128 | PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES | 0 | 1,130 | | | 0 | 1,130 |
| | **SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 129 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | 0 | 25 | | | 0 | 25 |
| | **PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 134 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 4,000 | | | 0 | 4,000 |
| 139 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 15,452 | | | 0 | 15,452 |
| 140 | C4ISR EQUIPMENT | 0 | 3,100 | | | 0 | 3,100 |
| 142 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 0 | 89,521 | | | 0 | 89,521 |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | |
| 145 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 0 | 2,837 | | | 0 | 2,837 |
| | **TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | **0** | **318,018** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **318,018** |
| | **PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | | | | | | |
| | **WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| | **TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 002 | LAV PIP | 0 | 58,229 | | | 0 | 58,229 |
| | **ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS** | | | | | | |
| 006 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | 18 | 54,000 | | | 18 | 54,000 |
| 008 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION | 0 | 3,351 | | | 0 | 3,351 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 010 | MODIFICATION KITS | 0 | 20,183 | | | 0 | 20,183 |
| 011 | WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | 0 | 9,151 | | | 0 | 9,151 |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 016 | MODIFICATION KITS | 0 | 8,506 | | | 0 | 8,506 |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 018 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | 0 | 11,741 | | | 0 | 11,741 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 019 | COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 0 | 462 | | | 0 | 462 |
| | **COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 021 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | 0 | 4,153 | | | 0 | 4,153 |
| 022 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | 0 | 3,096 | | | 0 | 3,096 |
| | **RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 023 | RADAR SYSTEMS | 0 | 3,417 | | | 0 | 3,417 |
| | **INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 024 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 0 | 521 | | | 0 | 521 |
| 025 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 0 | 37,547 | | | 0 | 37,547 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 026 | RQ-11 UAV | 0 | 13,000 | | | 0 | 13,000 |
| | **OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 027 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | 0 | 12,570 | | | 0 | 12,570 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | |
| 028 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | 0 | 23,105 | | | 0 | 23,105 |
| 029 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | 0 | 23,041 | | | 0 | 23,041 |
| 030 | RADIO SYSTEMS | 0 | 32,497 | | | 0 | 32,497 |
| 031 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | 0 | 2,044 | | | 0 | 2,044 |
| 032 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | 0 | 64 | | | 0 | 64 |
| | **SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 035 | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | 0 | 205,036 | | | 0 | 205,036 |
| 036 | MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 10,177 | | | 0 | 10,177 |
| 037 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | 0 | 131,044 | | | 0 | 131,044 |
| 038 | LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP | 0 | 59,219 | | | 0 | 59,219 |
| 039 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | 0 | 13,388 | | | 0 | 13,388 |
| | **ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 042 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | 0 | 5,119 | | | 0 | 5,119 |
| 043 | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT | 0 | 4,549 | | | 0 | 4,549 |
| 044 | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS | 0 | 33,421 | | | 0 | 33,421 |
| 045 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | 0 | 24,860 | | | 0 | 24,860 |
| 047 | EOD SYSTEMS | 0 | 47,697 | | | 0 | 47,697 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 048 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 0 | 19,720 | | | 0 | 19,720 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 050 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | 0 | 56,875 | | | 0 | 56,875 |
| | **GENERAL PROPERTY** | | | | | | |
| 053 | TRAINING DEVICES | 0 | 157,734 | | | 0 | 157,734 |
| 055 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | 0 | 35,818 | | | 0 | 35,818 |
| 058 | RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN | 0 | 55 | | | 0 | 55 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 059 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 0 | 39,055 | | | 0 | 39,055 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | **18** | **1,164,445** | **0** | **0** | **18** | **1,164,445** |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER AIRLIFT** | | | | | | |
| 006 | C-130J | 0 | 72,000 | | | 0 | 72,000 |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 025 | MQ-9 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 215,335 | 11 | 215,335 |
| | Transfer from Title I | | | [11] | [215,335] | | |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 028 | B-1B | 0 | 20,500 | | | 0 | 20,500 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TACTICAL AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 030 | A-10 | 0 | 10,000 | | | 0 | 10,000 |
| 032 | F-16 | 0 | 20,025 | | | 0 | 20,025 |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 034 | C-5 | 0 | 57,400 | | | 0 | 57,400 |
| 037 | C-17A | 0 | 132,300 | | | 0 | 132,300 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | |
| 052 | C-130 | 0 | 210,800 | | | 0 | 210,800 |
| 054 | C-135 | 0 | 16,916 | | | 0 | 16,916 |
| 056 | DARP (CLASSIFIED) | 0 | 10,300 | | | 0 | 10,300 |
| 063 | HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 7,000 | | | 0 | 7,000 |
| 064 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | 0 | 90,000 | | | 0 | 90,000 |
| 065 | MQ-1 MODS | 0 | 65,000 | | | 0 | 65,000 |
| 066 | MQ-9 MODS | 0 | 99,200 | | | 0 | 99,200 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| | **POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| 076 | C-17A | 0 | 11,000 | | | 0 | 11,000 |
| | **OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES** | | | | | | |
| 085 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | 0 | 114,000 | | | 0 | 114,000 |
| | **TOTAL - AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **0** | **936,441** | **11** | **215,335** | **11** | **1,151,776** |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | |
| 001 | ROCKETS | 0 | 3,488 | | | 0 | 3,488 |
| | **CARTRIDGES** | | | | | | |
| 002 | CARTRIDGES | 0 | 39,236 | | | 0 | 39,236 |
| | **BOMBS** | | | | | | |
| 004 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | 0 | 34,085 | | | 0 | 34,085 |
| 005 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 3,860 | 97,978 | | | 3,860 | 97,978 |
| | **FLARE, IR MJU-7B** | | | | | | |
| 007 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) | 0 | 4,800 | | | 0 | 4,800 |
| | **FUZES** | | | | | | |
| 011 | FLARES | 0 | 41,000 | | | 0 | 41,000 |
| 012 | FUZES | 0 | 14,595 | | | 0 | 14,595 |
| | **WEAPONS** | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL ARMS** | | | | | | |
| 013 | SMALL ARMS | 0 | 21,637 | | | 0 | 21,637 |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | **3,860** | **256,819** | **0** | **0** | **3,860** | **256,819** |
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL** | | | | | | |
| 005 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 385 | 29,325 | | | 385 | 29,325 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 006 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 100 | 7,300 | | | 100 | 7,300 |
| | **TOTAL - MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **485** | **36,625** | **0** | **0** | **485** | **36,625** |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | |
| | **VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 002 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | 0 | 3,364 | | | 0 | 3,364 |
| | **SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES** | | | | | | |
| 004 | SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES | 0 | 11,337 | | | 0 | 11,337 |
| | **FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 005 | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES | 0 | 8,626 | | | 0 | 8,626 |
| | **ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | |
| | **SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS** | | | | | | |
| 023 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | 0 | 1,600 | | | 0 | 1,600 |
| | **DISA PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 037 | MILSATCOM SPACE | 0 | 714 | | | 0 | 714 |
| | **OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP** | | | | | | |
| | **PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP** | | | | | | |
| 047 | NIGHT VISION GOGGLES | 0 | 14,528 | | | 0 | 14,528 |
| 048 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SAFETY) | 0 | 4,900 | | | 0 | 4,900 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| 051 | CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS | 0 | 11,300 | | | 0 | 11,300 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS** | | | | | | |
| 060 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. ( C ) | 0 | 34,400 | | | 0 | 34,400 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 2,230,780 | | | 0 | 2,230,780 |
| | **TOTAL - OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | **0** | **2,321,549** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2,321,549** |
| | **MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND** | | | | | | |
| | **MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND** | | | | | | |
| | MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND | 0 | 5,456,000 | | | 0 | 5,456,000 |
| | **TOTAL - MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND** | **0** | **5,456,000** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **5,456,000** |
| | **PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA** | | | | | | |
| 019 | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 0 | 1,500 | | | 0 | 1,500 |
| 021 | TELEPORT PROGRAM | 0 | 7,411 | | | 0 | 7,411 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 304,794 | | | 0 | 304,794 |
| | **SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND** | | | | | | |
| | **AVIATION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 052 | MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM | 0 | 5,900 | | | 0 | 5,900 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 055 | UNMANNED VEHICLES | 0 | 0 | | 14,000 | 0 | 14,000 |
| | All Environment Capable Variant UAV | | | | [14,000] | | |
| 057 | SOF U-28 | 0 | 3,000 | | | 0 | 3,000 |
| 060 | MQ-1 UAV | 0 | 1,450 | | | 0 | 1,450 |
| 062 | STUASL0 | 9 | 12,000 | | | 9 | 12,000 |
| 063 | C-130 MODIFICATIONS | 0 | 19,500 | | 85,000 | 0 | 104,500 |
| | MC-130W Dragon Spear Modifications | | | | [85,000] | | |
| | **AMMUNITION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 067 | SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT | 0 | 51,156 | | | 0 | 51,156 |
| 068 | SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION | 0 | 17,560 | | | 0 | 17,560 |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 069 | COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS | 0 | 2,000 | | | 0 | 2,000 |
| 070 | SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | 0 | 23,260 | | 33,800 | 0 | 57,060 |
| | HF-TTL Mission Set | | | | [33,800] | | |
| 071 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | 0 | 3,800 | | | 0 | 3,800 |
| 076 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 0 | 6,865 | | 43,300 | 0 | 50,165 |
| | Ground Mobility Vehicle SOF Mod Kits | | | | [43,300] | | |
| 083 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 0 | 11,000 | | | 0 | 11,000 |
| 085 | SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SY | 0 | 0 | | 28,900 | 0 | 28,900 |
| | Hand Held Imager - Pocket/Short Range and Long Range | | | | [28,900] | | |
| 086 | SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | 0 | 5,448 | | 31,300 | 0 | 36,748 |
| | MultiBand Inter/Intra Team Radios | | | | [31,300] | | |
| 090 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 0 | 11,900 | | 72,100 | 0 | 84,000 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request Qty | FY 2010 Request Cost | House Change Qty | House Change Cost | House Authorized Qty | House Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Classified | | | | [9,500] | | |
| | PRC 117G | | | | [23,900] | | |
| | Hatch Mounted Satellite Antenna | | | | [13,000] | | |
| | Multi-Discipline Intel PED Capability | | | | [6,200] | | |
| | Classified | | | | [19,500] | | |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 0 | 2,886 | | | 0 | 2,886 |
| | **CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE** | | | | | | |
| | **TOTAL - PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **9** | **491,430** | **0** | **308,400** | **9** | **799,830** |
| | **TOTAL - Overseas Contingency Operations - Procurement** | **26,171** | **23,741,226** | **23** | **674,800** | **26,194** | **24,416,026** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - RDT and E Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | | | |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | |
| 075 | 0604270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 18,598 | | 18,598 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION, ARMY** | **18,598** | **0** | **18,598** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 161 | 0303028A | SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 7,644 | | 7,644 |
| 162 | 0303140A | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 2,220 | | 2,220 |
| 167 | 0305204A | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 29,500 | | 29,500 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, ARMY** | **39,364** | **0** | **39,364** |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E ARMY** | **57,962** | **0** | **57,962** |
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | | | |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | |
| 027 | 0603216N | AVIATION SURVIVABILITY | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| 041 | 0603561N | ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES, NAVY** | **17,000** | **0** | **17,000** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - RDT and E Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 203 | 0305207N | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS ( C ) | 51,900 | | 51,900 |
| 210 | 0305234N | SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0) | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| 999 | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 32,280 | | 32,280 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, RDT&E** | **90,180** | **0** | **90,180** |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E NAVY** | **107,180** | **0** | **107,180** |
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | | | |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 128 | 0205219F | MQ-9 UAV | 1,400 | | 1,400 |
| 149 | 0207423F | ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS/JTRS | 9,375 | | 9,375 |
| 206 | 0305219F | MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV | 1,400 | | 1,400 |
| 999 | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 17,111 | | 17,111 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, AIR FORCE** | **29,286** | **0** | **29,286** |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E AIR FORCE** | **29,286** | **0** | **29,286** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - RDT and E Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Element | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 024 | 0603121D8Z | SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 0 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| | | Transfer from JIEDDO OCO | | [100,000] | |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **0** | **100,000** | **100,000** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 198 | 0303150K | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 2,750 | | 2,750 |
| 999 | 9999999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 113,076 | | 113,076 |
| | | **SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **115,826** | **0** | **115,826** |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide** | **115,826** | **100,000** | **215,826** |
| | | **TOTAL RDT&E** | **310,254** | **100,000** | **410,254** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 36,330,899 | | 36,330,899 |
| 150 | COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM | 1,500,000 | -200,000 | 1,300,000 |
| | Program Reduction | | [-200,000] | |
| 160 | RESET | 7,867,551 | | 7,867,551 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **45,698,450** | **-200,000** | **45,498,450** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 340 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 1,426,309 | | 1,426,309 |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 350 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 5,045,902 | | 5,045,902 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **6,472,211** | | **6,472,211** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army** | **52,170,661** | **-200,000** | **51,970,661** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 1,138,398 | | 1,138,398 |
| 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 2,640 | | 2,640 |
| 030 | AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES | 1,212 | | 1,212 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 26,815 | | 26,815 |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 44,532 | | 44,532 |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 158,559 | | 158,559 |
| | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 080 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 651,209 | | 651,209 |
| 090 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 22,489 | | 22,489 |
| 100 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,001,037 | | 1,001,037 |
| | **COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT** | | | |
| 120 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 20,704 | | 20,704 |
| 150 | WARFARE TACTICS | 15,918 | | 15,918 |
| 160 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 16,889 | | 16,889 |
| 170 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 1,891,799 | | 1,891,799 |
| 180 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 306 | | 306 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 200 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 6,929 | | 6,929 |
| 210 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 7,344 | | 7,344 |
| | **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 240 | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 68,759 | | 68,759 |
| 250 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 82,496 | | 82,496 |
| 260 | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 16,902 | | 16,902 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 280 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 7,629 | | 7,629 |
| 290 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 338,604 | | 338,604 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **5,521,170** | | **5,521,170** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | **READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES** | | | |
| 300 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 27,290 | | 27,290 |
| | **MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS** | | | |
| 330 | FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM | 4,336 | | 4,336 |
| 350 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 245,039 | | 245,039 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **276,665** | | **276,665** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 390 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 97,995 | | 97,995 |
| 420 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 5,463 | | 5,463 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **103,458** | | **103,458** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 470 | ADMINISTRATION | 3,899 | | 3,899 |
| 480 | EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 463 | | 463 |
| 500 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 563 | | 563 |
| 510 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 2,525 | | 2,525 |
| 520 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 23,557 | | 23,557 |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT** | | | |
| 540 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 223,890 | | 223,890 |
| 570 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 642 | | 642 |
| | **INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 610 | NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE | 37,452 | | 37,452 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 25,299 | | 25,299 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **318,290** | | **318,290** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | **6,219,583** | | **6,219,583** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 2,048,844 | | 2,048,844 |
| 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 486,014 | | 486,014 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 554,000 | | 554,000 |
| | **USMC PREPOSITIONING** | | | |
| 060 | NORWAY PREPOSITIONING | 950 | | 950 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 090 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 121,700 | | 121,700 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **3,211,508** | | **3,211,508** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 120 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 6,303 | | 6,303 |
| 140 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 923 | | 923 |
| 150 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 205,625 | | 205,625 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **212,851** | | **212,851** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 210 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 2,576 | | 2,576 |
| 220 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 269,415 | | 269,415 |
| 230 | ADMINISTRATION | 5,250 | | 5,250 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **277,241** | | **277,241** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | **3,701,600** | | **3,701,600** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 1,582,431 | | 1,582,431 |
| 020 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 1,460,018 | | 1,460,018 |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 109,255 | | 109,255 |
| 050 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 304,540 | | 304,540 |
| 060 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 121,881 | | 121,881 |
| 070 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,394,809 | | 1,394,809 |
| | **COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 080 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 130,885 | 125,200 | 256,085 |
| | Battlefield Airborne Communications Node | | [125,200] | |
| 090 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 407,554 | | 407,554 |
| | **SPACE OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 130 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 38,677 | | 38,677 |
| | **COCOM** | | | |
| 140 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 157,000 | | 157,000 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **5,707,050** | **125,200** | **5,832,250** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 160 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 3,171,148 | | 3,171,148 |
| 170 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 169,659 | | 169,659 |
| 180 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 167,070 | | 167,070 |
| 190 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 942 | | 942 |
| 200 | BASE SUPPORT | 45,998 | | 45,998 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **3,554,817** | | **3,554,817** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 240 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,019 | | 1,019 |
| 250 | BASE SUPPORT | 19,361 | | 19,361 |
| | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 260 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 48,442 | | 48,442 |
| 270 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 291 | | 291 |
| 280 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 290 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 1,427 | | 1,427 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **72,040** | | **72,040** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 370 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 328,009 | | 328,009 |
| 420 | BASE SUPPORT | 35,322 | | 35,322 |
| | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 430 | ADMINISTRATION | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| 440 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 178,470 | | 178,470 |
| | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 470 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 142,160 | | 142,160 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **692,961** | | **692,961** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | **10,026,868** | **125,200** | **10,152,068** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 2,519,935 | | 2,519,935 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:** | **2,544,935** | | **2,544,935** |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 100 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 13,908 | | 13,908 |
| 130 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 245,117 | | 245,117 |
| 150 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES | 115,000 | | 115,000 |
| 170 | DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY | 13,364 | | 13,364 |
| 200 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 2,018 | | 2,018 |
| 210 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY | 553,600 | | 553,600 |
| 220 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 63,130 | | 63,130 |
| 230 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 1,950,000 | | 1,950,000 |
| 270 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 79,047 | | 79,047 |
| | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 1,998,181 | | 1,998,181 |
| | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:** | **5,033,365** | | **5,033,365** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide** | **7,578,300** | | **7,578,300** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 86,881 | | 86,881 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 40,675 | | 40,675 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 21,270 | | 21,270 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 38,000 | | 38,000 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **204,326** | | **204,326** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | **204,326** | | **204,326** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 26,673 | | 26,673 |
| 020 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 400 | | 400 |
| 040 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 3,600 | | 3,600 |
| | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 060 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 7,416 | | 7,416 |
| 080 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 8,917 | | 8,917 |
| | **COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 090 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 3,147 | | 3,147 |
| 100 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 13,428 | | 13,428 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 140 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 4,478 | | 4,478 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **68,059** | | **68,059** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | **68,059** | | **68,059** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | | | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 77,849 | | 77,849 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 050 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 8,818 | | 8,818 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **86,667** | | **86,667** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | **86,667** | | **86,667** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 3,618 | | 3,618 |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 7,276 | | 7,276 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 114,531 | | 114,531 |
| 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 500 | | 500 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **125,925** | | **125,925** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | **125,925** | | **125,925** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 89,666 | | 89,666 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 1,196 | | 1,196 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 18,360 | | 18,360 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 380 | | 380 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 59,357 | | 59,357 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 94,458 | | 94,458 |
| | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 22,536 | | 22,536 |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 35,693 | | 35,693 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **321,646** | | **321,646** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | **321,646** | | **321,646** |
| | **Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | | | |
| | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 010 | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 103,259 | | 103,259 |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 51,300 | | 51,300 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 135,303 | | 135,303 |
| | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **289,862** | | **289,862** |
| | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | **289,862** | | **289,862** |
| | **Afghanistan Security Forces Fund** | | | |
| 010 | INFRASTRUCTURE | 868,320 | | 868,320 |
| 020 | EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION | 1,615,192 | | 1,615,192 |
| 030 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 272,998 | | 272,998 |
| 040 | SUSTAINMENT | 1,945,887 | | 1,945,887 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 060 | INFRASTRUCTURE | 605,584 | | 605,584 |
| 070 | EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION | 279,186 | | 279,186 |
| 080 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 648,217 | | 648,217 |
| 090 | SUSTAINMENT | 1,219,966 | | 1,219,966 |
| 120 | SUSTAINMENT | 5,919 | | 5,919 |
| 130 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| | **TOTAL, Afghanistan Security Forces Fund** | **7,462,769** | | **7,462,769** |
| | **Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund** | | | |
| | INFRASTRUCTURE | 41,970 | -41,970 | 0 |
| | Realigned from Defense to International Affairs | | [-41,970] | |
| | EQUIPMENT/TRANSPORTATION | 397,907 | -397,907 | 0 |
| | Realigned from Defense to International Affairs | | [-397,907] | |
| | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 67,953 | -67,953 | 0 |
| | Realigned from Defense to International Affairs | | [-67,953] | |
| | INFRASTRUCTURE | 73,000 | -73,000 | 0 |
| | Realigned from Defense to International Affairs | | [-73,000] | |
| | EQUIPMENT/TRANSPORTATION | 107,000 | -107,000 | 0 |
| | Realigned from Defense to International Affairs | | [-107,000] | |
| | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 8,170 | -8,170 | 0 |
| | Realigned from Defense to International Affairs | | [-8,170] | |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Operation and Maintenance Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE | 4,000 | -4,000 | 0 |
| | Realigned from Defense to International Affairs | | [-4,000] | |
| | **TOTAL, Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund** | **700,000** | **-700,000** | **0** |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS** | | | |
| 080 | IRAQ FREEDOM FUND | 115,300 | | 115,300 |
| | **TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS** | **115,300** | | **115,300** |
| | **TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS** | **89,071,566** | **-774,800** | **88,296,766** |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Military Personnel Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| MILITARY PERSONNEL | 13,586,341 | 0 | 13,586,341 |

## Title XV - Overseas Contingency Operations - Other Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | | | |
| **DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS** | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 396,915 | | 396,915 |
| **Total Revolving and Management Funds** | **396,915** | | **396,915** |
| **MILITARY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| **DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | | | |
| DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM O&M | 1,155,235 | | 1,155,235 |
| **Total Defense Health Program** | **1,155,235** | | **1,155,235** |
| **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE | 324,603 | | 324,603 |
| **Total Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities** | **324,603** | | **324,603** |
| **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | 8,876 | | 8,876 |
| **Total Office of the Inspection General** | **8,876** | | **8,876** |
| **TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | **1,885,629** | | **1,885,629** |

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Defense Advanced GPS Receivers

The fiscal year 2010 budget request for ongoing military operations contained $53.5 million for Defense Advanced GPS Receivers (DAGR). The committee notes that additional funding of $72.7 million for DAGRs is authorized in title I of this Act, for a total budget request of $126.2 million for acquisition of 41,370 DAGRs.

To date, over 275,000 DAGR units have been delivered to the Army, replacing the need to purchase jamming-susceptible commercial GPS receivers. However, approximately 60 percent of the currently fielded DAGRs have been installed in vehicles, creating a GPS void for individual service members. Additional funding for DAGR procurement should reduce the cost of each unit and increase the number of units available for deployment to individual warfighters.

The committee recommends $58.5 million, an increase of $5.0 million, for procurement of additional DAGRs for ongoing military operations. The $58.5 million authorized is in addition to the $72.7 million authorized in title I of this Act, for a total authorized amount of $131.2 million.

### Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

The budget request contained $1.5 billion for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF).

The committee concurs with the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization's (JIEDDO) decision to increase its support to disrupt and discourage human networks that use improvised explosive devices (IED) to attack U.S. and coalition military forces in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. U.S. and coalition forces' efforts to thwart IED networks have produced significant and relatively long-lasting reductions in violence and casualties.

The committee continues to encourage JIEDDO to support the Irregular Warfare Support (IWS) program and other Department agencies that have the expertise and experience to conduct successful irregular warfare and counter-insurgency programs against hostile human networks. The committee notes that the IWS program leverages ongoing research efforts at Special Operations Command and other parts of the federal government to analyze, modify, design, and demonstrate enduring technical and operational capabilities. Promising projects include: counter-motivation; counter-enterprise; counter-infrastructure; counter-financing; and sanctuary-denial methodologies for the tactical and operational warfighter. IWS personnel and agents alternatively provide both a mentoring and a support role to uniformed personnel performing in the field, or in analytical and command positions. The committee supports efforts to further mature this concept.

The committee is concerned that, despite the Secretary of Defense's priority for enhancing the Department's irregular warfare capabilities, the widespread endorsement of the IWS program by combatant commanders, and the strong encouragement by the committee to provide such funding, JIEDDO has not acted with urgency to fund relevant IWS and other related initiatives.

The committee recommends authorization of $1.4 billion, a decrease of $100.0 million, for the JIEDDF. The committee further authorizes $100.0 million for the IWS program within Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, PE 0603121D8Z.

### Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund

The budget request contained $700.0 million for a new Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund (PCCF). The committee has not provided the Department with funding for the PCCF for fiscal year 2010 because of the understanding between the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and the respective authorizing and appropriating congressional committees that the PCCF is to be funded from amounts authorized and appropriated to the 150 (International Affairs) Account. The committee addresses the President's request for this authority in title XII of this Act.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### 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—Army Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $9.8 billion for Army procurement.

### Section 1503—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would authorize an additional $1.4 billion for requirements to defeat improvised explosive devices.

### Section 1504—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization Pending Report to Congress

This section would limit the amount of funds that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) may obligate until the committee is provided JIEDDO's detailed budget and program information.

The committee recognizes that JIEDDO responds to rapidly changing requirements from combatant commanders to counter the threat of improvised explosive devices (IED), which continue to be the primary threat to U.S. military forces in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee also understands that in responding to these requirements, JIEDDO is unable to plan in advance how it will obligate all of its funds in any fiscal year. However, the committee believes that JIEDDO has become a sufficiently mature and established organization to allow it to plan in advance for continuing and enduring costs such as: staff and infrastructure; multiple-year initiatives; training support; and information fusion support.

In order for the congressional defense committees to conduct adequate oversight of JIEDDO and its efforts to support combatant commanders to defeat IEDs, JIEDDO must submit sufficiently detailed budgetary and programmatic information prior to the authorization of its appropriations.

Section 1505—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $3.2 billion for Navy and Marine Corps procurement.

Section 1506—Air Force Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $3.8 billion for Air Force procurement.

Section 1507—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $799.8 million for Defense-wide activities procurement.

Section 1508—Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Fund

This section would authorize the President's request of $5.5 billion for the mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicle fund. The committee is aware these vehicles are high priority assets in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom and continue to save lives in combat. The committee notes the extraordinary effort it took to produce over 16,000 vehicles in two years and commends the Secretary of Defense for acknowledging the importance of this program by making it a top priority.

The committee believes troops in pre-mobilization, post-mobilization, and final deployment training should have the ability to train in the same types of equipment they will operate while deployed in combat theaters of operation. The committee understands MRAP vehicles are currently in short supply for home-station training at joint national training centers and combined training centers. The committee believes the Secretary of Defense should use the funds provided in this account to address this critical shortfall and rapidly facilitate the fielding of MRAP vehicles for pre-mobilization, post-mobilization, and final deployment training.

The committee understands that in response to a joint, urgent operational needs statement from OEF and as part of the MRAP vehicle program, the MRAP joint program office is pursuing a MRAP all-terrain variant (MATV) that: would be a smaller, lighter-weight version of the original MRAP vehicle; is intended for use primarily in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; and is currently undergoing source-selection. The committee notes the MATV requirement could increase by over 3,000 vehicles in fiscal year 2010 and that increase could potentially create a $2.0 billion shortfall. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to pursue an aggressive acquisition strategy for this vehicle that would allow for the production and fielding of this vehicle as quickly as possible and to fully fund the new MATV requirement in fiscal year 2010. The committee also expects the Secretary of Defense to keep the committee fully informed as to the progress of this strategy.

Section 1509—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize an additional $410.3 million for research, development, test, and evaluation.

Section 1510—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize an additional $80.7 billion for operation and maintenance programs.

Section 1511—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize an additional $396.9 million for Defense Working Capital Funds.

Section 1512—Military Personnel

This section would authorize an additional $13.6 billion for military personnel.

Section 1513—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would authorize an additional $7.5 billion for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund and would subject these funds or any other funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund to the terms and conditions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 1514—Iraq Freedom Fund

This section would authorize an additional $115.3 million to the Iraq Freedom Fund.

Section 1515—Other Department of Defense Programs

This section would authorize an additional $1.5 billion to other Department of Defense programs.

Section 1516—Limitations on Iraq Security Forces Fund

This section would subject funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Iraqi Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2010 to the terms and conditions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 1517—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq

This section would apply section 1508(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) and prohibit the use of funds contained in this title for the acquisition, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of facilities for the use of the government of the Republic of Iraq, political subdivisions of Iraq, or agencies, departments, or forces of the government of Iraq or its subdivisions.

### Section 1518—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to an additional $4.0 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

### Section 1519—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.

# 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 2010. As recommended by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $23,174,965,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2010.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $13,111,072,000 for military construction, $7,876,266,000 for Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities, and $1,958,698,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends authorization of $13,635,301,000 for military construction, $7,666,266,000 for BRAC activities, and $1,958,698,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2010.

## DIVISION B - SUMMARY OF FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Army | 3,660,779 | -30,357 | 3,630,422 |
| Navy | 3,763,264 | -57,654 | 3,705,610 |
| Air Force | 1,145,434 | 213,737 | 1,359,171 |
| Defense Agencies | 3,097,526 | -43,400 | 3,054,126 |
| Chemical Demilitarization Construction | 146,541 | 0 | 146,541 |
| NATO Security Investment Program | 276,314 | 0 | 276,314 |
| Army National Guard | 426,491 | 102,638 | 529,129 |
| Army Reserve | 374,862 | 57,654 | 432,516 |
| Naval and Marine Corps Reserve | 64,124 | 108,053 | 172,177 |
| Air National Guard | 128,261 | 97,865 | 226,126 |
| Air Force Reserve | 27,476 | 75,693 | 103,169 |
| **Subtotal Construction** | **13,111,072** | **524,229** | **13,635,301** |
| Army Family Housing Construction | 273,236 | 0 | 273,236 |
| Army Family Housing Operations | 523,418 | 0 | 523,418 |
| Navy Family Housing Construction | 146,569 | 0 | 146,569 |
| Navy Family Housing Operations | 368,540 | 0 | 368,540 |
| Air Force Family Housing Construction | 66,101 | 0 | 66,101 |
| Air Force Family Housing Operations | 502,936 | 0 | 502,936 |
| Defense Agencies Family Housing Construction | 2,859 | | 2,859 |
| Defense Agencies Family Housing Operations | 49,214 | 0 | 49,214 |
| Homeowners Assistance | 23,225 | 0 | 23,225 |
| Family Housing Improvement Fund | 2,600 | 0 | 2,600 |

## DIVISION B - SUMMARY OF FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Subtotal Family Housing** | **1,958,698** | **0** | **1,958,698** |
| Base Realignment and Closure 2005 | | | |
| Army | 4,081,037 | 0 | 4,081,037 |
| Navy | 591,572 | 0 | 591,572 |
| Air Force | 418,260 | 0 | 418,260 |
| Defense Wide | 2,388,629 | -350,000 | 2,038,629 |
| Base Realignment and Closure IV | | | |
| Army | 98,723 | 35,000 | 133,723 |
| Navy | 168,000 | 60,000 | 228,000 |
| Air Force | 127,364 | 45,000 | 172,364 |
| Defense Wide | 2,681 | 0 | 2,681 |
| **Subtotal Base Closure (Title XXVII)** | **7,876,266** | **-210,000** | **7,666,266** |
| **Prior Year Savings** | | **-85,300** | **-85,300** |
| **Subtotal Construction, Housing and BRAC FY2010 Authorizations (Base Budget)** | **22,946,036** | **228,929** | **23,174,965** |
| **Title XXIX Construction for Overseas Contingency Operations** | | | |
| Army Military Construction | 923,884 | 6,600 | 930,484 |

## DIVISION B - SUMMARY OF FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Navy Military Construction | 474,500 | 0 | 474,500 |
| Defense-wide Military Construction | 6,600 | -6,600 | 0 |
| **Subtotal Construction for Overseas Contingency Operations** | **1,404,984** | **0** | **1,404,984** |
| **Total Division B** | **24,351,020** | **228,929** | **24,579,949** |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | AK | CLEAR AFS | POWER PLANT FACILITY | 24,300 | | 24,300 |
| Air Force | AK | ELMENDORF AFB | F-22 WEAPONS LOAD TRAINING FACILITY | 12,600 | | 12,600 |
| Air Force | AK | ELMENDORF AFB | RED FLAG ALASKA ADD/ALTER OPERATIONS CENTER | 3,100 | | 3,100 |
| Def-Wide | AK | ELMENDORF AFB | AEROMEDICAL SERVICES/MENTAL HEALTH CLINIC | 25,017 | | 25,017 |
| Army | AK | FORT RICHARDSON | AIRBORNE SUSTAINMENT TRAINING COMPLEX | 6,100 | | 6,100 |
| Army | AK | FORT RICHARDSON | TRAINING AIDS CENTER | 2,050 | | 2,050 |
| Army | AK | FORT RICHARDSON | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION COMPLEX | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Def-Wide | AK | FORT RICHARDSON | HEALTH CLINIC | 3,518 | | 3,518 |
| Army | AK | FORT WAINWRIGHT | AVIATION TASK FORCE COMPLEX, PH 1 | 125,000 | -30,000 | 95,000 |
| Army | AK | FORT WAINWRIGHT | AVIATION UNIT OPERATIONS COMPLEX | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Army | AK | FORT WAINWRIGHT | RAILHEAD COMPLEX | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | AK | FORT WAINWRIGHT | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION COMPLEX | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Army | AL | ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT | Industrial Area Electrical System Upgrade | | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| ARNG | AL | FORT MC CLELLAN | URBAN ASSAULT COURSE | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Army | AL | REDSTONE ARSENAL | Gate 7 Access Control Point | | 3,550 | 3,550 |
| Air Force | AR | LITTLE ROCK AFB | Security Forces Operations Facility | | 10,400 | 10,400 |
| Air Force | AR | LITTLE ROCK AFB | C-130 FLIGHT SIMULATOR ADDITION | 5,800 | | 5,800 |
| Army | AR | PINE BLUFF ARSENAL | FUSE & DETONATOR MAGAZINE, DEPOT LEVEL | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| ARNG | AZ | CAMP NAVAJO | COMBAT PISTOL QUALIFICATION COURSE | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Air_Guard | AZ | DAVIS MONTHAN AFB | TFI-PREDATOR BEDDOWN-FOC | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| Air Force | AZ | DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB | CSAR HC-130J INFRASTRUCTURE | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| Air Force | AZ | DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB | CSAR HC-130J RQS OPERATIONS FACILITY | 8,700 | | 8,700 |
| Air Force | AZ | DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB | CSAR HC-130J SIMULATOR FACILITY | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| Air Force | AZ | DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB | DORMITORY (144 RM) | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Army | AZ | FORT HUACHUCA | Fire Station, Two Company | | 6,700 | 6,700 |
| Army | AZ | FORT HUACHUCA | BATTALION HEADQUARTERS UAV | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| Army | AZ | FORT HUACHUCA | UAV ER/MPER/MP | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| MC, Naval Res | AZ | PHOENIX | RESERVE CENTER MOVE TO LUKE AFB, NOSC PHOENIX | 10,986 | | 10,986 |
| Navy | AZ | YUMA | AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR (PHASE 1) | 27,050 | | 27,050 |
| Navy | AZ | YUMA | AIRFIELD ELEC DIST. AND CONTOL | 1,720 | | 1,720 |
| MC, Naval Res | CA | ALAMEDA | RESERVE TRAINING CENTER - ALAMEDA, CA | 5,960 | | 5,960 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | CA | BRIDGEPORT | FIRE STATION - RENOVATION - MWTC | 4,460 | | 4,460 |
| Navy | CA | BRIDGEPORT | Mountain Warfare Training Commissary | | 6,830 | 6,830 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | NORTH REGION TERTIARY TREATMENT PLANT (PH 1) | 142,330 | -30,000 | 112,330 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | ANGLICO OPERATIONS COMPLEX | 25,190 | | 25,190 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | AVIATION TRANSMITTER/RECEIVER SITE | 13,560 | | 13,560 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | BEQ | 39,610 | | 39,610 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | COMM/ELEC MAINTENANCE FACILITY | 13,170 | | 13,170 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | COMMUNICATIONS UPGRADES | 79,492 | | 79,492 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | 76,950 | | 76,950 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | ENLISTED DINING FACILITY | 32,300 | | 32,300 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | ENLISTED DINING FACILITY - EDSON RANGE | 37,670 | | 37,670 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | EXPAND COMBAT AIRCRAFT LOADING APRON | 12,240 | | 12,240 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | EXPANSION OF SRTTP TO 7.5 MGD | 55,180 | | 55,180 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | GAS/ELECTRICAL UPGRADES | 51,040 | | 51,040 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | OPERATIONS ACCESS POINTS | 12,740 | | 12,740 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | RECON BN OPERATIONS COMPLEX | 77,660 | | 77,660 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | RECRUIT BARRACKS - FIELD/K-SPAN | 23,200 | | 23,200 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | RECRUIT BARRACKS - SCHOOL OF INFANTRY | 53,320 | | 53,320 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | RECRUIT MARKSMANSHIP TRAINING FACILITY | 13,730 | | 13,730 |
| Navy | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | WFTBN SUPPORT FACILITIES | 15,780 | | 15,780 |
| USAR | CA | CAMP PENDLETON | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 19,500 | | 19,500 |
| Def-Wide | CA | CORONADO | SOF CLOSE QUARTERS COMBAT TRAINING FACILITY | 15,722 | | 15,722 |
| Navy | CA | EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE | EDWARDS RAMP EXTENSION | 3,007 | | 3,007 |
| Def-Wide | CA | EL CENTRO | AIRCRAFT DIRECT FUELING STATION | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Army | CA | FORT IRWIN | MOUT ASSAULT COURSE, PH 4 | 9,500 | | 9,500 |
| ARNG | CA | LOS ALAMITOS | READINESS CENTER PH1 | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| USAR | CA | LOS ANGELES | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 29,000 | | 29,000 |
| Air Force | CA | LOS ANGELES AFB | Consolidated Parking Area, Ph1 | | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| AF Reserve | CA | MARCH ARB | Small Arms Firing Range | | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| Navy | CA | MIRAMAR | AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON MODIFICATION | 9,280 | | 9,280 |
| Navy | CA | MONTEREY NSA | Marine Meteorology Center | | 10,240 | 10,240 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | CA | POINT LOMA ANNEX | Alter/Add Marine Mammal Surgical Center | | 2,330 | 2,330 |
| Def-Wide | CA | POINT LOMA ANNEX | REPLACE FUEL STORAGE FAC INCR 2 | 92,300 | | 92,300 |
| Navy | CA | POINT LOMA ANNEX | PUBLIC WORKS SHOPS CONSOLIDATION | 8,730 | | 8,730 |
| Navy | CA | SAN DIEGO | MESSHALL EXPANSION | 23,590 | | 23,590 |
| Air_Guard | CA | SOUTH CALIFORNIA LOGISTICS AIRPORT | TFI-PREDATOR BEDDOWN-FTU/LRE SITE | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| Air Force | CA | TRAVIS AFB | Taxiway Mike Bypass Road | | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Air Force | CA | TRAVIS AFB | CONSTRUCT KC-10 CARGO LOAD TRAINING FACILITY | 6,900 | | 6,900 |
| Def-Wide | CA | TRAVIS AFB | REPLACE FUEL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | 15,357 | | 15,357 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | BEQ | 37,290 | | 37,290 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | BEQ | 37,290 | | 37,290 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | COMM/ELECT MAINT/STORAGE | 12,660 | | 12,660 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | CONSOLIDATED ARMORY - TANKS | 12,670 | | 12,670 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | CONSTRUCT ROADS - NORTH MAINSIDE | 29,360 | | 29,360 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | DINING FACILITY - NORTH MAINSIDE | 17,200 | | 17,200 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | ELEC. INFRA. UPGRADE - 34.5KV TO 115KV | 46,220 | | 46,220 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | ELEC. POWER PLANT/CO-GEN/GAS TURBINE - N | 53,260 | | 53,260 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | HTHW/CHILLED WATER SYSTEM | 25,790 | | 25,790 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | INDUSTRIAL WASTE WATER PRETREATMENT SYS. | 3,330 | | 3,330 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | LAYDOWN SITE WORK - NORTH MAINSIDE | 21,740 | | 21,740 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | MAINT. SHOP - TRACKED | 19,780 | | 19,780 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | MAINT. SHOP - WHEELED | 16,040 | | 16,040 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | MAINT. SUNSHADES - WHEELED | 12,580 | | 12,580 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | NATURAL GAS SYSTEM EXTENSION | 19,990 | | 19,990 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | SECONDARY ELEC.DIST. - NORTH MAINSIDE | 31,720 | | 31,720 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | SEWAGE SYSTEM IMP. AND LIFT STATION | 5,800 | | 5,800 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | STATION COMM FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE | 49,040 | | 49,040 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | SUB-STATION AND ELECTRICAL UPGRADES | 31,310 | | 31,310 |
| Navy | CA | TWENTYNINE PALMS | WATER IMPROVEMENTS AND STORAGE TANK | 30,610 | | 30,610 |
| Air Force | CA | VANDENBERG AFB | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| USAR | CO | COLORADO SPRINGS | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | AUTOMATED MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE | 7,400 | | 7,400 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | AUTOMATED QUALIFICATION TRAINING RANGE | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | BARRACKS & DINING, INCREMENT 2 | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | BRIGADE COMPLEX | 69,000 | | 69,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | BRIGADE COMPLEX, PH 1 | 102,000 | | 102,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | COMMISSARY | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | CONVOY LIVE FIRE RANGE | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 4,450 | | 4,450 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | RAILROAD TRACKS | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | SCOUT/RECCE GUNNERY COMPLEX | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | TRAINING AIDS CENTER | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | URBAN ASSAULT COURSE | 3,100 | | 3,100 |
| Army | CO | FORT CARSON | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION (WT) COMPLEX | 56,000 | | 56,000 |
| Def-Wide | CO | FORT CARSON | HEALTH AND DENTAL CLINIC | 52,773 | | 52,773 |
| Def-Wide | CO | FORT CARSON | SOF BATTALION OPS COMPLEX | 45,200 | | 45,200 |
| Def-Wide | CO | FORT CARSON | SOF MILITARY WORKING DOG FACILITY | 3,046 | | 3,046 |
| Air Force | CO | PETERSON AFB | East Gate Realignment | | 7,200 | 7,200 |
| Air Force | CO | PETERSON AFB | C-130 SQUAD OPS/AMU (TFI) | 5,200 | | 5,200 |
| Air Force | CO | PETERSON AFB | NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE INSTITUTE | 19,900 | | 19,900 |
| Chem Demil | CO | PUEBLO DEPOT | AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY, PH XI | 92,500 | | 92,500 |
| AF Reserve | CO | SCHRIEVER AFB | WING HEADQUARTERS | 10,200 | | 10,200 |
| Air Force | CO | U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY | ADD TO CADET FITNESS CENTER | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Air_Guard | CT | BRADLEY IAP | TFI-CNAF Beddown-Upgrade Facilities | | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| USAR | CT | BRIDGEPORT | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| Navy | CT | NEW LONDON NSB | MK-28 Torpedo Magazine | | 6,570 | 6,570 |
| Air Force | DE | DOVER AFB | C-5 CARGO AIRCRAFT MAINT TRAINING FACILITY P1 | 5,300 | | 5,300 |
| Air Force | DE | DOVER AFB | CONSOL COMM FAC | 12,100 | | 12,100 |
| Navy | FL | BLOUNT ISLAND | PORT OPERATIONS FACILITY | 3,760 | | 3,760 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | ANTI-ARMOR, TRACKING & LIVE FIRE RANGE | 3,400 | | 3,400 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | AUTOMATED QUALIFICATION/TRAINING RANGE | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Navy | FL | EGLIN AFB | BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS, EOD SCHOOL, PHASE | 26,287 | | 26,287 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | BASIC 10M - 25M FIRING RANGE (ZERO) | 3,050 | | 3,050 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | CONSTRUCT DORMITORY (96 RM) | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Navy | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 A/C PARKING APRON | 11,252 | -11,252 | 0 |
| Navy | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 HYDRANT REFUELING SYS, PH 1 | 6,208 | -6,208 | 0 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 DUKE CONTROL TOWER | 3,420 | | 3,420 |
| Navy | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 JP8 FLIGHTLINE FILLSTANDS (EGLIN) | 3,492 | -3,492 | 0 |
| Navy | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 JP8 WEST SIDE BULK TANK UPDGRADES | 621 | -621 | 0 |
| Navy | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 PARALLEL TAXIWAY LADDER | 931 | -931 | 0 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 LIVE ORDINANCE LOAD FACILITY | 9,900 | | 9,900 |
| Navy | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 POL OPERATIONS FACILITY (EGLIN) | 2,056 | -2,056 | 0 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 A/C PARKING APRON | 16,400 | 11,252 | 27,652 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | GRENADE LAUNCHER RANGE | 1,600 | | 1,600 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | HAND GRENADE QUALIFICATION COURSE | 1,400 | | 1,400 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | INDOOR FIRING RANGE | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | LIGHT DEMOLITION RANGE | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | LIVE FIRE EXERCISE BREACH FACILITY | 4,950 | | 4,950 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | LIVE FIRE EXERCISE SHOOTHOUSE | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | NON-STANDARD SMALL ARMS RANGE | 3,400 | | 3,400 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | OPERATIONS COMPLEX, PH 3 | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| Def-Wide | FL | EGLIN AFB | SOF MILITARY WORKING DOG FACILITY | 3,046 | | 3,046 |
| Army | FL | EGLIN AFB | URBAN ASSAULT COURSE | 2,700 | | 2,700 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 HYDRANT REFUELING SYSTEM PHASE 1 | 8,100 | 6,208 | 14,308 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 JP-8 WEST SIDE BULK FUEL TANK UPGRADES | 960 | 621 | 1,581 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 JPS FLIGHTLINE FILLSTANDS | 5,400 | 3,492 | 8,892 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 PARELLEL TAXIWAY LADDER | 1,440 | 931 | 2,371 |
| Air Force | FL | EGLIN AFB | F-35 POL OPS FACILITY | 3,180 | 2,056 | 5,236 |
| Air Force | FL | HURLBURT FIELD | Flight Test Operations Facility (413 FLTS) | | 9,400 | 9,400 |
| Air Force | FL | HURLBURT FIELD | ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SUBSTATION | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| Air Force | FL | HURLBURT FIELD | REFUELING VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| Def-Wide | FL | HURLBURT FIELD | SOF SIMULATOR FACILITY FOR MC-130 (RECAP) | 8,156 | | 8,156 |
| Navy | FL | JACKSONVILLE | P-8/MMA FACILITIES MODIFICATION | 5,917 | | 5,917 |
| Def-Wide | FL | JACKSONVILLE IAP | REPLACE JET FUEL STORAGE COMPLEX | 11,500 | | 11,500 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | FL | MACDILL AFB | Consolidated Communications Facility | | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| Air Force | FL | MACDILL AFB | CENTCOM COMMANDANT FACILITY | 15,300 | | 15,300 |
| Air Force | FL | MACDILL AFB | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| Air Force | FL | MACDILL AFB | DORMITORY (120 ROOM) | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| Navy | FL | MAYPORT | Fitness Center | | 26,360 | 26,360 |
| Navy | FL | MAYPORT | CHANNEL DREDGING | 46,303 | -46,303 | 0 |
| Navy | FL | MAYPORT | WHARF CHARLIE REPAIR | 29,682 | | 29,682 |
| Army | FL | MIAMI DORAL | SOUTHCOM HEADQUARTERS, INCR 3 | 55,400 | | 55,400 |
| USAR | FL | PANAMA CITY | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 7,300 | | 7,300 |
| Navy | FL | PENSACOLA | CORRY "A" SCHOOL BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS R | 22,950 | | 22,950 |
| Navy | FL | PENSACOLA | SIMULATOR ADDITION FOR UMFO PROGRAM | 3,211 | | 3,211 |
| USAR | FL | WEST PALM BEACH | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Navy | FL | WHITING FIELD | T-6B JPATS TRNG. OPS PARALOFT FACIILITY | 4,120 | | 4,120 |
| Navy | GA | ALBANY MCLB | Weapons Maintenance Hardstand Facility | | 4,870 | 4,870 |
| USAR | GA | ATLANTA | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | BATTLE LAB | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY | 10,800 | | 10,800 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | DINING FACILITY | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | FIRE AND MOVEMENT RANGE | 2,800 | | 2,800 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX, PH 1 | 74,000 | | 74,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | TRAINING AREA TANK TRAILS | 9,700 | | 9,700 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | TRAINING BATTALION COMPLEX | 38,000 | | 38,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | TRAINING BATTALION COMPLEX, PH 1 | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | TRAINING BATTALION COMPLEX, PH 1 | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT BENNING | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION (WT) COMPLEX | 53,000 | | 53,000 |
| ARNG | GA | FORT BENNING | READINESS CENTER | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Def-Wide | GA | FORT BENNING | BLOOD DONOR CENTER REPLACEMENT | 12,313 | | 12,313 |
| Def-Wide | GA | FORT BENNING | DENTAL CLINIC | 4,887 | | 4,887 |
| Def-Wide | GA | FORT BENNING | SOF EXPAND BATTALION HEADQUARTERS | 3,046 | | 3,046 |
| Def-Wide | GA | FORT BENNING | WILSON ES CONSTRUCT GYMNASIUM | 2,330 | | 2,330 |
| Army | GA | FORT GILLEM | FORENSIC LAB | 10,800 | | 10,800 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | GA | FORT STEWART | AUTOMATED SNIPER FIELD FIRE RANGE | 3,400 | | 3,400 |
| Army | GA | FORT STEWART | BARRACKS & DINING, INCREMENT 2 | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT STEWART | BRIGADE COMPLEX | 93,000 | | 93,000 |
| Army | GA | FORT STEWART | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION (WT) COMPLEX | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Def-Wide | GA | FORT STEWART | HEALTH AND DENTAL CLINIC | 26,386 | | 26,386 |
| Def-Wide | GA | FORT STEWART | NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | 22,502 | | 22,502 |
| Def-Wide | GA | FORT STEWART | NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL | 22,501 | | 22,501 |
| ARNG | GA | HUNTER AAF | Readiness Center | | 8,967 | 8,967 |
| Air Force | GA | WARNER ROBINS AFB | Hot Cargo Pad/Taxiway | | 6,200 | 6,200 |
| Def-Wide | HI | FORD ISLAND | PACIFIC OPERATIONS FACILITY UPGRADE | 9,633 | | 9,633 |
| Air Force | HI | HICKAM AFB | Ground Control Tower | | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Air_Guard | HI | HICKAM AFB | TFI - F-22 LO/COMPOSITE REPAIR FACILITY | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Air_Guard | HI | HICKAM AFB | TFI-F-22 PARKING APRON AND TAXIWAYS | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| Navy | HI | OAHU | RANGE, 1000 - PUULOA | 5,380 | | 5,380 |
| Navy | HI | PEARL HARBOR | APCSS CONFERENCE & TECHNOLOGY LEARNING CENTER | 12,775 | | 12,775 |
| Navy | HI | PEARL HARBOR | MISSILE MAGAZINES (5), WEST LOCH | 22,407 | | 22,407 |
| Navy | HI | PEARL HARBOR | PACFLT SUB DRIVE-IN MAG SILENCING FAC (INC) | 8,645 | | 8,645 |
| Army | HI | SCHOFIELD BARRACKS | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 63,000 | | 63,000 |
| Army | HI | SCHOFIELD BARRACKS | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| Army | HI | SCHOFIELD BARRACKS | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION (WT) BARRACKS | 55,000 | | 55,000 |
| Army | HI | SCHOFIELD BARRACKS | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION COMPLEX | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Air Force | HI | WHEELER AFB | CONSTRUCT ASOC COMPLEX | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Army | HI | WHEELER AFB | REGIONAL SATCOM INFORMATION CENTER | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| ARNG | ID | GOWEN FIELD | COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY | 16,100 | | 16,100 |
| Air Force | ID | MOUNTAIN HOME AFB | LOGISTICS READINESS CENTER | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| USAR | IL | CHICAGO | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| MC, Naval Res | IL | JOLIET ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT | RESERVE TRAINING CENTER | 7,957 | | 7,957 |
| Air_Guard | IL | LINCOLN CAPITAL AIRPORT | Security Improvements-Relocate Base Entrance | | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Air Force | IL | SCOTT AFB | Aeromedical Evacuation Facility | | 7,400 | 7,400 |
| ARNG | IN | MUSCATATUCK | COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY PH | 10,100 | | 10,100 |
| Army | KS | FORT RILEY | ADVANCED WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT | 28,000 | | 28,000 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | KS | FORT RILEY | BATTALION COMPLEX | 59,000 | | 59,000 |
| Army | KS | FORT RILEY | BRIGADE COMPLEX | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Army | KS | FORT RILEY | IGLOO STORAGE, INSTALLATION | 7,200 | | 7,200 |
| Army | KS | FORT RILEY | LAND VEHICLE FUELING FACILITY | 3,700 | | 3,700 |
| Army | KS | FORT RILEY | TRAINING AIDS CENTER | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Air_Guard | KS | MCCONNELL AFB | TFI-Upgrade DCGS | | 8,700 | 8,700 |
| Chem Demil | KY | BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT | AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION PH X | 54,041 | | 54,041 |
| Army | KY | FORT CAMPBELL | Chapel Complex | | 14,400 | 14,400 |
| Def-Wide | KY | FORT CAMPBELL | HEALTH CLINIC | 8,600 | | 8,600 |
| Def-Wide | KY | FORT CAMPBELL | SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS COMPLEX | 29,289 | | 29,289 |
| Def-Wide | KY | FORT CAMPBELL | SOF MILITARY WORKING DOG FACILITY | 3,046 | | 3,046 |
| Army | KY | FORT KNOX | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION (WT) COMPLEX | 70,000 | | 70,000 |
| Army | LA | FORT POLK | Multipurpose Machine Gun Range | | 6,400 | 6,400 |
| Army | LA | FORT POLK | LAND PURCHASES AND CONDEMNATION | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| Army | LA | FORT POLK | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION (WT) COMPLEX | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| Air_Guard | MA | BARNES ANGB | F-15 Aircraft Ready Shelters | | 8,100 | 8,100 |
| ARNG | MA | HANSCOM AFB | ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER(JFHQ) | 29,000 | | 29,000 |
| Def-Wide | MD | ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND | USAMRICD REPLACEMENT, INC II | 111,400 | | 111,400 |
| Air Force | MD | ANDREWS AFB | REPLACE MUNITIONS STORAGE AREA | 9,300 | | 9,300 |
| Air_Guard | MD | ANDREWS AFB | RPL MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE COMPLEX | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Navy | MD | CARDEROCK NSWC DET | RDTE Support Facility, Ph2 | | 6,520 | 6,520 |
| Army | MD | FORT DETRICK | ATL Auditorium and Training Center Expansion | | 7,400 | 7,400 |
| Army | MD | FORT DETRICK | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS CENTER | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Army | MD | FORT DETRICK | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Def-Wide | MD | FORT DETRICK | BOUNDARY GATE AT NALIN POND | 10,750 | | 10,750 |
| Def-Wide | MD | FORT DETRICK | EMERGENCY SERVICE CENTER | 16,125 | | 16,125 |
| Def-Wide | MD | FORT DETRICK | NIBC TRUCK INSPECTION STATION & ROAD | 2,932 | | 2,932 |
| Def-Wide | MD | FORT DETRICK | USAMRIID STAGE I, INC IV | 108,000 | -80,000 | 28,000 |
| Def-Wide | MD | FORT MEADE | MISSION SUPPORT - PSAT | 8,800 | | 8,800 |
| Def-Wide | MD | FORT MEADE | NSAW CAMPUS CHILLED WATER BACKUP | 19,100 | | 19,100 |
| Def-Wide | MD | FORT MEADE | SOUTH CAMPUS UTILITY PLANT PH 2 | 175,900 | | 175,900 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | MD | FORT MEADE | Intersection, Rockenbach Road and Cooper Avenue | | 2,350 | 2,350 |
| Navy | MD | PATUXENT RIVER NAS | Special Communications Requirements Engineering Facility | | 11,043 | 11,043 |
| Air_Guard | ME | BANGOR IAP | REPLACE AIRCRAFT MAINT HANGAR/SHOPS | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Navy | ME | PORTSMOUTH NSY | Gate 2 Security Improvements (AT/FP) | | 7,090 | 7,090 |
| ARNG | MI | FORT CUSTER | Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS) | | 7,732 | 7,732 |
| ARNG | MN | ARDEN HILLS | READINESS CENTER PH2 | 6,700 | | 6,700 |
| ARNG | MN | CAMP RIPLEY | URBAN ASSAULT COURSE | 1,710 | | 1,710 |
| Def-Wide | MN | DULUTH IAP | JET FUEL STOARGE COMPLEX | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| USAR | MN | FORT SNELLING | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| ARNG | MO | BOONVILLE | READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT | 1,800 | | 1,800 |
| Army | MO | FORT LEONARD WOOD | AUTOMATED-AIDED INSTRUCTION FACILITY | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Army | MO | FORT LEONARD WOOD | TRANSIENT ADVANCED TRAINEE BARRACKS, PH 1 | 99,000 | | 99,000 |
| Army | MO | FORT LEONARD WOOD | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION COMPLEX | 19,500 | | 19,500 |
| Army | MO | FORT LEONARD WOOD | WHEELED VEHICLE DRIVERS COURSE | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Def-Wide | MO | FORT LEONARD WOOD | DENTAL CLINIC ADDITION | 5,570 | | 5,570 |
| Army | MO | FORT LEONARD WOOD | Health Clinic | | 7,800 | 7,800 |
| Air Force | MO | WHITEMAN AFB | Explosive Ordnance Disposal Operations Complex | | 7,400 | 7,400 |
| Air Force | MO | WHITEMAN AFB | Land Acquisition North and South Boundaries | | 5,500 | 5,500 |
| ARNG | MS | CAMP SHELBY | COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TNG FAC ADD/ALT | 16,100 | | 16,100 |
| Air_Guard | MS | GULFORT-BILOXI RA | Relocate Base Entrance | | 6,500 | 6,500 |
| AF Reserve | MS | KEESLER AFB | AERIAL PORT SQUADRON FACILITY | 9,800 | | 9,800 |
| Def-Wide | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | SOF ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION FACILITY EXPANSION | 11,791 | | 11,791 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | 4TH INFANTRY BATTALION OPS COMPLEX | 55,150 | | 55,150 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - WALLACE CREEK | 34,160 | | 34,160 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - WALLACE CREEK | 43,480 | | 43,480 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - WALLACE CREEK | 44,390 | | 44,390 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - WALLACE CREEK | 44,390 | | 44,390 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - WALLACE CREEK | 42,110 | | 42,110 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | CONSOLIDATED INFO TECH/TELECOM COMPLEX | 46,120 | | 46,120 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | FIELD TRAINING FAC. - DEVIL DOG - SOI | 37,170 | | 37,170 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | MAINTENANCE/OPS COMPLEX | 52,390 | | 52,390 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | MP WORKING DOG KENNEL - RELOCATION | 8,370 | | 8,370 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | NEW BASE ENTRY POINT AND ROAD (PHASE 1) | 79,150 | | 79,150 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER | 39,760 | | 39,760 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | PRE-TRIAL DETAINEE FACILITY | 18,580 | | 18,580 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | ROAD NETWORK - WALLACE CREEK | 15,130 | | 15,130 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | SOI-EAST FACILITIES - CAMP GEIGER | 56,940 | | 56,940 |
| Navy | NC | CAMP LEJEUNE | UTILITY EXPANSION - COURTHOUSE BAY | 56,280 | | 56,280 |
| Navy | NC | CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION | EMS/FIRE VEHICLE FACILITY | 10,600 | | 10,600 |
| Navy | NC | CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION | ORDNANCE MAGAZINES | 12,360 | | 12,360 |
| ARNG | NC | EAST FLAT ROCK | Readiness Center Add/Alt | | 2,516 | 2,516 |
| Army | NC | FORT BRAGG | AUTOMATED MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN | 4,350 | | 4,350 |
| Army | NC | FORT BRAGG | COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITY | 3,300 | | 3,300 |
| Army | NC | FORT BRAGG | SIMULATIONS CENTER | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| Army | NC | FORT BRAGG | TRANSIENT TRAINING BARRACKS COMPLEX | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| Army | NC | FORT BRAGG | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 19,500 | | 19,500 |
| Army | NC | FORT BRAGG | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | ALBRITTON JHS ADDITION | 3,439 | | 3,439 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | CONSOLIDATED HEALTH CLINIC | 26,386 | | 26,386 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | HEALTH CLINIC | 31,272 | | 31,272 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SOF BATTALION & COMPANY HQ | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SOF BATTALION HEADQUARTERS FACILITY | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SOF MILITARY WORKING DOG FACILITY | 1,125 | | 1,125 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SOF MILITARY WORKING DOG FACILITY | 3,046 | | 3,046 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SOF OPERATIONS ADDITION NORTH | 27,513 | | 27,513 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SOF OPERATIONS SUPPORT ADDITION | 13,756 | | 13,756 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SOF TUAV HANGAR | 2,948 | | 2,948 |
| Def-Wide | NC | FORT BRAGG | SPECIAL OPS PREP & CONDITIONING COURSE | 24,600 | | 24,600 |
| ARNG | NC | FORT BRAGG | Tactical Unmanned Aerial System (TUAS) Support Facility | | 6,038 | 6,038 |
| Navy | NC | NEW RIVER | APRON EXPANSION (PHASE 2) | 35,600 | | 35,600 |
| Navy | NC | NEW RIVER | GYMNASIUM/OUTDOOR POOL | 19,920 | | 19,920 |
| Navy | NC | NEW RIVER | PARALLEL TAXIWAY | 17,870 | | 17,870 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | NC | NEW RIVER | TACTICAL SUPPORT VAN PAD ADDITION | 5,490 | | 5,490 |
| Navy | NC | NEW RIVER | VMMT-204 MAINTENANCE HANGAR - PHASE 3 | 28,210 | | 28,210 |
| Air Force | NC | SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB | Radar Approach Control (RAPCON) Complex, Ph1 | | 6,900 | 6,900 |
| Army | NC | SUNNY POINT MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL | LIGHTNING PROTECTION SYSTEM | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Army | NC | SUNNY POINT MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL | TOWERS | 3,900 | | 3,900 |
| Air Force | ND | MINOT AFB | MISSILE PROCEDURES TRNG OPERATIONS | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Air Force | ND | MINOT AFB | MUNITIONS TRAILER STORAGE FACILITY | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| ARNG | NE | LINCOLN | ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER(JFHQ) | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Air_Guard | NE | LINCOLN MAP | JOINT FORCES OPERATIONS CENTER - ANG SHARE | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| Air Force | NJ | MCGUIRE AFB | Warfighter and Family Support Center | | 7,900 | 7,900 |
| Army | NJ | PICATINNY ARSENAL | Ballistic Evaluation Facility, Ph2 | | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| Air Force | NM | CANNON AFB | WB - CONSOLIDATED COMMUNICATION FAC | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Def-Wide | NM | CANNON AFB | SOF AMU ADDITION (CV-22) | 11,595 | | 11,595 |
| Def-Wide | NM | CANNON AFB | SOF FUEL CELL HANGAR (MC-130) | 41,269 | | 41,269 |
| Air Force | NM | HOLLOMAN AFB | Fire/Crash Rescue Station | | 10,400 | 10,400 |
| Air Force | NM | HOLLOMAN AFB | F-22A CONSOLIDATED MUNITIONS MAINT (TFI) | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| Air Force | NM | KIRTLAND AFB | Add to Space RDT&E Operations Center | | 5,800 | 5,800 |
| Air Force | NM | KIRTLAND AFB | HC-130J SIMULATOR FACILITY | 8,700 | | 8,700 |
| Air Force | NM | KIRTLAND AFB | MC-130J SIMULATOR FACILITY | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| ARNG | NM | SANTA FE | ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| Air Force | NV | CREECH AFB | UAS AT/FP SECURITY UPDATES | 2,700 | | 2,700 |
| ARNG | NV | NORTH LAS VEGAS | READINESS CENTER | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | NY | FORT DRUM | All Weather Marksmanship Facility | | 8,200 | 8,200 |
| Army | NY | FORT DRUM | BARRACKS | 57,000 | | 57,000 |
| Army | NY | FORT DRUM | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION COMPLEX | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Army | NY | FORT DRUM | WATER SYSTEM EXPANSION | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| AF Reserve | NY | NIAGARA FALLS ARS | Indoor Small Arms Range | | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| USAR | NY | ROCHESTER | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 13,600 | | 13,600 |
| Air_Guard | NY | WHEELER SACK AAF | TFI-Reaper LRE Beddown | | 2,700 | 2,700 |
| USAR | OH | CINCINNATI | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Air_Guard | OH | MANSFIELD LAHM AIRPORT | TFI - RED HORSE SQUADRON BEDDOWN | 11,400 | | 11,400 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | OH | WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB | Replace West Ramp, Ph 2 (TFI) | | 10,600 | 10,600 |
| Air Force | OH | WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB | CONVERSION FOR ADVANCED POWER RESEARCH LAB | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Air Force | OH | WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB | INFO TECH COMPLEX PH 1 | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Air Force | OK | ALTUS AFB | REPAIR TAXIWAYS | 20,300 | | 20,300 |
| Def-Wide | OK | ALTUS AFB | REPLACE UPLOAD FACILITY | 2,700 | | 2,700 |
| Army | OK | FORT SILL | AUTOMATED INFANTRY SQUAD BATTLE COURSE | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| Army | OK | FORT SILL | BARRACKS | 65,000 | | 65,000 |
| Army | OK | FORT SILL | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION COMPLEX | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| Def-Wide | OK | FORT SILL | DENTAL CLINIC | 10,554 | | 10,554 |
| Army | OK | MCALESTER | GENERAL PURPOSE STORAGE BUILDING | 11,200 | | 11,200 |
| Army | OK | MCALESTER | HIGH EXPLOSIVE MAGAZINE, DEPOT LEVEL | 1,300 | | 1,300 |
| Air Force | OK | TINKER AFB | T-9 Noise Suppressor | | 5,100 | 5,100 |
| Air Force | OK | TINKER AFB | BUILDING 3001 HANGER DOOR | 13,037 | | 13,037 |
| Air_Guard | OK | WILL ROGERS WORLD AIRPORT | TFI - AIR SUPT OPERS SQDN (ASOS) BEDDN | 7,300 | | 7,300 |
| ARNG | OR | POLK COUNTY | Readiness Center | | 12,100 | 12,100 |
| USAR | PA | ASHLEY | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 9,800 | | 9,800 |
| FH Con DW | PA | DEF DISTR DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND | DEF DISTRIBUTION DEPOT NEW CUMBER | 2,859 | | 2,859 |
| USAR | PA | HARRISBURG | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| USAR | PA | NEWTON SQUARE | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| USAR | PA | UNIONTOWN | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 11,800 | | 11,800 |
| Navy | RI | NEWPORT | OFFICER TRAINING COMMAND QUARTERS | 45,803 | | 45,803 |
| Navy | RI | NEWPORT | Renovate Perry Hall | | 8,530 | 8,530 |
| Navy | SC | BEAUFORT | WIDEBODY AIRCRAFT FUEL LANE | 1,280 | | 1,280 |
| MC, Naval Res | SC | CHARLESTON | RESERVE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY | 4,240 | | 4,240 |
| Army | SC | CHARLESTON NAVAL WEAPON STATION | PIER AND LOADING/UNLOADING RAMPS | 5,700 | | 5,700 |
| Army | SC | CHARLESTON NAVAL WEAPON STATION | RAILROAD TRACKS | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Army | SC | CHARLESTON NAVAL WEAPON STATION | STAGING AREA | 4,100 | | 4,100 |
| ARNG | SC | EASTOVER | ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY ADD/ALT | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | SC | FORT JACKSON | ADVANCED SKILLS TRAINEE BARRACKS | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| Army | SC | FORT JACKSON | INFILTRATION COURSE | 1,900 | | 1,900 |
| Army | SC | FORT JACKSON | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 3,600 | | 3,600 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | SC | FORT JACKSON | TRAINING BATTALION COMPLEX | 66,000 | | 66,000 |
| ARNG | SC | GREENVILLE | ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| Navy | SC | PARRIS ISLAND | ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION AND IMPROVEMENTS | 6,972 | | 6,972 |
| Air Force | SC | SHAW AFB | Add/Alter USAFCENT Headquarters (Current Mission) | | 21,183 | 21,183 |
| ARNG | TX | AUSTIN | ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| ARNG | TX | AUSTIN | FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP, JOINT | 5,700 | | 5,700 |
| USAR | TX | AUSTIN | ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER/AMSA | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| USAR | TX | BRYAN | Army Reserve Center | | 12,200 | 12,200 |
| Navy | TX | CORPUS CHRISTI | OPERATIONAL FACILITIES FOR T-6 | 19,764 | | 19,764 |
| Air Force | TX | DYESS AFB | C-130J ALTER HANGAR | 4,500 | | 4,500 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | AIRCRAFT FUEL STORAGE | 10,800 | | 10,800 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | AUTOMATED INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | AUTOMATED MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE | 6,900 | | 6,900 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | AUTOMATED SNIPER FIELD FIRE RANGE | 4,250 | | 4,250 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | BRIGADE STAGING AREA COMPLEX | 14,800 | | 14,800 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | FIRE AND MILITARY POLICE STATIONS | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | KNOWN DISTANCE RANGE | 4,750 | | 4,750 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | LIGHT DEMOLITION RANGE | 2,400 | | 2,400 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | SCOUT/RECCE GUNNERY COMPLEX | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | SIMULATION CENTER | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE & COMPANY OPS FAC | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| Army | TX | FORT BLISS | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Def-Wide | TX | FORT BLISS | HEALTH AND DENTAL CLINIC | 30,295 | | 30,295 |
| Def-Wide | TX | FORT BLISS | HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, INCREMENT 1 | 86,975 | | 86,975 |
| USAR | TX | FORT BLISS | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 9,500 | | 9,500 |
| Army | TX | FORT HOOD | AUTOMATED MULTIPURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE | 6,700 | | 6,700 |
| Army | TX | FORT HOOD | URBAN ASSAULT COURSE | 2,400 | | 2,400 |
| Army | TX | FORT HOOD | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Def-Wide | TX | FORT HOOD | ALTER FUEL PUMP HOUSE AND FILL STAND | 3,000 | | 3,000 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | TX | FORT HOOD | Family Life Center | | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| Army | TX | FORT SAM HOUSTON | ACCESS CONTROL POINT AND ROAD IMPROVEMENTS | 10,800 | | 10,800 |
| Army | TX | FORT SAM HOUSTON | GENERAL INSTRUCTION BUILDING | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| MC, Naval Res | TX | FORT WORTH NAS/JRB | Replace Joint Base Communications | | 6,170 | 6,170 |
| Air Force | TX | GOODFELLOW AFB | JOINT INTEL TECH TRNG FAC, PH 1 (TFI) | 18,400 | | 18,400 |
| Air Force | TX | GOODFELLOW AFB | STUDENT DORMITORY (100 RM) | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| USAR | TX | HOUSTON | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 24,000 | | 24,000 |
| Air_Guard | TX | KELLY FIELD ANNEX | Add/Alt Aircraft Maintenance Shops | | 7,900 | 7,900 |
| Navy | TX | KINGSVILLE NAS | Solar Panel Array | | 4,470 | 4,470 |
| AF Reserve | TX | LACKLAND AFB | C-5 GROUND TRAINING SCHOOLHOUSE ADDITION | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| Air Force | TX | LACKLAND AFB | BMT SATELLITE CLASSROOM/DINING FAC | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| Air Force | TX | LACKLAND AFB | EVASION, CONDUCT AFTER CAPTURE TRNG | 4,879 | | 4,879 |
| Air Force | TX | LACKLAND AFB | RECRUIT DORMITORY 2, PHASE 2 | 77,000 | | 77,000 |
| Def-Wide | TX | LACKLAND AFB | AMBULATORY CARE CENTER | 72,610 | | 72,610 |
| Def-Wide | TX | LACKLAND AFB | DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT | 29,318 | | 29,318 |
| USAR | TX | ROBSTOWN | Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility | | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| MC, Naval Res | TX | SAN ANTONIO | RESERVE TRAINING CENTER | 2,210 | | 2,210 |
| USAR | TX | SAN ANTONIO | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Def-Wide | UT | CAMP WILLIAMS | IC CNCI DATA CENTER INCREMENT 2 | 800,000 | -300,000 | 500,000 |
| Army | UT | DUGWAY PROVING GROUND | WATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| AF Reserve | UT | HILL AFB | RESERVE SQUAD OPS/AMU FACILITY | 3,200 | | 3,200 |
| Air Force | UT | HILL AFB | F-22A RADAR CROSS SECTION TESTING FAC | 21,053 | | 21,053 |
| Air Force | UT | HILL AFB | PCC Apron NW End Taxiway A | | 5,100 | 5,100 |
| Def-Wide | VA | DAHLGREN | AEGIS BMD FACILITY EXPANSION | 24,500 | | 24,500 |
| Navy | VA | DAHLGREN | Electromagnetic Research & Engineering Facility Add, Ph 2 | | 3,660 | 3,660 |
| Def-Wide | VA | DAM NECK | SOF OPERATIONS FACILITY INC III | 15,967 | | 15,967 |
| Army | VA | FORT A.P. HILL | AUTOMATED INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| Army | VA | FORT A.P. HILL | FIELD TRAINING AREA | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| Army | VA | FORT A.P. HILL | TRAINING AIDS CENTER | 9,100 | | 9,100 |
| Army | VA | FORT BELVOIR | FLIGHT CONTROL TOWER | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| Army | VA | FORT BELVOIR | ROAD AND ACCESS CONTROL POINT | 9,500 | | 9,500 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | VA | FORT BELVOIR | ROAD AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Army | VA | FORT LEE | Defense Access Roads | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| ARNG | VA | FORT PICKETT | REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE PH2 | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| Air Force | VA | LANGLEY AFB | WEST & LASALLE GATES FORCE PROTECTION/ACCESS | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Def-Wide | VA | LITTLE CREEK | SOF SUPPORT ACTIVITY OPERATION FACILITY | 18,669 | | 18,669 |
| Navy | VA | LITTLE CREEK | NAVAL CONSTRUCTION DIVISION OPERATIONS FAC | 13,095 | | 13,095 |
| Navy | VA | NORFOLK | E-2D TRAINER FACILITY | 11,737 | | 11,737 |
| Navy | VA | NORFOLK | FACILITY UPGRADES FOR E-2D PROGRAM | 6,402 | | 6,402 |
| MC, Naval Res | VA | OCEANA NAVAL AIR STATION | C-40 HANGAR | 30,400 | | 30,400 |
| Def-Wide | VA | DAM NECK | SOF Cafeteria | | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| Def-Wide | VA | PENTAGON | PENTAGON ELECTRICAL UPGRADE | 19,272 | | 19,272 |
| Def-Wide | VA | PENTAGON | SECONDARY UNINTERRUPTIBLE POWER RAVEN ROCK | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| Navy | VA | PORTSMOUTH | SHIP REPAIR PIER REPLACEMENT | 226,969 | -50,000 | 176,969 |
| Navy | VA | QUANTICO | AIRCRAFT TRAINER | 3,170 | | 3,170 |
| Navy | VA | QUANTICO | BATTALION TRAINING FACILITY - MSGBN | 10,340 | | 10,340 |
| Navy | VA | QUANTICO | DINING FACILITY - TBS | 14,780 | | 14,780 |
| Navy | VA | QUANTICO | MC INFORMATION OPERATIONS CENTER - MCIOC | 29,620 | | 29,620 |
| Navy | VA | QUANTICO | SOUTH MAINSIDE ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION | 15,270 | | 15,270 |
| Navy | VA | QUANTICO | STUDENT QUARTERS - TBS (PHASE 4) | 32,060 | | 32,060 |
| Navy | WA | BANGOR | LIMITED AREA PRODUCTION/STRG CMPLX (INC 6) | 87,292 | | 87,292 |
| Navy | WA | BREMERTON | CVN MAINTENANCE PIER REPLACEMENT (INC 2) | 69,064 | | 69,064 |
| Navy | WA | BREMERTON | ENCLAVE FENCING/ PARKING, INCREMENT 1 | 67,419 | | 67,419 |
| Navy | WA | EVERETT NS | Small Craft Launch | | 3,810 | 3,810 |
| Def-Wide | WA | FAIRCHILD AFB | REPLACE FUEL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| Air Force | WA | FAIRCHILD AFB | TFI Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Facility | | 4,150 | 4,150 |
| Army | WA | FORT LEWIS | ANIMAL BUILDING | 3,050 | | 3,050 |
| Army | WA | FORT LEWIS | BRIGADE COMPLEX, INC 4 | 102,000 | | 102,000 |
| Army | WA | FORT LEWIS | LIVE FIRE EXERCISE SHOOTHOUSE | 2,550 | | 2,550 |
| Army | WA | FORT LEWIS | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 4,100 | | 4,100 |
| Def-Wide | WA | FORT LEWIS | HEALTH AND ENTAL CLINIC | 15,636 | | 15,636 |
| Def-Wide | WA | FORT LEWIS | SOF SUPPORT COMPANY FACILITY | 14,500 | | 14,500 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | WA | FORT LEWIS | Fort Lewis-McChord AFB Joint Access | | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Navy | WA | INDIAN ISLAND NM | Ordnance Storage Pads with 2 Covers | | 13,130 | 13,130 |
| Navy | WA | SPOKANE | JNT PERS RECOVERY AGENCY SPECIALIZED SERE TRA | 12,707 | | 12,707 |
| USAR | WI | FORT MCCOY | COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Air_Guard | WI | GENERAL MITCHELL IAP | Add/Alt KC-135 Corrosion Control Hangar | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Air Force | WY | F. E. WARREN AFB | ADAL MISSILE SERVICE COMPLEX | 9,100 | | 9,100 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY | 38,000 | -38,000 | 0 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | APS COMPOUND | 38,000 | -38,000 | 0 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | BARRACKS | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | COALITION OPERATION CENTER | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | PERIMETER FENCE AND GUARD TOWERS | 7,000 | -7,000 | 0 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | FUEL SYSTEM PH 6 | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Army | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | FUEL SYSTEM PH 7 | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Air Force | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | PASSENGER TERMINAL | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| Army | BE | BRUSSELS | NATO SOF Operational Support | | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Def-Wide | BE | BRUSSELS | REPLACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (SHAPE) | 38,124 | | 38,124 |
| Navy | BI | SW ASIA | WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PHASE 2 | 41,526 | | 41,526 |
| Air Force | CM | PALANQUERO AB | PALANQUERO AB DEVELOPMENT | 46,000 | | 46,000 |
| Navy | DJ | CAMP LEMONIER | AMMO SUPPLY POINT | 21,689 | | 21,689 |
| Navy | DJ | CAMP LEMONIER | FIRE STATION | 4,772 | | 4,772 |
| Navy | DJ | CAMP LEMONIER | INTERIOR PAVED ROADS PHASE A | 7,275 | | 7,275 |
| Navy | DJ | CAMP LEMONIER | SECURITY FENCING I | 8,109 | | 8,109 |
| Def-Wide | GB | GUANTANAMO BAY | REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS | 12,500 | | 12,500 |
| Def-Wide | GR | SOUDA BAY | FUEL STORAGE TANKS & PIPELINE RPL | 24,000 | | 24,000 |
| Def-Wide | GU | VARIOUS LOCATIONS | Unspecified Various Locations | | 350,000 | 350,000 |
| Def-Wide | GU | AGANA NAVAL AIR STATION | REPLACE GAS CYLANDER STORAGE FACILITY | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| Air Force | GU | ANDERSEN AFB | Postal Service Center | | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| Navy | GU | ANDERSEN AFB | AAFB NORTH RAMP PARKING (PHASE 1) | 88,797 | | 88,797 |
| Navy | GU | ANDERSEN AFB | AAFB NORTH RAMP UTILITIES (PHASE 1) | 21,500 | | 21,500 |
| Air Force | GU | ANDERSEN AFB | COMMANDO WARRIOR OPERATIONS FAC | 4,200 | | 4,200 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | GU | ANDERSEN AFB | NW FIELD ATFP PERIMETER FENCE AND ROAD | 4,752 | | 4,752 |
| Air Force | GU | ANDERSEN AFB | NW FIELD COMBAT SPT VEHICLE MAINT FAC | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Air Force | GU | ANDERSEN AFB | STRIKE FOL ELECTRICAL INFRASTRUCTURE | 33,750 | | 33,750 |
| ARNG | GU | BARRIGADA | READINESS CENTER | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Navy | GU | NAVAL BASE GUAM | APRA HARBOR WHARVES IMP. (PHASE 1) | 167,033 | -40,000 | 127,033 |
| Navy | GU | NAVAL BASE GUAM | CONSOLIDATED SLC TRAINING & CSS-15 HQ FAC | 45,309 | | 45,309 |
| Navy | GU | NAVAL BASE GUAM | DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS | 48,860 | | 48,860 |
| Navy | GU | NAVAL BASE GUAM | MILITARY WORKING DOG RELOCATION, APRA HARBOR | 27,070 | | 27,070 |
| Navy | GU | NAVAL BASE GUAM | TORPEDO EXERCISE SUPPORT BUILDING | 15,627 | | 15,627 |
| Army | GY | ANSBACH | BARRACKS | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Army | GY | ANSBACH | BARRACKS | 14,200 | | 14,200 |
| FH Con Army | GY | BAUMHOLDER | FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRU(138 UNITS) | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Def-Wide | GY | KAISERLAUTERN AB | KAISERSLAUTERN COMPLEX-PHASE 1 | 19,380 | | 19,380 |
| Def-Wide | GY | KAISERLAUTERN AB | KAISERSLAUTERN HS REPLACE SCHOOL | 74,165 | | 74,165 |
| Army | GY | KLEBER KASERNE | BARRACKS | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Army | GY | LANDSTUHL | WARRIOR IN TRANSITION (WT) COMPLEX | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Air Force | GY | RAMSTEIN AB | CONSTRUCT AGE MAINT COMPLEX | 11,500 | | 11,500 |
| Air Force | GY | RAMSTEIN AB | CONTINGENCY RESPONSE GROUP COMMAND | 23,200 | | 23,200 |
| Air Force | GY | SPANGDAHLEM AB | FITNESS CTR | 23,500 | | 23,500 |
| FH Con Army | GY | WEISBADEN | FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONST INC 2 | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| FH Con Army | GY | WEISBADEN | FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONST INC 2 | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| FH Con Army | GY | WEISBADEN | FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONST INC 2 | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Def-Wide | GY | WEISBADEN | WIESBADEN HS NEW CAFETERIA AND KITCHEN | 5,379 | | 5,379 |
| Air Force | IT | SIGONELLA | GLOBAL HAWK AIRCRAFT MAINT AND OPS COMPLEX | 31,300 | | 31,300 |
| Army | IT | VICENZA | BDE COMPLEX - BARRACKS/COMMUNITY, INCR 3 | 22,500 | | 22,500 |
| Army | IT | VICENZA | BDE COMPLEX - OPERATIONS SPT FAC, INCR 3 | 23,500 | | 23,500 |
| Army | JA | OKINAWA | TRAINING AIDS CENTER | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| Army | JA | SAGAMIHARA | TRAINING AIDS CENTER | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| Army | KR | CAMP HUMPHREYS | FIRE STATIONS | 13,200 | | 13,200 |
| Army | KR | CAMP HUMPHREYS | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Army | KR | CAMP HUMPHREYS | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 18,000 | | 18,000 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | KR | K-16 AIRFIELD | CONVERT WAREHOUSES | 5,050 | | 5,050 |
| Def-Wide | KR | OSAN AB | REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| FH Con Navy | KR | PUSAN | CONSTR CHINHAE WELCOME CTR/WAREHOUSE | 4,376 | | 4,376 |
| Army | KU | CAMP ARIFJAN | APS WAREHOUSES | 82,000 | | 82,000 |
| Def-Wide | ML | GUAM | HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT, INCREMENT 1 | 259,156 | | 259,156 |
| FH Con Navy | ML | GUAM | REPLACE GUAM N. TIPALAO PH III | 20,730 | | 20,730 |
| Air Force | OM | AL MUSANNAH AB | AIRLIFT RAMP AND FUEL FACILITIES | 69,000 | | 69,000 |
| Air Force | OM | AL MUSANNAH AB | WAR RESERVE MATERIAL COMPOUND | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| USAR | PR | CAGUAS | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 12,400 | | 12,400 |
| Air Force | QA | AL UDEID | BLATCHFORD-PRESTON COMPLEX PH II | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| Navy | SP | ROTA | RECEPTION AIRFIELD FACILITIES | 26,278 | | 26,278 |
| Air Force | TK | INCIRLIK AB | CONSTRUCT CONSOLIDATED COMMUNITY CTR | 9,200 | | 9,200 |
| Def-Wide | UK | MENWITH HILL STATION | MHS PSC CONSTRUCTION | 37,588 | | 37,588 |
| Def-Wide | UK | RAF MILDENHALL | CONNECT FUEL TANK DISTRIBUTION PIPE LN | 4,700 | | 4,700 |
| Def-Wide | UK | ROYAL AIR FORCE ALCONBURY | MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT | 14,227 | | 14,227 |
| Def-Wide | UK | ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH | LIBERTY IS - GYMNASIUM | 4,509 | | 4,509 |
| ARNG | VI | ST. CROIX | REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE PH1 | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Air Force | ZC | CLASSIFIED LOCATION | CLASSIFIED PLANNING & DESIGN | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| NSIP | ZU | NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM | NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM | 276,314 | -41,400 | 234,914 |
| NSIP | ZU | NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM | NATO Headquarters | | 41,400 | 41,400 |
| Air_Guard | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 9,000 | 15,005 | 24,005 |
| Air Force | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING & DESIGN | 79,363 | 11,044 | 90,407 |
| Air_Guard | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING & DESIGN | 10,061 | 1,960 | 12,021 |
| Air_Guard | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | Programmatic Plus Up | | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING & DESIGN FY10 | 153,029 | 9,843 | 162,872 |
| ARNG | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 23,981 | 16,507 | 40,488 |
| ARNG | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | Programmatic Plus Up | | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 166,896 | 12,756 | 179,652 |
| FH Con AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | CLASSIFIED PROJECT | 50 | | 50 |
| FH Con Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (2428 UNITS) | 219,300 | | 219,300 |
| FH Con AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | CONSTRUCTION IMPROVMENTS | 61,737 | | 61,737 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| FH Con Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | DESIGN | 2,771 | | 2,771 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 90,000 | | 90,000 |
| FHIF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| FH Con Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | FAMILY HOUSING P&D | 3,936 | | 3,936 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 39,182 | | 39,182 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 4,426 | | 4,426 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 19 | | 19 |
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 14,624 | | 14,624 |
| HOAP | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM | 23,225 | | 23,225 |
| Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | HOST NATION SUPPORT FY 10 | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | HOUSING PRIVATIZATION | 53,816 | | 53,816 |
| FH Con Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | IMPROVEMENTS | 118,692 | | 118,692 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | JEP EXERCISE RELATED CONSTRUCTION | 7,861 | | 7,861 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | LEASING | 102,858 | | 102,858 |
| FH Ops Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | LEASING | 205,685 | | 205,685 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | LEASING | 10,108 | | 10,108 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | LEASING | 33,579 | | 33,579 |
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | LEASING | 101,432 | | 101,432 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | LEASING ACCOUNT | 548 | | 548 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MAINTENANCE (RPMA & RPMC) | 148,318 | | 148,318 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT | 1,911 | | 1,911 |
| FH Ops Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 115,854 | | 115,854 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 69 | | 69 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 366 | | 366 |
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 94,184 | | 94,184 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 1,557 | | 1,557 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 51,334 | | 51,334 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 309 | | 309 |
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 60,278 | | 60,278 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 4,525 | | 4,525 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 3,717 | | 3,717 |
| Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MINOR CONSTRUCTION FY 10 | 23,000 | 10,000 | 33,000 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT | 1,543 | | 1,543 |
| FH Ops Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT | 1,177 | | 1,177 |
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT | 457 | | 457 |
| FH Ops Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | OPERATIONS | 87,263 | | 87,263 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | OPERATIONS | 35 | | 35 |
| FH Con AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING & DESIGN | 4,314 | | 4,314 |
| AF Reserve | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 1,976 | 2,693 | 4,669 |
| AF Reserve | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | Programmatic Plus Up | | 55,000 | 55,000 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 3,575 | | 3,575 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 10,534 | | 10,534 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 35,579 | -16,500 | 19,079 |
| MC, Naval Res | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 2,371 | 580 | 2,951 |
| MC, Naval Res | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | Programmatic Plus Up | | 101,303 | 101,303 |
| USAR | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 22,262 | 2,754 | 25,016 |
| USAR | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | Programmatic Plus Up | | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| FH Ops Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS | 31,789 | | 31,789 |
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS | 27,147 | | 27,147 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | SERVICES ACCOUNT | 20,183 | | 20,183 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | SERVICES ACCOUNT | 29 | | 29 |
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | SERVICES ACCOUNT | 16,462 | | 16,462 |
| Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTR | 12,483 | 5,000 | 17,483 |
| Air Force | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 18,000 | 5,000 | 23,000 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 6,800 | | 6,800 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 3,000 | -3,000 | 0 |
| USAR | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 3,600 | 2,500 | 6,100 |
| FH Ops AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 81,686 | | 81,686 |
| FH Ops Army | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 81,650 | | 81,650 |
| FH Ops DW | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 274 | | 274 |

## FY 2010 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FH Ops Navy | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 53,956 | | 53,956 |
| ARNG | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 10,300 | 18,778 | 29,078 |
| Army | ZU | VARIOUS LOCATIONS | Brigade Combat Team Stationing | 0 | -500,000 | -500,000 |
| Army | ZU | VARIOUS LOCATIONS | Trainee Troop Housing | | 450,000 | 450,000 |
| AF Reserve | ZU | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 800 | 2,500 | 3,300 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 72,974 | | 72,974 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 4,425 | | 4,425 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 8,855 | | 8,855 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONST | 6,022 | | 6,022 |
| Def-Wide | ZU | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 4,100 | | 4,100 |
| BRAC 05 | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE 2005 | 7,479,498 | -350,000 | 7,129,498 |
| BRAC IV | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE IV | 396,768 | 140,000 | 536,768 |
| | | | **TOTAL FY2010 AUTHORIZATIONS** | **22,946,036** | **314,229** | **23,260,265** |
| | | | **Prior Year Savings** | | **-85,300** | **-85,300** |
| | | | **GRAND TOTAL** | **22,946,036** | **228,929** | **23,174,965** |

### Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite Division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010."

### Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVI and title XXIX shall expire on October 1, 2012, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later.

### Section 2003—Effective Date

This section provides that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII and XXIX of this Act take effect on October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

## TITLE XXI—ARMY

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,660,779,000 for Army military construction and $796,654,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends authorization of $3,630,422,000 for military construction and $796,654,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Castner Range Complex at Fort Bliss

The committee understands that the Department of Defense ceased operations at the Castner Range Complex at Fort Bliss, Texas, in 1971. In testimony, the Army indicated that Castner Range is "wholly impractical to use for any range activity." The committee is interested in maintaining this land for a conservation purpose.

The committee encourages the Department to enter into a lease in furtherance of conveyance with eligible conservation entities.

#### 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) $500,000,000 for the stationing of brigade combat teams at Fort Carson, Colorado; Fort Stewart, Georgia; and Fort Bliss, Texas.

The budget request included $404,000,000 in brigade combat team construction and $1,070,000,000 in brigade combat team facility support construction.

The Secretary of Defense recently announced a reduction of the number of Army brigade combat teams from 48 to 45. The Army indicated that they will reduce the number of brigades programmed to arrive at Fort Carson, Fort Stewart, and Fort Bliss. Unfortunately, this revision was announced after significant infra-

structure investment was made at these three installations. This misalignment of infrastructure with the strategic posture of the Army is troubling. As a result of these announcements, the Army is developing a program that would seek to accelerate the reduction of temporary facilities at the three installations that were associated with the stationing of other brigade combat teams. The committee supports this initiative. The Army has indicated that they should complete a final analysis of this basing decision by July 31, 2009.

The committee is concerned that the application of funds beyond the support of brigade combat teams at the recipient locations is out of scope of the authorized projects. For those projects that exceed the scope of the current authorizations, the committee expects the Secretary of Defense to follow the process established by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and the budget reprogramming process. The committee also expects the Secretary of the Army to complete an update of the Grow the Army stationing plan by July 31, 2009:

(2) $30,000,000 for the Aviation Task Force Complex Phase 1 at Fort Wainwright, Alaska.

The budget request included $125,000,000 to support construction of various facilities including a barracks and a vehicle maintenance shop.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2010.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $95,000,000, a reduction of $30,000,000, to support this project.

### Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $401,000—Water Survival Training Facility, Fort Rucker, Alabama;

(2) $720,000—General Purpose Admin Facility, Fort Bragg, North Carolina;

(3) $6,500,000—Access Control Points, Fort Bliss, Texas;

(4) $900,000—Physical Fitness Complex, Fort Campbell, Kentucky; and

(5) $956,000—Information Processing Node, PH 2, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland.

## 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 2010. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in

this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2010.

### Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2010.

### Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2010 for the Army. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

### Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2873 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110–417) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct a 400-person chapel.

### Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2010, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

## TITLE XXII—NAVY

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,763,264,000 for Navy military construction and $515,109,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends authorization of $3,705,610,000 for military construction and $515,109,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head Division, Indian Head, Maryland

The committee supports the Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head "Naval Ashore Vision 2020 Plan" that contains infrastructure improvements vital to ensuring that the Indian Head Division maintains its critical role as the Department of Defense Energetics Center. Centerpieces of the "Naval Ashore Vision 2020 Plan" are the construction of the new Advanced Energetics Research Laboratory Complex and the Energetics Systems and Technology Laboratory Complex. Therefore, the committee urges the

Secretary of the Navy to ensure inclusion of these priority programs in the Future Years Defense Program.

### Navy-State Partnership for Improving Infrastructure at Naval Installations

The committee understands that the State of Connecticut offered $7.6 million in state funding to enter into an agreement with the Department of the Navy to improve the infrastructure of Naval Submarine Base New London. The funding is expected to be used to upgrade inefficient boilers at the base's power plant ($3.0 million) and make improvements to the 91-year-old dive locker ($4.6 million). The committee understands that the Navy has determined that these improvements can be made without congressional authorization so long as the State of Connecticut fully funds the projects.

The committee recognizes this agreement as an innovative partnership that invests in the operational needs of Naval Submarine Base New London, while providing the State of Connecticut the opportunity to participate in the support of the submarine force. The committee encourages the Department to view favorably these types of offers from states to support military installations.

### Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range

The committee notes that the San Diego Shotgun Sports Association (SDSSA) has operated a trap and skeet range on Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar since 1957, providing free recreational shooting for Marines and their families for more than 50 years. The committee understands that the operation of the range over the years may have caused lead contamination beyond the range boundaries and that the Marine Corps is conducting a Preliminary Assessment and Site Investigation (PA/SI) to assess necessary environmental mitigation. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to complete the PA/SI as rapidly as possible so that appropriate mitigation measures may be taken and the range reopened without undue delay. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives when the PA/SI is completed. The report should include a description of any mitigation measures needed and timeline to complete, and plans and timeline to reopen the range.

### 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) $30,000,000 for the North Region Tertiary Treatment Plant Phase 1 at Camp Pendleton, California.

The budget request included $142,330,000 to support construction of the 5 million gallon per day sludge treatment facility.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of De-

fense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2010.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $112,330,000, a reduction of $30,000,000, to support this project.

(2) $50,000,000 for the Ship Repair Pier Replacement at Naval Support Activity Norfolk Navy Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia.

The budget request included $226,969,000 to support a new ship repair pier.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2010.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $176,969,000, a reduction of $50,000,000, to support this project; and

(3) $40,000,000 for the Apra Harbor Wharf Improvement, Agana, Guam.

The budget request included $167,033,000 to provide infrastructure, wharf improvements, and utilities to allow cold iron berthing for transient ships.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2010.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $127,033,000, a reduction of $40,000,000, to support this project.

(4) $46,303,000 for Channel Dredging at Naval Station Mayport.

The budget request included $46,303,000 to support construction dredging of the Naval Station Mayport turning basin, inner channel, and outer channel.

The committee is concerned that a decision to complete the construction dredging of Naval Station Mayport would predispose a Quadrennial Defense Review's determination as to an East Coast Nuclear Aircraft Carrier basing.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $46,303,000, to support this project.

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Navy complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $510,000—Strategic Weapons Storage Facility, Naval Support Activity, Crane, Indiana;

(2) $520,000 Joint Diver A-School, Panama City, Florida;

(3) $850,000 Drydock 2 Starboard Waterfront Facility, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Hawaii; and

(4) $2,000,000 Consolidation of Structural Shops, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Maine.

## 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 2010. 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 2010.

### Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2010.

### Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2010 for the Navy. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

### Section 2205—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Project

This section would increase the authority for a project at Bangor, Washington that was included in section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Division B of Public Law 109–163), from $60,160,000 to $127,163,000. Furthermore, this section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2010, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later. Furthermore, it would increase the authorization listed by $67,003,000 to $127,163,000.

# TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,145,434,000 for Air Force military construction and $569,037,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends authorization of $1,359,171,000 for military construction and $569,037,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station

The 2005 Base Closure and Realignment findings directed that the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Wings at Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, in completing an association of the two wings, to jointly operate C–130 tactical airlift assets assigned to

the base. This association of the two wings requires the construction of a joint operations center to replace the smaller operations facilities manned separately by the 914th and 107th Wings at the base. Existing facilities had met the wings' needs under their previous configuration but will not adequately support the requirements of the joint operations under their association. The construction of a new joint operations center is essential to future operations at the base. The committee encourages the Air Force Reserve to include the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station Joint Operations Center in the Future Years Defense Program for its expeditious execution and construction to support the association.

### Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee notes that several projects included in the budget request were concurrently funded by the Navy and Air Force at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. The budget request also included a separate authorization for each of these projects and the committee notes that this request would not yield a complete and usable facility.

Therefore, the committee has realigned the Navy portion of the funds to the Air Force to ensure a complete and usable facility can be constructed.

### Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $384,000—Mission Support Facility, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida;

(2) $690,000—Civil Engineer Maintenance Complex, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho;

(3) $930,000—Physical Fitness Center, Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland;

(4) $1,710,000—Control Tower/Base Operations, Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota; and

(5) $450,000—Dormitory, Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico.

## 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 2010. 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 2010.

### Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2010.

### Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2010 for the Air Force. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

### Section 2305—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2010, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

### Section 2306—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2010, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

## TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,097,526,000 for defense agency military construction and $77,898,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends authorization of $3,054,126,000 for military construction and $77,898,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2010.

The budget request also contained $146,541,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of $146,541,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2010.

### 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) $300,000,000 for the second increment of funds associated with a data center at Camp Williams, Utah.

The budget request included $800,000,000 to support construction of the data center.

The committee supports the full scope of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2010.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $500,000,000, a reduction of $300,000,000, to support this project; and

(2) $80,000,000 for the fourth increment of funds associated with the United States Army Medical Research Institute.

The budget request included $108,000,000 to support construction of the replacement facility.

The committee supports the full scope of this project. However, the committee notes that the award of the replacement facility construction, using funding from increments one through three, occurred in March 2009, leaving a significant funding balance available in fiscal year 2008 and 2009 unexpended. 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 2010.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $28,000,000, a reduction of $80,000,000, to support this project.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

#### Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of defense agencies construction projects that would be authorized for fiscal year 2010. 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—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2010 for the defense agencies. This section would provide an overall limit on the amount the defense agencies may spend on military construction projects. Lastly, this section would require that a proportion of the funds for energy conservation projects equivalent to the proportion of energy used by reserve component facilities as a percentage of the total energy consumed by military installations be made available for reserve components.

#### Section 2403—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project

This section would increase the authority for a project at Point Loma Complex, California, that was included in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Division B of Public Law 110–181), from $140,000,000 to $195,000,000.

#### Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would increase the authority for a project at Souda Bay, Greece, that was included in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Division B of Public Law 110–417), from $8,000,000 to $32,000,000.

### Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2010, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

### SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

### Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2010 for the chemical demilitarization construction. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the chemical demilitarization office may spend on military construction projects.

## TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $276,314,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends authorization of $276,314,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2010.

### 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 $276,314,000 as the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

## TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,021,214,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2010 of $1,463,117,000 to be distributed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army National Guard | $529,129,000 |
| Air National Guard | 226,126,000 |
| Army Reserve | 432,516,000 |
| Naval and Marine Corps Reserve | 172,177,000 |
| Air Force Reserve | 103,169,000 |

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Virginia National Guard Headquarters

The committee understands that the Adjutant General of the Virginia National Guard has recommended that the Virginia National Guard headquarters relocate from Fort Pickett to Sandston, Virginia, to be closer to Richmond. The cited purpose of the move is to improve the Commonwealth's emergency response capabilities in a natural disaster or terrorist attack by collocating the State National Guard headquarters with other state emergency response agencies in the State capital. The committee believes that the current Virginia National Guard headquarters facility meets the needs of the Commonwealth, and questions whether this move is the best use of federal military construction funding. The committee believes that the Army National Guard military construction budget would be better applied to higher priority projects.

### Planning and Design, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $5,446,000—Readiness Center, Kapolei, Hawaii;

(2) $1,240,000—Readiness Center, West Memphis, Arkansas;

(3) $334,000—Joint Forces Headquarters, Frankfort, Kentucky;

(4) $440,000—Barracks Replacement PH 2, Camp Grayling, Minneapolis;

(5) $727,000—CST Ready Building, Las Vegas, Nevada;

(6) $368,000—Water Supply System, Camp Rilea, Oregon;

(7) $924,000—Readiness Center, Luzerne, Pennsylvania;

(8) $501,000—Readiness Center, Logan/Mingo County, West Virginia;

(9) $2,234,000—Readiness Center, Parkersburg, West Virginia; and

(10) $967,000—Field Maintenance Shop, Parkersburg, West Virginia.

### Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army complete unspecified minor construction activities for the following projects:

(1) $1,963,000—Motor Vehicle Storage Building, Freedom Center Armory, Camp Dodge, Idaho;

(2) $2,000,000—Army Aviation Support Facility Addition/Alteration, Davenport, Idaho;

(3) $2,000,000—Readiness Center Addition/Alteration, Iowa Falls, Idaho;

(4) $2,000,000—Field Maintenance Shop Addition/Alteration, Fairfield, Idaho;

(5) $1,750,000—Troop Medical Facility Addition/Alteration, Fort Harrison, Montana;

(6) $2,000,000—Joint Forces Headquarters Addition, Beightler Armory, Ohio;

(7) $2,000,000—Shoot House, Ravenna, Ohio;

(8) $1,996,000—Bachelor Quarters Addition/Alteration, Ethan Allen Range, Vermont; and

(9) $1,669,000—Urban Assault Course, Camp Santiago, Puerto Rico.

Planning and Design, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following project:

1(1) $600,000 Contingency Response Group Facility, Stanford Field, Kentucky.

Unspecified Minor Construction, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within the authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Air Force complete unspecified minor construction activities for the following projects:

(1) $1,300,000—Joint Use Armed Forces Reserve Center, McEntire Joint Reserve Base, South Carolina;

(2) $1,700,000—Munitions Administration Facility, Atlantic City International Airport, New Jersey;

(3) $1,805,000—Aviation Operations Facility, London, Kentucky;

(4) $1,900,000—Starbase Facility, Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport, Minnesota;

(5) $1,500,000—Joint Forces Operations Center, Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts;

(6) $2,000,000—Multi-Use Instructional Facility, Toledo Express Airport, Ohio;

(7) $1,000,000—New Supply Warehouse, Zanesville Air National Guard Base, Ohio; and

(8) $1,300,000—Addition to Munitions Maintenance Complex, Joe Foss Field, South Dakota.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2010. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2010. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2010. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2010. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize military construction for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2010. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for National Guard and Reserve by service component for fiscal year 2010. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Section 2607—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2007 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2010, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

### Section 2608—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2006 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2010, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

## TITLE XXVII BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACTIVITIES

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $396,768,000 for activities related to prior Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities and $7,479,498,000 for activities related to BRAC 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $536,768,000 for prior BRAC round activities and $7,129,498,000 for BRAC 2005 activities.

## TITLE XXVII - BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State | Comm Number | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | AL | 11 | Anniston (Pelham Range) | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| Army | AL | 11 | Birmingham | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Army | AL | 11 | Mobile | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 20,430 | | 20,430 |
| Defense Wide | AL | 134 | Redstone Arsenal | Von Braun Complex | 27,800 | | 27,800 |
| Army | AL | 11 | Tuscaloosa | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Army | AR | 13 | Camden | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 9,800 | | 9,800 |
| Army | AR | 13 | El Dorado | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Army | AR | 13 | Hot Springs | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 14,600 | | 14,600 |
| Army | AR | 13 | Pine Bluff | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Army | AZ | 12 | Marana | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Navy | CA | 57 | Barstow | Industrial Machine Shop Facility | 14,130 | | 14,130 |
| Navy | CA | 184 | China Lake | Shipboard Shock Test Facility | 3,160 | | 3,160 |
| Navy | CA | 184 | China Lake | Weapons Dynamics RDT&E Center | 5,970 | | 5,970 |
| Army | CT | 15 | Middletown | Armed Forces Reserve Center, Incr 2 | 37,000 | | 37,000 |
| Navy | DC | 149 | Washington | Navy Systems Management Activity Relocation (INCR II of | 71,929 | | 71,929 |
| Navy | DC | 149 | Washington | Renovate 3rd Floor Buildging 176, Washington Navy Yard | 750 | | 750 |
| Army | FL | 4 | Eglin AFB | Special Forces Complex, Incr 2 | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| Air Force | FL | 125 | Eglin AFB | BRAC F-35 Live Ordnance Load Area (LOLA) | 6,624 | | 6,624 |
| Air Force | FL | 4B, 125 | Eglin AFB | CE Facility | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| Air Force | FL | 125 | Eglin AFB | F-35 (JSF) Duke Field Control Tower | 2,280 | | 2,280 |
| Air Force | FL | 4B, 125 | Eglin AFB | Fitness Facility | 2,750 | | 2,750 |
| Air Force | FL | 125 | Eglin AFB | STOVL Simulated Carrier Practice Landing Deck | 27,690 | | 27,690 |
| Air Force | FL | 125 | Eglin AFB | School Age Facility | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| Air Force | FL | 125 | Eglin AFB | Security Forces Facility | 890 | | 890 |

## TITLE XXVII - BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State | Comm Number | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | FL | 125 | Eglin AFB | Taxiway Extension | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Air Force | FL | 125 | Eglin AFB | Traffic Management Cargo Processing Facility | 900 | | 900 |
| Army | GA | 9 | Benning | AAFES Troop Store | 1,950 | | 1,950 |
| Army | GA | 17 | Benning | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Army | GA | 2 | Benning | Equipment Concentration Site | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army | GA | 9 | Benning | General Instruction Complex 2, Incr 2 | 58,000 | | 58,000 |
| Army | GA | 9 | Benning | Maneuver Ctr HQ & CDI Bldg Expansion | 42,000 | | 42,000 |
| Army | GA | 9 | Benning | Medical Facility, Incr 2 | 77,000 | | 77,000 |
| Army | IA | 21 | Cedar Rapids | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 42,000 | | 42,000 |
| Army | IA | 21 | Iowa AAP | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Army | IA | 21 | Muscatine | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 8,800 | | 8,800 |
| Army | IL | 2 | Rock Island | Army Headquarters Building Renovation | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Army | KY | 43 | Campbell | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 5,900 | | 5,900 |
| Army | KY | 2 | Campbell | Headquarters Building, Group | 14,800 | | 14,800 |
| Army | KY | 55 | Knox | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 2,300 | | 2,300 |
| Army | MD | 5 | Aberdeen PG | C4ISR, Phase 2, Incr 2 | 156,000 | | 156,000 |
| Defense Wide | MD | 169 | Bethesda (WRNMMC) | Medical Center Addition - Increment 3 | 108,850 | | 108,850 |
| Defense Wide | MD | 169 | Bethesda (WRNMMC) | Traffic Mitigation Increment 1 | 18,400 | | 18,400 |
| Defense Wide | MD | 169 | Bethesda (WRNMMC) | Site Utility Infrastructure Upgrade for NICoE | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| Army | MD | 174 | Detrick | Joint Bio-Med RDA Management Center | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| Army | MD | 169 | Forest Glenn | Museum | 12,200 | | 12,200 |
| Defense Wide | MD | 140 | Fort Meade | Construct DISA Building | 131,662 | | 131,662 |
| Army | MD | 141 | Fort Meade | Defense Media Activity, Incr 2 | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| Navy | ME | 65 | Brunswick | Marine Corps Reserve Center | 12,960 | | 12,960 |

## TITLE XXVII - BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State | Comm Number | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | MI | 176 | Detroit Arsenal | Administrative Office Buildings, Incr 2 | 21,384 | | 21,384 |
| Army | MI | 176 | Detroit Arsenal | Weapons Systems Support and Training | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| Army | MI | 26 | Ft. Custer (Augusta) | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| Air Force | MI | 95 | Selfridge ANGB | A10 Arm/Disarm Apron | 1,350 | | 1,350 |
| Air Force | MI | 95 | Selfridge ANGB | Repair Munitions Admin Building 891 | 3,100 | | 3,100 |
| Air Force | MI | 95 | Selfridge ANGB | Upgrade Munitions Maintenance Shop | 1,650 | | 1,650 |
| Air Force | MI | 95 | Selfridge ANGB | Upgrade Munitions Missile Maintenance Bays | 2,350 | | 2,350 |
| Army | MO | 28 | Kirksville | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 6,600 | | 6,600 |
| Army | MT | 29 | Great Falls | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| Army | NC | 3 | Bragg | Band Training Facility | 4,200 | | 4,200 |
| Army | NC | 3 | Bragg | Headquarters Bldg, FORSCOM/USARC, Incr 3 | 124,000 | | 124,000 |
| Army | NC | 35 | Wilmington | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Army | ND | 36 | Fargo | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 11,200 | | 11,200 |
| Army | NE | 30 | Columbus | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 9,300 | | 9,300 |
| Army | NE | 30 | McCook | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 7,900 | | 7,900 |
| Army | NJ | 32 | Camden | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Army | NY | 5 | West Point | US Military Academy Prep School, Incr 2 | 98,000 | | 98,000 |
| Army | OH | 37 | Columbus | Armed Forces Reserve Center, Incr 2 | 30,218 | | 30,218 |
| Navy | OH | 73 | Akron | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 13,840 | | 13,840 |
| Army | OK | 126 | Sill | Joint Fires & Effects Simulator Building | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Air Force | OK | 92 | Will Rogers World APT AGS | Relocate Global Air Traffic Operation Program Office | 1,200 | | 1,200 |
| Army | PA | 40 | Allentown | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Army | PA | 150 | Tobyhanna | Electronics Maintenance Shop, Depot Level | 3,200 | | 3,200 |
| Air Force | PA | 68 | Willow Grove ARS, NAS Willow | Establish Enclave | 4,000 | | 4,000 |

## TITLE XXVII - BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State | Comm Number | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | RI | 42 | Bristol | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Navy | SC | 181 | Charleston | SPAWAR Data Center | 9,670 | | 9,670 |
| Navy | SC | 138 | Goose Creek | Consolidated Brig Addition | 9,790 | | 9,790 |
| Army | SC | 3 | Shaw AFB | Headquarters Building, Third US Army, Incr 2 | 55,000 | | 55,000 |
| Army | TN | 43 | Chattanooga | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| Army | TX | 10 | Bliss | Brigade Combat Team Complex #3, Incr 3 | 110,000 | | 110,000 |
| Army | TX | 10 | Bliss | Combat Aviation Brigade Complex, Incr 3 | 94,000 | | 94,000 |
| Army | TX | 10 | Bliss | Hospital Add/Alt, WBAMC | 24,000 | | 24,000 |
| Army | TX | 10 | Bliss | Hospital Replacement | 89,000 | | 89,000 |
| Army | TX | 10 | Bliss | Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility 2 | 104,000 | | 104,000 |
| Army | TX | 44 | Brownsville | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Army | TX | 44 | Huntsville | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| Army | TX | 44 | Kingsville | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Air Force | TX | 146 | Lackland AFB | Joint Base San Antonio Headquarters Facility | 8,500 | | 8,500 |
| Army | TX | 44 | Lufkin | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Air Force | TX | 128 | Randolph AFB | Renovate Building 38 | 2,050 | | 2,050 |
| Army | TX | 44 | Red River | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 14,200 | | 14,200 |
| Defense Wide | TX | 172 | Fort Sam Houston | San Antonio Military Medical Center (North) Incr 3 | 163,750 | | 163,750 |
| Army | TX | 148 | Sam Houston | Add/Alt Building 2270 | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Army | TX | 148 | Sam Houston | Housing, Enlisted Permanent Party | 10,800 | | 10,800 |
| Army | TX | 148 | Sam Houston | IMCOM Campus Area Infrastructure | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Army | TX | 148 | Sam Houston | Headquarters Bldg, IMCOM | 48,000 | | 48,000 |
| Army | VA | 132 | Belvoir | Infrastructure Support, Incr 3 | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Army | VA | 168 | Belvoir | Infrastructure Support, Incr 3 | 39,400 | | 39,400 |

## TITLE XXVII - BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State | Comm Number | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | VA | 169 | Belvoir | NARMC HQ Building | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Defense Wide | VA | 168 | Fort Belvoir | NGA Headquarters Facility | 168,749 | | 168,749 |
| Defense Wide | VA | 169 | Fort Belvoir | Hospital Replacement - Increment 4 | 140,750 | | 140,750 |
| Defense Wide | VA | 169 | Fort Belvoir | Dental Clinic | 12,600 | | 12,600 |
| Defense Wide | VA | 133 | Fort Belvoir | Office Complex Increment 3 | 360,533 | | 360,533 |
| Army | VA | 8 | Eustis | Bldg 705 Renv (AAA & 902d MI) | 1,600 | | 1,600 |
| Army | VA | 8 | Eustis | Headquarters Bldg, IMCOM Eastern Region | 5,700 | | 5,700 |
| Army | VA | 8 | Eustis | Headquarters Building, TRADOC, Incr 2 | 34,300 | | 34,300 |
| Army | VA | 8 | Eustis | Joint Task Force-Civil Support | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Army | VA | 3 | Eustis | Renovation for ACA and NETCOM | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| Army | VA | 121 | Lee | AAFES Troop Store | 1,850 | | 1,850 |
| Army | VA | 133 | Lee | Administrative Building (DCMA) | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Army | VA | 121 | Lee | Combat Service Support School, Ph 1, Incr 4 | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Army | VA | 121 | Lee | Combat Service Support School, Ph 2, Incr 3 | 137,000 | | 137,000 |
| Army | VA | 121 | Lee | Combat Service Support School, Ph 3, Incr 2 | 145,000 | | 145,000 |
| Army | VA | 121 | Lee | Consolidated Troop Med/Dntl Clinic | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Army | VA | 122 | Lee | HQs, Transportation Management Detachment | 1,200 | | 1,200 |
| Army | VA | 121 | Lee | USMC Training Facilities | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Navy | VA | 149 | Arlington | Crystal Park 5 to Arlington Service Center | 33,660 | | 33,660 |
| Navy | VA | 138 | Chesapeake | Joint Regional Correctional Facility (INCR II of II) | 47,560 | | 47,560 |
| Navy | VA | 181 | Norfolk | Building 1558 Renovations for SPAWAR | 2,510 | | 2,510 |
| Army | WV | 47 | Elkins | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| Army | WV | 47 | Fairmont | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Army | WV | 47 | Spencer-Ripley | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 19,540 | | 19,540 |

## TITLE XXVII - BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State | Comm Number | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | WW | PM | Various | Planning and Design | 26,100 | | 26,100 |
| Army | Various | | Various | Environmental | 147,693 | | 147,693 |
| Navy | Various | | Various | Environmental | 16,529 | | 16,529 |
| Air Force | Various | | Various | Environmental | 19,454 | | 19,454 |
| Army | Various | | Various | Operation and Maintenance | 1,169,334 | | 1,169,334 |
| Navy | Various | | Various | Operation and Maintenance | 322,495 | | 322,495 |
| Air Force | Various | | Various | Operation and Maintenance | 288,459 | | 288,459 |
| Defense Wide | Various | | Various | Operation and Maintenance | 836,715 | | 836,715 |
| Navy | Various | | Various | MilPers PCS | 6,504 | | 6,504 |
| Air Force | Various | | Various | MilPers PCS | 3,970 | | 3,970 |
| Army | Various | | Various | Other | 311,138 | | 311,138 |
| Navy | Various | | Various | Other | 20,115 | | 20,115 |
| Air Force | Various | | Various | Other | 23,443 | | 23,443 |
| Defense Wide | Various | | Various | Other | 412,320 | | 412,320 |
| Defense Wide | Various | | Various | Other | | (350,000) | (350,000) |
| | | | | Subtotal BRAC 2005 FY 2010, Army | 4,081,037 | - | 4,081,037 |
| | | | | Subtotal BRAC 2005 FY 2010, Navy | 591,572 | - | 591,572 |
| | | | | Subtotal BRAC 2005 FY 2010, Air Force | 418,260 | - | 418,260 |
| | | | | Subtotal BRAC 2005 FY 2010, Defense Wide | 2,388,629 | (350,000) | 2,038,629 |
| | | | | **Total BRAC 2005 FY 2010** | **7,479,498** | **(350,000)** | **7,129,498** |

## TITLE XXVII - BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | State | Comm Number | Installation | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Various | | Various | Base Realignment and Closure IV, Army | 98,723 | 35,000 | 133,723 |
| Navy | Various | | Various | Base Realignment and Closure IV, Navy | 168,000 | 60,000 | 228,000 |
| Air Force | Various | | Various | Base Realignment and Closure IV, Air Force | 127,364 | 45,000 | 172,364 |
| Defense Wide | Various | | Various | Base Realignment and Closure IV, Defense Wide | 2,681 | | 2,681 |
| | | | | **Total BRAC IV for FY 2010** | **396,768** | **140,000** | **536,768** |
| | | | | **Total All BRAC for FY 2010** | **7,876,266** | **(210,000)** | **7,666,266** |

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding in the budget request for the 2005 round of Base Closure and Realignment. This reduction includes:

(1) $350,000,000 for funds associated with the implementation of the 2005 round of Base Closure and Realignment at defense-wide activities.

The budget request included $7,479,498,000 to support construction of the data center.

The committee supports the implementation of the 2005 round of Base Closure and Realignment by the statutory deadline. 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 account, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2010.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $7,129,498,000, a reduction of $350,000,000, to support this account.

### Ft. Bragg/Pope Air Field BRAC Force Structure

BRAC legislation approved in 2005 directs transfer of the real property at Pope Air Force Base to Ft. Bragg to occur not later than September 15, 2011. It also directs the Army's Forces Command headquarters (FORSCOM) to relocate to Ft. Bragg from Atlanta, Georgia by 2011, and the relocation of a reserve Air Force airlift wing from Milwaukee to Pope AFB. As part of this realignment, BRAC 2005 downsized the active duty wing at Pope AFB to an active duty group which will maintain control of airfield operations and, along with the reserve wing, will provide support to Army operations.

Fort Bragg and Pope AFB are vital to this nation's rapid response capability including high level planning for contingency operations and the requirement to quickly generate and deploy troops, which is dependent on Air Force airlift support. Considering this essential mission and cooperation required, the committee is concerned that this reduced Air Force presence may not be able to fully support the expanding Army and Special Operations missions at Fort Bragg.

The committee therefore directs the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), to conduct a review of the air mobility requirements of the varied Army, Air Force, and Special Operations units likely to be deployed from Pope Air Force Base in support of the geographic combatant commanders and provide those requirements to the Secretary of the Air Force by December 31, 2009. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Air Force to report the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010, whether the Air Forces' programmed force structure at Fort Bragg (Pope Army Airfield) meets both the coordinating headquarters level planning capability and the operational requirements prescribed by the CJCS. The Secretary should also address how he plans to address any resultant shortfall in Air Force planning or operational capa-

bility at Fort Bragg to meet CJCS requirements for the expanded mission at Fort Bragg.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990

This section would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Closure and Realignment.

Section 2702—Authorized Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2010 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment. The table included in this title of this report lists the specific amount authorized at each location.

Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Closure and Realignment Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2010 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round. This provision also would provide an overall limit of the amount authorized for BRAC military construction projects. The state list contained in this report provides a list of specific projects authorized at each location.

### SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO BASE CLOSURE AND RELATED LAWS

Section 2711—Use of Economic Development Conveyances to Implement Base Closure and Realignment Property Recommendations

This section would amend section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510) and redefines the roles of economic development conveyances. Furthermore, this section eliminates fair market value negotiations between eligible parties and the Department of Defense prior to conveyance. The economic development conveyance would instead rely on actual market returns realized at the completion of the development. A revised economic development conveyance would expedite conveyances and allow local communities to quickly recover from the adverse effects of a tax base loss. Finally, the Secretary of Defense would be required to complete implementing regulations within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and be required to submit a report to Congress within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act regarding the status of ongoing economic development conveyances.

## SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 2721—Sense of Congress on Ensuring Joint Basing Recommendations Do Not Adversely Affect Operational Readiness

This section would express the sense of Congress that, in implementing joint basing recommendations associated with the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510), the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the operational employment of units at the joint base are not adversely impaired.

### Section 2722—Modification of Closure Instructions Regarding Paul Doble Army Reserve Center, Portsmouth, New Hampshire

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to locate a new reserve center and associated training and maintenance facilities adjacent or in the vicinity of Pease Air National Guard Base.

# TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Acquisition of Land in the Clear Zone and Accident Potential Zones

The committee believes that controlling land use near military airfields is important to minimize the damage resulting from potential aircraft accidents and to reduce hazards to aircraft navigation. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has delineated clear zones (CZs) and accident potential zones (APZs) in the vicinity of airfield runways where, if a problem developed, an aircraft mishap would likely occur. Studies show that most mishaps occur on or near the runway or along the extended centerline of the runway. However, the Department's acquisition of the CZs and the APZs has been haphazard and inconsistent.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010, on the Department's policy regarding acquisition of title or lease arrangements to secure compatible development in the CZs and APZs. Specifically, the Department should prepare an evaluation for each aviation installation as to their CZ and APZ requirements and whether the Department has obtained the developmental limits required of the installation. Furthermore, the Department should specify, for each aviation installation, any aviation waivers that are being used to continue flight operations.

### American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funding for Department of Defense Energy Initiatives

The committee notes that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2007 (Public Law 111–5) provided significant funding to the Department of Defense for energy-related initiatives. ARRA included $3.8 billion within operation and maintenance accounts for facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization, including funding to invest in the energy efficiency of the Depart-

ment's facilities. Of the funds provided within the operation and maintenance accounts, according to the ARRA expenditure plan dated March 20, 2009, the Department has identified for funding 1,473 energy-related projects with an estimated cost of $1.4 billion. ARRA also included $300.0 million split evenly among the Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide research, development, test, and evaluation accounts for improvements in energy generation, efficiency, transmission, regulation, storage, and for use on military installations and within operational forces. The act also included $100.0 million within the military construction, Navy and Marine Corps account for energy conservation and alternative energy projects. The act further included $120.0 million within the defense-wide military construction account for the Energy Conservation Investment Program. The committee expects the Department to apply this funding in ways that maximize the benefit to the warfighter and the Department's ability to meet existing energy-related goals and requirements for installations. Among these is the goal for the Department to produce or procure not less than 25 percent of the total quantity of electric energy it consumes within its facilities and in its activities during fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter from renewable energy sources as established by section 2852 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

### Annual Installation Energy Report

The committee received a report from the Department of Defense titled "Department of Defense Annual Energy Management Report" on March 13, 2009. According to its cover letter, the report was submitted pursuant to section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). The committee notes that the annual reporting requirement established by that section will expire on January 1, 2010. A similar reporting requirement is prescribed by part (a) of section 2925 of title 10, United States Code. The committee directs the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) to notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services as to whether the Department intends to submit an annual installation energy management report to Congress in fiscal year 2011, pursuant to the title 10 requirement. The notification should be submitted with the Department's annual energy management report for fiscal year 2009.

### Army Ammunition Plant Infrastructure

The committee remains concerned over the deteriorating infrastructure conditions at Army ammunition plants (AAP). The committee is specifically concerned by the lack of emergency response capabilities and other critical physical security deficiencies that continue to exist across the AAP industrial base despite increased funding across previous Future Years Defense Programs. The committee is aware that many of these AAPs are single points of failure. The committee notes the Radford Army Ammunition Plant, the single point of failure for propellant manufacturing, has identified critical infrastructure issues that must be mitigated in order

to ensure continuity of operations and protection of the physical plant.

The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) has published several directives to implement a program for a worldwide DOD installation emergency response to manage the consequences of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive incident (CBRNE). The committee expects that emergency operations and response activities will be a priority for the Department of Defense and would be incorporated as part of any AAP industrial base modernization plan.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report that would assess the immediate requirements for AAP infrastructure recapitalization to include improvements in mitigating shortfalls in any AAP's ability to respond to a CBRNE event. The assessment should also include a proposed schedule to address these requirements. Furthermore, this assessment should employ the facility sustainment and recapitalization metrics used by the Department of Defense in analyzing defense infrastructure. The assessment should also include a review as to the necessity of continuing to fund these infrastructure upgrades under the Procurement of Ammunition, Army Production Base Support account instead of the Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization account. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the report to the congressional defense committees by January 30, 2010.

Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives

The committee was advised that the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives U.S. Army Element selected a cost-plus-incentive-fee contract approach in 2002 and 2003 when the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics approved alternative technologies for the Colorado and Kentucky demilitarization plants. This decision to continue the cost-plus-incentive-fee methodology has continued with the award of subsequent phases of the program. While the previous decisions to use a cost-plus-incentive-fee contract model may have been valid during the deliberative sessions associated with the initial chemical weapons alternatives development process, the committee is concerned that the continued use of cost-plus-incentive-fees for which the overall construction requirement is well known at the solicitation of the next construction phase may be inappropriate. This continued use of cost-plus-incentive-fee contracting appears contrary to overall goals of best government practices and contrary to Federal Acquisition Regulation 16.301–2 that indicates "Cost-reimbursement contracts are suitable for use only when uncertainties involved in contract performance do not permit costs to be estimated with sufficient accuracy to use any type of fixed-price contract." At the same time, the committee is also concerned that an acquisition strategy change in the middle of the acquisition process is problematic.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the continued need to use cost-plus-incentive-fee type construction contracts in the future for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the findings of the acquisition vehicle assessment and an assessment of the necessity to continue the current

acquisition methodology. This report should be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010.

### Comptroller General Assessment of Military Basing Decision Process

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2010, on the military services' decision process used in making basing determinations, such as the decision to establish a second homeport for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier on the East Coast of the United States. The committee believes this decision raises significant strategic, cost, and risk questions.

It is not clear to the committee how the Navy has been determining its basing decisions. For example, the Navy's consideration of whether to homeport additional surface ships at Naval Station Mayport (NAVSTA Mayport), Florida, appears to lack strategic depth. The committee notes that homeporting a nuclear aircraft carrier at NAVSTA Mayport would cost at least $560.0 million in military construction, require the dredging and disposal of approximately 5.2 million cubic yards of dredge material, and increase long-term operation and maintenance costs. The Navy does not appear to have carried out a comprehensive process to determine the need for such expenditures with consideration for strategic rationale, fiscal realities, environmental impacts, and personnel impacts associated with the decision.

In light of the substantial costs and the strategic and community impacts that result from basing decisions, the committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a study on the manner in which the military services consider and utilize the following in making basing decisions: changes to military force structure, strategic imperative and risk assessment, input from combatant commanders, cost, and environmental and socio-economic impacts. Specifically, the review should address the following:

(1) Military force structure considerations: When rebasing military assets from one installation to another, the processes the military services use to assess the impact associated with the current and future home stations or homeports.

(2) Strategic imperative and risk assessment: The extent to which the military services consider strategic shifts in force posture, such as the shift of naval assets from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, in basing decisions. When making basing decisions related to strategic dispersal of military assets, the process used by the services to conduct and consider risk assessments. In making the nuclear aircraft carrier homeporting decision, how the Navy weighed the comparative risk between the different needs of the Navy. For example, the consideration the Navy gave to building an additional nuclear aircraft carrier homeport at Naval Station Mayport versus failing to meet ship maintenance and repair shortfalls, or the need for a 313–ship Navy.

(3) Cost: The extent to which the military services use a cost-benefit analysis in making basing decisions and the extent to which the budgetary requirements of the entire military service and Department of Defense are considered; the consideration given in the decision-making process to shortfalls in

other service budgets and other internal budget accounts; and how the services' analyses compare the strategic benefits of expending funds for one purpose (such as the construction of additional infrastructure) to the use of funds for other purposes (such as meeting unfunded procurement requirements) in determining whether to proceed with a decision.

Economic Impact of Brigade Combat Team Stationing Plan

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense's announcement of a reduction in the number of Army brigade combat teams from 48 to 45 may cause an undue economic hardship for those communities that expanded their own community infrastructure in response to the Army's request for support of its expanded force structure. Such hardship is particularly likely in rural communities where the infrastructure investment to absorb a brigade-sized population influx is disproportionate and has little or no economic value if the population influx does not occur. The committee is concerned that failure to halt or ameliorate undue losses on these investments will make it more difficult for the Army or other services to ensure that private and public infrastructure investments are made in a timely fashion by local communities to support future basing decisions.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report describing the enduring missions (across all branches) planned for the bases affected by the Secretary's decision not to expand to 48 brigade combat teams or affected by any decision to retain brigade combat teams in Europe. The committee encourages the Secretary, during identification of enduring missions for the affected bases, to make every effort to ameliorate any undue hardship and investment losses incurred by the communities that expanded their infrastructure to support the Army's prior brigade combat team basing plan. The report should also include an estimate, with supporting analysis, of the economic hardship and investment loss that has been, or will be, incurred by each of the affected communities as a result of these changed basing decisions and a statement of the extent to which the enduring missions identified for the bases will ameliorate or lessen the undue hardship and investment losses.

The committee also directs the Secretary to instruct the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) to develop a plan by which the OEA will work with the affected communities to mitigate the economic impact. This plan should be reported to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Installation Energy Strategy and Management Assessment

The committee is concerned that the absence of a comprehensive installation energy strategy for the Department of Defense has led to a proliferation of disparate, poorly integrated efforts to meet conservation and renewable energy mandates across the services. For example, while each service consumes about one third of the Department's total facility electricity, the Air Force purchased significantly more renewable electricity credits than the other services in fiscal years 2007 and 2008. The committee believes that this imbal-

ance is but one reflection of differing approaches to energy management among the services. While some degree of experimentation is appropriate, the committee believes that the Department would be better served by managing energy policy in a more coordinated fashion at the Department level.

The committee believes a more holistic approach to energy management will allow installation commanders to support missions as efficiently as possible while leveraging tools, such as installation metering, the Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP), and alternative financing mechanisms such as Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC), where these tools make sense.

The committee therefore urges the Secretary of Defense to establish a more comprehensive installation energy program that sets policies and guidance for the services. The committee also urges the Secretary to identify impediments that inhibit installations in a region or across the nation from furthering their renewable energy and energy security goals, and to make recommendations for actions to address those impediments. In doing so, the committee directs the Secretary to conduct an assessment of the following installation energy issues:

(1) Whether a dedicated funding mechanism for renewable energy projects on installations would enable further development consistent with the Department's installation energy strategy, or whether the existing tools, such as ECIP and other appropriated efforts and ESPC and other alternative financing mechanisms are sufficient for the Department to meet its renewable energy goals. It should include an estimate of the total funding required to meet the Department's renewable energy goals in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58), in Executive Order 13423, and in section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code;

(2) The costs, benefits, and feasibility of adopting a policy requiring that new power generation projects on installations include the electrical infrastructure necessary to enable the project to provide power directly to the installation, should the commercial grid fail. If it is determined that this is not a feasible policy, then an explanation of obstacles and costs that need to be addressed to enable this policy;

(3) The degree to which state or regional laws, regulations, and market structures serve as opportunities and obstacles to developing renewable energy projects on fixed installations. Considerations may include renewable portfolio standards, incentives, tariffs, and net metering. For instance, it could address whether net metering is currently considered and available for renewable energy projects, and if it is not available or obstacles prevent its use at installations where it would otherwise be used, the reason for its unavailability;

(4) A proposal for modifying the system by which the Department is allowed to calculate its progress towards meeting federally-mandated renewable energy goals. Currently, federal agencies can count the renewable energy they purchase or produce towards these goals only if the agency also owns or purchases the renewable energy credits (REC) associated with that energy. The Secretary of Defense should include an assessment of the value of RECs to the Department beyond the

paper "credit" and the feasibility of meeting the Department's renewable energy goals with on-base renewable energy production rather than with RECs;

(5) The building construction sustainable design principles and whether the goals of the current design standards (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design standards) are consistent with the overall goals of the Secretary;

(6) The feasibility and cost of developing net-zero energy installations and a detailed assessment, by installation, of power production (including renewable energy) measured against energy consumption. This assessment should include: current and future energy production and consumption; the utility of placing a monetary value on the ability of the base to obtain power from on-site renewable generation; and any utility privatization issues that may arise if the Department invests in additional transmission infrastructure on its installations; and

(7) Whether a dedicated funding mechanism for renewable energy projects for standalone facilities, such as National Guard and Reserve centers, would encourage greater use of renewable energy sources both at existing facilities and in new construction.

Findings and recommendations resulting from the assessment should be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2010. The committee further directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Secretary's report and submit a report on the Comptroller General's findings within 180 days after receipt of the Secretary's report. The Comptroller General may conduct such independent analysis of these issues as necessary in furtherance of this directive.

### Installation Master Plans

The committee is concerned about the planning decisions at military installations and the intent to advocate for low-density developments that promulgate sprawl. The committee understands that the Department of Defense's propensity for low-density development is being driven primarily by a facility-centric approach to anti-terrorism/force-protection issues and requirements to insert 10- and 25-yard standoff distances from roads and parking structures. Consequently, in the use of the current anti-terrorism/force-protection criteria, the value of land as a commodity has been lost.

The committee believes that a layered approach to anti-terrorism/force-protection design is critical to defeating threats against an installation threat and that effective perimeter security serves as the primary defense. Furthermore, the committee believes that stand-alone facilities should have sufficient standoff distances. However, a military installation, which is formed by the concentration of multiple facilities, should be approached from a holistic view and the development of anti-terrorism/force-criteria should be modified to reflect an installation approach.

Buttressing this installation approach to anti-terrorism/force-protection is the current public-sector approach to sustainable design. The committee believes that it is important to recognize that many communities are embracing a planning approach that promotes efficient use of public spaces and de-emphasizes vehicular travel.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010, that reviews current anti-terrorism/force-protection measures and considers alternative measures for installations. In conducting this review, the Secretary should consider current community-based, sustainable design techniques that support better quality-of-life techniques and increase working efficiencies.

### Military Construction Future Years Defense Program

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has decided not to submit a Future Years Defense Program for military construction for fiscal years 2010 through 2015. The committee has used this document for many years as a method to determine the validity of military construction projects. The inability of the Department to produce this critical document for consideration in this Act leads to a degradation of the quality of the military construction program. The committee encourages the Department to submit these documents to the congressional defense committees, in concert with other budget documents, for consideration in the annual budget request.

### Report on Implementation of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Standards

The committee is aware that each of the military services has endorsed sustainable building principles for new construction and commends the services for this effort. The Department of the Army sustainable design and development (SDD) policy, as updated April 27, 2007, requires that all new construction projects achieve the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) silver standard for new construction effective with the fiscal year 2008 military construction program. Further, beginning in fiscal year 2008, the Army policy states that "all major renovation and repair projects exceeding $7.5 million (requiring congressional notification) shall incorporate sustainable design features where lifecycle cost effective to achieve a minimum of the Certified level of the LEED® Existing Buildings rating system." The Naval Facilities Engineering Command bulletin issue number 2008–01 applies LEED silver-level performance metrics beginning in fiscal year 2009 to all new construction projects and major renovations where the work exceeds 50 percent of the building's plant replacement value. The Department of the Air Force sustainable design and development policy specifies that "Beginning in FY09, 100% of each MAJCOM's MILCON [(Major Command's Military Construction)] vertical construction projects, with climate control, shall be designed so that it is capable of achieving LEED Silver certification" beginning in fiscal year 2009. The committee notes that section 433 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) also requires application of sustainable design principles to all new construction and major renovations undertaken by federal agencies including the Department of Defense.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with each of the military service secretaries, to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on whether, as of the end of fiscal year

2009, each military construction project or major renovation as defined by section 2811 of title 10, United States Code, has achieved compliance with the respective service's policy to apply the LEED silver standards. An exceptions report for each project that has not obtained this status and the reason for not obtaining compliance also should be included. The committee directs this report to be submitted by February 1, 2010.

### Armed Forces Retirement Home—Gulfport 2003 Property Disposal

The committee is concerned with actions of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) with respect to the acquisition and subsequent disposal of property located adjacent to its facilities in Gulfport, Mississippi. Based on information provided to the committee, AFRH purchased 10.02 acres of property adjacent to its facilities in Gulfport, Mississippi, in 2003 for a sum of $5.7 million. Almost immediately thereafter, AFRH sold what appears to be the most commercially valuable portions of this acreage to private individuals for well below its appraised market value. These beachfront properties contained two large homes and totaled 3.81 acres. The committee questions whether these transactions and subsequent property boundary adjustments were within applicable law and regulations and in the best of interests of the United States.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Inspector General to prepare a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2009, on the following issues:

(1) The intent or purpose behind AFRH's decision to acquire and subsequently sell the property within such a short period of time;

(2) If appropriate procedures were followed in the acquisition, modification of parcel boundaries, and sale of the beachfront parcels, including an examination of whether the appraisals, property listings, surveys, and bid offerings followed generally accepted practices; and

(3) Other issues related to the overall real estate transaction.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

#### Section 2801—Modification of Unspecified Minor Construction Authorities

This section would amend section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate exercise-related project restrictions. This section also would expand the authority to receive funds provided in section 219(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) for revitalization and recapitalization of the defense laboratory complex.

#### Section 2802—Congressional Notification of Facility Repair Projects Carried out Using Operation and Maintenance Funds

This section would amend section 2811 of title 10, United States Code, to require that congressional notice of repair projects in excess of $7.5 million include comparison of the repair versus replace-

ment cost of a specific project and to require a description of the military construction contemplated in the repair.

Section 2803—Authorized Scope of Work Variations for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects

This section would amend section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and authorize the Department of Defense to exceed the scope of a military construction project after providing notification to the appropriate committees of Congress.

Section 2804—Imposition of Requirement that Acquisition of Reserve Component Facilities be Authorized by Law

This section would amend section 18233(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to require Reserve Components to have a military construction authorization prior to initiating construction.

Section 2805—Report on Department of Defense Contributions to States for Acquisition, Construction, Expansion, Rehabilitation, or Conversion of Reserve Component Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on disbursements made to states associated with section 18233(a) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2806—Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Inside the United States Central Command Area of Responsibility

This section would amend section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 2806 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110–417) to extend the use of operation and maintenance funds for construction projects at locations in the United States Central Command for an additional year. This section would eliminate the discretion of the Secretary of Defense to expand the authority from $200.0 million to $500.0 million, provided in the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). Finally, expanded authority to include an additional $10.0 million would be provided to the Secretary of Defense if the Secretary determines that additional funds are required to complete contract closeouts.

Section 2807—Expansion of First Sergeants Barracks Initiative

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to implement the First Sergeants Barracks Initiative to improve the quality of life for single soldiers and promote higher use of barracks spaces. Furthermore, it would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2010, and February 15, 2011, on efforts the Army has taken to achieve the goals stipulated in the provision.

### Section 2808—Reports on Privatization Initiatives for Military Unaccompanied Housing

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on options to expand the privatization of military unaccompanied housing authority associated with section 2881a of title 10, United States Code. The Comptroller General of the United States also would be required to submit a concurrent report on the same subject.

## SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

### Section 2811—Imposition of Requirement That Leases of Real Property to the United States With Annual Rental Costs of More Than $750,000 be Authorized by Law

This section would amend section 2661 of title 10, United States Code, and require that leases to the United States, in excess of $750,000, be specifically authorized by law.

### Section 2812—Consolidation of Notice-and-Wait Requirements Applicable to Leases of Real Property Owned by the United States

This section would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, and require additional reporting requirements associated with leases of real property owned by the United States that were previously included in section 2667 of title 10, United States Code.

### Section 2813—Clarification of Authority of Military Departments to Acquire Low-Cost Interests in Land and Interests in Land When Need is Urgent

This section would amend section 2664 of title 10, United States Code, and clarify that the requirement to obtain an authorization for land acquisition may be superseded when the elements of section 2663 of title 10, United States Code are met.

### Section 2814—Modification of Utility Systems Conveyance Authority

This section would amend section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, to require, in the consideration of a utility privatization proposal, a 10 percent preference to a government proposal when the period of performance is less than 10 years and a 20 percent preference to a government proposal when the period of performance is more than 10 years and less than 50 years. Furthermore, this provision would restrict review under this section when a similar review has been completed using the authority of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, within the past five years.

### Section 2815—Decontamination and Use of Former Bombardment Area on Island of Culebra

This section would amend the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–166) and remove restrictions to environmental remediation on the Island of Culebra that were incorporated to protect the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico, from further development.

### Section 2816—Disposal of Excess Property of Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would amend section 1511 of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 411) to require the Secretary of Defense to dispose of excess property in accordance with subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code. This type of property disposal method brings the Armed Forces Retirement Home into alignment with the Department of Defense on methods to dispose property.

### Section 2817—Acceptance of Contributions to Support Cleanup Efforts at Former Almaden Air Force Station, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to accept contributions from the State of California that would allow the demolition of property and to provide environmental remediation at the former Almaden Air Force Station.

### Section 2818—Limitation on Establishment of Navy Outlying Landing Fields

This section would limit the Secretary of the Navy from establishing an outlying landing field at a proposed location if the Secretary determines that the governmental body of the political subdivision of a state containing the proposed location is formally opposed to the establishment of the outlying landing field. This provision shall not apply if Congress enacts a law authorizing the Secretary to proceed with the outlying landing field notwithstanding the local government action.

### Section 2819—Prohibition on Outlying Landing Field at Sandbanks or Hale's Lake, North Carolina, for Oceana Naval Air Station

This section prohibits the Sandbanks and Hale's Lake sites in North Carolina from further consideration as an Outlying Landing Field to support field carrier landing practice for naval aircraft operating out of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia.

### Section 2820—Selection of Military Installations to Serve as Locations of Brigade Combat Teams

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to consider the availability and proximity of training spaces when selecting a military installation at which a brigade combat team will be stationed.

## SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATED TO GUAM REALIGNMENT

### Section 2831—Role of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in Management and Coordination of Department of Defense Activities Relating to Guam Realignment

This section would amend section 134 of title 10, United States Code, and delegate responsibility for coordinating the Guam realignment activities of the Department of Defense, and the activities of the Joint Guam Program Office, to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. Programming authority would remain the responsibility of the secretaries of the military departments.

Section 2832—Clarifications Regarding Use of Special Purpose Entities to Assist With Guam Realignment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the proposed implementing guidance associated with the special purpose enterprises that would be used in the Guam realignment. This section also would apply the United States Unified Facilities Criteria to all projects supported by the "Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account" established in section 2824 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110–417). Finally, this section would express the sense of Congress that utility improvements on Guam should incorporate military and civilian utilities on Guam into a unified grid.

Section 2833—Workforce Issues Related to Military Construction and Certain Other Transactions on Guam

This section would amend section 2824 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110–417) to require military construction contracts to comply with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code, and would require a construction wage determination to be determined at the rate of the lowest wage rate on a project of similar character for Hawaii. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress by February 15 of each year, on an assessment of the living standards of the construction workforce employed to carry out military construction projects and the adequacy of the contract standards and infrastructure that support temporary housing for the construction workforce and their medical needs.

Section 2834—Composition of Workforce for Construction Projects Funded Through the Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account

This section would amend section 2824 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110–417) and provide a 30 percent limit to the total hours worked per month by H2B visa holders on construction projects that support the realignment of military installations and the relocation of military personnel on Guam. This authority expires for construction projects whose groundbreaking extends beyond October 1, 2011. Furthermore, the construction contractor shall be required to advertise and solicit for construction workers in the United States. Additionally, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees by June 30, 2010, on efforts to implement Executive Order 13502, entitled "Use of Project Labor Agreements for Federal Construction Projects". Finally, the Secretary of Labor shall submit a report to the committees of jurisdiction by June 30, 2010, on efforts to expand the recruitment of construction workers in the United States to support this effort; on the ability of labor markets to support the Guam realignment; and the sufficiency of efforts to recruit United States construction workers.

### Section 2835—Interagency Coordination Group of Inspectors General for Guam Realignment

This section would establish the Interagency Coordination Group for Guam Realignment in order to provide independent and objective oversight and a transparent and reliable source of information relating to the programs and operations funded by the Department of Defense for military construction activities on Guam.

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to serve as chairperson of the Interagency Coordination Group and include the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior and Inspectors General of such other federal agencies as the chairperson considers appropriate.

This section would require the Interagency Coordination Group for Guam Realignment to submit to the congressional defense committees an annual report summarizing Guam realignment activities and activities under the programs and operations funded by the Department for military construction activities in Guam. The Interagency Coordination Group for Guam Realignment shall terminate upon the expenditure of 90 percent of all funds appropriated or otherwise made available for Guam realignment.

### Section 2836—Compliance With Naval Aviation Safety Requirements as Condition on Acceptance of Replacement Facility for Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to certify to the congressional defense committees that the Marine Corps Air Station Futenma Replacement Facility meets minimum Naval Aviation Safety Requirements before final acceptance of the facility.

### Section 2837—Report and Sense of Congress on Marine Corps Training Requirements in Asia-Pacific Region

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy and the Joint Guam Program Office, to submit a report on the command structure associated with the current and future locations of Marine Corps units in the Pacific, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Furthermore, the Secretary of Defense report would assess the training expectations associated with the Marine Corps realignment to Guam and the overall training requirements in the Northern Mariana Islands.

This section also would express the sense of Congress that the Marine Corps training expansion should be completed as soon as possible and should not impact the overall rebasing of Marines from Okinawa to Guam.

The committee supports a two-tiered approach to reviewing training requirements for the Marine Forces Pacific. The upper tier would include a comprehensive strategy that includes transient forces that train Marine Corps elements up to and including a Marine Air-Ground Task Force. The committee understands that this effort will be reviewed in the context of the Quadrennial Defense Review and may require a study per the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321). The lower tier would include elements associated with current Marine Corps training capabili-

ties available in Japan. The committee understands that this review will be finalized when the Guam Build-up Environmental Impact Study is concluded.

## SUBTITLE D—ENERGY SECURITY

### Section 2841—Adoption of Unified Energy Monitoring and Management System Specification for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Activities

This section would create section 2867 of title 10, United States Code, and require the Department of Defense to adopt a single specification for an energy management and monitoring system for use in military construction projects. The Secretary concerned would be able to waive the requirements to adopt a single specification if the Secretary determines that the inclusion in a military construction project is not cost effective over the lifecycle of the project. This section also would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the items associated with the adoption of a single specification for an energy management and monitoring system.

### Section 2842—Department of Defense Use of Electric and Hybrid Motor Vehicles

This section would amend subchapter II of chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section that would require that, when leasing or procuring motor vehicles for use by a military department or defense agency, the head of the military department or defense agency provide a preference for electric or hybrid motor vehicles when lifecycle cost effective. This section would not apply to tactical vehicles designed for use in combat.

### Section 2843—Department of Defense Goal Regarding Use of Renewable Energy Sources to Meet Facility Energy Needs

This section would amend section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code, by changing the definition of "renewable energy source" from the definition provided in section 203(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58) to a new definition that includes non-electric renewable energy such as thermal energy. This change applies to the Department of Defense goal to produce or procure renewable energy equivalent to 25 percent of the total quantity of electric energy it consumes within its facilities and in its activities during fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter.

### Section 2844—Comptroller General Report on Department of Defense Renewable Energy Initiatives

This section would require the Comptroller General to submit a report on renewable energy initiatives to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after enactment of this Act.

### Section 2845—Study on Development of Nuclear Power Plants on Military Installations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the feasibility of developing nuclear power plants on military installations. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2010.

## SUBTITLE E—LAND CONVEYANCES

### Section 2851—Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction, Port Chicago Naval Magazine, California

This section would amend section 203 of the Port Chicago National Memorial Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–562) to require the Secretary of Defense to transfer five acres of land to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior if the Secretary of Defense determines that the land is excess to military needs and all environmental remediation has been completed. The land would be used by the National Park System for purposes of administering the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial. The Secretary of Defense shall provide as much public access as possible without interfering with military needs.

### Section 2852—Land Conveyances, Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, six parcels of the former Naval Air Station, Barbers Point to the Hawaii Community Development Authority.

### Section 2853—Modification of Land Conveyance, Former Griffiss Air Force Base, New York

This section would amend section 2873 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375) and allow the Secretary of the Air Force to convey a third parcel at the former Griffiss Air Force Base to the Oneida County Industrial Development Agency.

### Section 2854—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army Reserve Center in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania without consideration, to the Chambersburg Area School District for educational, education support, and community activities.

### Section 2855—Land Conveyance, Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey 2.4 acres at Naval Air Station Oceana to the City of Virginia Beach for the purpose of permitting the City to expand services to support the Marine Animal Care Center.

### Section 2856—Land Conveyance, Haines Tank Farm, Haines, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey 201 acres at the former Haines Fuel Terminal to the Chilkoot Indian Association for industrial and commercial development purposes.

### Section 2857—Completion of Land Exchange and Consolidation, Fort Lewis, Washington

This section would amend section 2837 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107), as amended by section 2852 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375) and change the nature of the land conveyance from the Secretary of the Army to the Nisqually Tribe. Specifically, the conveyance would be modified by striking "may make the transfer" and inserting "shall make the transfer".

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 2871—Revised Authority to Establish National Monument to Honor United States Armed Forces Working Dog Teams

This section would amend section 2877 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by authorizing the John Burnam Monument Foundation, Inc., to provide recurring maintenance of the monument authorized.

### Section 2872—Naming of Child Development Center at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, in Honor of Mr. S. Lee Kling

This section would designate a child development center at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri as the "S. Lee Kling Child Development Center".

### Section 2873—Conditions on Establishment of Cooperative Security Location in Palanquero, Colombia

This section would prohibit, in this division or otherwise, funds being made available for military construction of a cooperative security location (CSL) at German Olano Airbase in Palanquero, Republic of Colombia, until 15 days from the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that an agreement has been entered into with the government of Colombia that permits the establishment of the cooperative security location at the German Olano Airbase in a manner that will enable the United States Southern Command to execute its Theater Posture Strategy in cooperation with the armed forces of Colombia. The committee notes that in title 23 of this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize the appropriation of $46.0 million, as requested by the Department of Defense, to construct the CSL at Palanquero, under the working premise that an agreement would be reached with the government of Colombia during fiscal year 2010.

This section does not provide for, authorize, or establish the permanent stationing of United States armed forces in Colombia.

### Section 2874—Military Activities at United States Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center

This section would amend section 1806 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11) by ensuring the United States Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center is not restricted or precluded by conducting activities at the Bridgeport Winter Recreation Center, California.

## TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,404,984,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction. The committee recommends authorization of $1,404,984,000 for military construction.

## TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Country | Location | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | BASIC LOAD AMMUNITION HOLDING AREA | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| ARMY | AF | KABUL | USFOR-A HEADQUARTERS & HOUSING | 98,000 | | 98,000 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | TROOP HOUSING PHASE 2 | 4,250 | -4,250 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | TROOP HOUSING PHASE 3 | 22,000 | -22,000 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY | 4,500 | | 4,500 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | TANKER TRUCK OFFLOAD FACILITY | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY | 4,500 | | 4,500 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY | 4,500 | | 4,500 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | SOUTHPARK ROADS | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PH 2 | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| ARMY | AF | MAYWAND | DINING FACILITY | 6,600 | | 6,600 |
| ARMY | AF | FRONTENAC | CONTINGENCY HOUSING | 3,800 | -3,800 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | DINING FACILITY | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| ARMY | AF | TARIN KOWT | DINING FACILITY | 4,350 | | 4,350 |
| ARMY | AF | WOLVERINE | DINING FACILITY | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| ARMY | AF | FRONTENAC | DINING FACILITY | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| ARMY | AF | AIRBORNE | DINING FACILITY | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| ARMY | AF | SHANK | DINING FACILITY | 4,350 | | 4,350 |
| ARMY | AF | ALTIMUR | DINING FACILITY | 2,150 | | 2,150 |
| ARMY | AF | JOYCE | DINING FACILITY | 2,100 | | 2,100 |
| ARMY | AF | GARDEZ | TACTICAL RUNWAY | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| ARMY | AF | SHANK | ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION GRID | 4,600 | | 4,600 |
| ARMY | AF | SHANK | TROOP HOUSING, PH 2 | 8,600 | -8,600 | 0 |

## TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Country | Location | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARMY | AF | SHANK | WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX | 8,100 | | 8,100 |
| ARMY | AF | AIRBORNE | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| ARMY | AF | SALERNO | WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| ARMY | AF | GHAZNI | WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| ARMY | AF | ASADABAD | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| ARMY | AF | BOSTICK | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | ACCESS ROADS | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY | 4,500 | | 4,500 |
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | ENTRY CONTROL POINT AND ACCESS ROADS | 14,200 | | 14,200 |
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | FUEL SYSTEM, PH 2 | 14,200 | | 14,200 |
| ARMY | AF | TARIN KOWT | FUEL SYSTEM PHASE 2 | 11,800 | | 11,800 |
| ARMY | AF | WOLVERINE | FUEL SYSTEM, PH 1 | 5,800 | | 5,800 |
| ARMY | AF | DWYER | FUEL SYSTEM, PH 1 | 5,800 | | 5,800 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | MEDLOG WAREHOUSE | 3,350 | | 3,350 |
| ARMY | AF | JALALABAD | CONTINGENCY HOUSING | 6,900 | -6,900 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | BLESSING | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| ARMY | AF | METHAR-LAM | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 4,150 | | 4,150 |
| ARMY | AF | GARDEZ | CONTINGENCY HOUSING | 8,400 | -8,400 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | WOLVERINE | WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX | 6,900 | | 6,900 |
| ARMY | AF | DWYER | WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX | 6,900 | | 6,900 |
| ARMY | AF | KABUL | CAMP PHOENIX WEST EXPANSION | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| ARMY | AF | TARIN KOWT | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 6,800 | | 6,800 |

## TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Country | Location | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARMY | AF | SHANK | WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | 2,650 | | 2,650 |
| ARMY | AF | MAYWAND | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| ARMY | AF | SHARANA | ROTARY WING PARKING | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| ARMY | AF | SHARANA | AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| ARMY | AF | SHARANA | AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES | 12,200 | | 12,200 |
| ARMY | AF | SHARANA | ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION GRID | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| ARMY | AF | JALALABAD | DINING FACILITY | 4,350 | | 4,350 |
| ARMY | AF | JALALABAD | AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| ARMY | AF | JALALABAD | PERIMETER FENCING | 2,050 | | 2,050 |
| ARMY | AF | SALERNO | ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION GRID | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| ARMY | AF | SALERNO | FUEL SYSTEM, PH 1 | 12,800 | | 12,800 |
| ARMY | AF | SALERNO | DINING FACILITY | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| ARMY | AF | ALTIMUR | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| ARMY | AF | JOYCE | WASTE MANAGEMENT AREA | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| ARMY | AF | GARDEZ | DINING FACILITY | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| ARMY | AF | GARDEZ | FUEL SYSTEM, PH 1 | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | ROADS | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | TROOP HOUSING, PH 3 | 3,250 | -3250 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | SALERNO | RUNWAY UPGRADE | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| ARMY | AF | TARIN KOWT | AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | LEVEL 3 MEDICAL FACILITY | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | WAREHOUSE | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| ARMY | AF | KANDAHAR | THEATER VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY | 55,000 | | 55,000 |

## TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Country | Location | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | WATER SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | 6,200 | | 6,200 |
| ARMY | AF | DWYER | DINING FACILITY | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| ARMY | AF | DWYER | CONTINGENCY HOUSING PHASE 1 | 8,600 | -8600 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | TROOP HOUSING, PH 4 | 3,800 | -3800 | 0 |
| ARMY | AF | DWYER | CONTINGENCY HOUSING PH 2 | 6,900 | -6900 | 0 |
| ARMY | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 20,000 | 100 | 20,100 |
| ARMY | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 76,284 | | 76,284 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | APS Compound | 0 | 38000 | 38,000 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | Command and Control Facility | 0 | 38000 | 38,000 |
| ARMY | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | Perimeter Fence and Guard Towers | 0 | 7000 | 7,000 |
| NSA | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | CLASSIFIED PROJECT | 6,000 | -6000 | 0 |
| NSA | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 600 | -600 | 0 |
| AF | AF | WOLVERINE | CARGO HANDLING AREA | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| AF | AF | DWYER | CARGO HANDLING AREA | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| AF | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | CARGO TERMINAL | 13,800 | | 13,800 |
| AF | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | AVIATION OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE FACILITIES | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| AF | AF | BAGRAM AIR BASE | EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTER SHELTER | 6,400 | | 6,400 |
| AF | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | STRATEGIC AIRLIFT APRON EXPANSION | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| AF | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | CAS APRON EXPANSION | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| AF | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | ISR APRON | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| AF | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | SECURE RSOI FACILITY | 10,000 | | 10,000 |

## TITLE XXIX - OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Country | Location | Project Title | FY 2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AF | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | CARGO HANDLING AREA | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| AF | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | AVIATION OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE FACS | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| AF | AF | TOMBSTONE/BASTION | EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTER SHELTER | 6,300 | | 6,300 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | SECURE RSOI FACILITY | 9,700 | | 9,700 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | TACTICAL AIRLFIT APRON | 29,000 | | 29,000 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | REFUELER APRON/RELOCATE HCP | 66,000 | | 66,000 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | CAS APRON EXPANSION | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | ISR APRON EXPANSION | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | AVIATION OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE FACILITIES | 10,500 | | 10,500 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTER SHELTER | 6,400 | | 6,400 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | CARGO HELICOPTER APRON | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| AF | AF | KANDAHAR | RELOCATE NORTH AIRFIELD ROAD | 16,000 | | 16,000 |
| AF | AF | SHANK | CARGO HANDLING AREA | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| AF | AF | TARIN KOWT | CARGO HANDLING AREA | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| AF | ZU | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| | | | **Grand Total Military Construction** | **1,404,984** | **0** | **1,404,984** |

## 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) $76,500,000 for 10 troop housing projects at various locations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The budget request included $76,500,000 to support construction of these projects.

The committee notes that these projects are projected to be funded by other authorities in fiscal year 2009. Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $76,500,000.

(2) $6,600,000 for a classified project.

The budget request included $6,600,000 to support planning, design, and construction of this project.

The committee notes that these projects will be funded using the operations and maintenance funds in fiscal year 2009. Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $6,600,000.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize war-related military construction projects for the Army. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

### Section 2902—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize war-related military construction projects for the Air Force. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

### Section 2903—Construction Authorization for Facilities for Office of Defense Representative-Pakistan

Notwithstanding section 2801 of title 10, United States Code, this section would authorize to be appropriated, up to $25.0 million for the planning, design, and construction of facilities on the United States Embassy Compound in Islamabad, Islamic Republic of Pakistan for use by the Office of Defense Representative-Pakistan (ODRP). This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to 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 on the number of personnel and the activities of the ODRP beginning with a report 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and continuing semiannually thereafter. This section would allow the submission of the report in classified form. The report would terminate after two years.

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

## TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $16.4 billion for atomic energy defense activities. Of this amount, $9.9 billion is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration and $6.4 billion is for environmental and other defense activities.

The committee believes that the budget request for Department of Energy National Security Programs for fiscal year 2010 reflects more risk within National Nuclear Security Administration programs than it does in Defense Environmental Cleanup activities. Because the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) included $5.1 billion in additional funding for Defense Environmental Cleanup, the committee believes these activities are well positioned to address program challenges during fiscal year 2010. At the same time, the request for the National Nuclear Security Administration does not adequately address the recognized need for increased investment in the Stockpile Stewardship Program and in Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs. The committee therefore recommends a shift in resources from Defense Environmental Cleanup to the National Nuclear Security Administration for the Stockpile Stewardship Program, in order to more appropriately balance risk across Department of Energy National Security Programs. The committee further recommends increased funding for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs.

The committee recommends $16.5 billion, an increase of $83.3 million to the amount of the request.

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 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 | 6,188 | 0 | 6,188 |
| | | | |
| **Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | | | |
| **National Nuclear Security Administration:** | | | |
| Weapons activities | 6,384,431 | 132,000 | 6,516,431 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 2,136,709 | 402,600 | 2,539,309 |
| Naval reactors | 1,003,133 | 0 | 1,003,133 |
| Office of the administrator | 420,754 | 0 | 420,754 |
| **Total, National Nuclear Security Administration** | **9,945,027** | **534,600** | **10,479,627** |
| | | | |
| **Environmental and other defense activities:** | | | |
| Defense environmental cleanup | 5,495,831 | -471,340 | 5,024,491 |
| Other defense activities | 852,468 | 20,000 | 872,468 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 98,400 | 0 | 98,400 |
| **Total, Environmental & other defense activities** | **6,446,699** | **-451,340** | **5,995,359** |
| **Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | **16,391,726** | **83,260** | **16,474,986** |
| | | | |
| **Total, Discretionary Funding** | **16,397,914** | **83,260** | **16,481,174** |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability** | | | |
| **Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability** | | | |
| Infrastructure security & energy restoration | 6,188 | 0 | 6,188 |
| **Weapons Activities** | | | |
| **Directed stockpile work** | | | |
| **Life extension programs** | | | |
| W76 Life extension program | 209,196 | 0 | 209,196 |
| **Total, Life extension programs** | **209,196** | **0** | **209,196** |
| **Stockpile systems** | | | |
| B61 Stockpile systems | 124,456 | 0 | 124,456 |
| W76 Stockpile systems | 65,497 | 0 | 65,497 |
| W78 Stockpile systems | 50,741 | 0 | 50,741 |
| W80 Stockpile systems | 19,064 | 0 | 19,064 |
| B83 Stockpile systems | 35,682 | 0 | 35,682 |
| W87 Stockpile systems | 51,817 | 0 | 51,817 |
| W88 Stockpile systems | 43,043 | 0 | 43,043 |
| **Total, Stockpile systems** | **390,300** | **0** | **390,300** |
| **Weapons dismantlement and disposition** | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 84,100 | 0 | 84,100 |
| **Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition** | **84,100** | **0** | **84,100** |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Stockpile services** | | | |
| Production support | 301,484 | 0 | 301,484 |
| Research and development support | 37,071 | 0 | 37,071 |
| R&D certification and safety | 143,076 | 10,000 | 153,076 |
| Dynamic plutonium experiment - NTS | | [10,000] | |
| Management, technology, and production | 200,223 | 0 | 200,223 |
| Plutonium infrastructure sustainment | 149,201 | 0 | 149,201 |
| **Total, Stockpile services** | **831,055** | **10,000** | **841,055** |
| **Total, Directed stockpile work** | **1,514,651** | **10,000** | **1,524,651** |
| | | | |
| **Campaigns:** | | | |
| **Science campaign** | | | |
| Advanced certification | 19,400 | 10,000 | 29,400 |
| Program increase | | [6,000] | |
| Dual Validation | | [4,000] | |
| Primary assessment technologies | 80,181 | 0 | 80,181 |
| Dynamic materials properties | 86,617 | 0 | 86,617 |
| Academic alliances | 30,251 | 0 | 30,251 |
| Advanced radiography | 22,328 | 0 | 22,328 |
| Secondary assessment technologies | 77,913 | 0 | 77,913 |
| **Total, Science campaign** | **316,690** | **10,000** | **326,690** |
| | | | |
| **Engineering campaign** | | | |
| Enhanced surety | 42,000 | 5,000 | 47,000 |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program increase | | [5,000] | |
| Weapon systems engineering assessment technology | 18,000 | 0 | 18,000 |
| Nuclear survivability | 21,000 | 0 | 21,000 |
| Enhanced surveillance | 69,000 | 0 | 69,000 |
| **Total, Engineering campaign** | **150,000** | **5,000** | **155,000** |
| | | | |
| **Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign** | | | |
| Ignition | 106,734 | 5,000 | 111,734 |
| National Ignition Campaign program increase | | [5,000] | |
| NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support | 72,252 | 5,000 | 77,252 |
| National Ignition Campaign program increase | | [5,000] | |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion | 5,000 | 10,000 | 15,000 |
| Z Machine operations, Sandia National Laboratory | | [10,000] | |
| Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas | 4,000 | 0 | 4,000 |
| Facility operations and target production | 248,929 | 12,000 | 260,929 |
| National Ignition Campaign program increase | | [12,000] | |
| **Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign** | **436,915** | **32,000** | **468,915** |
| | | | |
| **Advanced simulation and computing campaign** | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 556,125 | 30,000 | 586,125 |
| Program increase | | [30,000] | |
| **Total, Advanced simulation and computing campaign** | **556,125** | **30,000** | **586,125** |
| | | | |
| **Readiness Campaign** | | | |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Stockpile readiness | 5,746 | 0 | 5,746 |
| High explosives and weapon operations | 4,608 | 0 | 4,608 |
| Nonnuclear readiness | 12,701 | 0 | 12,701 |
| Tritium readiness | 68,246 | 0 | 68,246 |
| Advanced design and production technologies | 8,699 | 0 | 8,699 |
| **Total, Readiness campaign** | **100,000** | **0** | **100,000** |
| **Total, Campaigns** | **1,559,730** | **77,000** | **1,636,730** |
| | | | |
| **Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)** | | | |
| **Operation of facilities** | | | |
| Operation of facilities | | | |
| Kansas City Plant | 169,056 | 0 | 169,056 |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | 86,670 | 0 | 86,670 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory | 311,776 | 0 | 311,776 |
| Nevada Test Site | 79,583 | 0 | 79,583 |
| Pantex Plant | 131,602 | 15,000 | 146,602 |
| Program increase | | [15,000] | |
| Sandia National Laboratories | 104,133 | 10,000 | 114,133 |
| Program increase | | [10,000] | |
| Savannah River Site | 128,580 | 0 | 128,580 |
| Y-12 National Security Complex | 210,774 | 15,000 | 225,774 |
| Program increase | | [15,000] | |
| Institutional Site Support | 120,129 | 0 | 120,129 |
| **Total, Operation of facilities** | **1,342,303** | **40,000** | **1,382,303** |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program readiness | 73,021 | 0 | 73,021 |
| Material recycle and recovery | 69,542 | 0 | 69,542 |
| Containers | 23,392 | 0 | 23,392 |
| Storage | 24,708 | 0 | 24,708 |
| **Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)** | **1,532,966** | **40,000** | **1,572,966** |
| **Construction:** | | | |
| 10-D-501 Nuclear facilities risk reduction Y-12 National security complex, Oakridge, TN | 12,500 | 0 | 12,500 |
| 99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, SRS | 30,321 | 0 | 30,321 |
| 09-D-007 LANSCE refurbishment, Los Alamos National Laboratory | 0 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Program increase in support of RTBF | | [15,000] | |
| 09-D-404 Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Program increase in support of RTBF | | [5,000] | |
| 08-D-801 High pressure fire loop (HPFL), Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 31,910 | 0 | 31,910 |
| 08-D-804 TA-55 Reinvestment project, Los Alamos National Laboratory | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Program increase in support of RTBF | | [5,000] | |
| 08-D-802 High Explosive Pressing Facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 0 | -20,000 | -20,000 |
| Prior year savings | | [-20,000] | |
| 06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED), various locations | 70,678 | 0 | 70,678 |
| 06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV | 1,473 | 0 | 1,473 |
| 04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 55,000 | 0 | 55,000 |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 04-D-128 TA-18 Criticality experiments facility (CEF), Los Alamos National Laboratory Nevada Test Site, NV | 1,500 | 0 | 1,500 |
| **Total, Construction** | **203,382** | **5,000** | **208,382** |
| **Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities** | **1,736,348** | **45,000** | **1,781,348** |
| | | | |
| **Secure transportation asset** | | | |
| Operation and equipment | 138,772 | 0 | 138,772 |
| Program direction | 96,143 | 0 | 96,143 |
| **Total, Secure transportation asset** | **234,915** | **0** | **234,915** |
| | | | |
| **Nuclear counterterrorism incident response** | **221,936** | **0** | **221,936** |
| | | | |
| **Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program** | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 144,959 | 0 | 144,959 |
| **Construction:** | | | |
| 07-D-253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratory | 9,963 | 0 | 9,963 |
| **Total, Construction** | **9,963** | **0** | **9,963** |
| **Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program** | **154,922** | **0** | **154,922** |
| | | | |
| **Site stewardship** | | | |
| Environmental projects and operations | 41,288 | 0 | 41,288 |
| Nuclear materials integration | 20,000 | 0 | 20,000 |
| Stewardship planning | 29,086 | 0 | 29,086 |
| **Total, Site stewardship** | **90,374** | **0** | **90,374** |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Environmental projects and operations** | | | |
| Long term stewardship | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Safeguards and security** | | | |
| **Defense nuclear security** | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 700,044 | 0 | 700,044 |
| Construction: | | | |
| 10-D-701 Security improvements project Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN | 49,000 | 0 | 49,000 |
| **Total, Construction** | **49,000** | **0** | **49,000** |
| **Total, Defense nuclear security** | **749,044** | **0** | **749,044** |
| Cyber security | 122,511 | 0 | 122,511 |
| **Total, Safeguards and security** | **871,555** | **0** | **871,555** |
| **Total, Weapons Activities** | **6,384,431** | **132,000** | **6,516,431** |
| **Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | | | |
| Nonproliferation and verification R&D | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 297,300 | 0 | 297,300 |
| Nonproliferation and international security | 207,202 | 0 | 207,202 |
| International nuclear materials protection and cooperation | 552,300 | 179,100 | 731,400 |
| Program Increase | | [179,100] | |
| Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program | 24,507 | 0 | 24,507 |
| **Fissile materials disposition** | | | |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition** | | | |
| **Operation and maintenance** | | | |
| U.S. plutonium disposition | 90,896 | 0 | 90,896 |
| U.S. uranium disposition | 34,691 | 0 | 34,691 |
| Supporting activities | 1,075 | 0 | 1,075 |
| **Total, Operation and maintenance** | **126,662** | **0** | **126,662** |
| Construction: | | | |
| 99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC | 504,238 | 0 | 504,238 |
| 99-D-141-02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC | 70,000 | 0 | 70,000 |
| **Total, Construction** | **574,238** | **0** | **574,238** |
| **Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition** | **700,900** | **0** | **700,900** |
| Russian surplus materials disposition | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 |
| **Total, Fissile materials disposition** | **701,900** | **0** | **701,900** |
| | | | |
| **Global threat reduction initiative** | 353,500 | 223,500 | 577,000 |
| Program Increase | | [223,500] | |
| **Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | **2,136,709** | **402,600** | **2,539,309** |
| | | | |
| **Naval Reactors** | | | |
| **Naval reactors development** | | | |
| **Operation and maintenance** | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 935,533 | 0 | 935,533 |
| **Total, Operation and maintenance** | **935,533** | **0** | **935,533** |
| **Construction:** | | | |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL | 1,500 | 0 | 1,500 |
| 10-D-904, NRF infrastructure upgrades, Idaho | 700 | 0 | 700 |
| 09-D-190, PED, Infrastructure upgrades, KAPL | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 |
| 09-D-902, NRF Office Building #2 ECC Upgrade, Idaho | 6,400 | 0 | 6,400 |
| 08-D-190 Project engineering and design Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID | 9,500 | 0 | 9,500 |
| 07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC) | 11,700 | 0 | 11,700 |
| **Total, Construction** | **30,800** | **0** | **30,800** |
| **Total, Naval reactors development** | **966,333** | **0** | **966,333** |
| Program direction | 36,800 | 0 | 36,800 |
| **Total, Naval Reactors** | **1,003,133** | **0** | **1,003,133** |
| | | | |
| **Office of the Administrator** | | | |
| Office of the administrator | 431,074 | 0 | 431,074 |
| Use of prior year balances | -10,320 | 0 | -10,320 |
| **Total, Office of the Administrator** | **420,754** | **0** | **420,754** |
| | | | |
| **Defense Environmental Cleanup** | | | |
| **Closure sites:** | | | |
| Closure sites administration | 8,225 | 0 | 8,225 |
| Miamisburg | 33,243 | 0 | 33,243 |
| **Total, Closure sites** | **41,468** | **0** | **41,468** |
| | | | |
| **Hanford site:** | | | |

## Title XXXI – DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2012 accelerated completions** | | | |
| Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project | 327,955 | 0 | 327,955 |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition PFP | 118,087 | 0 | 118,087 |
| SNF stabilization and disposition | 55,325 | 0 | 55,325 |
| **Total, 2012 accelerated completions** | **501,367** | **0** | **501,367** |
| | | | |
| **2035 accelerated completions** | | | |
| Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford | 70,250 | 0 | 70,250 |
| Richland community and regulatory support | 21,940 | 0 | 21,940 |
| Soil and water remediation - groundwater vadose zone | 176,766 | 0 | 176,766 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition 200 area | 132,757 | 0 | 132,757 |
| **Total, 2035 accelerated completions** | **401,713** | **0** | **401,713** |
| **Total, Hanford site** | **903,080** | **0** | **903,080** |
| | | | |
| **Idaho National Laboratory:** | | | |
| SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012 | 14,768 | 0 | 14,768 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | 137,000 | 0 | 137,000 |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 95,800 | 0 | 95,800 |
| **Construction** | | | |
| 06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho | 83,700 | 0 | 83,700 |
| Soil and water remediation - 2012 | 71,000 | 0 | 71,000 |
| Idaho community and regulatory support | 3,900 | 0 | 3,900 |
| **Total, Idaho National Laboratory** | **406,168** | **0** | **406,168** |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **NNSA sites** | | | |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | 910 | 0 | 910 |
| NNSA Service Center/SPRU | 17,938 | 0 | 17,938 |
| Nevada | 65,674 | 0 | 65,674 |
| California site support | 238 | 0 | 238 |
| Sandia National Laboratories | 2,864 | 0 | 2,864 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory | 189,000 | 0 | 189,000 |
| **Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites** | **276,624** | **0** | **276,624** |
| | | | |
| **Oak Ridge Reservation:** | | | |
| Building 3019 | 38,900 | 0 | 38,900 |
| Nuclear facility D & D ORNL | 38,900 | 0 | 38,900 |
| Nuclear facility D & D Y-12 | 34,000 | 0 | 34,000 |
| Nuclear facility D & D, E. Tennessee technology park | 100 | 0 | 100 |
| OR reservation community and regulatory support | 6,253 | 0 | 6,253 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012 | 35,615 | 0 | 35,615 |
| **Total, Oak Ridge Reservation** | **153,768** | **0** | **153,768** |
| | | | |
| **Office of River Protection:** | | | |
| **Waste treatment and immobilization plant** | | | |
| **Construction:** | | | |
| 01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant | | | |
| 01-D-16A Low activity waste facility | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 |
| 01-D-16B Analytical laboratory | 55,000 | 0 | 55,000 |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01-D-16C Balance of facilities | 50,000 | 0 | 50,000 |
| 01-D-16D High level waste facility | 160,000 | 0 | 160,000 |
| 01-D-16E Pretreatment facility | 325,000 | 0 | 325,000 |
| **Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant** | **690,000** | **0** | **690,000** |
| | | | |
| **Tank farm activities** | | | |
| Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 408,000 | 0 | 408,000 |
| **Total, Office of River Protection** | **1,098,000** | **0** | **1,098,000** |
| | | | |
| **Savannah River sites:** | | | |
| **Nuclear material stabilization and disposition** | | | |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition | 385,310 | 0 | 385,310 |
| Construction: | | | |
| 08-D-414 Project engineering and design Plutonium Vitrification Facility, VL | 6,315 | 0 | 6,315 |
| **Total, Nuclear material stabilization and disposition** | **391,625** | **0** | **391,625** |
| | | | |
| **2035 accelerated completions** | | | |
| SR community and regulatory support | 18,300 | 0 | 18,300 |
| Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition | 38,768 | 0 | 38,768 |
| **Total, 2035 accelerated completions** | **57,068** | **0** | **57,068** |
| | | | |
| **Tank farm activities** | | | |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 527,138 | 0 | 527,138 |
| Construction: | | | |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River | 234,118 | 0 | 234,118 |
| **Total, Tank farm activities** | **761,256** | **0** | **761,256** |
| **Total, Savannah River sites** | **1,209,949** | **0** | **1,209,949** |
| | | | |
| **Waste Isolation Pilot Plant** | | | |
| Waste isolation pilot plant | 144,902 | 0 | 144,902 |
| Central characterization project | 13,730 | 0 | 13,730 |
| Transportation | 33,851 | 0 | 33,851 |
| Community and regulatory support | 27,854 | 0 | 27,854 |
| **Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant** | **220,337** | **0** | **220,337** |
| | | | |
| Program direction | 355,000 | 0 | 355,000 |
| Program support | 34,000 | 0 | 34,000 |
| | | | |
| **Safeguards and Security:** | | | |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Project | 4,644 | 0 | 4,644 |
| Oak Ridge Reservation | 32,400 | 0 | 32,400 |
| West Valley | 1,859 | 0 | 1,859 |
| Paducah | 8,190 | 0 | 8,190 |
| Portsmouth | 17,509 | 0 | 17,509 |
| Richland/Hanford Site | 82,771 | 0 | 82,771 |
| Savannah River Site | 132,064 | 0 | 132,064 |
| **Total, Safeguards and Security** | **279,437** | **0** | **279,437** |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology development | 55,000 | 0 | 55,000 |
| Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution | 463,000 | | 463,000 |
| **Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup** | **5,495,831** | **0** | **5,495,831** |
| | | | |
| **UNDISTRIBUTED** | | | |
| Realignment to support NNSA Weapons Activities | 0 | -102,540 | -102,540 |
| Transfer to Title II | 0 | -368,800 | -368,800 |
| **Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup** | **5,495,831** | **-471,340** | **5,024,491** |
| | | | |
| **Other Defense Activities** | | | |
| **Health, safety and security** | | | |
| Health, safety and security | 337,757 | 20,000 | 357,757 |
| Program increase | | [20,000] | |
| Program direction | 112,125 | 0 | 112,125 |
| **Total, Health, safety and security** | **449,882** | **20,000** | **469,882** |
| | | | |
| **Office of Legacy Management** | | | |
| Legacy management | 177,618 | 0 | 177,618 |
| Program direction | 12,184 | 0 | 12,184 |
| **Total, Office of Legacy Management** | **189,802** | **0** | **189,802** |
| | | | |
| **Nuclear energy** | | | |
| **Infrastructure** | | | |
| **Idaho facilities management** | | | |

## Title XXXI -- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2010 Request | House Change | House Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| INL infrastructure O&M | 83,358 | 0 | 83,358 |
| **Total, Infrastructure** | **83,358** | **0** | **83,358** |
| **Total, Nuclear energy** | **83,358** | **0** | **83,358** |
| Defense related administrative support | 122,982 | 0 | 122,982 |
| Office of hearings and appeals | 6,444 | 0 | 6,444 |
| **Total, Other Defense Activities** | **852,468** | **20,000** | **872,468** |
| **Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal** | | | |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 98,400 | 0 | 98,400 |
| **Total, Department of Energy** | **16,397,914** | **83,260** | **16,481,174** |

# ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $9.9 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends $10.5 billion, an increase of $534.6 million to the budget request.

### Weapons Activities

*Stockpile Stewardship Program*

The committee views execution of the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP) as the core national security mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The SSP utilizes data from previous nuclear tests, unique experimental tools, unmatched advanced simulation and computing capabilities, and the world's foremost nuclear weapons scientists, engineers, and technicians to maintain the safety and reliability of our weapons without nuclear tests.

After more than a decade of successful stewardship, the effort is poised to move into a second major phase. In the first phase, stockpile stewardship investments were largely focused on developing advanced simulation and computing capabilities and constructing world-class experimental tools, such as the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic-Test facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the Z Machine at Sandia National Laboratory. These experimental facilities, simulation and computing capabilities, and the scientists, engineers, and technicians supporting the Stockpile Stewardship Program, together form the pillars on which the stewardship program is based.

In its second phase, the SSP aims to advance the science of stewardship so that the performance of the stockpile can be validated without direct reliance on historical underground test data. The committee believes the Stockpile Stewardship Program can only advance in this fashion if the experimental capabilities that have been developed are exercised, and the scientists, engineers, and technicians employed in the nuclear security enterprise are actively engaged in challenging, meaningful work. Such activity is imperative because specific areas of remaining uncertainty about the performance of our nuclear weapons can only be illuminated through experiments facilitated by these capabilities.

As the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States noted in its final report, absent such activity, the nation will not be able to sustain the intellectual capital that is critical to maintaining its deterrent forces. The committee notes that many of these same scientists, engineers, and technicians provide the intellectual capital for other critical national security priorities, including nuclear nonproliferation, arms control verification, and nuclear forensics.

The committee believes the continued success of the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program is all the more critical as the Administration conducts the Nuclear Posture Review required by

the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), and as the nation pursues negotiations with the Russian Federation on reducing our respective nuclear arsenals.

In its final report, the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States noted that the intellectual infrastructure of the nuclear weapons complex "is in serious trouble—perhaps more so than the physical complex itself." The commission stated that it "strongly recommends that significant steps be taken to remedy the situation." The committee shares this concern; elsewhere in this title, the committee includes legislative provisions to strengthen and sustain the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program and recommends additional funding for key elements of the program.

*Directed Stockpile Work—Stockpile Services—Research and Development Certification and Safety*

The budget request contained $831.1 million for Stockpile Services, including $143.1 million for Research and Development Certification and Safety, a reduction of $44.5 million from the fiscal year 2009 appropriated level. The committee understands the budget request would not fully support experimental tests previously planned in support of the Science Campaign and the Stockpile Stewardship Program.

The committee therefore recommends $841.1 million for Stockpile Services, including $153.1 million for Research and Development Certification and Safety, an increase of $10.0 million, to support dynamic plutonium experiments at the Nevada Test Site.

*Science Campaign—Advanced Certification*

The budget request contained $316.7 million for the Science Campaign, including $19.4 million for Advanced Certification.

The committee believes additional investment is needed to support the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program as it moves into its second phase. In particular, the committee believes additional investment is needed to support analysis of various approaches to stockpile stewardship and management.

The committee also believes that the continued success of the Stockpile Stewardship Program requires thorough and rigorous scientific review processes to maintain the strategic deterrent without nuclear testing. Experts, including the JASON scientific advisory panel, have urged enhanced peer review within the stewardship program. Elsewhere in this title, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish a dual validation approach as part of the annual weapons assessment and certification process.

The committee recommends $326.7 million for the Science Campaign, including $29.4 million for Advanced Certification, an increase of $10.0 million. From within this recommended increase, the committee recommends $4.0 million to initiate dual validation of the B61 and B83 bombs, and the W78 and W87 warheads.

*Engineering Campaign*

The budget request contained $150.0 million for the Engineering Campaign, including $42.0 million for Enhanced Surety. The committee supports these activities, but understands that the request

is insufficient to fully support analysis of options for increasing the surety of existing legacy stockpile systems.

The committee therefore recommends $155.0 million for the Engineering Campaign, including $47.0 million for Enhanced Surety, an increase of $5.0 million.

*Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign*

The budget request contained $436.9 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign.

The committee supports the National Ignition Campaign and believes the successful execution of this campaign is critical to the success of the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program. The committee understands the fiscal year 2010 budget request does not fully fund the risk reduction measures recommended by the National Ignition Campaign Baseline Execution Plan, and believes that additional resources are necessary. The committee is also concerned that the budget request would not adequately support pulsed power activities within the Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield Campaign during fiscal year 2010.

The committee therefore recommends $468.9 million, an increase of $32.0 million, for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign. Specifically, the committee recommends: $111.7 million for Ignition, an increase of $5.0 million; $77.3 million for NIF Diagnostics, Cryogenics, and Experimental Support, an increase of $5.0 million; $15.0 million for Pulsed Power Inertial Confinement Fusion, an increase of $10.0 million; and $260.9 million for Facility Operations and Target Production, an increase of $12.0 million.

*Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign*

The budget request contained $556.1 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) Campaign.

The committee notes that the ASC Campaign funds the principal means of validating the performance of nuclear weapons absent nuclear explosive tests. As the major experimental tools of the Stockpile Stewardship Program are brought on line, more data will be available to inform these advanced simulations. Such simulations will be more robust than past efforts, and should yield greater confidence in the nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. But such simulations will also require more advanced computing capabilities.

The committee therefore recommends $586.1 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign, an increase of $30.0 million, specifically to support planned transitions to the Sequoia and Zia platforms.

*Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities—Pantex Plant*

The budget request contained $131.6 million within Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities for the Pantex Plant. The committee understands that the budget request was not sufficient to fully address mission needs at Pantex, in support of weapons dismantlement, stockpile life extension program work, and surveillance.

The committee recommends $146.6 million, an increase of $15.0 million, for Operations of Facilities for the Pantex Plant to address National Nuclear Security Administration facility maintenance requirements.

*Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities—Sandia National Laboratories*

The budget request contained $104.1 million within Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities for Sandia National Laboratories. The committee notes that budget request was $19.8 million below the fiscal year 2009 funded level, and further understands that the request was not sufficient to support mission needs.

The committee recommends $114.1 million for Operations of Facilities for Sandia National Laboratories, an increase of $10.0 million.

*Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities—Y–12 National Security Complex*

The budget request contained $210.8 million within Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Operations of Facilities for the Y–12 National Security Complex. The committee understands that the budget request was not sufficient to fully address mission needs at Y–12 in support of weapons dismantlement, refurbishment, and other national security missions. The committee believes these needs are important, given the age and condition of the existing uranium processing facility at the Y–12 National Security Complex.

The committee therefore recommends $225.8 million, an increase of $15.0 million, for Operations of Facilities for the Y–12 National Security Complex to reduce safety risks and security vulnerabilities.

*Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities—Construction*

The budget request contained $203.4 million for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) Construction, but contained: no funding for Project 09–D–007, Los Alamos Neutron Science Center Refurbishment at Los Alamos National Laboratory; no funding for Project 09–D–404, Test Capabilities Revitalization II at Sandia National Laboratories; no funding for Project 08–D–804, TA–55 Reinvestment Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and no funding for Project 08–D–802, High Explosive Pressing Facility, Pantex Plant.

The RTBF program provides funding for the physical infrastructure of the nuclear security complex of laboratories, plants, and facilities. The committee is concerned that inadequate funding for such projects will undermine successful execution of the Stockpile Stewardship Program. However, the Government Accountability Office has identified up to $42.1 million in prior year unobligated balances associated with Project 08–D–802, High Explosive Pressing Facility, Pantex Plant, that should be available due to cancellation of that project. The committee understands that a portion of these unobligated funds will be needed for project closeout, but the committee believes that reallocation of a portion of these prior year

balances to other active projects is appropriate given the priorities left unmet by the budget request.

The committee therefore recommends $208.4 million for RTBF—Construction, an increase of $5.0 million. Specifically, the committee recommends: $15.0 million for Project 09–D–007, Los Alamos Neutron Science Center Refurbishment at Los Alamos National Laboratory; $5.0 million for Project 09–D–404, Test Capabilities Revitalization II at Sandia National Laboratories; and $5.0 million for Project 08–D–804, TA–55 Reinvestment Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The committee further recommends a decrease of $20.0 million from within prior year unobligated balances associated with Project 08–D–802, High Explosive Pressing Facility, Pantex Plant.

*National Nuclear Security Administration Budget Categories*

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) executes a broad range of nuclear security programs, but its program and budget category descriptions do not accurately reflect this breadth. The committee notes that the largest budget category, Weapons Activities, includes activities that would be more accurately described as providing nuclear security or supporting the infrastructure of the nuclear laboratory and production complex.

The committee believes that additional clarity in the NNSA budget presentation would better reflect the breadth of programs administered by the NNSA. The committee therefore encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security to consider creating additional budget categories that would be equivalent in stature to Weapons Activities and would include those activities whose purposes extend beyond direct weapons stockpile work. The committee believes additional detail in the budget request would more accurately reflect the range of programs administered by the NNSA.

*National Nuclear Security Administration Governance*

For more than a decade, the committee has been concerned with the organization and management of the Department of Energy's national security programs. These concerns prompted the committee to lead the effort in 1999 to enact the National Nuclear Security Administration Act of 1999, which was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). A chief concern, both then and now, is that officials and employees responsible for the nuclear and national security programs executed by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) should not be subject to direction from the staff offices of the Department of Energy in executing those responsibilities.

As noted in the conference report (H. Rept. 106–301) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, ". . . each officer or employee of a contractor of the Administration would not be responsible to, or subject to the authority, direction, or control of any other officer, agent, or employee of the Department of Energy who is not an employee of the Administration, with the exception of the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Energy."

However since the establishment of the NNSA 10 years ago, various studies and examinations have concluded that the Department

of Energy has not afforded the NNSA the intended autonomy, including 2 expert reviews completed this year.

The Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States concluded in its final report, issued on May 6, 2009, that "the governance structure of the NNSA is not delivering the needed results." The commission further noted that, "The leadership of all three weapons laboratories believes that the regulatory burden is excessive, a view endorsed by the Commission." The Stimson Center Task Force on Leveraging the Scientific and Technological Capabilities of the NNSA National Laboratories for 21st Century National Security, which issued its report on March 4, 2009, found that, "The Laboratories and Nevada Test Site need more federal leadership and less federal management to be effective and efficient."

The committee is aware that the Office of Management and Budget has directed an organizational assessment of NNSA to be conducted jointly by the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense. The committee understands the assessment will include an examination of how NNSA supports the defense strategy and force structure that is being developed in the Quadrennial Defense Review and Nuclear Posture Review.

The committee encourages the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense, in conducting this review, to place a high priority on realizing the original intent of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act of 1999. Providing the NNSA with the ability to effectively and efficiently carry out its critical national security missions should be among the Administration's top priorities.

## Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

The budget request contained $2.1 billion for Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs.

The committee fully supports the goals of the NNSA's nonproliferation programs and continues to believe that such programs are critical to U.S. national security and must be a top national security priority. In recent years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have limited the progress of NNSA and other nonproliferation programs. The committee has also noted that despite the significant achievements of NNSA nonproliferation programs over the last 15 years, much remains to be done, and has emphasized the need for a strong national commitment to reinvigorate these programs.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) and the Duncan Hunter National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) addressed these concerns by increasing funding for NNSA nonproliferation programs, including the International Nuclear Materials and Cooperation (MPC&A) Program and the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI). Public Law 110–181 and Public Law 110–417 also: required a report by the President on nuclear terrorism prevention; required reports by the Secretary of Energy on strengthening and expanding the NNSA International Radiological Threat Reduction, MPC&A, and Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP)

programs; authorized a nonproliferation and national security scholarship and fellowship program; provided the Secretary of Energy with authority to accept international contributions for the NNSA Russian Plutonium Disposition and MPC&A programs; and included other provisions to ensure that wherever possible, NNSA nonproliferation programs address threats involving nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

In addition, the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), passed in the 110th Congress by both the House and Senate as H.R. 1 and commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," included a number of provisions and authorized funding to accelerate, strengthen, and expand NNSA nonproliferation programs. Provisions include the establishment of both a presidential coordinator and a congressional-executive commission on the prevention of weapons of mass destruction proliferation and terrorism. However, the committee believes there are additional opportunities for NNSA nonproliferation programs to address the wide variety of global threats arising from the proliferation of nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise. The committee welcomes the President's commitment to reinvigorate nonproliferation programs and ensure that they are a top priority going forward. This Act specifically supports the President's goals and objectives for NNSA nonproliferation programs, and encourages these programs to maintain a particular focus on securing nuclear and radiological weapons and weapons-related materials and technologies at the source wherever possible.

Moreover, the committee continues to welcome actions by the NNSA to eliminate impediments to timely obligation and execution of authorized and appropriated funds for NNSA nonproliferation programs. In recent years, such actions have enabled the NNSA to achieve a level of uncommitted uncosted balances for most NNSA nonproliferation programs that is below the acceptable levels established by the NNSA in close coordination with the Government Accountability Office. The committee encourages the NNSA to continue its efforts to eliminate any remaining impediments to timely obligation and execution of funds for NNSA nonproliferation programs.

The committee authorizes $2.5 billion, an increase of $402.6 million. This includes an increase of $223.5 million for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and $179.1 million for the International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation program.

*Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development*

The budget request contained $297.3 million for Nonproliferation Research and Development (R&D). The committee fully supports the goals of the R&D program, and continues to note that the program is the sole remaining U.S. Government capability for long-term nuclear nonproliferation research and development. The committee also continues to emphasize the importance of expanding U.S. scientific skills and resources and improving U.S. Government capabilities relating to both short- and long-term innovative nonproliferation research and development that will maintain U.S. technological advantage in this area.

The committee recommends $297.3 million, the amount of the budget request.

*Radiation detection technology*

The committee continues to encourage the National Nuclear Security Administration to work closely with the Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office on the research and development of radiation detection technology to ensure there is no duplication of research efforts, but rather a collaborative complementary approach to research in areas of common interest.

*Nonproliferation and International Security*

The budget request contained $207.2 million for Nonproliferation and International Security (NIS). The committee fully supports the goals of the NIS program.

The committee recommends $207.2 million, the amount of the budget request.

*Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention*

In recent years, the committee has been conducting vigorous oversight of the Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) program. In section 3116 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), the committee required a comprehensive review of the GIPP program and reports on: the goals of the program; criteria for partnership projects under the program; the plans for existing and new projects; and project funding. The committee appreciates the information provided by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) on the GIPP program in response to this reporting requirement. The committee particularly welcomes the completion of an interagency risk assessment of project institutes and facilities in the former Soviet Union (FSU) and the decision to focus on high priority institutes for engagement in this region. The committee also welcomes the new cost-sharing goal for GIPP projects in the FSU.

The committee recognizes that the GIPP program's engagement activities with former weapons of mass destruction (WMD) scientists continue to serve important U.S. nonproliferation interests, in part by helping to impede transfers of WMD expertise and know-how to states of concern or terrorist entities.

The committee encourages the NNSA to continue strengthening the management, implementation and oversight of the GIPP program as necessary to ensure the program achieves its intended nonproliferation objectives and in no way undermines U.S. national security interests. The committee also encourages the NNSA to consult with the committee regarding continued program improvements, and to keep the committee fully informed of significant program developments.

*Global Nuclear Energy Partnership*

In the committee report (H. Rept. 110–652) accompanying the National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee expressed its concerns regarding the proliferation risks associated with the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP). The com-

mittee addressed these concerns in section 3117 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The committee notes the budget request did not include any funding for GNEP activities from within any NNSA Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program line, and welcomes this positive development.

*International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation*

The budget request contained $552.3 million for International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation (MPC&A). The committee fully supports the goals of the MPC&A program.

The committee recommends $731.4 million, an increase of $179.1 million as follows: $30.0 million to secure vulnerable nuclear weapons and weapons-usable material located outside the United States; and $149.1 million to deploy radiation detection equipment and related capabilities at high-threat border crossings and ports of transit to deter, detect, and interdict illicit transfers of materials that could be used in weapons of mass destruction or a radiological dispersion device, known as a "dirty bomb."

*Second Line of Defense*

The committee continues to encourage the National Nuclear Security Administration to closely coordinate its Second Line of Defense efforts to deter, detect, and interdict illicit transfers of nuclear and radioactive materials at border crossings and ports with the efforts of any other relevant U.S. agency or department, including the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security.

*Fissile Materials Disposition*

*United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition*

The budget request contained $700.9 million for the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program.

The committee fully supports the goals of the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program. The committee also continues to support execution of program activities and functions relating to disposition of U.S. surplus weapons-grade plutonium and the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MOX project), including management and direction of the MOX project, from within the National Nuclear Security Administration Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program, given the important nonproliferation objectives, benefits, and national security goals associated with these activities.

The committee recommends $700.9 million for U.S. Fissile Materials Disposition, the amount of the budget request.

*Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition*

The budget request contained $1.0 million for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program.

The committee fully supports the goals of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program, which include disposition of the Russian Federation's surplus weapons-grade plutonium. The committee continues to emphasize the importance of nonproliferation cooperation with the Russian Federation to U.S. nonprolifera-

tion objectives and national security goals. The committee supports the President's efforts to strengthen and expand such cooperation.

The committee also continues to urge the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to resolve any outstanding issues with Russia relating to the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program and to move the program forward in a manner that is consistent with the program's nonproliferation objectives. Moreover, the committee continues to emphasize its concern with the use of fast reactors under the program and expects the NNSA to pursue a disposition path for Russia's surplus weapons-grade plutonium which ensures that any reactors used under the program do not produce plutonium and include necessary monitoring and inspection controls.

The committee encourages the NNSA to keep the committee fully informed of significant program developments and any funding needs to continue program activities during fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommends $1.0 million, the amount of the budget request.

*Global Threat Reduction Initiative*

The budget request contained $353.5 million for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI). The committee fully supports the goals of the GTRI program.

The committee recommends $577.0 million, an increase of $223.5 million, as follows: (1) $126.5 to support the President's four-year plan to secure and remove all known, vulnerable, weapons-usable nuclear material around the world by 2012; (2) $35.0 million to accelerate conversion of domestic and international research reactors from the use of weapons-usable highly-enriched uranium to low-enriched uranium; (3) $2.0 million to accelerate removal of vulnerable high-priority radiological sources located outside the United States; (4) $5.0 million to accelerate removal of excess and unwanted radiological sources within U.S. borders; (5) $10.0 million to accelerate efforts to secure sites with vulnerable high-priority nuclear and radiological sources located outside the United States; and (6) $45.0 million to accelerate efforts to secure U.S. research and test reactors and sites with high-priority radiological sources.

*Office of the United States Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism*

The committee notes that the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53), passed in the 110th Congress by both the House of Representatives and the Senate as H.R. 1 and commonly known as "the 9/11 bill," established a presidential coordinator on the prevention of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) proliferation and terrorism. The committee welcomes the President's appointment of a government-wide coordinator on WMD issues, and encourages the coordinator to keep the committee informed of developments with respect to U.S. efforts in this critical area.

Office of the Administrator

The budget request contained $420.8 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Office of the Administrator. The committee encourages the Office of the Administrator to ad-

dress any issues of limited staff capacity, capabilities, and resources related to implementation of critical NNSA nonproliferation programs and to advise the committee of any funding needs in this regard.

The committee recommends $420.8 million, the amount of the budget request.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

### Overview

The budget request contained $6.4 billion for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $6.0 billion, a decrease of $451.3 million.

### Defense Environmental Cleanup

*Defense Environmental Cleanup program funding*

The budget request contained $5.5 billion for Defense Environmental Cleanup, a decrease of $161.4 million from the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2009.

The committee is aware that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) provided an additional $5.1 billion in funding for Defense Environmental Cleanup. The committee is also aware that, according to a report issued by the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management in January 2009, pursuant to the requirement established by section 3130 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the cost to complete the current remaining work scope for the Department of Energy's Environmental Management program is between $205 billion and $260 billion. At current funding rates, the cleanup will take decades. The committee believes that the additional resources provided for the program in Public Law 111–5 were needed, particularly following the trend from fiscal years 2005 through 2008, during which time the program's annual budgets were decreasing while program lifecycle costs and work scope were increasing. The committee is supportive of the Department of Energy's expressed intent to focus the additional funding on reducing the footprint of contamination and on accelerating cleanup efforts while creating thousands of new jobs. The committee encourages the Secretary of Energy to maintain the momentum gained through the provision of the Public Law 111–5 funding by robustly funding Defense Environmental Cleanup in future years.

The committee is aware that the Department of Energy Inspector General broadly observed in a March 2009 report that the "infusion of these [Public Law 111–5] funds and the corresponding increase in effort required to ensure that they are properly controlled and disbursed in a timely manner will, without doubt, strain existing resources." At the same time, as mentioned elsewhere within this title, the committee recognizes the need for additional resources for the National Nuclear Security Administration's Stockpile Stewardship Program. The committee therefore recommends a decrease from the amount of the budget request for Defense Environmental Cleanup for fiscal year 2010 equivalent to two percent of the funding provided in Public Law 111–5, or $102.5 million. The com-

mittee recommends that the Secretary of Energy derive the decrease from among sites that are at greatest risk of being unable to execute Public Law 111–5 and fiscal year 2010 funding as planned in fiscal year 2010, or that are projected to meet regulatory milestones ahead of schedule in fiscal year 2010. However, the committee urges the Secretary to ensure that the distribution does not put any regulatory milestones at risk. The committee recommends the Secretary re-allocate these funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to address Stockpile Stewardship Program funding shortfalls identified elsewhere in this title.

In addition, the committee believes that the need to sustain the F–22 production line warrants an additional transfer from Defense Environmental Cleanup of $368.8 million. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Energy also derive this decrease from among sites that are projected to meet regulatory milestones ahead of schedule in fiscal year 2010, or that are at greatest risk of being unable to execute Public Law 111–5 and fiscal year 2010 funding as planned in fiscal year 2010.

The committee recommends $5.0 billion for Defense Environmental Cleanup, a decrease of $471.3 million from the amount of the budget request.

*Consideration of lifecycle cleanup costs during definition phase of new nuclear facilities*

The committee is aware that Department of Energy (DOE) order 413.3A, approved July 28, 2006, requires DOE elements, including the National Nuclear Security Administration, to consider lifecycle costs during the definition phase of the process for acquisition of capital assets. As defined in the order, lifecycle costs include "direct, indirect, recurring, nonrecurring, and other related costs incurred or estimated to be incurred in the design, development, production, operation, maintenance, support, long-term stewardship (if applicable), and final disposition of a project/system over its anticipated useful life span." The committee is supportive of the requirement to consider lifecycle costs during the definition phase for new capital assets, and wants to ensure that costs associated with safely addressing decontamination, decommissioning, and potential future environmental liabilities are considered as a part of the critical decision process for nuclear facilities.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to: (1) conduct a review of policies and guidance for consideration of final disposition costs and requirements, including for decontamination, decommissioning, and environmental cleanup, during the definition phase or subsequent phases of the acquisition process for new nuclear facility construction projects; and (2) assess the degree to which, pursuant to DOE order 413.3A or other relevant policies, potential environmental liabilities and cleanup costs are currently being considered during each of the acquisition project phases for new nuclear facilities under the purview of any DOE element. The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report on the results of the assessment, including any recommendations deemed necessary, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2010.

### Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

The budget request contained $98.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal.

The committee is aware that the President has indicated that he does not believe Yucca Mountain is a "suitable" site for a permanent high-level waste repository. The committee notes that approximately $7.7 billion has been invested into the Yucca Mountain site since Congress designated Yucca Mountain as the sole repository site in 1987. The committee also notes that Yucca Mountain remains designated as the sole repository site by law as set forth in section 10134 of title 42, United States Code.

Although the Department of Energy assesses that a "delayed repository opening has no significant near-term impacts" on the Environmental Management program, the committee is nonetheless concerned about the impact on Defense Environmental Cleanup activities. The committee is also concerned about the Department's ability to comply with existing laws and regulatory agreements in the mid-term and long-term. The committee is aware that the Secretary of Energy intends to designate a blue-ribbon panel of experts to provide an assessment of potential alternative disposition options. The committee is concerned that defense waste, which accounts for approximately 10 percent of the total material planned for disposition at the Yucca Mountain site, might be overlooked. The committee expects that the Secretary's panel will dedicate time and thought to challenges and solutions that may be unique to defense waste.

The committee recommends $98.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, the amount of the budget request.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

#### Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2010, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator.

#### Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize funds for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2010.

#### Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities for fiscal year 2010, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy.

#### Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal for fiscal year 2010.

### Section 3105—Energy Security and Assurance

This section would authorize funds for energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2010.

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

### Section 3111—Stockpile Stewardship Program

This section would make four changes to section 4201 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521), which codifies the Stockpile Stewardship Program.

First, this section would clarify that the Stockpile Stewardship Program has two broad objectives. The first objective, as previously codified, would be to ensure the preservation of the core intellectual and technical competencies of the United States in nuclear weapons, including weapons design, system integration, manufacturing, security, use control, reliability assessment, and certification. This section would also codify a second broad objective to assure that the nuclear weapons stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable without underground testing.

Second, this section would clarify that advanced simulation and computing capabilities are needed, not only for simulating the detonation of nuclear weapons, but also for understanding the performance over time of those weapons.

Third, this section would add a new provision to section 4201, clarifying that execution of the Stockpile Stewardship Program requires material support for the full use of the advanced experimental capabilities and facilities in the nuclear security complex, including the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic-Test facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the Z Machine at Sandia National Laboratory.

Fourth, this section would also add a new provision that requires material support for the sustainment and modernization of facilities with production and manufacturing capabilities that are necessary for the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile, including: the Pantex Plant; the Y–12 National Security Complex; the Kansas City Plant; and the Savannah River Site.

### Section 3112—Stockpile Management Program

This section would strike section 4204a of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2524), which codifies the Reliable Replacement Warhead program. This section would also amend section 4204, which establishes the Stockpile Life Extension Program, with a new provision establishing a Stockpile Management Program.

This section would establish that the objectives of the Stockpile Management Program are to: increase the reliability, safety, and security of the United States' nuclear weapons stockpile; further reduce the likelihood of the resumption of underground nuclear weapons testing; achieve reductions in the future size of the nuclear weapons stockpile; reduce the risk of accidental detonation; and reduce the risk that an element of the stockpile could ever be used by a person or entity hostile to the United States, its vital interests, or allies.

This section would also provide guidelines for stockpile management, requiring that changes may only be made to the stockpile in pursuit of these identified objectives. This section would further require that any changes must be consistent with basic design parameters, and must use components that are well understood or are certifiable without the need to resume underground nuclear weapons testing. Additionally, this section would provide that any such changes shall adhere to the design, certification, and production expertise resident in the nuclear security complex to fulfill current mission requirements of the existing stockpile.

The Stockpile Management Program would support and complement the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program, which focuses on sustaining the scientific and technical expertise and the experimental tools and capabilities needed to ensure that the nuclear stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear testing. The Stockpile Management Program, in turn, would provide a framework for the activities associated with actual work on the weapons that comprise the stockpile, including limitations on any changes to the stockpile.

### Section 3113—Plan for Execution of Stockpile Stewardship and Stockpile Management Programs

This section would amend section 4203 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523) to modify existing requirements for annual plans to support execution of the Stockpile Stewardship and Stockpile Management Programs.

Specifically, this section would require the Secretary of Energy, working through the Administrator for Nuclear Security, to prepare and annually update a plan for achieving the objectives of the Stockpile Stewardship Program, including the Stockpile Management Program.

With respect to the Stockpile Stewardship Program, the plan would include: (1) a description of the key technical challenges to the program, and strategies for addressing these challenges without resorting to nuclear tests; (2) a plan for using the laboratories' experimental tools, including advanced simulation and computing capabilities, to ensure the nuclear weapons stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear testing; (3) development of clear and specific criteria for judging whether the science-based tools being used to determine the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile are adequate to certify that the stockpile is safe and reliable; and (4) an assessment of the core scientific and technical competencies required to achieve the objectives of the Stockpile Stewardship Program and to execute other weapons and weapons-related activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy.

This section would amend existing requirements for submission of an annual plan for stockpile management, to clarify that the plan should describe the process used to recertify the safety, security, and reliability of each warhead type in the nuclear weapons stockpile without nuclear testing.

This section would also require the Secretary of Energy to submit a report describing these plans to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2010, and updated reports each year thereafter.

Finally, this section would repeal section 2522 of title 50, United States Code, which requires that the Secretary of Energy develop "clear and specific criteria for judging whether the science-based tools being used by the Department of Energy for determining the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile are performing in a manner that will provide an adequate degree of certainty that the stockpile is safe and reliable." This requirement would be made part of the plan and report required by the amended section 2523 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act.

Section 3114—Dual Validation of Annual Weapons Assessment and Certification

This section would amend section 4205 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2525) to modify existing requirements for annual assessments and reports to the President and Congress regarding the condition of the United States' nuclear weapons stockpile.

The committee notes that while the science-based Stockpile Stewardship Program has been successful, continued success depends on a thorough and rigorous scientific review process. Experts, including the JASON scientific advisory panel, have urged enhanced peer review within the stewardship program.

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to establish a dual validation component of the annual assessment and certification process. Dual validation would provide each of the two primary nuclear weapons design laboratories, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory, with an independent evaluation of the condition of each warhead for which it has lead responsibility.

This section would also require the Administrator to ensure that all surveillance and underground test data for all stockpile systems be accessible to both laboratories for use in the independent evaluations. This section would further require that each laboratory dual validation team utilize all available data to conduct its independent calculations, and be able to pursue independent experiments to support its evaluation.

This section would require the Administrator to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for implementing dual validation, including a schedule for such implementation, by March 1, 2010.

Section 3115—Annual Long-Term Plan for the Modernization and Refurbishment of the Nuclear Security Complex

This section would establish as United States policy that sustainment, modernization, and refurbishment of the nuclear security complex is mandatory for maintaining the future viability of the United States nuclear deterrent and a prerequisite for any reductions to the nuclear weapons stockpile of the United States.

This section would also require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit an annual plan for the modernization and refurbishment of the nuclear security complex, and a certification that the budget for that fiscal year and the future years' nuclear security program provide funding for modernization and refurbishment sufficient to support the National Security Strategy of the United

States and the nuclear posture of the United States as set forth in the most recent Nuclear Posture Review. The annual plans would include a program and schedule for funding the modernization and refurbishment of the nuclear security complex over the next 30 years, and a description of the necessary modernization and refurbishment measures to meet the requirements of the National Security Strategy.

This section would further require that if the budget for a fiscal year is insufficient to sustain the requirements of the annual nuclear security complex modernization plan, the Administrator for Nuclear Security must include in that year's plan a description of the risks to the ability of the nuclear security complex to support the annual certification process and to maintain the long-term viability of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

## SUBTITLE C—REPORTS

### Section 3121—Comptroller General Review of Management and Operations Contract Costs for National Security Laboratories

This section would require the Comptroller General to assess the costs associated with the transition to new management and operations (M&O) contracts which took place at Los Alamos National Laboratory in 2006 and at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in 2007.

Specifically, this section would require the analysis to include: (1) a description of the costs associated with replacing the management of each lab from the University of California to Los Alamos National Security, LLC and Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, respectively; (2) a description of any continuing differences in the cost structure of the M&O contract under the University of California and the cost structure of the M&O contracts under Los Alamos National Security, LLC and Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, respectively; (3) an assessment of the impact of such cost differences on the resources available to support scientific and technical programs at Los Alamos National Laboratory and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; and (4) an assessment of the effects of the transition on the laboratories' management of other important laboratory functions, including safety, security, and environmental management.

This section would further require the Comptroller General to submit a report on the results of the assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010.

### Section 3122—Plan to Ensure Capability to Monitor, Analyze, and Evaluate Foreign Nuclear Weapons Activities

This section would require the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, to prepare a plan to ensure that the national laboratories overseen by the Department of Energy maintain a robust technical capability to monitor, analyze, and evaluate foreign nuclear weapons activities.

On May 6, 2009, the final report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States recommended that, "The United States . . . reverse the decline of focus and re-

sources of the Intelligence Community devoted to foreign nuclear weapons capabilities, programs, and intentions. With some important exceptions, this subject has not attracted high-level attention since the end of the Cold War." The report went on to state that "the weapons laboratories have an important role to play here." The commission's report is only the most recent indicator that analysis of foreign nuclear weapons activities has atrophied over the past decade.

This section would also require a report by February 28, 2010, describing the plan for maintaining a robust nuclear weapons intelligence capability within the national laboratories and the resources necessary to implement it.

# TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $26.1 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2010. The committee recommends $26.1 million, the amount of the request.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2010.

# TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $23.7 million for fiscal year 2010 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

# TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2010

This section would authorize a total of $401.9 million for the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2010. Of the funds authorized, $152.9 million would be available for operations and training activities, $174.0 million would be available for the Maritime Security Program, $15.0 million for the program to dispose of obsolete vessels, and $60.0 million for the loan guarantee program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Title XI Loan Guarantee Program.

### Section 3502—Liquidation of Unused Leave Balance at the United States Merchant Marine Academy

This section would authorize the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to make lump-sum payments to personnel previously employed by non-appropriated fund instrumentalities at the United States Merchant Marine Academy for unused leave balances when the personnel were either terminated or transferred to the general schedule of the United States Civil Service in accordance with section 3506 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

### Section 3503—Adjunct Professors

This section would amend section 3506 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to make permanent the authority granted the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to hire adjunct professors at the United States Merchant Marine Academy for a period of not longer than one year. Additionally, this section would require that any use of the authority to hire adjunct professors would require notification to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

### Section 3504—Maritime Loan Guarantee Program

This section would express the findings of Congress that it is in the national security interest of the United States to foster commercial shipbuilding, that the maritime guarantee loan program has a long history of facilitating successful construction projects, that strengthening the industrial base enhances sealift capabilities for the Department of Defense, and that revitalizing the maritime loan guarantee program would increase construction rates of commercial vessels in domestic shipyards.

### Section 3505—Defense Measures Against Unauthorized Seizures of Maritime Security Fleet Vessels

This section would amend section 53107(b) of title 46, United States Code to require that vessels operating under agreements with the United States under that section and operating in areas designated by the Coast Guard or International Maritime Bureau of the International Chamber of Commerce as areas of high risk of piracy, are equipped with appropriate non-lethal defense measures to protect the vessel from acts of piracy.

### Section 3506—Technical Corrections to State Maritime Academies Student Incentive Program

This section would amend section 53107(b) of title 46, United States Code, and allow the Secretary of Transportation to disburse Student Incentive Payments for midshipmen and cadets with agreements pursuant to the section, in installments over the course of the academic year, vice a lump sum payment at the beginning of the academic year.

Section 3507—Limitation on Disposal of Interest in Certain Vessels

This section would require that Maritime Administrator to notify the Secretary of the Navy if, as a result of default on a loan guaranteed under chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, the United States gains financial interest in the motor vessels Huakai and Alakai, currently owned by the Hawaiian Superferry company. The section would require the Maritime Administrator to wait 180 days after such notification prior to disposing of the financial interest of the United States in the vessels.

## 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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2009.*

*Hon.* NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose a few additional legislative initiatives for inclusion in the same bill.

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 the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, May 15, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposal as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of the proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to

the presenting of this legislative proposal for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, May 19, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposal as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of the proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of this legislative proposal for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, May 29, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposal as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of this proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of this legislative proposal for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, May 29, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposal as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of this proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of this legislative proposal for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, June 4, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

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 the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, June 10, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

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 the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

---

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, June 16, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed legislative proposals as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2010.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

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 the Congress.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
*General Counsel.*

Enclosure: As stated.

## COMMITTEE POSITION

On June 16, 2009, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 2647, as amended, by a vote of 61–0.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
*Washington, DC, June 17, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review the text of H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, for provisions which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources. Among these provisions are those dealing with compensation and benefits for the NOAA Corps, transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Port Chicago Naval Magazine, Guam realignment issues, and reauthorization of Title I of the Sikes Act, among others.

Because of the continued cooperation and consideration that you have afforded me and my staff in developing these provisions, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 2647 based on their inclusion

in the bill. Of course, this waiver is not intended to prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over these provisions or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Natural Resources on these provisions, and request your support if such a request is made.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 2647 and 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.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL II,
*Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
*Washington, DC, June 16, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in matters being considered in H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 2647 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. My decision to waive further consideration of H.R. 2647 is conditional on our mutual understanding that no part of this legis-

lation waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I respectfully request that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging this Committee's 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any conference between the House and the Senate.

I thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

SILVESTRE REYES,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. SILVESTRE REYES,
*Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
*Washington, DC, June 16, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science and Technology in H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 2647 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intent to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology,

and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as a part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Science and Technology 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,*

BART GORDON,

Chairman.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. BART GORDON,
*Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. I agree that the Committee on Science and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Science and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing about H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, which the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported on June 17, 2009.

I appreciate your effort to consult with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform regarding those provisions of H.R. 2647 that fall within the Oversight Committee's jurisdiction. These provisions involve the federal civil service and federal acquisition policies.

In the interest of expediting consideration of H.R. 2647, the Oversight Committee will not request a sequential referral of this bill. I would, however, request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Oversight Committee should H.R. 2647 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate. Moreover, this letter should not be construed as a waiver of the

Oversight Committee's legislative jurisdiction over subjects addressed in H.R. 2647 that fall within the jurisdiction of the Oversight Committee.

Finally, I request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to consult the Committee on these matters.

Sincerely,

EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
*Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
*Washington, DC, June 17, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs agrees not to request a sequential referral. By waiving consideration of H.R. 2647, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over any subject matter contained in the bill which falls within its jurisdiction. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are consid-

ered in a House-Senate conference, and requests your support if such a request is made.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 2647 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 with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

BOB FILNER,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. BOB FILNER,
*Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding consideration of H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. As you know, this legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Given the importance of moving this bill forward promptly, I do not intend to request the sequential referral of H.R. 2647 to the Committee on Education and Labor. I do so, however, only with the understanding that this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice this Committee's jurisdictional interests and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation. In addition, should this bill or similar legislation be considered in a conference with the

Senate, I request your support for members of the Committee on Education and Labor to be appointed to the conference committee.

Finally, I ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters in your committee's report on H.R. 2647 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
*Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. I agree that the Committee on Education and Labor has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Education and Labor is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters. Should this bill or similar legislation be the subject of a House-Senate conference, I will support the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
*Washington, DC, June 17, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 2647, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010".

H.R. 2647 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, I agree to waive consideration of this bill with the mutual understanding that my decision to forgo a sequential referral of the bill does not waive, reduce, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over H.R. 2647.

Further, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the appointment of conferees on H.R. 2647 or similar legislation.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in the Committee Report on H.R. 2647 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure in the House.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 introduced on June 2, 2009.

H.R. 2647 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill

should not be construed as the Committee on Homeland Security waiving, altering, or otherwise affecting its jurisdiction over subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for an appropriate number of members of the Committee on Homeland Security be appointed conferees on any House-Senate conference convened on this or similar legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response be included in the legislative report on H.R. 2647 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. I agree that the Committee on Homeland Security has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you concerning the bill, H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

This bill contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign 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 mark up this bill. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Foreign Affairs Committee conferees during and House-Senate conference convened on this legislation. I would ask that you place this into the Committee Report on H.R. 2647.

I look forward to working with you as we move this important measure through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

HOWARD BERMAN,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. HOWARD BERMAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. As you know, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has jurisdictional interest in several provisions of this bill.

In light of the interest in moving this bill forward promptly, I do not intend to exercise the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce by seeking sequential referral of H.R. 2647. I do this, however, only with the understanding that forgoing consideration of H.R. 2647 at this time will not be construed as prejudicing this Committee's jurisdictional interests and prerogatives on the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, we reserve the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference named to consider such provisions.

I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for your cooperation on this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of Committee on Financial Services, specifically regarding actions under the Defense Production Act. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Financial Services 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 committee report or in the Congres-

sional Record during consideration of H.R. 2647 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

BARNEY FRANK,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on Financial Services is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that, as a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are able to agree to waive seeking a formal referral of the bill, in order that it may proceed without delay to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with the understanding that by forgoing further consideration of H.R. 2647 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. We reserve the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this important legislation, and request your support if such a request is made.

I would appreciate your including this letter in your committee report, or in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to our re-

quests, and for the cooperative relationship between our two committees.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2009.*

Hon. JOHN CONYERS Jr.,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. 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 schedule a mark-up of this bill in the interest of expediting consideration. I agree that by agreeing to waive consideration of certain provisions of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction over these matters.

This exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
*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 2010 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)(2) 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 Rules of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

Congressional Budget Office Preliminary Cost Estimate

JUNE 18, 2009.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
*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. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on

June 16, 2009. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 2647, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

Based on legislative language for H.R. 2647 that was provided to CBO on June 15 and June 16, CBO estimates that only one provision would significantly affect direct spending. Section 422 would repeal section 1002 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), which shifted 1 percent of military retirement payments scheduled to occur in September of 2013 to October of 2013. CBO estimates that repeal of section 1002 would shift $43 million in outlays from fiscal year 2014 back to fiscal year 2013. That change would have no net effect on budget authority or outlays over the 2010–2014 period, or the 2010–2019 period. Enactment of the bill would not affect revenues.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Schmit, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF, *Director.*

Enclosure.

### COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee generally concurs with the preliminary estimate as contained in the report of the Congressional Budget Office.

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XXI

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee is required to include a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, which are in the bill or the report. The following table provides the list of such provisions which are included in the bill and the report:

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | APA | | 20 | Air filtrations systems for helicopters | $2,000 | Akin (MO) | Aerospace Filtration Systems, Inc. | St. Charles, MO |
| I | APA | | 22 | Common Avionics Architecture System (CAAS-PVI) CH-47F | $2,000 | McHugh (NY) | Rockwell Collins (HQ Cedar Rapids, IA) | Binghamton, NY |
| I | APA | | 22 | Vibration Management Enhancement Program (VMEP) | $4,000 | Wilson (SC) | South Carolina Army National Guard | Columbia, SC |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60 Rewiring Program - Army National Guard | $5,000 | Granger (TX) | InterConnect Wiring L.L.P. | Fort Worth, TX |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Alexander (LA) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Boren (OK) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Boswell (IA) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Brown-Waite (FL) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Courtney (CT) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Dahlkemper (PA) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Delahunt (MA) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | DeLauro (CT) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Fleming (LA) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | King (NY) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Langevin (RI) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Loebsack (IA) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Massa (NY) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Ortiz (TX) | United Technologies Corporation | Corpus Christi, TX |
| I | APA | | 26 | UH-60A to UH-60L Upgrade for the Army National Guard | $20,400 | Schauer (MI) | Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation | Stratford, CT |
| I | APA | | 30 | Shadow TUAS Training Aids, Devices, Simulators, and Simulations (TADSS) for the Army National Guard | $2,500 | Bartlett (MD) | AAI Corporation | Hunt Valley, MD |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | WTCV | | 44 | Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI) at Rock Island Arsenal | $3,000 | Hare (IL) | Rock Island Arsenal | Rock Island, IL |
| I | WTCV | | 47 | Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI) at Rock Island Arsenal | $3,000 | Braley (IA) | Rock Island Arsenal | Rock Island, IL |
| I | PAA | | 7 | 40MM Tactical All Types – Mortar Rounds | $3,000 | Tanner (TN) | Milan AAP | Milan, TN |
| I | PAA | | 8 | M722 60mm White Phosphorus Smoke Mortar | $3,000 | Ross (AR) | Pine Bluff Arsenal | Pine Bluff, AR |
| I | PAA | | 36 | Bomb Line Modernization at McAlester Ammunition Plant | $5,000 | Boren (OK) | McAlester Army Ammunition Plant | McAlester, OK |
| I | PAA | | 36 | Iowa Army Ammunition Plant Energy Infrastructure Project | $5,800 | Loebsack (IA) | Iowa Army Ammunition Plant | Middletown, IA |
| I | PAA | | 36 | Mobile Ammunition Processing Facility (MAPF) | $7,400 | Boren (OK) | Defense Ammunition Center, McAlester Army Ammunition Plant | McAlester, OK |
| I | OPA | | 4 | High Mobility Multi-Purpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) Fire Suppression System Kits | $5,000 | Wilson (SC) | Trenton Plastics | Trenton, SC |
| I | OPA | | 135 | FIDO Explosive Detector | $7,000 | Fallin (OK) | Nomadics | Stillwater, OK |
| I | OPA | | 154 | Life Support for Trauma and Transport (LSTAT) | $3,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Integrated Medical Systems | Signal Hill, CA |
| I | OPA | | 154 | Life Support for Trauma and Transport (LSTAT) | $3,000 | Reyes (TX) | Integrated Medical Systems | Signal Hill, CA |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Basic Rifle/Pistol Marksmanship for the U.S. Army Reserve | $2,500 | Bartlett (MD) | MPRI Training and Technology Group | Columbia, MD |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Immersive Group Simulation Virtual Training System for the Hawaii Army National Guard | $2,500 | Abercrombie (HI) | Atlantis Cyberspace | Honolulu, HI |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Marksmanship Skills Trainer for TXARNG | $2,200 | Conaway (TX) | Texas Army National Guard | Austin, TX |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Marksmanship Skills Trainer for TXARNG | $2,200 | Ortiz (TX) | Texas National Guard | Austin, TX |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Mobile Firing Range for TXARNG | $1,500 | Conaway (TX) | Texas Army National Guard | Austin, TX |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Mobile Firing Range for TXARNG | $1,500 | Granger (TX) | Texas National Guard | Fort Worth, TX |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | OPA | | 177 | Training Aid Enhancements for the Vermont Army National Guard | $1,300 | Welch (VT) | Vermont Army National Guard | Westminster, VT |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Virtual Door Gunner Trainer for TXARNG | $1,100 | Conaway (TX) | Texas Army National Guard | Austin, TX |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (V.I.C.E ) training system for the Virginia National Guard | $4,900 | Connolly (VA) | Dynamic Animation Systems, Inc. | Fairfax County, VA |
| I | OPA | | 177 | Virtual Interactive Combat Environment (VICE) Training Systems for Fort Jackson | $4,800 | Wilson (SC) | Dynamic Animation Systems, Inc. | Fairfax, VA |
| I | APN | | 52 | Crane Integrated Defensive Countermeasures (IDECM) Depot Capability | $8,300 | Ellsworth (IN) | ITT Electronic Systems and NSWC, Crane | Crane, IN |
| I | APN | | 58 | Engine Installation & Removal Vehicle (EIRV) | $3,400 | Shuster (PA) | JLG Industries | McConnellsburg, PA |
| I | OPN | | 19 | M952 Weapon Light | $4,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Surefire | Fountain Valley, CA |
| I | OPN | | 25 | Barrier Boat Craft | $5,000 | Pingree (ME) | Washburn & Doughty | East Boothbay, ME |
| I | OPN | | 45 | AN/USQ-167 COMSEC Upgrade | $3,000 | Hunter (CA) | Cubic Solutions | San Diego, CA |
| I | OPN | | 64 | Deployable Joint Command and Control (DJC2) Shelter Upgrade Program | $4,000 | Salazar (CO) | Weatherport/Alaska Structures | Delta, CO |
| I | OPN | | 97 | Multi-Climate Protection System (MCPS) | $5,000 | Hodes (NH) | Polartec, LLC | Hudson, NH |
| I | OPN | | 97 | Multi-Climate Protection System (MCPS) | $5,000 | Rogers (MI) | Peckham | Lansing, MI |
| I | OPN | | 97 | Multi-Climate Protection System (MCPS) | $5,000 | Shea-Porter (NH) | Polartec, LLC | Hudson, NH |
| I | OPN | | 97 | Multi-Climate Protection System (MCPS) | $5,000 | Tsongas (MA) | Polartec, LLC | Lawrence, MA |
| I | OPN | | 128 | LRAD (Long Range Acoustical Device) Anti-Terrorism Force Protection Equipment for USN Assets | $5,000 | Bartlett (MD) | American Technology Corporation | San Diego, CA |
| I | OPN | | 134 | Man Overboard Indicator (MOBI) | $2,000 | Davis (CA) | BriarTek, Inc. | San Diego, CA |
| I | OPN | | 134 | Man Overboard Indicator (MOBI) | $2,000 | Nye (VA) | Roger Mau, Naval Sea Systems Command, Washington Navy Yard | WASHINGTON, DC |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

**(Dollars In Thousands)**

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | PMC | | 44 | USMC Tactical Fuel Systems (Nitrile Rubber Collapsible Storage Units) | $5,100 | Taylor (MS) | Avon Engineered Fabrications, Inc | Picayune, MS |
| I | PMC | | 48 | Tractor, Rubber Tired, Articulated Steering, Multi-Purpose (TRAM) | $21,000 | Braley (IA) | John Deere Davenport Works | Davenport, IA |
| I | PMC | | 50 | Millennia Military Vehicle / Extendable Boom Fork Lift (MMV / EBFL) | $30,000 | Shuster (PA) | JLG Industries | McConnellsburg, PA |
| I | APAF | | 17 | C-40C Aircraft, Scott AFB | $105,250 | Costello (IL) | 932nd Airlift Wing | Scott AFB, IL |
| I | APAF | | 52 | Scathe View Hyper-Spectral Imagery Upgrade | $5,400 | Berkley (NV) | Nevada Military Department | Carson City, NV |
| I | APAF | | 52 | Scathe View Hyper-Spectral Imagery Upgrade | $5,400 | Titus (NV) | Nevada Military Department/Nevada National Guard | Carson City, NV |
| I | APAF | | 52 | Senior Scout COMINT (Communications Intelligence) Capability Upgrade | $4,000 | Andrews (NJ) | L-3 Communications - East | Camden, NJ |
| I | APAF | | 52 | Senior Scout COMINT (Communications Intelligence) Capability Upgrade | $4,000 | LoBiondo (NJ) | L-3 Communications Systems | Camden, NJ |
| I | OPAF | | 12 | Eagle Vision III, 147th Combat Communications Squadron, San Diego, California | $4,000 | Bilbray (CA) | 147th Combat Communications Squadron, California Air National Guard, San Diego, California | San Diego, CA |
| I | OPAF | | 12 | Eagle Vision III, 147th Combat Communications Squadron, San Diego, California | $4,000 | Davis (CA) | 147th Combat Communications Squadron, California Air National Guard, San Diego, California | San Diego, CA |
| I | OPAF | | 12 | Eagle Vision Upgrade | $2,000 | Wilson (SC) | South Carolina Air National Guard | Eastover, SC |
| I | OPAF | | 20 | Application Software Assurance Center of Excellence | $5,000 | Bright (AL) | Telos Corporation, Southeast | Montgomery, AL |
| I | OPAF | | 20 | Application Software Assurance Center of Excellence | $5,000 | Rogers (AL) | Telos Corporation | Montgomery, AL |
| I | OPAF | | 54 | Advanced Reconfigurable Containers | $1,700 | Larsen (WA) | Ultimate Survival Technologies | Monroe, WA |
| I | OPAF | | 54 | Aircrew Body Armor and Load Carriage Vest System | $9,000 | Akin (MO) | Eagle Industries | Fenton, MO |
| I | PDW | | 63 | Intelligence Broadcast Receiver (IBR) for AFSOC MC-130 | $2,500 | Miller (FL) | DRS Technologies | Fort Walton Beach, FL |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | PDW | | 63 | LAIRCM for AFSOC MC-130 | $4,000 | Miller (FL) | L-3 Crestview | Crestview, FL |
| I | PDW | | 71 | Special Operations Forces Combat Assault Rifle (SCAR) | $4,300 | Wilson (SC) | FN Manufacturing, LLC | Columbia, SC |
| I | PDW | | 74 | Special Operations Craft-Riverine | $10,800 | Taylor (MS) | United States Marine, Inc | Gulfport, MS |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | Smart Wound Dressing for MRSA-infected Battle Wounds | $4,000 | Cummings (MD) | Soluble Systems, LLC. | Newport News, VA |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | Smart Wound Dressing for MRSA-infected Battle Wounds | $4,000 | Scott (VA) | Eastern Virginia Medical School | Norfolk, VA |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Performance Steel Castings for Improved Weapons Systems Reliability | $4,000 | Loebsack (IA) | The University of Iowa | Iowa City, IA |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Advanced Nanoscale Tungsten Kinetic Energy Composites | $2,000 | Davis (CA) | San Diego State University Research Foundation | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Advanced Nanoscale Tungsten Kinetic Energy Composites | $2,000 | Hunter (CA) | San Diego State University Research Foundation | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Dual Stage Variable Energy Absorber | $4,070 | Murphy (PA) | ARCCA, Inc. | Penns Park, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Hardmetal Epidemiology Investigation | $7,000 | Shuster (PA) | University of Pittsburgh, Department of Biostatistics | Pittsburgh, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Multi-Scale Modeling of 3-D Damage Tolerant Composite Materials | $1,000 | Sestak (PA) | Widener University | Chester, RI |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Nanomanufacturing of Multifunctional Sensors | $3,000 | Tsongas (MA) | University of Massachusetts Lowell | Lowell, MA |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Next Generation High Strength Glass Fibers for Ballistic Armor Applications | $3,300 | Wilson (SC) | AGY Holding Corporation | Aiken, SC |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Ultra Lightweight Metallic Armor | $3,000 | Costello (IL) | Magnesium Elektron North America | Madison, IL |
| II | RDA | 0602120A | 6 | Electromagnetic Geolocation | $2,000 | Davis (CA) | QUASAR Federal Systems | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0602303A | 10 | Anti-Materiel Explosive Round for Javelin Block II | $3,000 | Miller (FL) | General Dynamics Ordinance and Tactical Systems | Niceville, FL |
| II | RDA | 0602303A | 10 | Center of Excellence in Integrated Sensor Systems | $750 | Griffith (AL) | Alabama A&M University Research Institute (AAMURI) | Normal, AL |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Digital Engine / Hydraulic Valve Actuation Technology | $3,500 | Lamborn (CO) | Army TARDEC/National Automotive Center | Warren, MI |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Glass Ceramic Armor Technology for Vehicle Survivability | $1,250 | Sestak (PA) | SCHOTT Diamondview Armor Products | Boothwyn, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab) | $4,800 | Adler (NJ) | SeaBox | East Riverton, NJ |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab) | $4,800 | Andrews (NJ) | SeaBox, Inc. | East Riverton, NJ |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab) | $4,800 | Lance (NJ) | SeaBox, Inc. | No Brunswick, NJ |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab) | $4,800 | Markey (MA) | Thermo Fisher Scientific | Waltham, Woburn, Billerica, Beverly, Lowell, MA |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab) | $4,800 | Tsongas (MA) | Thermo Fisher Scientific | Billerica, MA |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Tactical Metal Fabrication (TacFab) | $4,800 | Turner (OH) | BuyCASTINGS.com, Inc. | Miamisburg, OH |
| II | RDA | 0602618A | 14 | Beneficial Infrastructure for Rotorcraft Risk Reduction Demonstrations (BIRRRD) Program | $2,000 | Sestak (PA) | Dragonfly Pictures, Inc. | Essington, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | Defense Support for Civil Authorities (DSCA) for Key Resource Protection – South Central, PA | $3,000 | Shuster (PA) | L. Robert Kimball & Associates | Ebensburg, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | High Power Electrolytic Super-Capacitors Based On Conducting Polymers | $9,000 | Akin (MO) | Crosslink, Inc | Fenton, MO |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | Highly Integrated Production for Expediting RESET | $8,200 | Rogers (AL) | Anniston Army Depot | Anniston, AL |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | Highly Integrated Production for Expediting RESET | $8,200 | Wilson (SC) | South Carolina Research Authority | Columbia, SC |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | Hybrid Projectile Program | $3,000 | Courtney (CT) | University of Hartford | West Hartford, CT |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | Hybrid Projectile Program | $3,000 | Larson (CT) | University of Hartford | West Hartford, CT |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | Specialized Compact Automated Mechanical Clearance Platform (SCAMP) | $4,000 | Murphy (PA) | Humanistic Robotics, Inc. | Bristol, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602705A | 18 | Novel Zinc Air Power Sources for Military | $4,000 | Rogers (AL) | Electric Fuel Battery Corporation (Arotech Subsidiary) | Auburn, AL |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0602705A | 18 | Recon Scout Robot Research and Development | $3,500 | McCollum (MN) | ReconRobotics, Inc | Edina, MN |
| II | RDA | 0602716A | 21 | LWI Training-based Collaborative Research | $15,000 | Skelton (MO) | Leonard Wood Institute | Fort Leonard Wood, MO |
| II | RDA | 0602720A | 22 | Cluster Bomb Unit/ Combined Effects Munitions (CBU/CEM) Demil System | $1,000 | Brady (PA) | Day & Zimmermann | Philadelphia, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602720A | 22 | Range Scrap Demil System | $1,500 | Brady (PA) | Day & Zimmerman | Philadelphia, VA |
| II | RDA | 0602720A | 22 | Range Scrap Demil System | $1,500 | Sestak (PA) | Day & Zimmermann | Philadelphia, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602720A | 22 | Renewable Energy Testing Center | $2,200 | Matsui (CA) | Renewable Energy Institute International | Sacramento, CA |
| II | RDA | 0602720A | 22 | Self-Inerting Munitions | $4,500 | Langevin (RI) | Malcolm Pirnie Inc., with the support of the University of Rhode Island, Kingston | Kingston, RI |
| II | RDA | 0602720A | 22 | SUNY Cobleskill Biowaste-to-Bioenergy Center | $4,650 | Murphy (NY) | State University of New York | Cobleskill, NY |
| II | RDA | 0602720A | 22 | SUNY Cobleskill Biowaste-to-Bioenergy Center | $4,650 | Tonko (NY) | State University of New York College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill | Cobleskill, NY |
| II | RDA | 0602782A | 23 | Portable Non-Magnetic Compass, Positioning and Timing Device | $2,000 | Michaud (ME) | Zachariah Conover | North Windham, ME |
| II | RDA | 0602782A | 23 | Portable Non-Magnetic Compass, Positioning and Timing Device | $2,000 | Pingree (ME) | CrossRate Technology | Windham, ME |
| II | RDA | 0602783A | 24 | Shared Information and Data Exchange Platform (SIDEP) supporting Project National Shield (PNS) | $4,000 | Brady (PA) | Drakontas LLC | Glenside, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602784A | 25 | Cellulose Nanocomposite Panels for Ballistic Protection | $5,000 | Michaud (ME) | University of Maine | Orono, ME |
| II | RDA | 0602784A | 25 | Cellulose Nanocomposite Panels for Ballistic Protection | $5,000 | Pingree (ME) | University of Maine | Orono, ME |
| II | RDA | 0602784A | 25 | Encapsulated Ballistic Protection System (EBPS) | $5,000 | Langevin (RI) | Kelly Space & Technology | Warwick, RI |
| II | RDA | 0602784A | 25 | Geosciences/Atmospheric Research (CG/AR) | $3,000 | Markey (CO) | Colorado State University | Fort Collins, CO |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0602784A | 25 | Photovoltaic Rooftop Systems - Army | $1,500 | Schauer (MI) | United Solar Ovonic | Auburn Hills/Battle Creek, MI |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Advanced Bio-engineering for Enhancement of Soldier Survivability | $3,000 | Gingrey (GA) | Georgia Institute of Technology | Atlanta, GA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Advanced Bio-engineering for Enhancement of Soldier Survivability | $3,000 | Johnson (GA) | Georgia Institute of Technology | Atlanta, GA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Advanced Functional Nanomaterials for Biological Processes | $2,500 | Snyder (AR) | University of Arkansas at Little Rock | Little Rock, AR |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Brain Injury Recovery Clinic | $6,000 | Wilson (SC) | University of South Carolina | Columbia, SC |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Center for Vaccine Scale-Up/Process Research, Phase II | $1,700 | Johnson (GA) | Georgia State University | Atlanta, GA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Developing Interventions to Repress Viral Replication | $2,500 | Murphy (PA) | Institute for Hepatitis and Virus Research | Doylestown, PA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Human Organ and Tissue Preservation Technology | $3,000 | Wilson (SC) | Lifeblood Medical | Columbia, SC |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Improving Soldier Recovery from Catastrophic Bone Injuries | $5,000 | Murphy (CT) | University of Connecticut Health Center | Farmington, CT |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Locally Delivered Treatments For Noise Induced Hearing Loss (NIHL) | $1,500 | Davis (CA) | Otonomy, Inc. | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Military Photomedicine Program | $3,000 | Calvert (CA) | Air Force Office of Scientific Research | Arlington, VA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Military Photomedicine Program | $3,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Air Force Office of Scientific Research | Irvine, CA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Military Photomedicine Program | $3,000 | Lynch (MA) | Air Force Office of Scientific Research | Arlington, VA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Optical Neural Techniques for Combat and Post-Trauma Healthcare | $4,700 | Smith (WA) | Lockheed Martin Aculight | Bothell, WA |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Plasma Technologies | $1,000 | Ortiz (TX) | Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi | Corpus Christi, TX |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Attention Modification Program for Veterans | $1,250 | Davis (CA) | San Diego State University Research Foundation | San Diego, CA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Prevention of Compartment Syndrome with Ultrafiltration Catheters | $1,900 | Ellison (MN) | Twin Star Medical | St. Paul, MN |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Prevention of Compartment Syndrome with Ultrafiltration Catheters | $1,900 | McCollum (MN) | Twin Star Medical | St. Paul, MN |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Self Powered Prosthetic Limb Technology | $2,000 | Thompson (PA) | KCF Technologies | State College, PA |
| II | RDA | 0603001A | 29 | High Pressure Pasteurization & Pressure Assisted Thermal Sterilization Project | $4,300 | Ellsworth (IN) | AmeriQual Group, LLC and Natick Soldier Research, Development and Engineering Center | Evansville, IN |
| II | RDA | 0603001A | 29 | Next Generation Precision Airdrop System (Next-Gen PADS) | $3,000 | Larson (CT) | Capewell Components Company, LLC | South Windsor, CT |
| II | RDA | 0603001A | 29 | Onyx System Precision Guided Airdrop Equipment | $3,890 | McMahon (NY) | Atair Aerospace | Brooklyn, NY |
| II | RDA | 0603001A | 29 | Onyx System Precision Guided Airdrop Equipment | $3,890 | Towns (NY) | Atair Aerospace | Brooklyn, NY |
| II | RDA | 0603001A | 29 | Onyx System Precision Guided Airdrop Equipment | $3,890 | Velazquez (NY) | Atair Aerospace | Brooklyn, NY |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Carbide Derived Carbon for Treatment of Combat Related Sepsis | $2,750 | Sestak (PA) | Y-Carbon Inc. | King of Prussia, PA |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Clinical Technology Integration for Military Health | $8,100 | Markey (MA) | DocBox, Inc. | Waltham, MA |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Institute for Simulation and Interprofessional Studies | $5,800 | Smith (WA) | University of Washington | Seattle, WA |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Malaria Vaccine Development: Protecting our Troops | $5,000 | Smith (WA) | Seattle Biomedical Research Initiative | Seattle, WA |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Multi-dose Closed-loop pH Monitoring System for Platelets | $1,000 | Smith (WA) | Blood Cell Storage, Inc. | Seattle, WA |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Nightengale | $5,000 | Maffei (NY) | Welch Allyn, Inc. | Skaneateles Falls, NY |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Nightengale | $5,000 | McHugh (NY) | WelchAllyn | Skaneateles Falls, NY |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Northern Illinois Proton Treatment and Research Center | $2,000 | Foster (IL) | Northern Illinois University | DeKalb, IL |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Pediatric/Adolescent Trauma and Resuscitation | $2,900 | Brady (PA) | The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia | Philadelphia, PA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Regenerative Medicine to Address Acute Hearing Loss | $3,000 | Smith (WA) | FATE Therapeutics | Seattle, WA |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Wounded Servicemember Bioelectrics Research | $2,000 | Nye (VA) | Old Dominion University (ODU) | Norfolk, VA |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | Advanced Affordable Turbine Engine (AATE) Program | $6,000 | DeLauro (CT) | Pratt & Whitney | East Hartford/Middletown, CT |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | Advanced Affordable Turbine Engine (AATE) Program | $6,000 | Larson (CT) | Pratt & Whitney | East Hartford, CT |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | Advanced Performance for Military Helicopters | $1,900 | Tauscher (CA) | Curtiss-Wright Metal Improvement Company | Livermore, CA |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | Drive System Composite Structural Component Risk Reduction Program | $5,000 | Brady (PA) | V System Composites, Inc. | Chester, PA |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | Mission Equipment Technology Implementation (METI) | $5,300 | Akin (MO) | Qinetiq North America (formerly Westar Aerospace) | St. Charles, MO |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | Robust Composite Structural Core for Army Helicopters | $4,000 | Shea-Porter (NH) | Albany Engineered Composites | Rochester, NH |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | UH-60 Transmission/Gearbox Galvanic Corrosion Reduction | $3,800 | Kissell (NC) | United Protective Technologies | Locust, NC |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | Universal Control Program | $9,000 | Larson (CT) | Goodrich Pump & Engine Controls | West Hartford, CT |
| II | RDA | 0603004A | 32 | Dual Mode Mortar SAL Integration | $7,500 | Boren (OK) | Raytheon Company (HQ Tucson, AZ) | McAlester, OK |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 32 | Dual Mode Mortar SAL Integration | $7,500 | Rothman (NJ) | Raytheon Missile Systems | Tucson, AZ |
| II | RDA | 0603004A | 32 | Remote Sighting System | $2,000 | McHugh (NY) | Legend Technologies | Keeseville, NY |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Advanced Composites for Light Weight, Low Cost Transportation Systems using a 3+ Ring Extruder | $4,000 | Stupak (MI) | Century/3 Plus, LLC | Traverse City, MI |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Advanced Lithium Iron Phosphate Battery System for Army Combat Hybrid HMMWV and Other Army Vehicle P | $3,000 | Dingell (MI) | A123Systems, Inc. | Ann Arbor, MI |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Automatic Data Organization for Vehicle and Diagnostic Systems | $1,500 | Levin (MI) | BOSSdev, Inc. | St. Clair Shores, MI |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Fire Shield | $2,000 | Dreier (CA) | Chang Industry, Inc | La Verne, CA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Hybrid Electric (Heavy Truck) Vehicle | $3,000 | Bartlett (MD) | Volvo Powertrain of North America | Hagerstown, MD |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Hydraulic Hybrid Vehicle (HHV) for the Tactical Wheeled Fleet | $3,500 | Peters (MI) | Bosch Rexroth Corporation | Rochester Hills, MI |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Industry Innovation for Defense Sustainment Program | $5,000 | Ortiz (TX) | The National Center for Manufacturing Sciences | Ann Arbor, MI |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Protective 3-D Armor Structure to Safeguard Military Vehicles and Troops | $2,000 | Levin (MI) | Lawrence Technological University | Southfield, MI |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Unmanned Robotic System Utilizing a Hydrocarbon Fueled Solid Oxide Fuel Cell System | $6,000 | Dingell (MI) | Adaptive Materials, Inc. | Ann Arbor, MI |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Vehicle Electronics SWaP2-C2 Optimization | $2,400 | McKeon (CA) | Curtiss-Wright Controls Embedded Computing | Santa Clarita, CA |
| II | RDA | 0603008A | 34 | Applied Communciations and Information Networking (ACIN) | $7,000 | Andrews (NJ) | Drexel University | Camden, NJ |
| II | RDA | 0603008A | 34 | Applied Communciations and Information Networking (ACIN) | $7,000 | LoBiondo (NJ) | Drexel University | Philadelphia, PA |
| II | RDA | 0603015A | 38 | HapMed Combat Medic Trainer | $1,000 | Hunter (CA) | CHI Systems | Poway, CA |
| II | RDA | 0603015A | 38 | HapMed Combat Medic Trainer | $1,000 | Schwartz (PA) | CHI Systems, Inc. | Fort Washington, PA |
| II | RDA | 0603015A | 38 | Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System Enhancements | $2,500 | Fallin (OK) | Creative Technologies Inc. | Fort Sill, OK |
| II | RDA | 0603103A | 40 | Development of Demilitarized Equipment for Cluster Ammunition - MCAAP | $5,000 | Boren (OK) | General Dynamics - McAlester Army Ammunition Plant | McAlester, OK |
| II | RDA | 0603103A | 40 | Propellant Conversion to Fertilizer Program for Tooele Army Depot | $3,400 | Bishop (UT) | Tooele Army Depot, Utah | Tooele, UT |
| II | RDA | 0603270A | 43 | Advanced Ground Electronic Warfare & Signals Intelligence System | $7,000 | Larsen (WA) | Agilent Technologies | Everett, WA |
| II | RDA | 0603270A | 43 | Advanced Ground Electronic Warfare & Signals Intelligence System | $7,000 | Smith (WA) | Agilent Technologies | Everett, WA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0603313A | 44 | Scenario Generation for Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) Evaluation (SGIE) | $800 | Reyes (TX) | Integrated Defense Applications and QNA SEG and Integration Innovation, Incorporated (I3) | El Paso, Union Grove, AL and Huntsville, AL, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 48 | Brownout Situational Awareness Sensor | $3,000 | Hunter (CA) | Trex Enterprises | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 48 | Brownout Situational Awareness Sensor | $3,000 | Olver (MA) | Trex Enterprises | West Hatfield, MA |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 48 | Buster/Blacklight UAV Development | $5,000 | Ortiz (TX) | Mission Technologies | San Antonio, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 48 | Buster/Blacklight UAV Development | $5,000 | Rodriguez (TX) | Mission Technologies, Inc | San Antonio, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 48 | High Resolution Personal Miniature Thermal Viewer (PMTV) | $2,200 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Irvine Sensors | Costa Mesa, CA |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 48 | Hyper-IFP (Hyper spectral Sensor for Improved Force Protection) | $5,400 | Akin (MO) | Clean Earth Technologies, LLC | St. Louis, MO |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 48 | Infrared Goggle Upgrade System (IRGUS) | $3,200 | Shea-Porter (NH) | Optics 1, Inc. | Manchester, NH |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 50 | Demonstration of Thin Film Solar Modules as a Renewable Energy Source – Fort Bliss | $1,000 | Reyes (TX) | Florida Solar Energy | Boca Raton, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 50 | Electric Vehicle Charging Network | $2,500 | Abercrombie (HI) | Better Place Hawaii | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 50 | Field Deployable Hologram Production System | $4,800 | Conaway (TX) | Zebra Imaging, Inc. | Austin, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 50 | Field Deployable Hologram Production System | $4,800 | Granger (TX) | Zebra Imaging, Inc | Austin, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 50 | Nanotechnology for Potable Water and Waste Treatment | $2,000 | Murphy (PA) | PPG Industries | Monroeville, PA |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 50 | PacCom Renewable Energy Security Systems | $3,500 | Abercrombie (HI) | Pacific Biodiesel | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 50 | Renewable Energy Project - Fort Jackson | $3,550 | Wilson (SC) | Engenuity, SC | Columbia, SC |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 51 | Foliage Penetrating, Reconnaissance, Surveillance, Tracking, and Engagement Radar (FORESTER) | $5,000 | Maffei (NY) | Syracuse Research Corporation | North Syracuse, NY |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 51 | Foliage Penetrating, Reconnaissance, Surveillance, Tracking, and Engagement Radar (FORESTER) | $5,000 | McHugh (NY) | Syracuse Research Corporation | North Syracuse, NY |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 51 | Optimizing Natural Language Processing of Open Source Intelligence (OSINT) | $1,500 | Bishop (UT) | Army / Attensity, Inc., / partnered with University of Buffalo | Salt Lake City, UT |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 51 | Software Lifecycle Affordability Management (SLAM) | $5,000 | Adler (NJ) | PRICE Systems LLC | Mount Laurel, NJ |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 51 | Software Lifecycle Affordability Management (SLAM) | $5,000 | Andrews (NJ) | Price Systems LLC | Mount Laurel, NJ |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 51 | Software Lifecycle Affordability Management (SLAM) | $5,000 | LoBiondo (NJ) | Price Systems, LLC | Mount Laurel, NJ |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 51 | X-Band Interferometric Radar (XBIR) | $5,000 | Langevin (RI) | Applied Radar, Inc. | North Kingstown, RI |
| II | RDA | 0603305A | 53 | Biological Air Filtering System Technology (BAFST) | $4,000 | Berry (AR) | Arkansas State University | Jonesboro, AR |
| II | RDA | 0603305A | 53 | Compact Pulsed Power Initiative | $8,500 | Conaway (TX) | Texas Tech University | Lubbock, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603305A | 53 | Compact Pulsed Power Initiative | $8,500 | Neugebauer (TX) | Texas Tech University | Lubbock, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603327A | 55 | Center for Defense Systems Research (CDSR) | $1,000 | Reyes (TX) | University of Texas at El Paso | El Paso, TX |
| II | RDA | 0603774A | 63 | Enhanced Threat Imaging System | $10,000 | Snyder (AR) | Nychorama | Little Rock, AR |
| II | RDA | 0603779A | 64 | Cadmium Emissions Reduction - Letterkenny Army Depot | $1,000 | Shuster (PA) | Mountain Research, LLC | Altoona, PA |
| II | RDA | 0603779A | 64 | Vanadium Technology Program | $4,000 | Wilson (SC) | Advanced Technology Institute | North Charleston, SC |
| II | RDA | 0603779A | 64 | Zero Waste to Landfill Demonstration Project - Washington State | $1,200 | Smith (WA) | Evergreen Recycling, Inc. | Seattle, WA |
| II | RDA | 0603807A | 70 | Leishmania Skin Test | $1,000 | Hunter (CA) | Allermed Laboratories, Inc | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0603807A | 70 | Rapid Bone Fracture Reduction and Fixation | $1,200 | Souder (IN) | Zimmer, Inc. | Warsaw, IN |
| II | RDA | 0603827A | 71 | Acid Alkaline Direct Methanol Fuel Cell | $5,000 | McIntyre (NC) | Fayetteville Works Plant | Fayetteville, NC |
| II | RDA | 0604804A | 103 | Autonomous Sustainment Cargo Container (ASCC), "Sea Truck" | $7,500 | Bartlett (MD) | AEPLOG Inc. | Germantown, MD |
| II | RDA | 0604807A | 105 | Plasma Sterilizer | $800 | Ellison (MN) | Phygen, Inc | Minneapolis, MN |
| II | RDA | 0604807A | 105 | Plasma Sterilizer | $800 | McCollum (MN) | Phygen-Sterilucent | Minneapolis, MN |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDA | 0604807A | 105 | Rotary Valve Pressure Swing Absorption Oxygen Generator (RVPSAOG) | $2,500 | Davis (CA) | SeQual Technologies | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0604854A | 114 | Paladin Integrated Management, M109A6 | $9,000 | Platts (PA) | BAE Systems | Arlington, VA |
| II | RDA | 0604854A | 114 | Paladin Integrated Management, M109A6 | $9,000 | Rogers (AL) | BAE Systems | Arlington, VA |
| II | RDA | 0604869A | 115 | Ultra Low Phase Noise Oscillator | $4,000 | Tsongas (MA) | Hittite Microwave Corporation | Chelmsford, MA |
| II | RDA | 0605602A | 128 | MOTS All Sky Imager | $1,200 | Reyes (TX) | Aerospace Missions Corporation and Trex Enterprises | El Paso and San Diego, CA, TX |
| II | RDA | 0203726A | 147 | AFATDS Voice Recognition and Cross Platform Speech Interface System | $2,500 | Shuster (PA) | Szanca Solutions, Inc. | Bedford, PA |
| II | RDA | 0203744A | 150 | Boned Cellular Alumninum Tail Rotor Blades | $3,600 | Akin (MO) | Goodrich Corporation & Kemco Aerospace | St. Louis, MO |
| II | RDA | 0203802A | 155 | Javelin Warhead Improvement Plan | $10,000 | Bright (AL) | Lockheed Martin Corporation | Troy, AL |
| II | RDA | 0305208A | 168 | Adaptive-Defense HIPPIE (High-speed Internet Protocol Packet Inspection Engine) on a Chip | $6,000 | Akin (MO) | TechGuard Security, LLC | Chesterfield, MO |
| II | RDA | 0305208A | 168 | Asymmetric Threat Response and Analysis Project (ATRAP) | $5,000 | Giffords (AZ) | University of Arizona | Tucson, AZ |
| II | RDA | 0305208A | 168 | Joint STARS Surveillance and Control Data Link (SCDL) Technology Refresh | $5,000 | Davis (CA) | Cubic Defense Applications | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDA | 0708045A | 172 | Light Weight Armored Windows for Airborne Vehicles | $3,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc | Garden Grove, CA |
| II | RDA | 0708045A | 172 | Moldable Ceramic Composite for Tactical Vehicle Protection | $2,000 | Olver (MA) | Triton Systems | Chelmsford, MA |
| II | RDA | 0708045A | 172 | Moldable Ceramic Composite for Tactical Vehicle Protection | $2,000 | Tsongas (MA) | Triton Systems, Inc. | Chelmsford, MA |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | Gulf of Mexico Geoid Model | $3,500 | Ortiz (TX) | Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi | Corpus Christi, TX |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 1 | Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Options for Military Build-Up | $2,000 | Bordallo (GU) | University of Guam | Mangilao, GU |
| II | RDN | 0601153N | 3 | ONAMI Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology and Nanobiotechnology (N31) Initiative | $2,000 | Blumenauer (OR) | Portland State University (with Subcontracting to Oregon State Univesity and University of Oregon) | Portland, OR |
| II | RDN | 0601153N | 3 | ONAMI Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology and Nanobiotechnology (N31) Initiative | $2,000 | DeFazio (OR) | University of Oregon | Eugene, OR |
| II | RDN | 0601153N | 3 | ONAMI Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology and Nanobiotechnology (N31) Initiative | $2,000 | Schrader (OR) | ONAMI | Corvalis, OR |
| II | RDN | 0601153N | 3 | ONAMI Nanoelectronics, Nanometrology and Nanobiotechnology (N31) Initiative | $2,000 | Walden (OR) | University of Oregon; Oregon State University; Portland State University; ONAMI | Eugene; Corvallis; Portland; Corvallis, OR |
| II | RDN | 0602114N | 4 | Multifunctional Materials, Their Applications and Devices | $5,000 | Kilroy (OH) | The Ohio State University | Columbus, OH |
| II | RDN | 0602114N | 4 | Whale and Dolphin Hearing and Echolocation | $2,550 | Abercrombie (HI) | Marine Mammal Research Program, University of Hawaii | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Advanced Energy Storage Technologies for UUVs | $3,000 | Davis (CA) | General Atomics | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Design Optimization of Composite High-Speed Boats using Advanced Composite Manufacturing and Non-Des | $2,000 | Pingree (ME) | Hodgdon Defense Composites | Portland, ME |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Force Protection – Non Traditional Weaving Application for Aramid (Ballistic) Fibers and Fabrics | $3,586 | LoBiondo (NJ) | Absecon Mills Inc. | Cologne, NJ |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Lithium Ion Storage Advancement for Aircraft Applications | $4,200 | Blunt (MO) | EaglePicher Technologies LLC | Joplin, MO |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Standoff Explosives Detection System (SEDS) | $2,000 | Peters (MI) | BOSSdev, Inc. | Troy, MI |
| II | RDN | 0602235N | 8 | Coordinated Operation of Unmanned Vehicles for Littoral Defense | $2,000 | Miller (FL) | Florida Institute for Human and Machine Cognition | Pensacola, FL |
| II | RDN | 0602236N | 9 | Managing and Extending DoD Asset Lifecycles (MEDAL) | $3,000 | Abercrombie (HI) | Referentia Systems | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDN | 0602236N | 9 | Remote Fuel Assessment System (RFAS) | $2,000 | Bartlett (MD) | Zeltex, Inc. | Hagerstown, MD |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDN | 0602271N | 10 | Photonic Digital Radar for the Next Generation of Electronic Warfare Systems | $5,500 | Ellsworth (IN) | Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology | Terre Haute, IN |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Countermine Lidar UAV-based System (CLUBS) | $2,600 | Taylor (MS) | Optech International Inc. | Kiln, MS |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Detection, Tracking, and Identification for ISRTE of Mobile and Asymmetric Targets | $3,500 | Abercrombie (HI) | Pukoa Scientific | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Quiet Drive Advanced Rotary Actuator | $2,000 | Higgins (NY) | Moog Inc. | East Aurora, NY |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Quiet Drive Advanced Rotary Actuator | $2,000 | Sestak (PA) | Moog Inc. | East Aurora, NY |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Tactical High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile Demonstration | $1,900 | Connolly (VA) | Aerojet-General Corporation | Gainesville, VA |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Tactical High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile Demonstration | $1,900 | McKeon (CA) | Naval Air Warfare Center, China Lake | China Lake, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | ASC-1187 36mm Advanced Countermeasure | $1,250 | Sestak (PA) | Alloy Surfaces, Inc | Chester, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Euler Turbine for Fuel Cell Energy Recovery | $2,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Energent Corporation | Santa Ana, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | High Speed Power Node Switching and Power Node Control Centers | $5,000 | Murphy (PA) | SPD Electrical Systems | Philadelphia, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | High-Temperature Radar Dome Materials | $2,250 | Giffords (AZ) | University of Arizona | Tucson, AZ |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Improved Stealth and Lower Cost Operations for US Naval Ships Using High Strength Netting | $6,000 | Larsen (WA) | Diamond Nets Inc. | Everson, WA |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Pure Hydrogen Supply from Logistic Fuels | $4,000 | Murphy (PA) | Power and Energy, Inc. | Ivyland, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Strategic Mobility 21 | $2,000 | McKeon (CA) | California State University Long Beach | Long Beach, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603236N | 18 | Active Acoustic Analysis and Mitigation System (ASAAMS) | $4,000 | Abercrombie (HI) | University of Hawaii Applied Research Laboratory | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDN | 0603729N | 22 | Navy Special Warfare Performance and Injury Prevention Program for SBT 22 at Stennis Space Center | $2,500 | Taylor (MS) | University of Pittsburgh Scool of Health and Rehabilitation | Pittsburgh, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603747N | 23 | Navy Use of UNOLS Fleet | $3,500 | Davis (CA) | University of California, San Diego | San Diego, CA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDN | 0603216N | 27 | Lighter-Than-Air Stratospheric UAV for Persistent Communications Relay and Surveillance | $6,000 | Lamborn (CO) | U.S. Northern Command | Colorado Springs, CO |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | Air Deployable ASW Custer Sensors for Non-Acoustic Detection | $2,000 | Hunter (CA) | Information Systems Laboratories | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | Airborne Aquatic Detection Sensor System | $1,200 | Davis (CA) | Brainlike, Inc. | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | Marine Mammal Awareness, Alert and Response Systems (MMAARS) | $3,500 | Abercrombie (HI) | BAE Systems | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | Marine Mammal Awareness, Alert and Response Systems (MMAARS) | $3,500 | Smith (NJ) | Integrated Systems Solutions, Inc. (ISSI) | Lakehurst, NJ |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | NIR Sight (near infra-red ranging) | $4,000 | Brady (PA) | RL Associates | Chester, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | NIR Sight (near infra-red ranging) | $4,000 | Schwartz (PA) | AMPAC, Inc | North Wales, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | NIR Sight (near infra-red ranging) | $4,000 | Sestak (PA) | RL Associates | Chester, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603254N | 29 | Trigger and Alert Sonobuoy System Project | $1,500 | Abercrombie (HI) | Guide Star Engineering | Kapolei, HI |
| II | RDN | 0603506N | 33 | Continuous Active Sonar (CAS) for Torpedo DCL Systems | $5,000 | Courtney (CT) | Alion Science and Technology | Mystic, CT |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 35 | Advanced Steam Turbine | $7,500 | Massa (NY) | Dresser-Rand | Wellsville, Painted Post, Olean, NY |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 35 | Advanced Steam Turbine | $7,500 | Olver (MA) | DRS | Fitchburg, MA |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 35 | Advanced Steam Turbine | $7,500 | Tsongas (MA) | DRS Power Technology, Inc | Fitchburg and Hudson, MA |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 35 | Mobile Valve and Flex Hose Maintenance (MVFM) | $1,000 | Pingree (ME) | ARA Inc | Brunswick, ME |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 35 | Next Generation Shipboard Integrated Power: Fuel Efficiency and Advanced Capability Enhancer | $5,000 | Bartlett (MD) | Northrop Grumman | Los Angeles, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 41 | Future Generation Thinline Towed Array | $4,700 | Maffei (NY) | Lockheed Martin Corporation | Syracuse, NY |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 41 | Future Generation Thinline Towed Array | $4,700 | McHugh (NY) | Lockheed Martin | Syracuse, NY |

# COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 41 | Low Cost-Laser Module Assembly for Navy's Acoustic Sensors (LC-LMA) | $1,500 | Sestak (PA) | Clear Align | Eagleville, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 41 | Submarine Fatline Vector Senor Towed Array | $3,200 | Kratovil (MD) | L3 Chesapeake Sciences Corporation | Millersville, MD |
| II | RDN | 0603564N | 44 | Support for Naval Ship Hydrodynamics Test Facilities | $10,000 | Van Hollen (MD) | Carderock Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center | West Bethesda, MD |
| II | RDN | 0603573N | 46 | High Density Power Conversion and Distribution Equipment | $3,400 | Boren (OK) | Westwood Corporation, L-3 | Tulsa, OK |
| II | RDN | 0603573N | 46 | High Density Power Conversion and Distribution Equipment | $3,400 | Sullivan (OK) | L-3 Westwood Corporation | Tulsa, OK |
| II | RDN | 0603573N | 46 | Hybrid Propulsion / Power Generation for Increased Fuel Efficiency for Surface Combatants | $5,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | L-3 Power Paragon, Inc. | Anaheim, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603573N | 46 | Hybrid Propulsion / Power Generation for Increased Fuel Efficiency for Surface Combatants | $5,000 | Miller (CA) | NAVSEA Electric Ship Office | Washington, DC |
| II | RDN | 0603725N | 59 | Photovoltaic Rooftop Systems - Navy | $1,500 | Peters (MI) | United Solar Ovonic | Auburn Hills, MI |
| II | RDN | 0603725N | 59 | Regenerative Fuel Cell Back-up Power | $1,700 | Larson (CT) | Infinity Fuel Cell and Hydrogen, Inc. | Windsor, CT |
| II | RDN | 0603725N | 59 | Testing of critical components for ocean alternate energy options | $3,800 | Abercrombie (HI) | Makai Ocean Engineering | Kailua, HI |
| II | RDN | 0603725N | 59 | Wave Energy PowerBuoy Generating System | $3,000 | Abercrombie (HI) | Ocean Power Technologies | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDN | 0603725N | 59 | Wave Energy PowerBuoy Generating System | $3,000 | Hirono (HI) | Ocean Power Technologies | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDN | 0603725N | 59 | Wave Energy PowerBuoy Generating System | $3,000 | Schrader (OR) | Columbia Power Technologies | Corvallis, OR |
| II | RDN | 0603739N | 61 | In Transit Visibility System | $1,200 | Brady (PA) | ePortation Inc | Philadelphia, PA |
| II | RDN | 0603795N | 69 | Land Attack Technology | $5,000 | Hunter (CA) | MBDA, L-3, Boeing, Raytheon | Westlake Village, San Diego, Chicago, Walthan, CA |
| II | RDN | 0603925N | 74 | High Energy Density Capacitors for Military Applications | $3,000 | Heinrich (NM) | TPL, Inc | Albuquerque, NM |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDN | 0603925N | 74 | Joint Technology Insertion & Accelerated System Integration Capability for Electronic Warfare | $4,000 | Ellsworth (IN) | Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) and NSWC, Crane | Crane, IN |
| II | RDN | 0604215N | 82 | Measurement Standards Research and Development | $2,000 | Calvert (CA) | Naval Surface Warfare Center, Corona Division, Corona, CA 92878-5000 | Corona, CA |
| II | RDN | 0604216N | 83 | USN MH-60S 'Close the Lethality Gap' M230 Pylon Qualification | $4,700 | Massa (NY) | Navy Strike and Air Warfare Center | Fallon, NV |
| II | RDN | 0604270N | 94 | Electronic Warfare Technology, Doctrine, and Tactics Development | $4,000 | Larsen (WA) | Electronic Warfare Associates | Oak Harbor, WA |
| II | RDN | 0604307N | 99 | Advanced Capability Build 12 and ACB 14 | $5,000 | Adler (NJ) | Lockheed Martin MS2 | Moorestown, NJ |
| II | RDN | 0604558N | 110 | Common Command and Control System Module (CCCS) | $9,000 | Courtney (CT) | General Dynamics Electric Boat | Groton, CT |
| II | RDN | 0604558N | 110 | Common Command and Control System Module (CCCS) | $9,000 | Langevin (RI) | General Dynamics Electric Boat | North Kingstown, RI |
| II | RDN | 0604558N | 110 | Mold -In-Place (MIP) Coating Development for the U.S. Submarine Fleet | $2,000 | Taylor (MS) | Seeman Composites, Inc | Gulfport, MS |
| II | RDN | 0604567N | 113 | Automated Fiber Optic Manufacturing Initiative for Navy Ships | $5,200 | Nye (VA) | CAPT Brian Antonio, PEO Aircraft Carriers PMS 378, Washington Navy Yard | Washington, DC |
| II | RDN | 0604567N | 113 | Automated Fiber Optic Manufacturing Initiative for Navy Ships | $5,200 | Tsongas (MA) | kSaria | Lawrence, MA |
| II | RDN | 0604727N | 119 | JSOW-ER | $6,500 | Akin (MO) | LaBarge Inc. as subcontractor to Raytheon Corp | St. Louis, MO |
| II | RDN | 0604727N | 119 | JSOW-ER | $6,500 | Blunt (MO) | LaBarge | Joplin, MO |
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 124 | Flexible Medical Solutions FlexMedPatch (TM) Program | $2,000 | Bartlett (MD) | Information Control | Gaithersburg, MD |
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 124 | HI-CA Biorepository Consortium for DOD Research | $2,500 | Davis (CA) | University of California, San Diego | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 124 | Neurogenesis Therapeutics for PTSD | $3,000 | Davis (CA) | BrainCells Inc | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 124 | Strategies to Reduce Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) & Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Burden | $4,000 | Davis (CA) | Science Applications International Corporation | San Diego, CA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 124 | U.S. Navy Pandemic Influenza Vaccine Program: Enhancement of Influenza Vaccine Efficacy | $8,000 | McHugh (NY) | Trudeau Institute (Saranac Lake, NY) and Naval Health Research Center (NHRC) (San Diego, CA) | Saranac Lake, NY |
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 124 | U S. Navy Vaccine Program | $4,000 | Alexander (LA) | The Breast Foundation | Baton Rouge, LA |
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 124 | U.S. Navy Vaccine Program | $4,000 | Jones (NC) | OncBioMune, LLC | Baton Rouge, LA |
| II | RDN | 0605013N | 129 | Advanced Maintenance and Environmental Monitoring Technologies for Public Shipyards | $600 | Shea-Porter (NH) | Orbis, Inc. | Portsmouth, NH |
| II | RDN | 0605013N | 129 | Maintenance Planning and Assessment Technology (MPAT) Insertion | $3,000 | Brady (PA) | Progeny Systems | Philadelphia, PA |
| II | RDN | 0605804N | 143 | Center for Commercialization of Advanced Technology | $3,000 | Davis (CA) | San Diego State University Research Foundation | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDN | 0101221N | 160 | Advanced LINAC Facility | $1,170 | Hill (IN) | Indiana University | Bloomington, IN |
| II | RDN | 0101402N | 163 | E-6B Strategic Communications Upgrade Block 1A (VLF-TX & HPTS) | $4,000 | Fallin (OK) | Rockwell Collins through the US Navy | Tinker AFB, OK |
| II | RDN | 0101402N | 163 | E-6B Strategic Communications Upgrade Block 1A (VLF-TX & HPTS) | $4,000 | Loebsack (IA) | Rockwell Collins | Cedar Rapids, IA |
| II | RDN | 0204311N | 169 | Deployable Autonomous Distributed System (DADS) | $3,600 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | General Dynamics Advanced Information Systems | Anaheim Hills, CA |
| II | RDN | 0204311N | 169 | Deployable Autonomous Distributed System (DADS) | $3,600 | Miller (CA) | U.S. Navy Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDN | 0205601N | 174 | AARGM Derivative Program | $1,900 | Larsen (WA) | ATK | Eden Prairie, MN |
| II | RDN | 0205601N | 174 | AARGM Derivative Program | $1,900 | Ortiz (TX) | Alliant Techsystems | Edina, MN |
| II | RDN | 0205633N | 178 | Reduction of Weapon System Downtime Rapid Repair Structural Adhesives | $4,000 | Langevin (RI) | Epoxies Etc. Inc. | Cranston, RI |
| II | RDN | 0708011N | 216 | Laser Optimization Remote Lighting Systems | $2,500 | Larson (CT) | RSL Fiber Systems, LLC | East Hartford, CT |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDAF | 0602015F | 6 | AFSOC Injury Prevention and Human Performance Initiative | $1,000 | Miller (FL) | University of Pittsburgh School of Health and Rehabilitative Services/Andrews Institute | Pittsburgh, PA |
| II | RDAF | 0602102F | 7 | Rio Grande Valley Nanotech Institute | $5,000 | Ortiz (TX) | The University of Texas at Brownsville | Brownsville, TX |
| II | RDAF | 0602201F | 8 | UAV Sensor and Maintenance Development Center | $5,500 | Bishop (UT) | Utah State University Space Dynamics Lab / Ogden ALC | Logan, UT |
| II | RDAF | 0602201F | 8 | Unmanned Sense, Track, and Avoid Radar (USTAR) | $3,000 | Lamborn (CO) | N/A | Colorado Springs, CO |
| II | RDAF | 0602203F | 10 | Advanced Lithium Battery Scale-up and Manufacturing | $10,000 | Johnson (GA) | Excellatron Solid State, LLC | Atlanta, GA |
| II | RDAF | 0602203F | 10 | Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center (AVPC) | $3,000 | McKeon (CA) | Advatech Pacific, Inc. | Redlands, CA |
| II | RDAF | 0602203F | 10 | Integrated Electrical Starter | $3,500 | Turner (OH) | GE Aviation Systems, Electrical Power | Vandalia, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0602203F | 10 | Multi-Mode Propulsion Phase IIA: High Performance Green Propellant | $5,000 | Kratovil (MD) | Alliant Techsystems Inc. (ATK) | Baltimore, MD |
| II | RDAF | 0602204F | 11 | Advanced Meta Materials | $3,750 | Turner (OH) | Mound Laser & Photonics Center, Inc | Miamisburg, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0602204F | 11 | Information Quality Tools for Persistent Surveillance Data Sets | $2,000 | Snyder (AR) | University of Arkansas at Little Rock | Little Rock, AR |
| II | RDAF | 0602204F | 11 | Net-Centric Sensor Grids | $3,000 | Hill (IN) | Indiana University | Bloomington, IN |
| II | RDAF | 0602204F | 11 | Sensors and Near Field Communications Technologies | $2,900 | Turner (OH) | NCR Corporation | Dayton, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0602601F | 12 | Advanced Modular Avionics for ORS Use | $4,800 | Heinrich (NM) | Goodrich ISR Systems Albuquerque | Albuquerque, NM |
| II | RDAF | 0602890F | 17 | Advanced Deformable Mirrors for High Energy Laser Weapons | $2,000 | Heinrich (NM) | MZA Associates Corporation and Active Optical Systems | Albuquerque, NM |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | Arcuri (NY) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Multiple Locations, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | DeFazio (OR) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Multiple Locations, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | DeFazio (OR) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | East Hartford, CT |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | DeLauro (CT) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Multiple Locations, OH |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | Holden (PA) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Multiple Locations, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | Kaptur (OH) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Multiple Locations, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | Kissell (NC) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Metals Affordability Initiative Consortium Program, CT |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | Latta (OH) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Multiple Locations, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Metals Affordability Initiative | $10,000 | Ryan (OH) | Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) | Multiple Locations, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 18 | Rapid Automated Processing of Advanced Low Observables | $4,500 | Turner (OH) | ATK Aerospace Structures | Dayton, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603203F | 20 | Moving Target Strike | $3,000 | Miller (FL) | General Atomics/Alpha Data Corporation | Fort Walton Beach, FL |
| II | RDAF | 0603211F | 21 | Long-Loiter, Load Bearing Antenna Platform for Pervasive Airborne Intelligence | $8,000 | Blunt (MO) | QinetiQ North America | Springfield, MO |
| II | RDAF | 0603216F | 22 | 150 Shaft Horse Power Scalable UAV Engine | $5,000 | Courtney (CT) | United Technologies Research Center | East Hartford, CT |
| II | RDAF | 0603216F | 22 | Adaptable Integrated Vapor Cycle Based Environmental Control and Power System | $4,200 | Bartlett (MD) | Fairchild Controls | Frederick, MD |
| II | RDAF | 0603231F | 23 | JSF Tactical Air Configuration Module | $5,000 | Murphy (PA) | Environmental Tectonics Corporation | Southampton, PA |
| II | RDAF | 0603270F | 24 | COTS Analysis Tools for Navigational Warfare | $1,500 | Sestak (PA) | Analytical Graphics Inc. | Exton, PA |
| II | RDAF | 0603401F | 25 | Department of Defense Cubesat Bus Development | $2,000 | McKeon (CA) | Andrews Space | Valencia, CA |
| II | RDAF | 0603401F | 25 | Small Responsive Spacecraft at Low-Cost (SRSL) | $4,500 | Bishop (UT) | Utah State University Space Dynamics Laboratory / Air Force Research Laboratory | Logan, UT |
| II | RDAF | 0603680F | 30 | Advanced Integrated Structure for Affordable Transport Aircraft | $3,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | VSystems Composites | Anaheim, CA |
| II | RDAF | 0603680F | 30 | Nanocomposite Structures Manufacturing Technology Development | $4,000 | Turner (OH) | Vector Composites, Inc. | Dayton, OH |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDAF | 0603680F | 30 | Production of Nanocomposites for Aerospace Applications | $3,500 | Turner (OH) | NanoSperse, LLC | Kettering, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0603680F | 30 | Repair Technology Insertion Program (RepTIP) | $5,200 | Bishop (UT) | Hill AFB / General Atomics | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDAF | 0603788F | 31 | Cyber Attack and Security Environment | $5,000 | Arcuri (NY) | Air Force Research Laboratory/RI | Rome, NY |
| II | RDAF | 0603788F | 31 | Cyber Attack and Security Environment | $5,000 | McHugh (NY) | Clarkson University and ITT | Clarkson (Potsdam) and ITT (Rome), NY |
| II | RDAF | 0604796F | 56 | Advanced Propulsion Non-Tactical Vehicle (APNTV) | $5,500 | Massa (NY) | Steven McTier, Project Manager (Robbins AFB) | Honeoye Falls, NY |
| II | RDAF | 0604796F | 56 | Bio-Diesel Algae Fuel Production Program | $3,000 | Loebsack (IA) | Bio-NRG LLC | Mt. Pleasant, IA |
| II | RDAF | 0604240F | 66 | B-2 Advanced Tactical Data Link | $14,600 | McKeon (CA) | Northrop Grumman Corporation | Los Angeles, CA |
| II | RDAF | 0604270F | 68 | Rapid Replacement of Mission Critical Logistics Electronics | $4,900 | Marshall (GA) | WR-ALC | Warner Robins, GA |
| II | RDAF | 0604617F | 79 | Backpack Medical Oxygen System (BMOS) | $2,900 | Akin (MO) | Essex Cryogenics | St Louis, MO |
| II | RDAF | 0604706F | 80 | ACES 5 Ejection Seat | $7,000 | Lamborn (CO) | Aircrew Performance Systems Acquisition Program, SAF/AQPC, Combat Support and Joint Counterair Div. | Washington, DC |
| II | RDAF | 0604706F | 80 | ACES 5 Ejection Seat | $7,000 | Pastor (AZ) | Goodrich Corporation | Phoenix, AZ |
| II | RDAF | 0604706F | 80 | ACES 5 Ejection Seat | $7,000 | Tauscher (CA) | Goodrich Corporation | Phoenix, AZ |
| II | RDAF | 0604740F | 82 | Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT) | $7,000 | Andrews (NJ) | Accenture National Security Services | Camden, NJ |
| II | RDAF | 0604740F | 82 | Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT) | $7,000 | LoBiondo (NJ) | Accenture | Camden, NJ |
| II | RDAF | 0604740F | 82 | Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (DMIT) | $7,000 | Sestak (PA) | Accenture National Security Services | King of Prussia, PA |
| II | RDAF | 0604759F | 101 | Eglin AFB Range Operations Control Center (ROCC) | $3,000 | Miller (FL) | Cubic Corporation | Arlington, VA |
| II | RDAF | 0605978F | 109 | Computer-Control Upgrade to the Mechanical BAK-12 Aircraft Arresting Gear System | $1,750 | Sestak (PA) | Engineered Arresting Systems Corp. (ESCO) | Aston, PA |
| II | RDAF | 0101815F | 123 | DaVinci Project | $1,250 | Davis (CA) | Semantic Research, Inc. | San Diego, CA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDAF | 0207134F | 132 | Corrosion Detection and Visualization Program | $2,000 | Smith (WA) | Quest Integrated, Inc. | Kent, WA |
| II | RDAF | 0301310F | 165 | Open Source Research Centers | $4,000 | Turner (OH) | Radiance Technologies | Fairborn, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0301315F | 167 | Technical Sensors Integrated Ground Station | $4,800 | Turner (OH) | Ball Aerospace & Technologies Corp. | Fairborn, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0304348F | 181 | Advanced Technical Intelligence Center | $9,000 | Turner (OH) | Advanced Technical Intelligence Center for Human Capital Development (ATIC) | Beavercreek, OH |
| II | RDAF | 0305159F | 182 | Carbon Nanotube Enhanced Power Sources for Space | $3,300 | Markey (MA) | Northeastern University | Boston, MA |
| II | RDAF | 0305206F | 203 | Multiple UAS Cooperative Concentrated Observation and Engagement Against a Common Ground Objective | $7,500 | Bartlett (MD) | Proxy Aviation Systems | Germantown, MD |
| II | RDAF | 0305207F | 204 | Rivet Joint Services Oriented Architecture (SOA) | $2,500 | Hall (TX) | L-3 Communications Integrated Systems | Greenville, TX |
| II | RDAF | 0408011F | 228 | Special Mission Clothing for AFSOC | $2,700 | Rogers (AL) | THY Enterprises | Alexander City, AL |
| II | RDAF | 0708011F | 231 | Wire Integrity Technology | $2,000 | Marshall (GA) | WR-ALC | Warner Robins, GA |
| II | RDAF | 0708611F | 233 | ALC Logistics Integration Environment | $2,000 | Shuster (PA) | IS2 Technologies, Inc | Altoona, PA |
| II | RDAF | 0708611F | 233 | Micro-Grid Energy Storage Utilizing a Deployable Zinc-Bromide Flow Battery | $5,000 | Marshall (GA) | WR-ALC | Warner Robins, GA |
| II | RDAF | 0708611F | 233 | Warner Robins Air Logistics Center (WR-ALC) Special Operations Forces (SOF) | $4,200 | Marshall (GA) | WR-ALC | Warner Robins, GA |
| II | RDDW | 0601000BR | 1 | Virtual Perimeter Monitoring System (VPMS) | $2,000 | Miller (FL) | DRS Technologies | Fort Walton Beach, FL |
| II | RDDW | 0601101E | 2 | Development of Low-Cost, Stable Vaccines for Field Application | $3,200 | Smith (WA) | PATH | Seattle, WA |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Ackerman (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Arcuri (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Bishop (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Clarke (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Israel (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Maloney (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | McCarthy (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | McCarthy (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Rangel (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Tonko (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Tonko (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Synchrotron Beamline and Experimental Station | $5,000 | Towns (NY) | New York Structural Biology Center | New York, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0602384BP | 14 | Chemical and Biological Resistant Clothing | $2,000 | Sestak (PA) | Arkema, Inc. | King of Prussia, PA |
| II | RDDW | 0602715E | 18 | Improved Performance of ODS Ferritic Steels | $2,000 | Tauscher (CA) | Curtiss-Wright Metal Improvement Company | Livermore, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0602718BR | 20 | Eagle Eyes - Stand-off Radiation Detection | $3,600 | Taylor (MS) | Signal Research Center | Hattiesburg, MS |
| II | RDDW | 1160401BB | 21 | Rapid & Low Cost Development of Next Generation Patrol Ships for Special Operations | $2,250 | Davis (CA) | M Ship Co | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDDW | 1160401BB | 21 | SOF Craft Integrated Backbone | $2,000 | McHugh (NY) | Sensis Corporation | East Syracuse, NY |
| II | RDDW | 0603121D8Z | 24 | Lasercomm Link for Explosive Ordnance Disposal Robot Operations | $3,000 | Abercrombie (HI) | Innovative Technical Solutions (dba NovaSol) | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDDW | 0603121D8Z | 24 | Lasercomm Link for Explosive Ordnance Disposal Robot Operations | $3,000 | Hirono (HI) | Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc. (dba NovaSol) | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDDW | 0603122D8Z | 25 | Advanced Transparent LAS Glass Ceramic Armor Systems for Force Protection | $1,250 | Sestak (PA) | SCHOTT Diamondview Armor Products | Boothwyn, PA |
| II | RDDW | 0603122D8Z | 25 | Affordable Robust Mid-Sized (ARMS) Unmanned Ground Vehicle | $4,000 | Tsongas (MA) | Black-I Robotics, Inc. | Tyngsborough, MA |
| II | RDDW | 0603122D8Z | 25 | Combating Terrorism: Threat and Risk Assessment | $2,650 | Brady (PA) | Foreign Policy Research Institute | Philadelphia, PA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDDW | 0603122D8Z | 25 | Integrated Rugged Checkpoint Container | $2,500 | Taylor (MS) | Rapiscan Systems, Inc | Ocean Springs, MS |
| II | RDDW | 0603122D8S | 25 | Thresholds for Neurological Injuries from Repeated Blast Exposures | $3,000 | Rodriguez (TX) | Applied Research Associates | Pecos, TX |
| II | RDDW | 0603200D8Z | 28 | Robotic Border Area Surveillance System Program | $4,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Rockwell Collins | Anaheim Hills, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0603384BP | 32 | Total Perimeter Surveillance | $2,000 | Schauer (MI) | Dexter Research Center, Inc. | Dexter, MI |
| II | RDDW | 0603648D8Z | 34 | Distributed Network Switching and Security | $2,300 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Raptor Networks Technology, Inc. | Santa Ana, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0603648D8Z | 34 | High Accuracy Network Determination System - Intelligent Optical Networks (HANDS-IONS) | $2,000 | Abercrombie (HI) | Oceanit | Honolulu, HI |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 41 | Next Generation Manufacturing Technologies Initiative | $2,000 | Loebsack (IA) | The University of Iowa | Iowa City, IA |
| II | RDDW | 0603720S | 44 | End to End Semi Fab Alpha Tool | $5,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Digibeam Corporation | San Juan Capistrano, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0603720S | 44 | Feature Size Yield Enhancement at DMEA's Semiconductors Foundry | $2,500 | Matsui (CA) | Defense Microelectronics Activity | McClellan, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0603828D8Z | 60 | Tidewater Full Scale Exercise | $2,700 | Forbes (VA) | N/A | various, VA |
| II | RDDW | 0603942D8Z | 63 | National Radio Frequency RD&T Transfer Center | $3,000 | Buyer (IN) | Technology Service Corporation | Bloomington, IN |
| II | RDDW | 0603942D8Z | 63 | National Radio Frequency RD&T Transfer Center | $3,000 | Ellsworth (IN) | Technology Service Corporation and NSWC Crane | Crane, IN |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center | $3,500 | Etheridge (NC) | Partnership for Defense Innovation | Fayetteville, NC |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center | $3,500 | Kissell (NC) | Partnership for Defense Innovation | Fayetteville, NC |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Partnership for Defense Innovation Wi-Fi Laboratory Testing and Assessment Center | $3,500 | McIntyre (NC) | Partnership for Defense Innovation | Fayetteville, NC |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDDW | 0603709D8Z | 71 | Autonomous Machine Vision for Mapping and Investigation of Remote Sites | $2,250 | Davis (CA) | Vision Robotics Corp | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0603709D8Z | 71 | RobonostiX Integration to Improve Readiness of Robotic Unmanned Systems | $1,600 | Davis (CA) | Sullivan International Group | San Diego, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0603898C | 89 | Independent Advisory Group to Review Ballistic Missile Defense Training Needs | $500 | Lamborn (CO) | Missile Defense Agency | Colorado Springs, CO |
| II | RDDW | 0603913C | 97 | Short Range Ballistic Missile Defense | $20,500 | Blunt (MO) | LaBarge | Joplin, MO |
| II | RDDW | 0604161D8Z | 102 | Mobile Detection Assessment Response System Enhancements | $4,300 | Bartlett (MD) | General Dynamics Robotics Systems | Westminster, MD |
| II | RDDW | 0604940D8Z | 129 | Advanced SAM Hardware Simulator Development | $1,500 | Johnson (GA) | Georgia Institute of Technology | Atlanta, GA |
| II | RDDW | 0604940D8Z | 129 | Gulf Range Mobile Instrumentation Capability | $3,000 | Miller (FL) | Prologic | Manassas, VA |
| II | RDDW | 0604940D8Z | 129 | Joint Gulf Range Complex Test and Training | $3,000 | Miller (FL) | Boeing | Fort Walton Beach, FL |
| II | RDDW | 0605804D8Z | 153 | Renewable Energy Systems (RES) for Defense Applications | $3,000 | Andrews (NJ) | Stevens Institute of Technology | Hoboken, NJ |
| II | RDDW | 0605804D8Z | 153 | Renewable Energy Systems (RES) for Defense Applications | $3,000 | Sires (NJ) | Stevens Institute of Technology | Hoboken, NJ |
| II | RDDW | 0301301L | 181 | Advanced Scientific Missile Intelligence Preparation of the Battlespace (IPB) | $4,000 | Griffith (AL) | SPARTA Inc. | Huntsville, AL |
| II | RDDW | 0301301L | 181 | Portable Device for Latent Fingerprint Identification | $1,800 | Smith (WA) | Sagem Morpho | Tacoma, WA |
| II | RDDW | 0305884L | 220 | Personal Area Network for Land Soldiers (PANLS) | $3,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Interstate Electronics Corporation | Anaheim, CA |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 238 | Commercialization of High-Rate Polyimide Composites for Military and Commercial Aircraft | $2,000 | Turner (OH) | Renegade Materials Corporation | Springboro, OH |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 238 | Northwest Manufacturing Initiative | $1,200 | Blumenauer (OR) | Manufacturing 21 Coalition | Portland, OR |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 238 | Northwest Manufacturing Initiative | $1,200 | DeFazio (OR) | Manufacturing 21 Coalition | Portland, OR |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 238 | Northwest Manufacturing Initiative | $1,200 | Walden (OR) | Manufacturing 21 Coalition | Portland, OR |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 238 | Optical Fiber Assembly Manufacturing | $1,000 | Courtney (CT) | Fiberoptics Technology Inc. | Pomfret, CT |
| II | RDDW | 1160405BB | 247 | Advanced, Long Endurance Unattended Ground Sensor | $8,000 | Taylor (MS) | Mississippi State University, Camgian Microsystems Corp | Starkville, MS |
| II | RDDW | 1160405BB | 247 | Biometric Optical Surveillance System (BOSS) | $2,000 | Guthrie (KY) | EWA, Inc. | Bowling Green, KY |
| II | RDDW | 1160405BB | 247 | Counterproliferation Analysis and Planning System (CAPS) | $20,100 | McNerney (CA) | Captain Jeff Trumbell | MacDill Air Force Base, FL |
| II | RDDW | 1160405BB | 247 | Counterproliferation Analysis and Planning System (CAPS) | $20,100 | Tauscher (CA) | Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | Livermore, CA |
| II | RDDW | 1160479BB | 260 | Miniature Day Night Sight for Crew Served Weapons | $1,750 | Sestak (PA) | Peak Beam Systems Inc. | Edgmont, PA |
| II | RDDW | 1160483BB | 263 | Transformer Technology for Combat Submersibles (TTCS) | $4,000 | Bishop (NY) | STIDD Systems Inc | Greenport, NY |
| II | RDDW | 11604B3BB | 263 | Transformer Technology for Combat Submersibles (TTCS) | $4,000 | Ros-Lehtinen (FL) | STIDD Systems Inc | Marathon, FL |
| II | RDDW | | 999 | Final E-Curfew (FeC) Enhancements | $3,000 | Posey (FL) | Soneticom Inc | West Melbourne, FL |
| III | OMA | ba01-2020a | 50 | M-Gator | $2,000 | Kissell (NC) | John Deere | Cary, NC |
| III | OMA | ba01-2020a | 50 | M-Gator | $2,000 | McHugh (NY) | John Deere | Cary, NC |
| III | OMA | ba01-2020a | 60 | Mi-17 Aircraft Modifications | $8,000 | Reyes (TX) | Army Threat Simulation Management Office | Redstone Arsenal, AL |
| III | OMA | ba01-2020a | 80 | Operational and Technical Training Validation for Joint Maneuver Forces at Fort Bliss | $1,000 | Reyes (TX) | Digital Fusion Solutions | El Paso, TX |
| III | OMA | ba01-2020a | 90 | Texas Defense Manufacturing Supply Chain Initiative | $5,000 | Ortiz (TX) | US - Mexico Cultural and Educational Foundation | Irving, TX |
| III | OMA | ba01-2020a | 100 | Fort Bliss Data Center | $1,700 | Reyes (TX) | Fort Bliss | El Paso, TX |
| III | OMA | ba04-2020a | 370 | Operational & Tactical Log Asset Visibility (Fuel & Ammo) | $3,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Integrated Data Corporation | Culver City, CA |
| III | OMA | ba04-2020a | 380 | M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade | $1,000 | Arcuri (NY) | US Army Military Center - Small Arms Division - Combat Developments | Fort Benning, GA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III | OMN | ba01-1804n | 170 | Navy Tactical Development | $1,000 | Davis (CA) | DDL OMNI Engineering LLC | San Diego, CA |
| III | OMN | ba02-1804n | 320 | Navy Ship Disposal - Carrier Demonstration Project | $6,000 | Ortiz (TX) | United States Navy | Washington, DC |
| III | OMN | ba03-1804n | 390 | Mobile Learning Cultural Training for Military Personnel | $1,500 | Miller (FL) | University of West Florida | Pensacola, FL |
| III | OMN | ba03-1804n | 420 | U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps | $651 | Calvert (CA) | U.S Naval Sea Cadet Corps | Arlington, VA |
| III | OMN | ba03-1804n | 430 | U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps | $651 | Bishop (NY) | U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps | Arlington, VA |
| III | OMN | ba03-1804n | 430 | U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps | $651 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Navy Recruiting Command | Millington, TN |
| III | OMN | ba03-1804n | 430 | U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps | $651 | Ortiz (TX) | U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps | Arlington, VA |
| III | OMN | ba04-1804n | 560 | Mobile Condition Assessment System Pilot for Commander, Navy Region Hawaii | $3,000 | Abercrombie (HI) | Commander, Navy Region Hawaii | Naval Station Pearl Harbor, HI |
| III | OMMC | ba01-1106n | 10 | Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS) | $2,600 | Hodes (NH) | Polartec, LLC | Hudson, NH |
| III | OMMC | ba01-1106n | 10 | Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS) | $2,600 | Nye (VA) | A.J. Pasagian, PM-Infantry Combat Equipment, MARCORSYSCOM | Quantico, VA |
| III | OMMC | ba01-1106n | 10 | Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS) | $2,600 | Rogers (MI) | Peckham Industries | Lansing, MI |
| III | OMMC | ba01-1106n | 10 | Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS) | $2,600 | Shea-Porter (NH) | PolarTech, LLC. | Hudson, NH |
| III | OMMC | ba01-1106n | 10 | Flame Resistant Organizational Gear (FROG) | $5,000 | Cummings (MD) | 180s, LLC | Baltimore, MD |
| III | OMMC | ba01-1106n | 10 | Flame Resistant Organizational Gear (FROG) | $5,000 | Kissell (NC) | Longworth Industries | Candor, NC |
| III | OMMC | ba01-1106n | 10 | Ultra Lightweight Camouflage Net System (ULCANS) | $4,000 | Etheridge (NC) | Saab | Lillington, NC |
| III | OMAF | ba01-3400f | 10 | Advanced Autonomous Robotic Inspections for Aging Aircraft | $2,000 | Fallin (OK) | Veracity Technology Solutions, LLC | Midwest City, OK |
| III | OMAF | ba01-3400f | 30 | Air Education and Training Command Range Improvements | $4,555 | Giffords (AZ) | Barry M. Goldwater Range - Luke Air Force Base | Luke Air Force Base, AZ |
| III | OMAF | ba01-3400f | 70 | Wage Modification for US Azores Portugese National Employees | $240 | Frank (MA) | N/A | N/A, nonUSA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III | OMAF | ba02-3400f | 240 | Warner Robins Air Logistics Center (WRALC) Strategic Airlift Aircraft Availability Improvement | $2,000 | Marshall (GA) | WR-ALC | Warner Robins, GA |
| III | OMDW | ba01-0100d | 20 | Special Operations Forces (SOF) Modular Glove System | $2,500 | Kratovil (MD) | W.L Gore and Associates | Elkton, MD |
| III | OMDW | ba04-0100d | 160 | Redevelopment of Naval Station Ingleside | $3,000 | Ortiz (TX) | Ingleside Local Redevelopment Authority | Ingleside, TX |
| III | OMDW | ba04-0100d | 200 | SOaR Recruiting Initiative | $3,400 | Braley (IA) | University of Northern Iowa | Cedar Falls, IA |
| III | OMDW | ba04-0100d | 270 | Critical Language Training | $2,000 | Davis (CA) | San Diego State University Research Foundation | San Diego, CA |
| III | OMDW | ba03-2020a | 290 | SOaR Recruiting Initiative | $3,400 | Wilson (SC) | Celebrate Freedom Foundation | Columbia, SC |
| III | OMDW | ba04-0100d | 999 | Western Regional Counter-Drug Training Center | $2,500 | Larsen (WA) | Washington State National Guard Counter Drug Task Force | Camp Murray, Tacoma, WA |
| III | OMDW | ba04-0100d | 999 | Western Regional Counter-Drug Training Center | $2,500 | Smith (WA) | Washington State National Guard | Camp Murray, WA |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 50 | Modular Shoot House | $2,200 | Conaway (TX) | Texas Army National Guard | Austin, TX |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 60 | Joint Command Vehicle and Supporting C3 Systems | $2,250 | Shea-Porter (NH) | New Hampshire National Guard | Concord, NH |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | $1,600 | Butterfield (NC) | North Carolina National Guard | Raleigh, NC |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | $1,600 | Etheridge (NC) | North Carolina National Guard | Raleigh, NC |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | $1,600 | Kissell (NC) | North Carolina National Guard | Raleigh, NC |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | $1,600 | McIntyre (NC) | NC National Guard | Raleigh, NC |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | $1,600 | Miller (NC) | North Carolina National Guard | RALEIGH, NC |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers | $1,600 | Watt (NC) | North Carolina National Guard | Raleigh, NC |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | Our Military Kids | $3,500 | Kilroy (OH) | Our Military Kids | McLean, VA |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | Our Military Kids | $3,500 | Ortiz (TX) | Our Military Kids, Inc. | McLean, VA |
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 100 | Our Military Kids | $3,500 | Taylor (MS) | Our Military Kids, Inc | McLean, VA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| III | OMNG | ba01-2065a | 110 | Camp Ethan Allen Training Site Road Equipment | $300 | Welch (VT) | Vermont Army National Guard | Jericho, VT |
| III | OMNG | ba04-2065a | 150 | Emergency Management Staff Trainer Distributed Learning Courseware | $2,000 | Loebsack (IA) | MediaTech | Centerville, IA |
| III | OMANG | ba01-3840f | 10 | MBU-20A/P Oxygen Mask and Mask Light | $6,000 | Dreier (CA) | Gentex Corporation | Rancho Cucamonga, CA |
| VII | DHP | | | Combined Injury Consortium | $1,500 | Snyder (AR) | University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences | Little Rock, AR |
| VII | DHP | | | Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization | $430 | McHugh (NY) | Fort Drum Regional Health Planning Organization | Watertown, NY |
| VII | DHP | | | Tacoma Trauma Trust | $2,500 | Smith (WA) | Madigan Army Medical Center, MultiCare Health System, and Franciscan Health System | Tacoma, WA |
| VII | DHP | | | USUHS Immersive, Wide Area Virtual Environment (WAVE) Simulation for Medical Readiness Training | $3,000 | Van Hollen (MD) | The Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) | Bethesda, MD |
| XIV | DICA | | | Mi-17 Aircraft Modifications | $8,000 | Reyes (TX) | Army Threat Simulation Management Office | Redstone Arsenal, AL |
| XV | OCO - OPA | | 28 | Defense Advanced GPS Receiver (DAGR) | $5,000 | Braley (IA) | Rockwell Collins, Inc. | Cedar Rapids, IA |
| XV | OCO - OPA | | 28 | Defense Advanced GPS Receiver (DAGR) | $5,000 | Loebsack (IA) | Rockwell Collins | Coralville, IA |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Admin, Gen Pur (Army Field Spt Bde-CE) | $720 | Kissell (NC) | Fort Bragg | Ft Bragg, NC |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Admin, Gen Pur (Army Field Spt Bde-CE) | $720 | McIntyre (NC) | Fort Bragg | Fort Bragg, NC |
| XXIII | MCA | | | All Weather Marksmanship Facility | $8,200 | McHugh (NY) | Fort Drum | Watertown, NY |
| XXIII | MCA | | | ALT Auditorium and Training Center Expansion | $7,400 | Bartlett (MD) | Fort Detrick | Fort Detrick, MD |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Ballistic Evaluation Facility Phase 2 | $10,200 | Frelinghuysen (NJ) | Picatinny Arsenal | Picatinny, NJ |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Chapel Complex-Fort Campbell | $14,400 | Tanner (TN) | Fort Campbell | Fort Campbell, KY |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXIII | MCA | | | Chapel Complex-Fort Campbell | $14,400 | Wamp (TN) | Fort Campbell | Fort Campbell, KY |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Chapel Complex-Fort Campbell | $14,400 | Whitfield (KY) | Fort Campbell | Ft. Campbell, KY |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Defense Access Road | $5,000 | Forbes (VA) | Fort Lee | Fort Lee, VA |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Family Life Center | $8,500 | Carter (TX) | Fort Hood | Fort Hood, TX |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Fire Station, Two Company | $6,700 | Giffords (AZ) | Fort Huachuca | Fort Huachuca, AZ |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Fort Lewis-McChord AFB Joint Access | $9,000 | Smith (WA) | Fort Lewis | Fort Lewis, WA |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Gate 7 Access Control Point | $3,550 | Griffith (AL) | Redstone Arsenal | Huntsville, AL |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Health Clinic | $7,800 | Skelton (MO) | Fort Leonard Wood | Fort Leonard Wood, MO |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Industrial Area Electrical System Upgrade | $3,300 | Rogers (AL) | Anniston Army Depot | Anniston Army Depot Alabama, AL |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Information Processing Node, Phase II | $956 | Kratovil (MD) | Aberdeen Proving Ground | Aberdeen, MD |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Information Processing Node, Phase II | $956 | Ruppersberger (MD) | Aberdeen Proving Ground | Aberdeen, MD |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Intersection, Rockenbach Road & Cooper Avenue | $2,350 | Kratovil (MD) | Fort George G. Meade | Ft. Meade, MD |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Intersection, Rockenbach Road & Cooper Avenue | $2,350 | Sarbanes (MD) | Fort George G. Meade | Fort Meade, MD |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Multipurpose Machine Gun Range | $6,400 | Fleming (LA) | Fort Polk | Leesville, LA |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Physical Fitness Facility, Clarksville Base | $900 | Davis (TN) | Fort Campbell | Fort Campbell, KY |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Physical Fitness Facility, Clarksville Base | $900 | Tanner (TN) | Fort Campbell | Fort Campbell, KY |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Physical Fitness Facility, Clarksville Base | $900 | Wamp (TN) | Fort Campbell | Fort Campbell, KY |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Physical Fitness Facility, Clarksville Base | $900 | Whitfield (KY) | Fort Campbell | Fort Campbell, KY |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Planning and Design for Access Control Points | $6,500 | Reyes (TX) | Fort Bliss | El Paso, TX |
| XXIII | MCA | | | Water Survival Training Facility | $401 | Bright (AL) | Fort Rucker | Fort Rucker, AL |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXIII | MCN | | | Add/Alt Marine Mammal Surgical Center | $2,330 | Davis (CA) | Naval Base Point Loma | San Diego, CA |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Consolidation of Structural Shops | $2,000 | Hodes (NH) | NSS Portsmouth Naval Shipyard | Kittery, ME |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Consolidation of Structural Shops | $2,000 | Pingree (ME) | NSS Portsmouth Naval Shipyard | Kittery, ME |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Consolidation of Structural Shops | $2,000 | Shea-Porter (NH) | NSS Portsmouth Naval Shipyard | Kittery, ME |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Drydock 2 STBD Waterfront Facility | $850 | Abercrombie (HI) | Naval Station Pearl Harbor | Pearl Harbor, HI |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Drydock 2 STBD Waterfront Facility | $850 | Hirono (HI) | Naval Station Pearl Harbor | Pearl Harbor, HI |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Electromagnetic Research & Engineering Facility, Phase 2 | $3,660 | Wittman (VA) | Naval Support Activity South Potomac | Dahlgren, VA |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Fitness Center | $26,360 | Crenshaw (FL) | Naval Station Mayport | Jacksonville, FL |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Gate 2 Security Improvements (AT/FP) | $7,090 | Hodes (NH) | NSS Portsmouth Naval Shipyard | Kittery, ME |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Gate 2 Security Improvements (AT/FP) | $7,090 | Pingree (ME) | NSS Portsmouth Naval Shipyard | Kittery, ME |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Gate 2 Security Improvements (AT/FP) | $7,090 | Shea-Porter (NH) | NSS Portsmouth Naval Shipyard | Kittery, ME |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Joint Diver A-School Dormitory | $520 | Boyd (FL) | Naval Support Activity Panama City | Panama City, FL |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Marine Meteorology Center | $10,240 | Farr (CA) | Naval Support Detachment | Monterey, CA |
| XXIII | MCN | | | MK-48 Torpedo Magazine | $6,570 | Courtney (CT) | Naval Sub Base New London | Groton, CT |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Mountain Warfare Training Commissary | $6,830 | McKeon (CA) | Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training | Bridgeport, CA |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Ordnance Storage Pads with 2 Covers | $13,130 | Dicks (WA) | Naval Magazine Indian Island | Port Townsend, WA |
| XXIII | MCN | | | RDT&E Support Facility Phase 2 | $6,520 | Van Hollen (MD) | Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock | West Bethesda, MD |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Renovate Perry Hall | $8,530 | Kennedy (RI) | Newport Naval Station | Newport, RI |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Small Craft Launch | $3,810 | Larsen (WA) | Naval Station Everett | Everett, WA |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Solar Panel Array | $4,470 | Ortiz (TX) | Kingsville Naval Air Station | Delray Beach, FL |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXIII | MCN | | | Special Communications Requirements Engineering Facility | $11,043 | Hoyer (MD) | Naval Air Station Patuxent River | Patuxent River, MD |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Strategic Weapons System Engineering | $510 | Ellsworth (IN) | Naval Support Activity Crane (N61018) | Crane, IN |
| XXIII | MCN | | | Weapons Maintenance Hardstand Facility | $4,870 | Bishop (GA) | Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany | Albany, GA |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Add to Space RDT&E Operations Center | $5,800 | Heinrich (NM) | Kirtland Air Force Base | Albuquerque, NM |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Add/Alter USAFCENT Headquarters (Current Mission) | $21,183 | Spratt (SC) | Shaw Air Force Base | Shaw Air Force Base, SC |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Aeromedical Evacuation Facility | $7,400 | Costello (IL) | Scott Air Force Base | Scott AFB, IL |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Air Traffic Control Complex | $1,710 | Pomeroy (ND) | Minot Air Force Base | Minot, ND |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Civil Engineer Maintenance Complex | $690 | Simpson (ID) | Mountain Home Air Force Base | Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Consolidated Communications Facility | $21,000 | Young (FL) | MacDill Air Force Base | MacDill Air Force Base, FL |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Consolidated Parking Area, Phase 1 | $8,000 | Loretta Sanchez (CA) | Los Angeles Air Force Base | El Segundo, CA |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Construct Hot Cargo Pad/Taxiway | $6,200 | Marshall (GA) | Warner Robins Air Logistics Center | Warner Robins, GA |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Construct Physical Fitness Center | $930 | Edwards (MD) | Andrews Air Force Base | Andrews Air Force Base, MD |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Construct Postal Service Center | $3,500 | Bordallo (GU) | Andersen Air Force Base, Guam | Yigo, GU |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Dormitory (96 rm) | $450 | Lujan (NM) | Cannon Air Force Base | Clovis, NM |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | East Gate Realignment | $7,200 | Lamborn (CO) | Peterson Air Force Base | Peterson Air Force Base, CO |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Explosive Ordnance Operations Complex | $7,400 | Skelton (MO) | Whiteman Air Force Base | Whiteman AFB, MO |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Fire/Crash Rescue Station | $10,400 | Teague (NM) | Holloman Air Force Base | Holloman AFB, NM |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Flight Test Operations Facility (413 FLTS) | $9,400 | Miller (FL) | Hurlburt Air Force Base | Hurlburt Air Force Base, FL |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars in Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Ground Control Tower | $4,000 | Abercrombie (HI) | Hickam Air Force Base | Hickam Air Force Base, HI |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Land Aquisition North and South Boundries | $5,500 | Skelton (MO) | Whiteman Air Force Base | Whiteman Air Force Base, MO |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | MacDill Mission Support Facility | $384 | Castor (FL) | MacDill Air Force Base | Tampa, FL |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | PCC Apron NW End Taxiway A | $5,100 | Bishop (UT) | Hill Air Force Base | Clearfield, VA |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Radar Approach Control (RAPCON) Complex Phase 1 | $6,900 | Jones (NC) | Seymour Johnson Air Force Base | Goldsboro, NC |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Replace West Ramp, Phase 2 (TFI) | $10,600 | Turner (OH) | Wright Patterson Air Force Base | Dayton, OH |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Security Forces Operations Facility | $10,400 | Snyder (AR) | Little Rock Air Force Base | Jacksonville, AR |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | T-9 Noise Suppressor Support | $5,100 | Fallin (OK) | Tinker Air Force Base | Tinker AFB, OK |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Taxiway Mike Bypass Road | $6,000 | Tauscher (CA) | Travis Air Force Base | Travis Air Force Base, CA |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | TFI Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Facility | $4,150 | McMorris Rodgers (WA) | Fairchild Air Force Base | Spokane, WA |
| XXIII | MCAF | | | Warfighter and Family Support Center | $7,900 | Adler (NJ) | McGuire Air Force Base | McGuire Air Force Base, NJ |
| XXIV | MCDW | | | SOF Cafeteria | $6,100 | Nye (VA) | Dam Neck | Dam Neck, VA |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Add/Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shops | $7,900 | Gonzalez (TX) | Kelly Field Annex | San Antonio, TX |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Add/Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shops | $7,900 | Rodriguez (TX) | Kelly Field Annex | San Antonio, TX |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Alter Building 659 for STARBASE | $1,900 | Ellison (MN) | Minneapolis St.Paul Intl Airport - 133rd Airlift Wing | Minneapolis, MN |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Construct New Supply Warehouse | $1,000 | Space (OH) | Zanesville Air National Guard Station | Zanesville, OH |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Contingency Response Group Facility | $600 | Yarmuth (KY) | Standiford Field | Standiford Field, KY |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | F-15 Aircraft Ready Shelter | $8,100 | Olver (MA) | Barnes Municipal Airport | Westfield, MA |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Force Protection Measures – Relocate Base Entrance | $6,500 | Taylor (MS) | Gulfport - Biloxi Regional Airport | Gulfport, MS |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Joint Forces Operations Center - ANG Share | $1,500 | Tierney (MA) | Hanscom Air Force Base | Hanscom Air Force Base, MA |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Joint Forces Operations Center - ANG Share | $1,500 | Tsongas (MA) | Hanscom AFB | Bedford, MA |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Joint-Use Armed Forces Reserve Center | $1,300 | Wilson (SC) | McEntire Joint National Guard Base | Eastover, SC |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Multi-use Instructional Facility | $2,000 | Kaptur (OH) | 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport | Swanton, OH |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Munitions Administration Facility | $1,700 | LoBiondo (NJ) | Atlantic City International Airport | Egg Harbor Township, NJ |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Security Improvements-Relocate Base Entrance | $3,000 | Hare (IL) | Lincoln Capital Airport | Springfield, IL |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | Security Improvements-Relocate Base Entrance | $3,000 | Shimkus (IL) | Lincoln Capital Airport | Springfield, IL |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | TFI - CNAF Beddown - Upgrade Facilities | $9,000 | Courtney (CT) | Bradley International Airport | Windsor Locks, CT |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | TFI - CNAF Beddown - Upgrade Facilities | $9,000 | DeLauro (CT) | Bradley International Airport | Windsor Locks, CT |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | TFI - CNAF Beddown - Upgrade Facilities | $9,000 | Himes (CT) | Bradley International Airport | Windsor Locks, CT |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | TFI - CNAF Beddown - Upgrade Facilities | $9,000 | Larson (CT) | Bradley International Airport | Windsor Locks, CT |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | TFI - CNAF Beddown - Upgrade Facilities | $9,000 | Murphy (CT) | Bradley International Airport | Windsor Locks, CT |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | TFI - Reaper LRE Beddown | $2,700 | Maffei (NY) | Fort Drum Military Reservation | Fort Drum Military Reservation, NY |
| XXVII | MCANG | | | TFI - Upgrade DCGS Facilities | $8,700 | Tiahrt (KS) | McConnell Air Force Base | Wichita, KS |
| XXVII | MCAR | | | Army Reserve Center | $12,200 | Edwards (TX) | Moore Memorial USARC | Bryan, TX |
| XXVII | MCAR | | | Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility | $10,200 | Ortiz (TX) | Robstown | Robstown, TX |
| XXVII | MCNR | | | Replace Joint Base Communications Building | $6,170 | Granger (TX) | Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth | Fort Worth, TX |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | New Shoothouse | $2,000 | Ryan (OH) | Ravenna Training and Logistics Site | Columbus, OH |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Add/Alt Davenport Army Aviation Support Facility | $2,000 | Braley (IA) | Davenport AASF | Davenport, IA |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Add/Alt KC-135 Corrosion Control Hangar | $5,000 | Moore (WI) | General Mitchell International Airport | Milwaukee, WI |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Add/Alt Readiness Center | $2,516 | Shuler (NC) | East Flatrock Armory | East Flat Rock, NC |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Add/Alt Troop Medical Facility | $1,750 | Rehberg (MT) | Fort Harrison | Fort Harrison, MT |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Add/Alter Munitions Maintenance Complex, Buildings 83 and 84 | $1,300 | Herseth (SD) | Joe Foss Field | Sioux Falls, SD |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Barracks Replacement Phase Two | $440 | Stupak (MI) | Camp Grayling Joint Maneuver Training Center | Camp Grayling, MI |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Construction of New Joint Operations Center | $2,000 | Kilroy (OH) | Beightler Armory | Columbus, OH |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | CST Ready Building | $727 | Berkley (NV) | Las Vegas Readiness Center | Las Vegas, NV |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | CST Ready Building | $727 | Titus (NV) | Las Vegas Readiness Center | Las Vegas, NV |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Ethan Allen Firing Range BOQ Add/Alt | $1,996 | Welch (VT) | Ethan Allen Range | Jericho, VT |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Fairfield Field Maintenance Shop Add/Alt | $2,000 | Loebsack (IA) | Fairfield | Fairfield, IA |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Field Maintenance Shop Parkersburg | $967 | Mollohan (WV) | Adjutant General | Charleston, WV |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Freedom Center Motor Vehicle Storage Building | $1,963 | Boswell (IA) | Freedom Center Armory-Camp Dodge | Johnston, IA |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Iowa Falls Readiness Center Add/Alt | $2,000 | Latham (IA) | Iowa Falls | Iowa Falls, IA |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Joint Forces Headquarters | $334 | Chandler (KY) | Frankfort | Frankfort, KY |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Luzerne/Wyoming County Readiness Center | $924 | Carney (PA) | Luzerne/Wyoming County | West Pittston, PA |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Organizational Maintenance Shop (AORS) | $7,732 | Schauer (MI) | Fort Custer | Augusta, MI |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Parkersburg Readiness Center | $2,234 | Mollohan (WV) | Adjutant General | Charleston, WV |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Phase IV Aviation Operation Facility | $1,805 | Rogers (KY) | London Joint Readiness Center | London, KY |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Polk County Rediness Center | $12,100 | Schrader (OR) | Oregon Military Department | Dallas, OR |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Readiness Center (JFHQ-HIARNG) | $5,446 | Abercrombie (HI) | Joint Forces Headquarters | Honolulu, HI |

## COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULES XXI

(Dollars In Thousands)

| TITLE | ACCT | PE OR PROJECT | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER | INTENDED RECIPIENT | INTENDED LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Readiness Center-Hunter | $8,967 | Kingston (GA) | Hunter Army Aviation Facility, Hunter Army Airfield | Savannah, GA |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Readiness Center-Hunter | $8,967 | Marshall (GA) | Hunter Army Aviation Facility, Hunter Army Airfield | Savannah, GA |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Readiness Center-Logan/Mingo | $501 | Rahall (WV) | 1/150th Armored Reconnaissance Squadron | Logan, WV |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Readiness Center-West Memphis | $1,240 | Berry (AR) | West Memphis | West Memphis, AR |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Tactical Unmanned Aerial System Support Facility | $6,038 | Kissell (NC) | Fort Bragg | Raleigh, NC |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Tactical Unmanned Aerial System Support Facility | $6,038 | McIntyre (NC) | Fort Bragg | Raleigh, NC |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Urban Assault Course | $1,669 | Pierluisi (PR) | Camp Santiago | Salinas, PR |
| XXVII | MCARNG | | | Water Supply System | $368 | Wu (OR) | Camp Rilea | Camp Rilea, OR |
| XXVII | MCAFR | | | Indoor Small Arms Range | $5,700 | Lee (NY) | Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station | Niagara Falls, NY |
| XXVII | MCAFR | | | Indoor Small Arms Range | $5,700 | Slaughter (NY) | Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station | Niagara Falls, NY |
| XXVII | MCAFR | | | Small Arms Firing Range | $9,800 | Calvert (CA) | March Air Reserve Base | Riverside, CA |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | National Ignition Campaign | $22,000 | Tauscher (CA) | Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC | Livermore, CA |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities - Operations of Facilities | $15,000 | Wamp (TN) | B&W Y-12 National Security Complex | Oak Ridge, TN |

## 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)(2) 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, this legislation would address several general and outcome-related performance goals and objectives. The general goal and objective of this legislation is to provide the necessary resources and authorities to restore military readiness, take care of service members and their families, focus on our strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan and on redeployment from Iraq, eliminate waste and recover savings through acquisition reform, and maintain robust oversight of the Department of Defense, all of which further the national security interests of the United States.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of restoring military readiness and reducing strategic risk, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Address manpower needs with an increase of 15,000 personnel in the Army, 8,000 in the Marine Corps, 14,650 in the Air Force, and 2,477 in the Navy in 2010. This would bring end strength levels to 547,400 for the Army, 202,000 for the Marine Corps, 331,700 for the Air Force, and 328,800 for the Navy;

(2) Authorize $11 billion for the Army and $2 billion for the Marine Corps to fully fund equipment reset requirements; and

(3) Authorize $6.9 billion to address equipment shortfalls in the National Guard and Reserves; and

(4) Provide $762 million to fully fund Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization accounts to keep defense facilities in good working order and to address urgent issues such as dilapidated military barracks.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of taking care of service members and their families, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide a 3.4 percent across the board pay raise for our men and women in uniform. The raise would reduce the pay gap between the military and private sector pay to 2.4 percent;

(2) Expand TRICARE health coverage to reserve component members and their families for 180 days prior to mobilization;

(3) Improve benefits available to wounded warriors by providing travel and transportation for three designated persons

to visit hospitalized service members and enabling seriously injured service members to use a non-medical attendant for help with daily living or during travel for medical treatment; and

(4) Meet the needs of today's service members and their families by providing $2.1 billion for family support programs, providing $1.95 billion for family housing programs, providing $50 million for Impact Aid for local education agencies and an additional $15 million for schools heavily impacted by force structure changes and BRAC, and establishing an internship pilot program for military spouses.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of increasing focus on our strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan and on redeployment from Iraq, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Ensure our strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan is effective and achieves the intended goals by requiring the President to assess U.S. efforts and report on progress;

(2) Build partnership capacity by providing funds to train and equip the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) and authorizing the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund to improve the counterinsurgency capabilities of Pakistan's security forces;

(3) Improve accountability and oversight of U.S. assistance by requiring the President to establish a system to register and track all U.S. defense articles provided to the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan;

(4) Ensure our plans to redeploy forces from Iraq and build up forces in Afghanistan are sound by requiring the Department of Defense to report on its efforts to prioritize resources and capabilities between Iraq and Afghanistan; and

(5) Help Congress monitor the redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq by requiring the Department of Defense to develop a detailed plan for the disposition of U.S. military equipment in Iraq.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of eliminating waste and recovering savings through acquisition reform, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Support the Secretary of Defense's plan to increase the size of the civilian acquisition workforce and to reduce the Department of Defense's reliance on contractors for critical acquisition functions; and

(2) Improve the Department of Defense's process for acquiring new information technology systems.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of maintaining robust oversight of the Department of Defense, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Encourage the Department of Defense to follow the requirements written in law as it prepares the report of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), which was established to help Congress develop our national security priorities;

(2) Direct the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assess the degree to which the Department of Defense has complied with the requirements written in the law creating the QDR and to require the Secretary of Defense to report on any shortcomings;

(3) Create a Congressionally-appointed National Defense Panel to conduct an independent review of the QDR's effective-

ness and issue recommendations on how to improve the decision making process for determining national security objectives; and

(4) Require the Department of Defense to report to Congress on the force structure requirements used to guide the QDR process so that Congress may better understand the foundation of the QDR's analysis.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to rule XIII, clause 3(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

## 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.

## RECORD 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. 2647. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 2647 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 61–0, a quorum being present.

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 111TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment # 110** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Substitute to Turner #90R - Sense of Congress support for protecting US against ballistic missiles** **Offered by: Mr. Andrews**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | | x | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | | x | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | | x | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | | x | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | x | | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | x | | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sanchez | x | | | Mr. LoBiondo | | x | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | | x | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | | x | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | | x | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | x | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | | x | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | x | | | Dr. Fleming | | x | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **Ayes 35** **Noes 27** **Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**111TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 122** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Policy on Ballistic Missile Defense System to protect US and allies** **Offered by: Mr. Franks**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | | x | | Mr. McKeon | x | | |
| Mr. Spratt | | x | | Mr. Bartlett | x | | |
| Mr. Ortiz | | x | | Mr. Thornberry | x | | |
| Mr. Taylor | | x | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | | x | | Mr. Akin | x | | |
| Mr. Reyes | | x | | Mr. Forbes | x | | |
| Dr. Snyder | | x | | Mr. Miller | x | | |
| Mr. Smith | | x | | Mr. Wilson | x | | |
| Ms. Sanchez | | x | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | | x | | Mr. Bishop | x | | |
| Ms. Tauscher | | x | | Mr. Turner | x | | |
| Mr. Brady | | x | | Mr. Kline | x | | |
| Mr. Andrews | | | | Mr. Rogers | x | | |
| Mrs. Davis | | x | | Mr. Franks | x | | |
| Mr. Langevin | | x | | Mr. Shuster | x | | |
| Mr. Larsen | | x | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | x | | |
| Mr. Cooper | | x | | Mr. Conaway | x | | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | x | | |
| Ms. Bordallo | | x | | Mr. Wittman | x | | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | | x | | Ms. Fallin | x | | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | | x | | Mr. Hunter | x | | |
| Mr. Johnson | | x | | Dr. Fleming | x | | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | | x | | Mr. Coffman | x | | |
| Mr. Courtney | | x | | Mr. Rooney | x | | |
| Mr. Loebsack | | x | | Mr. Platts | x | | |
| Mr. Sestak | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | | x | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **27 Ayes 34 Noes** **Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**111TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 122 reconsidered** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Policy on Ballistic Missile Defense System to protect US and allies** **Offered by: Mr. Franks**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | | x | | Mr. McKeon | x | | |
| Mr. Spratt | | x | | Mr. Bartlett | x | | |
| Mr. Ortiz | | x | | Mr. Thornberry | x | | |
| Mr. Taylor | | x | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | | x | | Mr. Akin | x | | |
| Mr. Reyes | | x | | Mr. Forbes | x | | |
| Dr. Snyder | | x | | Mr. Miller | x | | |
| Mr. Smith | | x | | Mr. Wilson | x | | |
| Ms. Sanchez | | x | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | | x | | Mr. Bishop | x | | |
| Ms. Tauscher | | x | | Mr. Turner | x | | |
| Mr. Brady | | x | | Mr. Kline | x | | |
| Mr. Andrews | | x | | Mr. Rogers | x | | |
| Mrs. Davis | | x | | Mr. Franks | x | | |
| Mr. Langevin | | x | | Mr. Shuster | x | | |
| Mr. Larsen | | x | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | x | | |
| Mr. Cooper | | x | | Mr. Conaway | x | | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | x | | |
| Ms. Bordallo | | x | | Mr. Wittman | x | | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | | x | | Ms. Fallin | x | | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | | x | | Mr. Hunter | x | | |
| Mr. Johnson | | x | | Dr. Fleming | x | | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | | x | | Mr. Coffman | x | | |
| Mr. Courtney | | x | | Mr. Rooney | x | | |
| Mr. Loebsack | | x | | Mr. Platts | x | | |
| Mr. Sestak | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | | x | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **26 Ayes 36 Noes** **Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 111TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment # 124** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Substitute to Turner #89R - availability of funds for a missile defense system for Europe and US** **Offered by: Mr. Larsen**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | | x | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | | x | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | | x | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | | x | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | x | | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | x | | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sanchez | x | | | Mr. LoBiondo | | x | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | | x | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | | x | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | | x | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | x | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | | x | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | x | | | Dr. Fleming | | x | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **36 Ayes 26 Noes** **Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**111TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 120** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Increase RDTE by $237 million for Airborne Laser (ABL) program** **Offered by: Mr. Franks**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | | x | | Mr. McKeon | x | | |
| Mr. Spratt | | x | | Mr. Bartlett | x | | |
| Mr. Ortiz | | x | | Mr. Thornberry | x | | |
| Mr. Taylor | | x | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | | x | | Mr. Akin | x | | |
| Mr. Reyes | | x | | Mr. Forbes | x | | |
| Dr. Snyder | | x | | Mr. Miller | x | | |
| Mr. Smith | | x | | Mr. Wilson | x | | |
| Ms. Sanchez | | x | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | | x | | Mr. Bishop | x | | |
| Ms. Tauscher | | x | | Mr. Turner | x | | |
| Mr. Brady | | x | | Mr. Kline | x | | |
| Mr. Andrews | | x | | Mr. Rogers | x | | |
| Mrs. Davis | | x | | Mr. Franks | x | | |
| Mr. Langevin | | x | | Mr. Shuster | x | | |
| Mr. Larsen | | x | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | x | | |
| Mr. Cooper | | x | | Mr. Conaway | x | | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | x | | |
| Ms. Bordallo | | x | | Mr. Wittman | x | | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | | x | | Ms. Fallin | x | | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | | x | | Mr. Hunter | x | | |
| Mr. Johnson | | x | | Dr. Fleming | x | | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | | x | | Mr. Coffman | x | | |
| Mr. Courtney | | x | | Mr. Rooney | x | | |
| Mr. Loebsack | | x | | Mr. Platts | x | | |
| Mr. Sestak | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | | x | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **27 Ayes 35 Noes** **Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 111TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment # 1R** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Prohibition on outlying landing field at Hale's Lake, NC** **Offered by: Mr. Jones**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | x | | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | x | | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | | | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | | x | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | | x | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sanchez | | | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | | | x |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | x | | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | | | | Mr. Shuster | | | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | | |
| Mr. Cooper | | | x | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | | x | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | | | | Dr. Fleming | | | x |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | | x | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | | | x | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | | x | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **29 Ayes 21 Noes 6 Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**111TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 14** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Increase military construction authorization for Mayport NS, FL for dredging** **Offered by: Mr. Rooney**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | | x | | Mr. McKeon | x | | |
| Mr. Spratt | | x | | Mr. Bartlett | x | | |
| Mr. Ortiz | | x | | Mr. Thornberry | x | | |
| Mr. Taylor | | x | | Mr. Jones | | x | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | | x | | Mr. Akin | x | | |
| Mr. Reyes | | x | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | | x | | Mr. Miller | x | | |
| Mr. Smith | | x | | Mr. Wilson | x | | |
| Ms. Sanchez | | x | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | | x | | Mr. Bishop | x | | |
| Ms. Tauscher | | x | | Mr. Turner | x | | |
| Mr. Brady | | x | | Mr. Kline | x | | |
| Mr. Andrews | | x | | Mr. Rogers | x | | |
| Mrs. Davis | | x | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | | x | | Mr. Shuster | x | | |
| Mr. Larsen | | x | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | x | | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | x | | |
| Mr. Marshall | | x | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | | x | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | | x | | Ms. Fallin | x | | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | | x | | Mr. Hunter | x | | |
| Mr. Johnson | | x | | Dr. Fleming | x | | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | | x | | Mr. Coffman | x | | |
| Mr. Courtney | | x | | Mr. Rooney | x | | |
| Mr. Loebsack | | x | | Mr. Platts | x | | |
| Mr. Sestak | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | | | x | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | | x | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **21 Ayes 40 Noes 1 Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 111TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment # 78R2** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Amend section 2833 prevailing wage requirements applicable to military construction on Guam** **Offered by: Mr. Abercrombie**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | | x | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | | x | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | | x | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | | x | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | | x | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sánchez | | x | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | | x | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | | x | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | | x | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | x | |
| Mr. Cooper | | x | | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | | x | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | x | | | Dr. Fleming | | x | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **32 Ayes 30 Noes** **Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 111TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment:** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Motion to table motion to appeal Chair's ruling on Wilson amendment #31** **Offered by: Dr. Snyder**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | | x | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | | x | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | | x | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | | x | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | x | | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | x | | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sanchez | x | | | Mr. LoBiondo | | x | |
| Mr. McIntyre | | x | | Mr. Bishop | | x | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | | x | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | | x | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | x | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | x | | | Dr. Fleming | | x | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **35 Ayes 26 Noes** **Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**111TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment #** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Motion to table motion to appeal Chair's ruling on Wilson amendment #32** **Offered by: Dr. Snyder**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | | x | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | | x | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | x | | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | x | | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | x | | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sanchez | x | | | Mr. LoBiondo | | x | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | | x | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | | x | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | | x | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | x | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | x | | | Dr. Fleming | | x | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **39 Ayes 23 Noes** **Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**111TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment # 140** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Substitute to Forbes 43R2 - limits funds for transfer or release of individuals at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba** **Offered by: Mr. Skelton**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | | x | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | | x | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | | x | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | | x | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | x | | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | x | | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sanchez | x | | | Mr. LoBiondo | | x | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | | x | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | | x | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | | x | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | x | | | Dr. Fleming | | x | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **35 Ayes 25 Noes** **Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 111TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment # 143** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Substitute to Forbes** **Offered by: Mr. Andrews**
**42R2 - compliance w/ requirement for plan on disposition of detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | | x | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | | x | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | | x | |
| Mr. Taylor | | x | | Mr. Jones | | x | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | | x | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | | x | |
| Dr. Snyder | x | | | Mr. Miller | | x | |
| Mr. Smith | x | | | Mr. Wilson | | x | |
| Ms. Sanchez | x | | | Mr. LoBiondo | | x | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | | x | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | | x | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | | x | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | | x | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | | x | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | | x | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | | x | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | | x | |
| Mr. Marshall | | x | | Mr. Lamborn | | x | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | | x | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | | x | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | | x | |
| Mr. Johnson | x | | | Dr. Fleming | | x | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | | x | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | | x | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | | x | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | | x | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **32 Ayes 29 Noes** **Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 111TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment # 121R** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Increase aircraft procurement, AF, by $368,800,000 for advance procurement for F-22 fighter aircraft** **Offered by: Mr. Bishop**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | | x | | Mr. McKeon | x | | |
| Mr. Spratt | | x | | Mr. Bartlett | x | | |
| Mr. Ortiz | | x | | Mr. Thornberry | x | | |
| Mr. Taylor | | x | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | | x | | Mr. Akin | x | | |
| Mr. Reyes | | x | | Mr. Forbes | x | | |
| Dr. Snyder | | x | | Mr. Miller | x | | |
| Mr. Smith | | x | | Mr. Wilson | x | | |
| Ms. Sanchez | | | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | x | | |
| Ms. Tauscher | | x | | Mr. Turner | x | | |
| Mr. Brady | | x | | Mr. Kline | x | | |
| Mr. Andrews | | x | | Mr. Rogers | x | | |
| Mrs. Davis | | x | | Mr. Franks | x | | |
| Mr. Langevin | | x | | Mr. Shuster | x | | |
| Mr. Larsen | | x | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | x | | |
| Mr. Cooper | | x | | Mr. Conaway | x | | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | x | | |
| Ms. Bordallo | | x | | Mr. Wittman | x | | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | | x | | Ms. Fallin | x | | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | | x | | Mr. Hunter | x | | |
| Mr. Johnson | | x | | Dr. Fleming | x | | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | | x | | Mr. Coffman | x | | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | x | | |
| Mr. Loebsack | | x | | Mr. Platts | x | | |
| Mr. Sestak | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | | x | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | | x | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | | x | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **31 Ayes 30 Noes** **Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**111TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment #** **Date: June 16, 2009**

**Description:** **Final passage of H.R. 2647 and order to be reported, as amended**

| Rep. | Aye | No | Present | Rep. | Aye | No | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Skelton | x | | | Mr. McKeon | x | | |
| Mr. Spratt | x | | | Mr. Bartlett | x | | |
| Mr. Ortiz | x | | | Mr. Thornberry | x | | |
| Mr. Taylor | x | | | Mr. Jones | x | | |
| Mr. Abercrombie | x | | | Mr. Akin | x | | |
| Mr. Reyes | x | | | Mr. Forbes | x | | |
| Dr. Snyder | x | | | Mr. Miller | x | | |
| Mr. Smith | x | | | Mr. Wilson | x | | |
| Ms. Sanchez | x | | | Mr. LoBiondo | x | | |
| Mr. McIntyre | x | | | Mr. Bishop | x | | |
| Ms. Tauscher | x | | | Mr. Turner | x | | |
| Mr. Brady | x | | | Mr. Kline | x | | |
| Mr. Andrews | x | | | Mr. Rogers | x | | |
| Mrs. Davis | x | | | Mr. Franks | x | | |
| Mr. Langevin | x | | | Mr. Shuster | x | | |
| Mr. Larsen | x | | | Mrs. McMorris Rodgers | x | | |
| Mr. Cooper | x | | | Mr. Conaway | x | | |
| Mr. Marshall | x | | | Mr. Lamborn | x | | |
| Ms. Bordallo | x | | | Mr. Wittman | x | | |
| Mr. Ellsworth | x | | | Ms. Fallin | x | | |
| Mr. Murphy (PA) | x | | | Mr. Hunter | x | | |
| Mr. Johnson | | | | Dr. Fleming | x | | |
| Ms. Shea-Porter | x | | | Mr. Coffman | x | | |
| Mr. Courtney | x | | | Mr. Rooney | x | | |
| Mr. Loebsack | x | | | Mr. Platts | x | | |
| Mr. Sestak | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Giffords | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Tsongas | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Nye | x | | | | | | |
| Ms. Pingree | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kissell | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Heinrich | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Kratovil | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Massa | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Bright | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Murphy (NY) | x | | | | | | |
| Mr. Boren | x | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:** **61 Ayes** **Noes** **Present**

# 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

We support H.R. 2647, but write to express our concern about the reduction of $368.8 million from Department of Energy Defense Environmental Cleanup accounts approved during full committee consideration of the draft bill.

This reduction resulted from an amendment offered by Mr. Bishop that used Environmental Management (EM) program funding to offset another activity. An assertion was made during the debate on the amendment that the Department of Energy will be unable to execute American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (or "stimulus") funding. The argument was based on information indicating that $2.8 billion of EM's stimulus funds remained unobligated as of May 2009. We disagree with the premise of that argument.

In fact, the ability of the EM program to obligate over half of its stimulus funding in only three months is strong evidence that the balance of the stimulus funds will be obligated within the next few months.

The Department of Energy should be applauded for acting so quickly to obligate and execute their stimulus funding to meet validated cleanup requirements. By so doing, the EM program is accomplishing what the stimulus bill enabled it to accomplish.

We would also like to rebut an additional assertion made during the course of the debate on the amendment: that the $369 million cut taken by the amendment is no different than an adjustment made by the Strategic Forces subcommittee mark. The subcommittee mark, which included a modest reduction to Defense Environmental Cleanup, was based on a thorough review of the budget request for fiscal year 2010 and stimulus funds. We found that there is very limited overlap between activities funded by the stimulus and those to be funded by the fiscal year 2010 request. The mark had only a modest reduction to Defense Environmental Cleanup, because deeper cuts, such as those made by the Bishop amendment, will jeopardize the high priority cleanup activities funded by the FY10 request.

We believe that it is our legal and moral obligation to clean up the legacy of environmental contamination left behind from the Cold War, and we are optimistic about the progress that may result from a robustly funded cleanup program in the future.

RICK LARSEN.
JAMES R. LANGEVIN.
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO.
BRAD ELLSWORTH.
LARRY KISSELL.
CHELLIE PINGREE.
JOE SESTAK.
HANK JOHNSON.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.

MARTIN HEINRICH.
NIKI TSONGAS.
SUSAN A. DAVIS.
JIM COOPER.
JOHN SPRATT.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
ADAM SMITH.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
ROBERT ANDREWS.
GENE TAYLOR.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We support H.R. 2647 and feel that it reflects our committee's strong and continued support for the brave men and women of the United States armed forces. In many ways, this bill is a good bill. It authorizes the President's request for $550.5 billion for the Fiscal Year 2010 base budget of the Department of Defense and national security programs of the Department of Energy. Additionally, it includes $130 billion to fund Fiscal Year 2010 war costs.

As proud as we are of this legislation, we also recognize that this bill is not a perfect bill.

*Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan*

In regards to Afghanistan, it acknowledges that the United States has a vital national security interest in ensuring that Afghanistan does not once again become a safe haven to terrorists, supports a comprehensive counterinsurgency strategy that is adequately resourced and funded by Congress, and calls on the President to provide our U.S. military commanders with the military forces they request to succeed. With regard to Pakistan, the bill provides for necessary and prudent oversight of the transfer of funds from the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund of the Department of State to the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund of the Department of Defense to ensure the Commander, U.S. Central Command has the tools and flexibility needed to assist Pakistan's security forces in building their counterinsurgency capabilities and to respond to emerging requirements in a timely manner. In Iraq, the committee ensures that the Congress will support a responsible redeployment of combat forces while providing our Commanders on the ground the flexibility to hold hard fought security gains and ensure the safety of our forces.

*Top line defense spending*

We are concerned that the President's Budget did not adequately increase defense spending. After taking into account the migration into the base budget of items previously funded in the supplemental the net effect is less than 2% real growth. As a result, the committee had limited headroom in which to address many of the programmatic cuts that accompanied Secretary Gates' so-called "reform budget." While the committee included a number of measures in the mark that redress some of the shortcomings found in the Administration's request, including adopting an amendment which authorized much of the Army and Marine Corps Unfunded Requirements, we question some of the spending priorities of the committee. Most notably, this committee provides for an additional $402.6 million above the President's Budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA's) defense nuclear nonproliferation program which was already increased from the

previous year's request. We are concerned that this funding was provided without a formal request by the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator of NNSA and without an integrated, interagency plan for securing nuclear materials. We will carefully monitor NNSA's execution of these funds in the coming year.

*Missile defense*

We believe that such additional funding could have been used to address other priorities such as missile defense. Congress, and particularly the Armed Services Committees in both chambers, has the unmistakable obligation to ensure that the Department of Defense develops and deploys defensive capabilities that protect the American people, our forward-deployed forces, and our allies. This includes promising programs in the area of missile defense.

On the same day in which President Obama acknowledged that a nuclear-armed North Korea posed a "grave threat" to the world, the committee chose to sustain the Administration's $1.2 billion cut to missile defense. In a year where Iran and North Korea have demonstrated the capability and intent to pursue long-range ballistic missiles and nuclear weapon programs, and a track record for widespread proliferation—elements of a genuine national security threat—the committee endorsed reductions to capabilities that would provide a comprehensive missile defense system to protect the U.S. homeland, our forward-deployed troops, and allies.

The committee sustained the Administration's 35% reduction to the Ground-based Midcourse Defense program. This national missile defense system, located in Alaska and California, is designed to protect the U.S. homeland from long-range ballistic missiles fired either in anger or by accident. We are deeply disappointed that the committee rejected an amendment to restore funding to the program. The amendment provided a modest increase of funds to complete a partially constructed missile interceptor field in Alaska where all the equipment had already been purchased. It sought to pay for this program with funds set aside to dismantle North Korea's nuclear program. After witnessing Kim Jong Il walk away from the Six-Party talks, kick out U.S. and International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors, and vow to be recognized as a nuclear weapons state, it is unrealistic to expect that there will be any dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear program within the fiscal year. We believe that those resources could have been better spent on real, near-term capabilities to protect the United States. Should progress be made in negotiations with North Korea such that dismantling their nuclear complex becomes possible, funds could be reprogrammed at that time.

It is equally troubling that the committee did not enact amendments to reverse the Administration's decision to reduce and terminate pioneering missile defense programs like the Airborne Laser, Kinetic Energy Interceptor, Multiple Kill Vehicle, and Space Tracking and Surveillance System, or restore their funding. The Department of Defense has yet to deliver to the committee any analysis or new requirements to justify these sweeping decisions. Furthermore, we cannot reconcile the simple fact that as the missile threat is increasing—substantiated by our own intelligence agencies—funding for our missile defense capabilities is decreasing.

The committee supported increased funding for theater missile defenses, which are important capabilities in protecting our forward-deployed troops and allies from shorter-range missiles. However, with a net $1.2 billion cut, we have been forced to trade national missile defense for more theater missile defense. Setting up such a false choice between the defense of our homeland and defense of our forward-deployed troops and allies is neither smart nor sound policy. Both are necessary and both could have been adequately funded without such deep cuts.

*Allies and partners: building collective security*

We commend the inclusion of provisions taken from the bipartisan NATO FIRST bill that was introduced earlier in the year by Representatives Turner and Marshall. A strong commitment to transatlantic security is necessary as the Administration engages in a reset policy with Russia. We regret that the committee did not adopt the Administration's proposals relating to building the capacity of partners in order to increase coalition partner nation participation in Afghanistan. These proposals are necessary to be able to quickly implement the new Afghanistan policy. Without these authorities we miss an opportunity to reduce the burden on our deployed forces in Afghanistan.

We are pleased the committee endorsed an amendment that sought to increase support for a European missile defense system proposed to be located in the Czech Republic and Poland. As the amendment noted, "Missile defense promotes the collective security of the United States and NATO and improves linkages among member nations of NATO by defending all members of NATO against the full range of missile threats." Though the committee rejected authorizing additional resources, it did support the creation of a framework to evaluate alternatives, should they be pursued by the Administration. However, we would note that based on independent analysis requested by the committee, we have seen no alternative that provides a more cost-effective and operationally available solution to protect the U.S. and Europe than the current proposal.

We appreciate the Chairman's commitment to work with us to address an amendment that would establish binding legislation to ensure that any treaty or agreement with Russia that seeks bilateral reductions in our strategic nuclear forces does not include limitations on U.S. missile defenses, space, or advanced conventional weapons capabilities. These important conventional capabilities continue to remain vital to our military forces and the defense of the American people and our allies, and are not collateral for U.S. negotiators to trade away to persuade Russia to reduce its nuclear forces.

*Major weapons programs*

H.R. 2647 makes a number of policy and funding decisions with respect to major weapons programs. We had concerns about the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program and the relief that was being provided to the cost cap in the subcommittee mark. Current law caps LCS end costs at $460 million per vessel, beginning in fiscal year 2010, with the fifth and follow-on ships. The committee has

now raised the cap or delayed implementation of the cap for three years in a row. This program was proposed to Congress on the basis of affordability, but the price tag of the latest ships is approximately 250% greater than the original price estimate. We have increased congressional oversight of this program; but, particularly in light of the passage of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 in May, the first legislative act of this committee should not be approving a unilateral increase to the end cost of this program. This is especially true since the Navy has not officially requested a change to the current legislation. Therefore, we were pleased that the committee agreed to support an amendment to strengthen section 121, regarding the LCS cost cap. The bipartisan amendment imposes additional requirements before any changes to the cost cap may go into effect. This amendment is intended to send the signal that this committee is serious about controlling costs, does not adjust cost caps lightly, and is determined that the Navy make a knowledge-based decision prior to procuring additional Flight 0 LCS vessels.

Additionally, we were concerned that the Administration seeks to terminate F–22 fighter aircraft production at 187 despite General Norton Schwartz's (Chief of Staff of the Air Force) public statement that 243 F–22 aircraft are necessary to support the National Military Strategy with moderate risk. We are pleased that the committee adopted an amendment to provide $368.8 million advance procurement funding for twelve additional F–22s. We believe that continuing F–22 production is not only necessary to meet military requirements, but also sustains a critical sector of the defense industrial base and provides over 95,000 direct and indirect jobs at a time when our economy is struggling through recession.

We are disappointed that the committee carried a $327 million reduction to the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS) program. This represents the fifth consecutive funding cut to the FCS program totaling over $1 billion. While the committee has scrutinized the FCS program in a bipartisan manner since 2004, including looking at the survivability of the Manned Ground Vehicles, we have never questioned the validity of the need for the Army to modernize and replace a combat vehicle fleet that is in excess of 30 years old. Our concern is that there is still much information that the committee needs from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) so that we can make informed decisions. We believe that OSD has not provided the appropriate level of information to justify another funding reduction to the program. We believe that if the committee's assumptions about unobligated balances are incorrect, or if OSD has already targeted those funds for higher priorities, then the Army will be forced to cover termination liability out of the core FCS program. This would further delay future capabilities that our war-fighters need. Now that OSD has decided to provide proper oversight of the program, we expect to receive all the required information and analysis so that we can support and fully fund the program in the future.

*Military personnel*

As a nation, we owe more than our gratitude to the brave men and women in uniform and their families, past and present, for the

sacrifices they make to protect our freedom. Republicans tried to honor that commitment during consideration of H.R. 2647.

However, for the second year in a row the Democrats failed to enact a Republican amendment to increase payments to military surviving spouses and children, which would have repealed the Survivor Benefit Plan–Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (SBP–DIC), or "widow's tax," and would have provided for concurrent receipt of retirement pay and Veterans Affairs disability benefits for all military retirees. The amendment would also have extended TRICARE to Guard and Reserve members who are already receiving early retirement.

Our disappointment extends further to when the Chairman immediately ruled the amendment out of order, and the majority quickly moved to table a challenge of the ruling of the Chair. We do, however, appreciate that the chairman subsequently allowed a meaningful discussion on this important issue.

We are outraged that in the "Year of the Military Family," where the House leadership has spent over $1 trillion on the Troubled Asset Relief Program, wasteful spending in the Stimulus Package, and bailouts of failed corporations such as GM and AIG, this same House leadership working through the Budget Committee did not see funding $36 billion on concurrent receipt and the repeal of SBP–DIC as a priority. As a result, the use of the reserve fund established in the concurrent budget resolution to provide for concurrent receipt and the SBP–DIC repeal was an empty promise to our veterans and their families.

*Detainees and the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba*

The committee has no greater responsibility than providing for the safety of our forces and the protection of the homeland. With respect to detainee affairs, the committee could have done more to meet these responsibilities. We appreciate the Chairman's commitment to work with us to include an amendment that prohibits the release of detainee photos subject to the Freedom of Information Act, which the President determined—if released—would risk the safety of U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. We believe the committee should do everything possible to see that these pictures are not released. While the committee did adopt an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to report on how providing detainees in Afghanistan Miranda rights will affect the safety of our forces and impact U.S. operations in Afghanistan, the committee failed to adopt language that would prohibit detainees from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba from being transferred or released into the United States. The committee also failed to include an amendment that would require the approval of State legislatures and Governors prior to the release or transfer of Guantanamo detainees into the United States. We believe the American people do not want these detainees brought to the sovereign territory of our country. We are disappointed that the committee chose not to give Congress the power to carry out the will of the people.

*Transparency and Defense oversight*

Finally, we believe that to carry out our constitutional mandate to raise and support the armed forces, the committee expects a

transparent and open relationship with the Department of Defense where the independent views of the Service Chiefs are represented to the Congress by the civilian senior leadership in a timely manner. That is why we are disappointed that the committee did not fully adopt an amendment that would have provided a statutory framework for the Service Chiefs to provide their independent view to the Congress.

As a nation, we face a multitude of threats to our way of life and our national security interests. As legislators, we must accept that it is our duty to ensure that our men and women in uniform, who have bravely volunteered to serve our nation, have the best available tools at their disposal to combat those threats and protect those interests. This bill goes a considerable way in demonstrating this committee's resolve, but we can—and should—improve it.

We owe that much to our men and women, who answer the call in defense of our nation.

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON.
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT.
MAC THORNBERRY.
W. TODD AKIN.
J. RANDY FORBES.
JEFF MILLER.
JOE WILSON.
FRANK A. LOBIONDO.
ROB BISHOP.
MICHAEL TURNER.
JOHN KLINE.
MICHAEL ROGERS.
TRENT FRANKS.
BILL SHUSTER.
CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY.
DOUG LAMBORN.
ROB WITTMAN.
MARY FALLIN.
DUNCAN HUNTER.
JOHN FLEMING.
MIKE COFFMAN.
TOM ROONEY.
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE SILVESTRE REYES

I strongly support H.R. 2647, and I am particularly pleased that the measure included important provisions which affect our nation's civil servants. As reported by the Committee, the measure would roll back both the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) and the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS).

The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) shares jurisdiction with the House Committee on Armed Services over Department of Defense (DOD) civilian intelligence employees and DCIPS. As chair of the HPSCI, I wanted to provide additional comments about DCIPS and the rationale behind the provisions included in H.R. 2647.

In a joint letter to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair, the Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence expressed their concern about the implementation of the DCIPS pay system. DCIPS would replace the existing General Schedule pay scale with a system of pay bands. This pay-banded system has been misleadingly named "pay-for-performance."

For the past three years, the HPSCI has expressed concerns that this compensation system lacks transparency and accountability, and could have an adverse impact on minorities. The HPSCI is also concerned that the system was developed without sufficient consultation with employees in the Intelligence Community. Further, the pay system is being implemented across the Intelligence Community without regard to the needs of different career fields or mission needs of the various intelligence agencies. In 2003, the HPSCI objected to the implementation of a similar program at the Central Intelligence Agency out of concern that it would have an undesirable impact on the workforce.

The HPSCI continues to be concerned that the implementation of such a system has been rushed and that there has not been adequate time to ensure managers are properly trained. Human resources personnel have raised concerns that they do not have final policy guidance and that they will not have sufficient time prior to implementation to ensure all employees receive training. Recent training events have demonstrated that managers need more practice and guidance in determining performance objectives under the systems.

I support the idea of rewarding performance but believe that the current performance bonus system has not been effectively used. As someone who worked under the current civil service system, I know all too well that it has flaws and needs improvement. The Director of the Office of Personnel Management has indicated his intent to reform the civilian personnel system across the entire federal gov-

ernment. As such, I believe that the most prudent course of action would be to delay the implementation of DCIPS while a new, government-wide system is developed.

SILVESTRE REYES.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE ROB BISHOP

It has become readily apparent in this year's defense budget and authorization process that the Obama Administration has taken a haphazard approach to cutting several important defense programs, such as missile defense programs, and the F–22 fighter. At a time when the Administration is spending upwards of a trillion dollars on everything else BUT defense, I feel compelled to raise a voice of warning.

Missile Defense Cuts (GMD and KEI): I strongly oppose the cuts proposed by Secretary Gates and President Obama to missile defense programs such as Ground Midcourse Defense (GMD) and Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI). It seems that the "savings" from these cuts, at $1.8 billion, are rather small in comparison to the lost opportunities for further research and development in improving our defense of the homeland against emerging and future missile threats which will have implications on our ability to adequately defend our homeland a decade and two decades from now. These cuts will also have a devastating impact on the defense industrial base, particularly with regard to large defense solid rocket booster production. If these decisions are allowed to stand, practically every program associated with solid booster production will be decimated with significant negative long-term implications for our future defense readiness. It seems as if no one at DoD has been paying attention to the cumulative impact of these different programmatic budget decisions on the solid rocket booster industrial base as a whole. It also seems wasteful and, frankly, ridiculous that DoD and the Missile Defense Agency will not proceed with a planned booster test firing in September of this year with the KEI program when the booster has already been produced and delivered to the test site at Vandenberg AFB. Even if KEI termination is upheld, it makes perfect sense to move forward with this test that has already been bought and paid for by U.S. taxpayer investment since 2004, and which could result in a significant harvest of scientific data for use on future defense projects.

F–22 Program: Defense Secretary Robert Gates' decision to terminate this next-generation fighter program at 187 aircraft is simply not supported by any objective military analysis. When the F–22 program requirement was first established, it was based on procurement of 750 aircraft. That number has been constantly whittled away until Secretary Gates asserts that 187 are sufficient. We have repeatedly requested that the Department provide the Committee and members with analysis upon which this budget decision was based. That analysis has not yet been provided, leading to a strong indication that it is a budget drill, pure and simple. I am pleased that a majority of Committee members supported an amendment to restore F–22 long-lead procurement funding for 12 additional aircraft in FY10. There were strong indications during

markup that many members, a good majority on both sides of the political aisle, would like to have supported additional F–22 production, and some members otherwise disposed to support the amendment voted no due to concerns about the offset to defense environmental accounts.

It is also ironic that, at a time when the Obama Administration is spending hundreds of billions in tax dollars to create jobs and put people back to work, that it would be so intent on cutting the F–22 program which is responsible for approximately 95,000 direct and indirect jobs in most of the 50 states. These are good jobs that are producing a vital defense weapons system to protect our homeland as well, which will now be lost unless funding is restored.

One of the most disturbing recent developments on the F–22 is the release of a letter signed by Air Force Combat Commander, General John D. W. Corley, USAF, in answer to questions asked of him by U.S. Senator Saxby Chambliss, which authoritatively states that there are NO studies which support Secretary Gates' number of 187 aircraft. In this letter, a copy of which I include following these remarks, General Corley maintains that 250 aircraft are necessary to ensure U.S. Air Superiority at a "moderate risk" level. The Secretary of Defense also apparently developed his F–22 termination plan without consulting with Air Combat Command, as further outlined in the letter. It is only common sense that the Secretary should at least have consulted with and seriously considered the professional and technical views of the very operational command tasked with air superiority requirements both during peace and wartime operations.

I have included a copy of this letter so that the public will have access to this information. I urge Secretary Gates and my colleagues to work cooperatively on an F–22 termination plan that is reasoned and based on real military requirements and analysis; not budget drills. There is nothing more fundamental to the future prosperity and very survival of America than the United States military. Everything else is a corollary to that fundamental principle. It is my profound hope that we work together over the next 3 to 4 years to build the additional F–22s until we reach the 240–250 numbers that Air Force planners have repeatedly stated are absolutely necessary.

Enclosure.

ROB BISHOP.

**COPY**

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR COMBAT COMMAND
LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA

OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER
205 DODD BOULEVARD SUITE 100
LANGLEY AFB VA 23665-2788

JUN 9 2009

The Honorable Saxby Chambliss
416 Senate Russell Office Building
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510-1007

Dear Senator Chambliss

Thank you for your letter and the opportunity to comment on the critical issue of F-22 fleet size. At Air Combat Command we have held the need for 381 F-22s to deliver a tailored package of air superiority to our Combatant Commanders and provide a potent, globally arrayed, asymmetric deterrent against potential adversaries. In my opinion, a fleet of 187 F-22s puts execution of our current national military strategy at high risk in the near to mid-term.

To my knowledge, there are no studies that demonstrate 187 F-22s are adequate to support our national military strategy. Air Combat Command analysis, done in concert with Headquarters Air Force, shows a moderate risk force can be obtained with an F-22 fleet of approximately 250 aircraft.

While OSD did not solicit direct input from Air Combat Command, we worked closely with our Headquarters in ensuring our views were available. We realize the tough choices our national leadership must make in balancing current warfighting needs against the fiscal realities our Nation faces.

The F-22, a critical enabler of air dominance, plays a vital role and indispensable role in ensuring joint freedom of action for all forces and underpins our ability to dissuade and deter. Thank you for your continued support of the US Air Force and Air Combat Command.

Sincerely

JOHN D.W. CORLEY
General, USAF
Commander

*Global Power For America*

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

The Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program for the National Guard and Reserve was signed into law by President Bush on January 28, 2008. Section 582 of the 08 NDAA designated the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness as the executive agent for the program. The Guard and Reserve components have continued to expand their reintegration programs—taking full advantage of, and collaborating with, other federal, state, and local agencies and volunteer organizations to provide a robust set of services and support at locations, to the extent possible, where the military member resides. However, additional improvements are necessary.

The funding requirements as directed through DoD policy must continue to be obligated as long as the National Guard and Reserve remain an Operational Reserve and not a Strategic Reserve.

Existing service-specific limitations also preclude individuals from full access to reintegration assistance in certain geographic locations. For example, a Marine reservist from Minnesota coming off of mobilization orders and returning home may not have access to a Marine Yellow Ribbon Reintegration event in his or her home state. In these circumstances it would be beneficial for every service or component to be able to administer the program to members of any service or component, and receive adequate funding to cover any cost overruns.

The promotion of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration program has improved, but there is still room for growth. It is understood that the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness is developing media to promote the program, including a website, pamphlets, and standalone briefings. In addition, the office is also developing a web-based Decision Support Tool, which will provide interested personnel the ability to find the date, locations, and types of reintegration events. It is imperative these programs are seen through to fruition.

JOHN KLINE.

## SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

In the last week, we have heard the clearest statements yet on the intent of the Air Force and Defense Department to use the QDR as a mechanism for reducing the size of the fighter force. Despite past promises to provide a solid plan to sustain the current requirement for 2,200 fighters and pledges that the proper analysis would be done before making a decision, last week's comments by the Chief of the Air Force were very clear.

Without a shred of analysis being provided to Congress or any evidence that shows current plans meet current reality, the Air Force dismissed the idea of providing real life aircraft to real life Airmen. Instead, we have been asked, once again, to hold our breath and wait.

As two wars are being fought and the security of our homeland remains vital, the Department planned to retire 253 aircraft and invest in new aircraft that will be, in the words of the Air Guard's top officer, "late to need."

Congressman LoBiondo and I have continued to work with the Chairman and Ranking Member and the great staff here to get answers from DoD. Unfortunately, the silence has been deafening.

And now, without analysis and based on flawed assumptions of expectations that cannot be met, the Air Force has dismissed out of hand the only clear solution to our impending fighter gap.

The amendment from Congressman LoBiondo and I make certain that a full and thorough examination is performed by the Department. The analysis must be done outside of the vacuum of the QDR and based in the reality of the world we live in today, not the one we hope will be here ten years down the road.

I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for all of his hard work on the fighter gap issue. And I look forward to continuing to work with him to find the right solution for the fighter shortfall.

GABRIELLE GIFFORDS.

## SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

This is a landmark bill for DoD energy legislation that builds upon last year's successes and sets a more clear road to a renewable, responsible energy future.

This year's bill will enhance reporting requirements, speed-up development of bio-fuels, grow the fleet of hybrid and electric vehicles, encourage the continued use of geothermal energy, and kick-start the office of operational energy.

For too long, we as a nation have approached energy security strictly through the prism of environmental detriment. However, operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have shown clearly the real-life human cost of our dependence on a long and insecure energy supply line. We have learned the hard way that we need to be lighter and faster on the battlefield as well as off.

As we continue to move forward on smarter, enterprise-wide solutions for energy security, we take convoys off the road and reduce our dependence on foreign fossil-based fuels. This progress saves lives and saves money.

I am proud to have worked with Congressman Andrews on a biofuels provision in this bill and with Chairman Ortiz on a number of other vital pieces of language that will help move DoD and the country toward a responsible energy future. They understand as well as I do the importance of this issue.

I also want to thank Eryn Robinson on the Committee staff for allowing us the opportunity to forward this important priority.

I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman Ortiz and the other Members of this Committee to pass some truly comprehensive reforms in DoD energy.

GABRIELLE GIFFORDS.

○